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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

A dilemma faces those who are responsible for the administration of public education in Ohio's independent suburban school districts. This involves conflicting values and interrelated problems. Difficult choices which involve the sacrificing of one educational value in order to achieve others seem to be required.

These suburban school districts are those independent of direction of both the office of the county and of the central metropolitan city. Many of them are small city districts. The remaining districts became exempted villages when this was still possible in Ohio. In either case, a common factor among these districts is that they are controlled by a locally elected board of education which is responsible to and assisted by no other higher authority than that of the state. Within the delegation of authority and responsibility from the state, they are free to determine educational policies for their communities.

In many respects, these districts offer programs of education which are among the best in the state. Commonly, their community support, administrative leadership, teaching staffs, and student's ability are all strong. Financial resources devoted to public education are in many cases among the highest in the state. In spite of these advantages, however, many of these districts have a weakness of concern to administrators, teachers, and members of the community.
The problem lies in the fact that some of those services and programs which are generally accepted as necessary for a complete educational program are not found in many of these districts. Special education programs for exceptional children are frequently either lacking or only partially effectuated. Curriculums of these districts generally are excellent so far as they go. Often, however, they have not had the horizontal and vertical extensions considered desirable for a complete educational program.

Many of these suburban districts are aware of their needs. Many have more than adequate financial resources to provide for these services, and little doubt exists that community support for increased offerings exists or would exist as the people of the community became fully aware of the need. Why then are these districts not doing a better job of providing services?

Much of the answer to this appears to be the result of the small pupil population of these districts. While 16 per cent of the children in a normal school district need special educational opportunities, these children represent an amalgamation of many distinct types of special needs. Each type is found in an average of 2 per cent of the total population. This figure will be documented in Chapter II of this report. Thus, in order to have a class of children with certain special needs, a rather large pupil population base is required.

Independent suburban school communities prize their autonomy. The citizens of these districts often feel that their schools are superior to those of the large metropolitan city adjoining them. They
value the intimate involvement with the school and its affairs that the
face-to-face contact of the community makes possible.

This then is the dilemma. Some school programs and services
require a large pupil population for economical operation. Members of
suburban communities often want and expect a full program of educational
services for the children of their district. Yet, values are perceived,
and appear to exist which require the retention of the intimate nature
of the small autonomous school district.

The research reported in this paper is designed to report facts
which will indicate that this dilemma is not as harsh as it appears.
In essence, the study is undertaken in the faith that it is possible to
devise a method by which districts in the close geographic proximity of
a metropolitan area can cooperate to attack those problems that are
complicated by the size of the district. It is anticipated that means
for this cooperation will be such that full independence can be
retained by these districts. It is believed that in the absence of
some solution of this sort the autonomy of the suburban districts may
be sacrificed in order that full educational services to all children
can be provided.

The Research Plan

This type of research is somewhat unusual in educational
administration. Some writers describe it as creative research. Whitney
describes this kind of research as follows:

It may crystallize in a specific problem which may be treated
in terms of hypothetical solutions, the getting of experi­
mental evidence, and the final acceptance of worth-while
generalizations. For example, in many modern cities, as in
Denver, the need arises in the minds of a few far thinking citizens for something other than the usual geometric arrangement of streets and buildings in the business district. A civic center is conceived and its production becomes a definite city problem. Reflective thinking is continued by individuals and committees in terms of this solution or that, until hypothetical plans are adopted and investigated experimentally in terms of former experiences and of similar activities in other communities.\(^1\)

Creativity as it is expressed as a function of administration is the designing and building of organizations in which the fullest potentialities of the members may develop. If blocks of structure or human relations, lack of materials or limitations of purpose, exist they must be removed. This is a job of administration. This study is addressed to the problem of blocks interfering with the best possible program of education in the independent suburban school situation.

**Similar Research**

Research into the problems of providing full services for schools has tended to be focused upon the very small rural district. Factors such as sparsity of population, inadequacy of tax base, and the limiting nature of small enrollments have been documented. These factors have led researchers to recommend district reorganization as the most promising solution to the problem. This solution has been further supported by evidence of curricular needs in the small rural schools.

The suburban school district presents a special problem. The importance of the problems of districts of this type has been emphasized

---

by the increase in the proportion of the population living in suburban areas, and the rapidity with which this growth has taken place. Differences, both of an objective and of a psychological nature, characteristic of the patrons of the suburban district have not been widely considered. Providing organizational structure which will utilize fully the capacity to create desirable educational services is difficult for any district. The special difficulty and particular problems of the suburban school district have received only slight consideration.²

Some attention has been given to developing concepts of the intermediate administrative unit. Research and good practice have established a trend toward emphasis upon the provision of services to the quasi-corporate district as the desirable function of the intermediate district. Trillingham,³ Butterworth,⁴ Dawson,⁵ Hardesty,⁶ and Bozarth⁷ give evidence of this trend.

The origin of the present study lies in the belief that research to determine possible opportunities to combine the above problem and trend to the benefit of educational organizational patterns is desirable. Little research focused upon the suburban school district has been done. No generally accepted principles for the solution of the special problems of this type district have been formulated.

The first purpose of this study is to bring empirical evidence to bear concerning the problems and needs of this type of district. The second is to suggest, in terms of the evidence, ways in which districts might cooperate as proposed in the research.

Some reinforcement for the need and pertinence of such a study can be drawn from various sources. Rinehart, in his dissertation, suggests the need for work in the area in his conclusion that,

There is also a growing conviction that community schools, after effective reorganization, need the supplementary leadership and services of an intermediate "service center" to provide those phases of the educational program that might otherwise be difficult to realize at the local level. The goal is to establish a means by and through which two or more schools can share services that are available at the intermediate level without surrendering their local community autonomy.  

Speaking of the independent suburban district, The Report of the Commission on School District Organization makes a similar point. This report says, "Even where local districts are adequately organized, there

---

are programs and services which demand co-operative action among
districts, which demand an areawide approach."\(^9\)

Specifically then, this study is designed to focus upon the
independent suburban school district. Independence in this sense refers
to the fact that these districts are a part neither of the central core
city nor of the existing county school district. Their suburban status
will be defined in such a way as to limit the districts to those within
metropolitan areas. The study investigated the feasibility of a form of
organization which will enable these districts to provide services,
achieve economies, and utilize personnel through cooperative action.
This investigation was delimited solely to activities which the districts
could not do or could not do as well alone as they might conjointly.

**Questions to be Answered**

In pursuing the objectives of this study, answers were sought to
the following questions:

1. Are superintendents of independent suburban school districts
   in Ohio satisfied with the provision in their district of

   a) extensions or adaptations of the conventional educational
      program in order to meet the specific needs of individual
      students?

   b) curriculum development activities designed to study and
      improve the quality of educational services presented?

   c) specialized professional personnel qualified to perform
      various pupil personnel services?

   d) economical business administration practices?

\(^9\) opi. cit., p. 294.
2. Are there differences in the viewpoints of superintendents of independent suburban school districts which vary in accordance with the size or wealth of the districts they serve?

3. What blocks are identified by superintendents of these districts as hindering the achievement of the level of educational services they desire for their districts to provide?

4. Would cooperative or joint action be perceived by these superintendents as a promising solution to their problems?

Assumptions

The assumptions upon which the hypothesis is built are listed below:

1. That the suburban school district is administered in a matrix or problems which are, to some degree, specific to that situation.

2. That blocks do exist which tend to hamper the independent suburban school district from providing the full range of services which are desired by many of its constituents.

3. That there are values existent in the nature of the independent suburban school district which argue against the solution of this problem through either annexation to the core city, or through the reorganization of suburban districts into much larger units.

4. That existing practice and legislation relative to district reorganization is not readily applicable to problems of the independent suburban school.

5. That the research herein proposed will have greater validity if done on the basis of a single state (Ohio). Since education is a function of each of the sovereign states, each state has characteristics of organization and structure peculiar to its circumstance. For this reason, proposals for modification of programs must be made in terms of the existing structure and particular needs of each state.

The above assumptions provide a foundation upon which the hypothesis of the study may be based. As previously established, the hypothesis of research of this type properly is stated in the form of a
hypothesised solution to an established problem. The feasibility, practicality, and acceptability of this solution is tested through the research process.

The problems have been discussed. They grow from the following circumstances—

1. Many independent suburban school districts seem presently to be blocked from providing as complete a program of education as their superintendents believe is necessary and desirable.

2. The primary cause is that relatively small pupil populations are characteristic of districts of this type.

3. The existing practice of meeting needs for special education through the utilization of outside agencies is not altogether satisfactory.

4. Community expectations are high in suburban areas. The schools are expected to provide all of the program and services presented by the central metropolitan school district.

Hypothetical Solution to the Problem

To contribute to the solution of the problem, the following hypothetical solution is proposed—

1. That school districts of the type described above engage in inter-district cooperative activity. Explorations of feasibility, practicality, and acceptability of such cooperation are to be construed broadly as follows:

   a) cooperation in joint research activities
   
   b) cooperation in curriculum development activities
   
   c) cooperation for horizontal curriculum extensions
   
   d) cooperation for vertical curriculum extensions
   
   e) cooperation to effectuate economies in the operation of the business affairs of the districts
f) cooperation for the joint provision of special education opportunities as needed by children in these districts

g) cooperation to employ and to utilize the services of a variety of specialized personnel whose services are necessary to the operation of a modern school district

Research Techniques to be Utilized

Population to be Studied

The sample population has consisted of the independent suburban school districts in the state of Ohio. Suburban status has been established as that of districts which exist within a metropolitan area. A metropolitan area is defined by the U. S. Bureau of the Census as, "... a county or group of counties which contains at least one city of 50,000 inhabitants or more." Inasmuch as the same census definition classifies cities of 25,000 or more existing within a metropolitan area as also being core cities, their coterminus school districts will be excluded from this study. The criterion of independence has been established as referring to districts served by no intermediate county district. This, in Ohio, limits the districts of the sample to those described by the Ohio Revised Code as either city or exempted village school districts.

For the purpose of gathering data relative to this study, a universe of the state of Ohio was used. This consisted of the superintendents of independent suburban school districts of this state.

---

Now the purpose of organizing data, the universe was divided on the basis of pupil population. Larger districts are identified as those with a pupil population in average daily membership in excess of 2,000. A second division of the sample was made on the basis of the present operational expenditures of the districts. Those districts classified as being relatively higher in present expenditures were those spending above $300 per year per pupil. This figure represents, roughly, the median level of per pupil expenditures for the State of Ohio in 1958. (State median per pupil costs for 1957-58 equals $301.32.)

Respondents

The respondents utilized for this study were the superintendents of schools for each of the districts identified. The superintendent was selected because of his status as the educational leader in the community. By virtue of the responsibilities of his office and the data available to him, it was felt that he was best qualified to be the spokesman for his district in providing the requisite data.

Methods of Obtaining Data

A questionnaire was devised and administered to the superintendents of those districts appropriate to this study. The first section of this instrument proposed a number of possible ways in which districts...
might cooperate. The second section was designed to give an opportunity for respondents to indicate the needs for special education services in their district. Further opportunity was given in which respondents could reflect existing status as well as their perceptions of needs for the utilization of personnel to serve special education needs. Finally, the superintendents were asked to indicate the degree of satisfaction or dissatisfaction they felt about the special education program of their districts. Where dissatisfaction existed, superintendents were asked to identify the reasons for the persistence of the unsatisfactory situation.

Treatment of Data

The data as described above were treated in order to provide a status picture of the problems, perceived needs, and resources for special education existing in the independent suburban school districts of Ohio. Interest in suggested cooperative action was also reported. Further treatment of the data was programmed in order to test whether or not significant differences in the opinions and interests of superintendents existed according to the types of districts they served. Comparisons were made between the opinions of superintendents of small districts with low expenditure histories, large districts with low expenditures, small districts which spent relatively large amounts on their educational program and large, wealthy, districts. In making these comparisons the t-test for significance of difference between two proportions was utilized as the statistical tool.
Authorities were selected and asked to participate as members of a jury for the purpose of establishing criteria to be used in this study. A description of the process of selection can be found in Chapter V of this report. These criteria were designed to enable the writer to make recommendations of appropriate cooperative action for each of the metropolitan areas. Various criteria were selected or derived from the literature of the field. Jury members were then asked to react to and modify if necessary these criteria in order to make them appropriate for application to problems of inter-district cooperation. Members of the jury were also asked to consider the applicability of the proposed criteria for Ohio.

Two uses may be seen for these generalizations from empirical data. They provide a basis from which school districts may adapt plans for cooperative action. Secondly, they serve a heuristic function. As the people involved experience success in inter-district cooperation toward some ends, they presumably may be encouraged to look for new opportunities for mutual gain through cooperative action. Conservative implementation of programs of this sort seems preferable to the establishment of a crash program.

A more complete description of the procedures used in gathering and treating the data used in this research is presented in Chapter III of this report.
Operational Definitions

1. Suburban school district - A suburban school district is a school district which is located wholly or partly within a metropolitan area.

2. Metropolitan area - An area composed of the areas included within the boundaries of a county or counties which themselves contain or are contiguous to a city of a population of at least 50,000 inhabitants.

3. Independent school district - An independent school district exists in direct relationship with the people of the district and with the State Department of Education with no intervening intermediate district relationships.

4. Inter-district cooperation - The joint financing and administering of some activity, the benefits of which accrue to two or more districts participating in this shared activity.

5. Intermediate school district - An intermediate district is one which functions as an intermediate step between the local district on the one hand, and the State Department of Education on the other.

6. Subject matter consultants - Persons with training and experience which qualifies them to work with classroom teachers in order to assist them in the continual development and improvement of instruction.

7. Quasi-corporate school district - A district which actually directly operates schools.

Delimitations of the Study

This study is delimited to the state of Ohio. In the United States, education is clearly a function of the individual sovereign states. Each state has developed a structure for the administration of this responsibility. These vary as the perceptions of those originating the plans varied. Special circumstances in the individual states have played a part in causing these distinctions.
Since this study is related closely to the problems of working with and through the existing pattern of organization for public education, it must necessarily be closely aligned to a given state. Ohio, as the state most familiar to the writer, was chosen.

A second delimitation of the study is to suburban communities existing in standard metropolitan areas. Other small communities have similar problems to those discussed. Nevertheless, the hypothetical solution investigated is predicated upon several districts with similar problems existing in proximity to each other. As a general rule, this circumstance exists for independent districts solely in the vicinity of metropolitan cities. The concept of the standard metropolitan area was borrowed from the usage of the United States Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census.

Superintendents of schools were selected as the persons to provide data for this study. Opinions were gathered only from this source. This decision was made because of the nature of the opinions sought. Essentially, what was being asked was information to indicate a possible direction toward which leadership in the districts might be oriented. To be sure, there are sources of leadership in most districts other than the superintendent of schools. It is possible that interests of others might impel a district toward or away from the decisions implied in this study. While recognizing this however, it still seemed likely that no movement toward serious inter-district joint action could be successful without the enthusiasm and cooperation of the respective superintendents. Thus their reaction to the several proposals was deemed to be critical.
Summary

Creative research is that which is designed to test a hypothetical solution to a problem. Research of this type is reported in this paper.

The problem can be stated by the question: How can a full program of educational services be provided economically in suburban communities with relatively small pupil populations?

This problem might be attacked by making these communities a part of the school district of the larger metropolitan city they adjoin. It might also be attacked by consolidation of these autonomous districts into much larger suburban districts which would encompass several municipalities. Since both these possible solutions appear to be contrary to values frequently held by members of communities of this type, alternative suggestions are needed. This is the function of this study.

The alternative studied here as a hypothetical solution is based upon several assumptions. The central assumption is that these communities may be able to provide full educational programs while still retaining their autonomous status. In order to accomplish this it is suggested that these small pupil population districts voluntarily establish joint, shared, or cooperative institutional arrangements so that, where necessary, their combined populations may be served by a single resource.

A number of proposals for such voluntary action are suggested. These proposals are tested in this study to establish three things.
They are tested to see if they are feasible. This is defined as being perceived as desirable and useful by superintendents of schools of districts included in this study. The proposals are tested to see if they are practical. This is defined in terms of the problems of effectuating such joint or shared action. Distance, traffic, and the availability of facilities are aspects of the practical consideration. Finally, the proposals are tested to see if they are acceptable. This dimension is that such proposals, once implemented, would result in programs of educational value in the opinion of persons expert in these areas.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED RESEARCH AND LITERATURE

Progress comes as man seeks improved ways to organize his efforts in order to accomplish the tasks he has set for himself. In this instance, the task is to provide improved educational services in the independent suburban school system. This job is in the field of education. The primary responsibility for the study of methods of organization lies in the area of educational administration. Consequently, both a broad and a narrower field of experience are suggested as possible sources for previous thought and experience about the problem.

From a broad view, all of the work done to seek better ways of organizing collective effort has some pertinence. The entire science of political organization represents conscious attempts to find answers to problems of this sort. For the practical purposes of this investigation, it shall be assumed that the structure sought must be congruent with the basic democratic beliefs of our society as well as the republican nature of our political organization. It is beyond the scope of the present consideration to examine the desirability of this. Our problem is to seek organizational structure which is appropriate to the socio-political environment of our time. This structure will be strengthened
by considering, in its planning, some of the recent thought and research in the political science field.

Within the profession of education administration, much work has been done in seeking ways of providing better programs of education. Part of the job undertaken in this study is to winnow these previous attempts. Since the particular concern here is to suggest better methods of providing educational services in the suburban sectors of the metropolitan areas of Ohio, research and good practice toward the same end for the local rural school situation, for instance, seems pertinent. Consequently, the literature has been sifted to search for principles and experiences which seem to be adaptable from their original context into that of the metropolitan suburban school situation.

Two criteria were established to aid in determining the pertinence of the literature and research studied. First, the inclusions should aid in the understanding of the educational, political, social, and economic factors which affect the suburban school situation. Secondly, they should report attempts to provide organizational structure to aid in the solution of similar problems in related circumstances.

The Extent and Nature of Suburban Life in the United States

One of the salient characteristics of the findings of demography in the United States in the post-war period has been what has been called the flight to the suburbs. This seems to have been initiated by the war-caused housing shortage, stimulated by the tendency toward larger families, and sustained by the twin factors of improved
standard of living for our people. The results have been dramatically
evident by mass construction. Real estate developments have sprung
almost overnight from corn fields.

While the increased population of the nation has played a part in
this suburban movement, the growth exceeds this. A new pattern of
expectations and a new pattern of desire on the part of millions of
Americans has sparked this movement. The Editors of Fortune in The
Exploding Metropolis have presented an easily readable overview of this
phenomenon. They point out that between 1950 and 1955 the total number
of people in the country's metropolitan areas increased by 12 million,
growing from 84,500,000 to 96,100,000. During this same period of time
within the city limits of these areas the number increased by only
2,400,000. In some cities a decrease in population was registered.

Fortune's Editors say,

Clearly, the norm of American aspiration is now in suburbia.
Here is the place to enjoy the new leisure, and as more people
make more money and spend less time making it, the middle-
class identification with suburbia will be made more compelling
yet.

The movement to the suburbs represents more than just an attempt
to find enough space to build the necessary dwelling units to house our
increasing population. People move to the suburbs in the hope that
there they will find a new way of life and a more satisfactory place to
live and to raise their families.

---

1The Editors of Fortune, The Exploding Metropolis (Garden City,
The magnitude of this emigration, however, has tended in many places to create problems which frustrate the aspirations which have led to the movement in the first place. Municipal services are overwhelmed. Garbage goes uncollected, sewers are not built fast enough to keep up with the growth, police and fire protection is diluted dangerously. These problems, partially at least, are problems of time lag or what industry calls lead time. This is that lapse between when a need is apparent and plans drawn, and when the completed project is ready. Of greater concern are the problems growing out of the vast inertia of social institutions. Rural governmental organization, rural school systems, and rural patterns of voter representation may inherently not be capable of solving the problems of suburbia.

Suburban school problems have been discussed in the Study Guide for developing the Future Status of the District Superintendency. The authors discuss the hopes of those coming to the suburban situation.

The problems of providing these services require the best thinking and leadership available if the hopes of the people for a better way of life are to be fulfilled. They must be carried out with the same creative imagination and the same bold conception that transforms a potato field almost over night into thousands of new dwelling units. The whole problem of developing a full satisfying community life, and particularly that of adequate schools are problems that confront the district superintendency in suburban areas.2

Suburban life then must be accepted as a dynamic part of American life. Most of the impulses which drive it are praiseworthy. The

---

aspirations of those moving to the suburbs should be achieved. It becomes clear that the problems involved in proving high quality education for the children of the suburbanite are valid, timely problems of education and need careful attention.

The School in the Suburban Setting

Three types of school districts are found in Ohio's suburban school circumstances. The first of these is the local school district. This district is a part of a county school district and, as a result of this, may receive supervisory aid, special services, consultative help as well as administrative assistance from the county office. Frequently it has been the case that the most overwhelming population surges into suburban areas have occurred in areas in which the school district is a local district. In cases of this sort the problems have been grave as inadequate buildings, staff, transportation facilities, and tax resources have been swamped by sheer numbers of children. These problems are outside the immediate concern of this study, however. Our question concerns available administrative machinery to make possible a full program of services. The answer for the local district must be affirmative. The county intermediate district is tending increasingly to accept a role of a service agency. While in practice in many cases, the opportunities available to the local district are few, the tide of practice is running toward increased services. Hope for aggressive service resource units from the county can be held. Particularly in the metropolitan areas is this becoming common.
The now obsolescent\(^3\) but still vigorous exempted village school district and the small city district comprise the remainder of the suburban school districts. There are, in addition, some rather large city districts in the suburban areas, but they will be disregarded in this study. Typically, the small independent (of county control) suburban district has been in existence for a long time. Generally, these areas were once villages which were near the core city. As the city grew, the villages became contiguous to or even surrounded by it. The movement to the suburbs affected these villages first in many cases. As a result they expanded sharply in population. However, only limited amounts of building room existed in many of the villages and when it was gone the surge of people went on into the open areas of the county beyond. This population growth frequently, while considerable, did not overwhelm the villages or change too radically the character of the population.

While little research has been done into the nature of the suburban school situation, already some evidence exists that the expectations, interest, support, and involvement of the patrons varies from that of either the large city or from the rural village. An American Association of School Administrators Report gives evidence of this by saying,

> Schools and their communities become closely tied. People who move from city to suburb are inclined to like suburban schools. The leadership resources are tremendous. Children and the kinds of educational opportunities

\(^3\)Ohio Revised Code (1953), sec. 3311.34.
available for them are major interests. PTA, child study groups, community associations, and many other similar organizations are strong and active. In every suburb schools are important to people.4

It is not uncommon to find the strong interest and support of this kind linked, in suburban areas, with relatively strong financial ability. Even in districts with little or no industrial complement to the tax base, high per-pupil valuations may be found. Frequently, these small independent suburban districts have a community tradition of good schools which encouraged people interested in good education to move to the village. This movement has then reinforced the existing pattern of expectation and support.

One of the problems of the suburban school is the small size of the districts. In 1957, for instance, there were, in the United States, 174 standard metropolitan areas. Within them were contained 7031 separately operating school districts.5 Ohio is no exception.

The independent suburban school then seems to be characterized by certain factors. Frequently high value is placed upon education by the patrons of the district. A tradition of good public schools exists. Often adequate to excellent financial support is available. And finally, the districts frequently are relatively small in terms of geographic area as well as pupil population. One fact stands out. The people want good schools.


Elements of a Good School System

What then are those factors which, taken collectively, result in these "good schools" which can and should be provided in the suburbs? In every respect it must be affirmed that they are no different than good schools anywhere else. Good schools are those which are located, organized, staffed, financed, administered, supervised, planned, and receive leadership to the end that the learning experiences they provide—their curriculum—contribute as effectively as possible to the wholesome development of each child as an individual and as a member of society.

The people who live in suburbs tend to have a protective feeling about their schools. They frequently feel that their schools will be "good" at least in part to the extent that they retain their autonomy. Support for this position can be marshalled. McLure says "Extreme bigness does something to the school, to the relations of pupils and teachers, and to the relations of parents to the school. Some of the vibrancy in 'community interest' is either handicapped or lost."^6

Eight characteristics of satisfactory schools have been identified by the Commission on School District Organization:^7

1. Desirable interpersonal relationships
2. Staff of a high quality
3. Teachers having a chance to teach with a minimum of outside pressure

---


^7American Association of School Administrators, pp. 105-119.
4. First rate principals
5. The help of specialized personnel
6. An educational program which meets the needs of all the children and youth who attend the school
7. Buildings designed to facilitate the teaching-learning process
8. Communication between the school and the community which builds a strong spirit of cooperation.

The Educational Policies Commission of the National Education Association indicated six characteristics that were present in desirable school districts:

1. That the district be large enough to permit the employment of competent administrative and supervisory services.
2. That the district serve 10,000 to 12,000 students for economical operation.
3. That the district be large enough to supplement locally the state foundation program.
4. That the district be organized into attendance centers so that children may attend schools with a minimum of necessary transportation.
5. That the district be related to other governmental units to achieve desirable cooperation.
6. That the district be representative of a natural social and economic unit.

The National Commission of School District Reorganization, Howard Dawson, and Roald F. Campbell all have established similar statements of desirable characteristics.

---


10 Howard A. Dawson, Satisfactory Local School Units, Field Study No. 7 (Nashville, Tennessee: Division of Surveys and Field Studies, George Peabody College for Teachers, 1934), pp. 44-60.

Consideration of these components of a good school system indicates that one of the critical factors is the number of pupils enrolled. Unless sufficient numbers of students are present, it is almost impossible to provide all of the requisite characteristics of good schools. This may be true even when there is an ample financial basis, eager community support, and strong professional personnel. Hamlin and Sumption highlight the problem while indicating a possible solution. They say,

We can expect that people will not long be satisfied with the service of . . . a school district as more comprehensive programs develop in schools all around it. They are likely to become restive about paying large tax bills for inadequate services. . . . some small districts have increased their chances of survival as independent units by extending the services of their schools. . . .

Worth McClure says, "Mushrooming suburban areas are encountering problems which seem to spill over local school district boundaries."13

It is clear from these considerations that one of the elements of a good school system is the amount and quality of special services which it provides. It is equally clear that this is a difficult problem for small school districts with a relatively small number of children who need any one of these various special services. The local district can turn to the county office. Through this intermediate administrative

---


unit the administrative process necessary to develop special services can be programmed on the basis of the several school districts comprising the county system. The small suburban independent district presently has no equivalent place to turn.

Special Services Provided by Good School Systems in Our Country

The question of identification of these special services which good schools are providing for their communities must be considered next. This area is relatively new, and even in the most advanced systems pragmatic experimentation with type, kind, degree, and methods of providing services is going on.

The services which need to be provided are determined by the needs of people. Statistics are available to indicate the incidence of need for special opportunities in unselected samples of the American population. Research reported by the National Education Association's Department of Rural Education indicates this incidence.\textsuperscript{11} Their figures show that 16 per cent of the children of our country are in need of special education opportunities. This total is made up from ten different classifications of need. The classifications run from that of the mentally gifted (2 per cent) to behavior problems of the socially unadjusted (2½ per cent). The blind and partially sighted

comprise a small segment (only two-tenths of one per cent), while incidence of the hard of hearing is relatively high at 3 1/2 per cent.

Campbell and Garafalo\textsuperscript{15} list what they describe as essential services which should be provided by school systems. They include the following which are designed in part to meet needs such as those indicated above.

1. Health services
2. Library services
3. Provision for audio-visual aids
4. Psychological services including testing
5. Guidance services
6. Corrective instruction for pupils having speech defects
7. Remedial reading programs
8. Physical and recreational activities
9. A system of cumulative records on pupils

Dawson establishes minimum standards for school districts as including, in the area of services:\textsuperscript{16}

a) supervision of attendance
b) specialized guidance and counseling services
c) psychological and psychiatric services
d) health services, including medical and dental inspection and examination, immunization, prevention and control of contagious and infectious diseases, physiotherapy, safety education and accident prevention, all of which depend upon the availability of professional personnel such as doctors, dentists, dental hygienists, school health nurses, physiotherapists, dieticians, physical education and safety specialists
e) library services and materials bureau
f) special teachers, particularly in such areas as art, music, and manual arts and crafts
g) special services and instruction for exceptional children, who, excluding the hard of hearing, may be expected to constitute ten to twelve per cent of the school population.


Providing this broad range of services presents real problems for all but the largest school districts. The 1954 Department of Rural Education Yearbook says,

As people develop educational programs related to the real needs of each community, they discover that there is need for services which are beyond the reach of most local school districts, even those which have been reorganized. The problem which community schools face is how to get these educational services at a reasonable cost while at the same time preserving local community autonomy.¹⁷

The intermediate unit is the source for the provision of these services in many cases. One of the outstanding programs of this type has been developed for the schools of Los Angeles County. C. C. Trillingham reports the following services available to schools of this county.¹⁸

1. visual aids library
2. operation of two junior camps and three senior camps as well as special schools
3. consultant in trades and industry education
4. psychologists and consultants
5. cooperative school library service—a central library, book mending, etc.
6. coordinator of speech education who provides diagnostic services
7. audiometer-telebinocular technician
8. health services including nurse-teachers; physical education consultants, corrective physical education specialists, school physicians, and dentists
9. curriculum development consultants
10. administrative and financial services.

¹⁷National Education Association, Department of Rural Education, 1954 Yearbook, p. iii.

It is readily apparent that some of the services listed above are appropriate to the function of the county district in its role as the intermediary of the State Department of Education. Many others are in the nature of services to local districts.

Many similar listings are available as more and more intermediate districts are providing educational services to their local districts. Regardless of the form they may take, it is essential that the services be based upon the needs of the districts. Needs are, however, what they are perceived to be. The expectations and aspirations of people are their final determinants. Studies in New York\(^1\) show that between 1926 and 1949 adjusted total school expenditures increased 54 per cent. During this time, however, expenditures for auxiliary services increased 100 per cent. This disparity reflects increases in demands for service. The budget for the district superintendencies during this time has risen from $991,000 in 1926 to $8,000,000 in 1948. The number of services provided has doubled. Some of these which have been added since 1926 include, among many, school psychologists, visiting teachers, remedial reading teachers, and guidance counselors.

The special services provided by good school districts are those designed to provide maximum opportunities to the children attending

\(^{19}\) "Rural Leadership and Service," pp. 21-23.
The 1948 Yearbook of the American Association of School Administrators puts it thus:

There is no way to apply the American concept of free public education for all children except to provide education for every child in accordance with his needs and capacities—physical, mental, and emotional. This is the right of all children. It is also necessary for society, since whatever benefits children today contributes wholesomely to the communities in which they as adults will live and work tomorrow.

Problems and Choices of the Small Suburban School System

The dilemma of organizational structure is clearly apparent in the case of the small independent suburban school. How are full educational services to be provided when the number of students served by the district is so small? Or, how can the number of students upon which planning and organization can be based be raised to practicable levels?

At present, several alternative choices are available to the board of education and school administration considering the problem. The suburb could annex to the core city. In many areas pressure to do so is being applied by the core city. This alternative would eliminate the problem, at least in its context of being a problem of the small independent district. Services could be planned on the large base of the entire city system. The suburb would no longer exist.

---

The second choice is to merge the school system with that of the core city. From the standpoint of the administration of public education this alternative is the same as the previous one. The small independent school district would cease to exist. The suburban community would, however, continue to maintain its separate identity for purposes other than public education.

A third alternative is that several of the independent systems could reorganize into a larger system excluding the core city. In essence this choice is very like avoiding joining "the city" system by creating a new "city system" in the adjoining areas. Suburban schools would still exist, but the administering district would represent several suburbs.

The districts could rejoin the county system. In this event they would no longer have exempted village or city status. In Ohio the procedure for accomplishing this is simple. The city or exempted village status is generally highly prized, however. Only in rare circumstances does it seem likely that the citizens of a district would prefer this alternative. This would not rule out the possibility though that as the county districts are strengthened and as they expand both in kind and quality the services they provide to the local districts, that public opinion might change relative to this alternative.

A final alternative is being exercised in some circumstances. The independent school district can contract with either the city or the county district for the provision of services which are available to schools within their areas. This plan has worked to advantage in
some instances. The difficulty seems to be that if all the independent districts in a metropolitan area attempt to meet their needs for services through this means, considerable expansion of facilities on the part of the unit providing the services would become necessary. While these districts are frequently happy to contract for services to the extent that their existing staff and facilities can handle the demand, doubt exists as to whether they would be willing to expand their facilities to handle sharply increased demands. Thus this alternative may be of more value to small independent districts in isolated regions. In metropolitan areas containing many small independent districts other solutions will need to be sought.

Limiting factors exist which mitigate against changes in school district organization. In considering problems of school district organization in Wisconsin, Jenson identified a number of problem areas as perceived by county superintendents.\textsuperscript{21} Those of this listing which would affect the acceptance of one or more of the alternatives listed above would include—

1. Complacency and aversion to disturbing the status quo.
2. Problems of attaching rural areas to urban school districts.
3. Fear of losing their voice in the operation of new district.
4. Reluctance of district school boards to give up their jobs.
5. Desire of people to preserve the small high school.

Values in the Preservation of the Autonomy of the Suburban School District

The dilemma which has been described loses much of its difficulty if one does not hold that the autonomy of the independent suburban school district should be retained. If this is not to be prized, then a merger with either the core city or the county district would quickly solve the problem of having sufficient numbers of students on which to base a program of services.

Values seem to exist, however, which can best be maintained in the suburban circumstance, through the retention of the independent nature of the suburban school. John Stuart Mill, in discussing problems of local government, argued for as great a measure as possible of local control of the affairs of a community. He said, in speaking of the tendency to use centralized governing agencies, that they frequently were engaged in "cutting small knots which there ought to be other and better ways of untying."22 The intimate knowledge of and concern with problems of neighbors tends to encourage their representatives to seek ways of untying knots. As the decision making process becomes more impersonal and further removed from neighborliness the knots are frequently cut. Government of this sort may give the impression of clean-lined efficiency; this may not, however, be the most satisfactory way of solving problems.

Campbell and Ramseyer establish the necessity for the professional and the citizen to work together in public education in order that the best possible program for the community can be developed. Ten principles are identified as contributing to this optimum circumstance. None of the ten imply per se any advantages to be gained by establishing large school districts. Five of the ten seem to be such as to imply that the more intimate human relations and contacts possible in the small district would aid in their accomplishment:

1. Only as lay citizens and professional school people work together can public education become what it ought to be.

2. Decision regarding what the school ought to be is an obligation which the lay citizen cannot side step.

3. Only as lay citizens learn to clarify problems and seek evidence upon such problems can public participation be constructive.

4. To succeed, public participation should take into account the values, ways of working, and organizational patterns of each community.

5. Public participation is developmental in nature: As lay citizens and school workers succeed in small tasks, they gain confidence and skill to bring such interaction to full flower.

The maintenance of independent status by suburban districts may make it easier for them to provide the good school system they desire. As has been suggested, one of the characteristics of many of those living in the suburbs is their interest in and aspiration for good schools. An opportunity to provide these schools and to lead the way in

public education is available in many of these districts. The desirability of this is recognized by Burke in suggesting that "differences in educational opportunity resulting from decentralization are unavoidable and should not be eliminated. The very fact that able and willing communities are free to pioneer, progress, and create makes possible the improvement of educational opportunities for all children." The intimate association of citizens with similar goals for public education in the relatively small suburban school district is an end-product, the creation of which is an objective of our nation's system of decentralized schools.

Danger must be recognized in pursuing the course the arguments above suggest, however. The heart of this argument is the contention that the school district should be kept as closely identified as possible with the community which it serves. Care must be taken in considering a given community to consider two points. First, what really is involved for purposes of public education in identifying a "community"? What are the critical factors which constitute a community? The second is that care be taken that what is recognized today as a "community" is not, in reality, fast becoming a neighborhood of a larger emerging community. More complete discussion of this point is developed by McLure.25


25McLure, op. cit., p. 20.
Basic Issues in the Development of the Modern Intermediate Unit

The history of the intermediate unit in American public education is one characterized by tenacity of existence coupled with modification of function. Campbell\textsuperscript{26} points out that the office of county superintendent has evolved from a position of clerk for the state whose responsibility was to collect statistics. The trend is toward rendering services to the local districts who cannot provide or are handicapped in providing these services for themselves.

The intermediate unit has pertinence for this study since the experience which has been gained in the provision of services to small quasi-corporate local districts is parallel to that of providing services to small quasi-corporate independent districts.

The basic issue is whether this service function is preferable or whether the county should become the basic unit for the administration of public education. This question is a variant of that which has been discussed in relation to suburban districts.

One body of thought about the question holds the opinion that the basic unit of school administration should comprise enough student population to justify all services necessary except for those provided by the state. The other opinion is that the basic unit for school administration should be the local community. To the extent that the small rural community is too small to provide for full services, the

\textsuperscript{26}Campbell, The Administration of Public Education, pp. 104-105.
county unit as its intermediate unit would be so organized as to assume this function. Those who favor the first alternative support the concept of the county unit as found in twelve states. Those holding the second belief favor supporting the emerging modern intermediate unit concept.

An excellent statement of the position of those who favor a modern intermediate unit was that of Butterworth. He said, "However, an important theory lies back of the intermediate district, namely, that, in order to retain local interest and initiative, the basic control of educational affairs should be left with the people of local communities and that the intermediate district should do only what the local districts cannot do."

Criteria for Desirable Intermediate Unit Function

The criteria which when applied to an intermediate district provide a basis for judging it as adequate in terms of its modern role may also be appropriate for a service agency for independent districts. For this reason attention needs to be given to these criteria.

In the Inter-District Study in New York, the intermediate district was conceived of as a federation or union of a suitable number of local

school districts so that services could be provided to each on a cooperative basis. Three criteria were established for the intermediate unit:28

1. The area should have a sufficient number of people that educational services, those now commonly accepted and those likely to be demanded in the future, can be provided economically, either separately or in cooperation with other districts, such as rural areas, villages, or cities.

2. The area should be sufficiently large that it can provide challenging opportunities in educational leadership.

3. The area should be sufficiently compact and socially cohesive so that citizens can be made to feel a keen sense of responsibility for the educational program.

This comprehensive study of the functions, organization, and operation of the intermediate unit in New York was designed to rehabilitate the operation of the intermediate unit. The objective was to establish functions and organizational structure appropriate for the intermediate unit at the present time. The Department of Rural Education reports New York research as finding:29

In order to be effective the intermediate unit requires the following:

a) A lay board of control with limited powers (Area Superintendency Council) to function primarily as a policy making and advisory group.

b) A representative lay body (school committee) elected by the people with responsibility for appointing the control board (Council) and reviewing and approving the budget.


29 National Education Association, Department of Rural Education, 1954 Yearbook, p. 146.
c) An administrative officer (Area Superintendent) selected by the control board and eligible for tenure after a successful probationary period.

d) An adequate staff of specialists selected by the superintendent to serve the needs of the Area.

e) Adequate fiscal support, both from state and local districts.

Additional consideration of the fiscal and economic aspects of a satisfactory intermediate unit can be drawn from research conducted by Thompson. He discusses technical problems of discerning the optimum size for both attendance and administrative units. The relationship which exists between the cost per pupil and the number of pupils enrolled relative to providing certain levels of educational services is explored. One of the findings of this study is that where a constant level of educational service is maintained, the cost per pupil declines to a point where the resultant size requires considerable increases in staff to coordinate and control activities. At this point the cost per pupil rises again. The implication here is that the economical intermediate unit or service agency would be that one which had enough pupils to achieve the lowest possible per pupil cost for services without having so many as to require too large an administrative effort.

The Trend in Function of the Intermediate Unit

The central concern of this study is to search for ways that small districts can cooperate to provide services which alone they

---

cannot provide or cannot provide as well. The trend in the modern intermediate unit certainly parallels this. Perhaps as good a statement to this effect as any was made by C. C. Trillingham.\textsuperscript{31}

The function of the county office under this professional program has been the champion of the little fellow of the smaller districts . . . to see to it that they (the people in these districts) can get an educational service comparable to what a good city program is able to do. We think it is an economy to do it through a central office because it certainly can be more expensive if every one of these districts try to do all of that for themselves. We try to lean over backwards to work under the philosophy that the center of gravity of education is within the local district. It is not in the county office. We do not try to run the districts—we try to serve the districts. We try to emphasize over and over again to our people that the local administrator, working under the local board and selected by the local people has the final answers. We are a service to them. We are resource people. We bring some special resources that they need and do not have on their staffs.

Frank Cyr, who was quite influential in New York's attempts to refurbish the intermediate unit for their state discusses the provision of special services to schools.\textsuperscript{32} He points out all of the needs for special services which school districts feel. In his view, the cooperation of a group of adjoining consolidated or community schools which recognize their common interests and realize that by working together as individual communities through a joint program they may employ specialists. It is this necessity for employing specialists to perform these needed services which highlights the need for inter-district cooperation.


\textsuperscript{32}Frank W. Cyr, "Cooperating for Better Rural Schools," \textit{Phi Delta Kappan} (October, 1954), 44-46.
Rinehart\textsuperscript{33} established trends for the intermediate unit in Ohio:

1. Reorganizing local and intermediate districts in terms of natural sociological community.

2. Accepting the concept that education should be organized around strong community schools.

3. Realizing that even after effective reorganization has been consumated a need exists for the supplementary leadership and services of an intermediate "service center."

4. The replacement of stress on clerical, inspectoral, and regulatory duties with a developing emphasis upon professional leadership and a functional program of educational services.

5. The cooperative development of specialized services provided by the intermediate unit. These are coming to be provided on a contract basis under some circumstances.

6. Increasing number and kinds of specialized services developing as people work together to redefine the role of the intermediate unit.

Cooper and Fitzwater\textsuperscript{34} give an extended treatment to the development of the modern intermediate unit. They point out that the change in the role ascribed to the public school has played a large part in this development. No longer are schools viewed by most people solely as being responsible for teaching the three "R's." Concepts of child development and life adjustment have altered the experiences the school must be prepared to present. This requires a much broader base of expertise than formerly was the case. This base in turn requires organizational structure to aid its functioning. California is cited as

\textsuperscript{33} Rinehart, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 87.

\textsuperscript{34} Shirley Cooper and Charles O. Fitzwater, \textit{County School Administration} (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1954), p. x.
a notable example of the developing service function of the intermediate
district.

Shared Services in New York State

Previously in this discussion the work which has been done in New
York has been referred to. A comprehensive study of the present situa­
tion, needs, and possible changes in organizational patterns was carried
on in this state recently. The result of this work has been a rather
complete overhauling of the intermediate unit concept. Major changes
in the size of the intermediate unit and the role which it is designed
to play have been initiated.

As a part of this work, the New York State Association of District
Superintendents, in 1949, authorized the appointment of a committee to
study the changing status of the district superintendency. Frank W. Cyr
was appointed as the director of the study.

Five functions were identified as comprising the role of the
district superintendent in carrying out his responsibility of assisting
the State Education Department:

1. Adaptation—helping schools grow
2. General supervision—acting as a consultant
3. Coordination among local districts and between state and
   local levels
4. Shared services—working with the Council and staff
5. Administrative procedures—decision-making and routine

Of these, number four was directed especially to the problem of
making special services available to districts which could not provide
them for themselves.
The "Council" referred to in the statement of the function is a body designed to enable representatives from all districts participating to have an opportunity to play a part in directing this function. The advisory nature of the Council is emphasized. Control over the educational program is sharply limited. That responsibility is reserved to the local board of education. Each participating local district has representation on the Council.

The district superintendent, as the executive officer of the Council, has the responsibility of administering the shared services. He has authority to organize shared services. He should gather data which gives evidence of the need for these. Once the shared services are organized, he plans for expansion of the program until all of the educational needs of the children in the area have been met.

In the New York plan the district superintendent performs a dual function. He is an officer of the state. Yet in the administration of the program of shared services he acts in another capacity—as the administrator of a resource center providing services on a shared basis to local districts in the manner and to the degree which they see as desirable. His status as a state officer is not designed to give him authority to instigate or require the use of any of these services.

The sharing of services in this plan is accomplished on an individual contract basis. Local districts which desire to participate and make use of any one or all of the services available through this agency contract for them and pay the proportionate cost. The utilization of one service does not carry any requirement of contracting for others. Through this mechanism, the determination of policy is
clearly reserved to the local board of education. The administrative structure of the district superintendency provides the mechanism and opportunity for the services to be available if they are desired.

New York has, through the establishment of this organization, made a significant step toward equalizing educational opportunity throughout the state. The children attending schools in small districts may have access to the same services as do their heretofore more fortunate brothers in the cities. Yet the structure and organization is such that the dilemma is dissolved. Control and autonomy is retained by the local school district. Cooperation between districts is organized on an equal basis with the decision to participate in the direction of the district function safeguarded to the local district.

A complete discussion of the structure of the Area superintendency, the function of the council, its organization and the operation of the superintendent as an officer of the state, an administrator of the council, and as a representative of local districts is available in the discussion guide written to effectuate the results of the study.35

Some Suggestions for Cooperative Action in Order that Full Services Be Available to All Children

The program in New York represents one attempt to utilize the idea of inter-district cooperative action as a means of solving the dilemma, i.e., to make possible full educational services to all children without requiring all school districts to be large school

35"Rural Leadership and Service," II.
districts. Various authorities and writers have indicated that desirable practices based upon this concept may be developed.

The Regents Inquiry in New York preceded by several years the adoption of the new intermediate organization. The thinking which resulted in some of the cooperative practices is foreshadowed in this study, however. At one point it is recommended that "... in order to strengthen the educational provisions for mentally and physically handicapped children, and, subject to state regulations, require adjoining districts to cooperate in the maintenance of such services."\(^\text{36}\)

This same report argues the position that the relation of the school to the community and the closeness of the school to the people are of primary educational significance. The conclusion is reached that the sacrifice of this intimacy in hopes of gaining increased educational "efficiency" is to be avoided. In the view of the authors, the cooperative provision of services requiring a substantial base of student population is both feasible and desirable. They stress the value of retaining the more intimate school-community situation.

Finally, it is recommended that the state encourage experimentation with the development of local cooperative service arrangements among school systems in large regional areas. The Inquiry also recommends that the school systems of a county or other appropriate area be permitted on the approval of the commissioner, to establish joint "cooperative service districts" to deal with commonly

found school problems as in the field of transportation, purchasing and other business matters. Such a unit might also deal with special education problems which extend beyond the powers or resources of the cooperating districts.\textsuperscript{37}

Wofford\textsuperscript{38} established three difficulties which exist in the small school system which hamper it in its attempts to provide services. While she wrote concerning the small rural school, the points seem to be appropriate to some small suburban schools:

1. The average local districts do not have sufficient financial resources to underwrite these special services which are always expensive.

2. Small school districts do not have enough pupils to justify an adequate program of special services.

3. Small school districts do not have the requisite administrative machinery to coordinate special services.

The desirability of cooperative action in the metropolitan areas is, of course, not limited to action regarding school programs. A ferment of thought and proposals relative to ways and means of accomplishing this is reflected in almost every daily paper published in metropolitan areas. The advocates of vast area-wide institutions claim possibilities of increased efficiency through a process of centralization of power and authority. Others, looking at the mushrooming size of the metropolitan area are concerned with the problem of retaining at least some of the features of small community self-government within the

\textsuperscript{37}Ibid., p. 109.

\textsuperscript{38}Kate Wofford, "Better Rural Education through Reorganization of the Administrative Unit and the Curriculum," Education in Rural Communities, Fifty-First Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1950), pp. 165-91.
larger city. Chicago's experimentation with decentralization of their tremendous school district is one example.

This concern was evidenced by Luther Gulick. In an address focused upon the problem of retaining some local autonomy, he said, "We also need to look much more carefully at the possibility of neighborhood quasi-political institutions within the great cities..."39

The Developing Theory of Special District Governments as an Integral Part of the American Political System

Perhaps the older concept of three levels of government is no longer accurate for our society? This question has been posed in the developing thought of political science. Americans are accustomed to talk in terms of federal, state, and local political levels. However, in the concern for solving problems of our complex society, many new forms of political organization seem to have features which might be adapted to problems of school district organization.

Bollens40 has developed the theory of special district governments to describe and to analyze the newer attempts to organize social


effort. He defines special districts as having the following characteristics:

1. They are organized entities.
2. They possess structural form.
3. They have a name, perpetual succession and rights to sue and to be sued.
4. They have officers who are elected or appointed by elected officials.
5. They have considerable degree of financial independence.\(^{41}\)

The special district government is an attempt to provide a higher level of services to people than has been possible through the agency of general local government. Such accepted structures as park boards and water conservancy districts are examples of these special district governments. They have come into existence to meet needs which the general local government either could not or would not undertake to meet.

Bollens says,

Despite the post–World War II upsurge in annexation by cities, the limits of most governments are rigidly or relatively inflexible. Such inflexibility is a crucial problem when the area of the general unit is smaller than the territory needing the service. . . . Furthermore, long-term contracts between general governments to handle a functional need in an area larger than a single unit, although increasing in number are not in general use. Therefore, when existing governments are smaller territorially than the area having a specific need, the district device is frequently utilized as a substitute for land absorption, consolidation of general units, or contractual agreements.\(^{42}\)

\(^{41}\)Ibid., p. 6.
\(^{42}\)Ibid.
While special district governments represent some centralization of government, they serve to encourage or make possible continued decentralization. They serve to centralize government only for the specific purpose for which this centralization is required. This then enables the continued autonomous operation of the local general government. The parallel circumstance in school district organization is the formation of some kind of organizational structure which would permit the solution of problems which are difficult or impossible of solution by school districts acting independently. This provision then strengthens the autonomy of the local district by removing a weakness which threatens its existence. The local district then can pursue its traditional decentralized function in those areas in which this decentralization is valuable.

Additional support for the maintenance of decentralized operations can also be drawn from some thinking in the field of industrial management. An example of this is given by Dale:

By 1975 we may well have a firmer belief in the superiority of decentralized action than we have today. Our large companies will continue, but their headquarters may become management companies aiding groups of manufacturers and distributors with advice in their final decision making . . . the large corporation may function as a consultant at the head office, as some already do.\textsuperscript{43}

Summary

Some literature and research has been reviewed in the search for empirical data and experience bearing upon the problem of providing full educational services in the small independent suburban school districts of Ohio.

Attention to the phenomena of the population movement to the suburbs indicates the factors which bear upon the school-community situation in the metropolitan areas. People living in the suburbs tend to want good schools. The demands they make, reflecting their conception of what good schools are, include a demand for a full program of educational services for all of their children. At the same time these people frequently identify good schools as those which retain their autonomy.

Modern trends in the development of the intermediate unit include the trend toward casting the intermediate unit in the role of a provider of services to relatively autonomous local school districts. Thus, the solutions which are being worked out in progressive intermediate units are solutions to similar problems to that of providing full services in the independent suburban school districts. In each case, people desire to provide full services based upon a sufficiently large student population to enable economical operation. In each case, many people desire to do so while retaining as much local autonomy as possible.

In the field of political science as well as in industrial management, decentralization is receiving an increasing amount of examination. More and more people are seeking to preserve values by decentralizing authority and responsibility to as great a degree as
Many feel that this can be best accomplished by centralization of only those functions which can be done best in this manner and by leaving all other functions decentralized to as great a degree as possible.

The research reported in the remainder of this paper is designed to aid in the development of optimum school programs. Its function will be to serve as a starting point for school districts desirous of providing higher levels of educational services through cooperative action. The perceptions of problems and needs of independent suburban school districts in Ohio as held by their chief executive officers will be determined. The thought and data reported in this chapter will be applied to the perceived problems in an attempt to find a way of practical cooperative action.
CHAPTER III

ANALYSIS OF METHODS AND INSTRUMENTS

This study is designed to focus on the independent suburban school district. The central idea underlying the assumptions on which it is based is that these districts frequently find it difficult to perform all of the functions, or provide all of the services, that the larger neighboring core cities provide. Further, the assumption has been made that the relatively small size of these districts is a critical factor of these problems.

The product of this study is in the form of an analysis of data about the component independent suburban districts of each of the metropolitan areas of the state. These data are required in order to establish evidence relative to hypothetical solutions previously established.

Each of the metropolitan areas of the state differ. Casual inspection indicates that they differ in geographical location, in size, and in relationships existing among their component districts. Empirical data is required to determine other kinds and degree of differentiation. Data of this sort, specifically focused upon the differences in the provision and opinion about school services were sought.

Differences in specific circumstances, however, need not necessarily preclude the existence of general principles relevant to
all of these communities. Thus, this study is designed to seek commonality while identifying diversity.

In thinking about the ends and means of this study one finds himself thinking of "needs." What is it that these districts need? What needs are not being met presently which might be met or met better through cooperative action? What are the expressions of need from the districts which exist in a common metropolitan area? What common needs do they have? These questions are central to this concern. In order to insure as clear an understanding as possible, it is necessary to define the need as used here.

Two interpretations have been made. In the first instance, need is considered as that which is perceived to be needed. This need is a component of desire for improved operation. That is needed which is felt to be necessary. Need in this sense is psychological in nature.

A second aspect of need can also be determined. This is more philosophical in nature. In this case, need is said to exist when practice varies from that implied by the objectives of the district. A district's philosophy may be such that the education of all youth is mandated. If this district makes no provision for the special education needs of handicapped children, this district varies in practice from its objectives. The extent of this variance is a measure of the amount of need in this instance. To be sure, objectives generally will be established so as to be ahead of practice. Need is built in, so to speak. This is another way of saying that districts tend to push themselves or to be pushed by their constituents so that they cannot
accept the status quo. In this sense, need always is present as the necessity for continual improvement always is present.

The Survey

Need, then, is the underlying basis upon which the study was planned. A status survey was designed to gather data. Specific objectives for this survey were established:

1. To determine what kinds of inter-district cooperative action would be perceived by superintendents as useful. In this case, superintendents were not to be asked to commit themselves to more than an expression of interest in further exploration of ways and means.

2. To determine the existing needs for special education programs and facilities in the independent suburban school districts.

3. To determine the degree to which superintendents of these districts perceive their programs for special education to be adequate.

4. Where superintendents feel that their program is inadequate to determine the opinions of these leaders as to the reasons for the existence of this inadequacy.

Development of Items

In order to meet these objectives, a questionnaire was developed and mailed to the superintendents of all independent suburban school districts in Ohio. A list of these districts and the questionnaire are included in the appendix.

That part of the questionnaire designed to meet the first objective was made up of questions developed on an a priori basis. Many ideas of possible ways in which districts might cooperate to improve their programs were collected. In part, these came from the experience
and concepts of the writer. Other persons interested in this study contributed their thought to the development of this list of proposals.

Categorization of Proposals

The list, as finally established, contained thirteen suggested ways in which districts might cooperate. These were proposed to the superintendents. They were asked if any of these proposals were, in their judgment, relevant and of interest to them. The group of proposals were classified into six categories, although this classification was not identified in the instrument. The categories were

1. cooperative action for research activities;
2. cooperative action for curriculum development activities;
3. cooperative action for horizontal curriculum extensions;
4. cooperative action for vertical curriculum extensions;
5. cooperative action to improve the kind and amount of special services offered by the districts;
6. cooperative action for more effective business operation of the district's affairs.

Survey objectives two, three, and four concerned special education. A number of items were included in order to gather data about the present status in each of the districts. Data concerning the numbers of children in each of those categories established by the Ohio Department of Special Education were requested. The source of these data was also sought. Secondly, a number of specialized personnel frequently utilized in special education programs were listed. Superintendents were asked to indicate which of these they presently employed or whose services were available to them. They were also asked to indicate
which personnel from this list they would identify as needed in their
schools either on a part-time or full-time basis.

Both the present status and the future plans of the districts in
the area of special education were objectives of the survey. In order
fully to meet the requirements of the objectives of the survey, it was
necessary to explore not only what the district presently was doing,
but also what immediate plans for improved programs existed.

Finally, two major opinion items were included. The first of
these was included because it was deemed necessary to have a measure
of the degree of satisfaction the leaders of the districts felt concern-
ing the program of special education as presently provided. Since a
basic concept behind the study is that ways can be found better to meet
some of the problems of school administration in these districts, it is
necessary continually to check to see if those responsible desire to
change. A modification of the Likert scale for measuring opinion was
used. Specific definitions were provided for each of the number values
to be assigned. The superintendents were asked to register opinions for
each of the eight categories identified by the Ohio State Department of
Special Education.

The second opinion item required the superintendents to indicate
their opinion as to why those areas in which they previously indicated
dissatisfaction are unsatisfactory. A form of instrumentation similar
to that just described was used.
Since the survey instrument was sent to all of the superintendents of the independent suburban school districts in Ohio, no sampling procedure was required.

Treatment of Data

One statistical test was planned. The districts studied were divided by two factors into four groups. These factors were pupil population and per pupil expenditure. In each case a high and a low group was established. Thus a given district might be high in population and low in expenditure, or any of the four possible combinations. The opinions of the superintendents were compared in order to judge whether opinions of the superintendents varied as the types of districts they represent vary. The statistical methodology used was the t-test to show significance of the difference between two proportions. More detailed explanation of this is included in the next chapter.

The collection of data just described comprised Phase I of this study. These data were organized in order to attempt to provide dependable information about the opportunities for cooperative action in each of the metropolitan areas.

The Development of Criteria

Phase II of the study involved the development of criteria to be used relative to the prospective organization of cooperative action in the various metropolitan areas. This was done because considerations other than interest of the administrators were believed to be necessary before a metropolitan area could be said to be a promising area for inter-district cooperation.
A listing of proposed criteria was developed first. These criteria were developed from literature of various fields pertinent to this study. In general, they were deduced from the study of existing programs similar to one proposed for cooperative action. Thus the criteria developed were founded upon successful practice in similar circumstances. Other criteria were discovered which had been established by some authoritative body to serve as standards for practice.

These proposed criteria were then presented to a jury of persons deemed to be highly competent to judge their applicability for this study. The jury was composed of two groups. Each of these was asked to react to that portion of the proposed criteria which was within their particular competence.

The first of these groups represents persons presently a part of the Bureau of Educational Research and Service, The Ohio State University. Each of these is a specialist in the field of Special Education. The persons participating were Dr. Viola Cassidy, Dr. Wilda Rosebrook, and Dr. Donald C. Smith. These three were asked to evaluate the criteria proposed for cooperative development of programs of special education.

The other half of the jury was composed of members of The Center for Educational Administration, The Ohio State University. Dr. Walter Hack, Dr. T. J. Jenson, and Dr. William Frederick Staub were included. These persons were asked to evaluate that portion of the criteria which dealt with cooperative administrative and/or school program activities.
They also were asked to evaluate proposed criteria for the employment of specialized personnel.

The criteria as proposed and modified were developed as a tool. These were to be used in order to arrive at judgments about each of the metropolitan areas in Ohio. Three factors were available. The objective circumstances of the independent suburban schools of each metropolitan area had been reported by their superintendents. These same superintendents had reported their opinions relative to the feasibility and desirability of cooperative action involving their schools. Finally, outside criteria were available to be used to aid in judging the appropriateness of proposals for cooperative action in each of these areas.

The three factors just described provide a basis for decision as to the plausibility of cooperative action to improve the programs of the independent suburban school districts of Ohio. A major purpose of this study is to identify those independent districts whose superintendents recognized inadequacies in program. If superintendents within the same metropolitan area are interested in cooperative action in order to improve a facet of their operation, this possibility ought to be explored. The application of independent criteria serves to guide these leaders in making the decision as to the practicality for them of such cooperative action.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS OF THE STUDY

The problem of this study has been described in Chapter I. Essentially, this problem results from several factors that are assumed to be present in many independent suburban school districts.

1. Many independent suburban school districts seem presently to be blocked from providing as complete a program of education as their superintendents believe is necessary and desirable.

2. The primary cause of this is that relatively small pupil populations are characteristic of districts of this type.

3. The existing practice of meeting needs for special education through the utilization of outside agencies is not altogether satisfactory.

4. Community expectations are high in suburban areas. The schools are expected to provide all of the program and services presented by the central metropolitan school district.

The first function of the data to be presented in this chapter is to substantiate these assumptions. It would be foolish to propose solutions to persons in situations where no problem was seen.

The second function is to indicate whether or not inter-district cooperation is perceived by superintendents as a promising solution to these problems. If the very idea of joint activity with other districts is rejected, little hope can be held that the hypothetical solutions are feasible.
What then is the nature of the situation in Ohio. Does it seem that the independent suburban school districts have difficult persistent problems related to their relatively small pupil population bases? Or, perhaps, are the superintendents of these districts generally satisfied with the status quo? Are the superintendents receptive to suggestions of ways in which they and their districts might engage in joint action with neighboring districts? Or, perhaps, do superintendents feel that each district should work out its own problems and that cooperative activity is undesirable? These questions are central to this research. In order to further this study these questions require answers based upon empirical data.

The survey instrument previously described was designed to provide such data. Chapter III contains a listing of the specific questions the instrument is designed to approach. The superintendents of the suburban districts were asked to provide data relative to these questions.

A number of proposals of ways in which districts might engage in cooperative action were made. These proposals can be grouped into six clusters or categories. These proposals represent a measure of—

1. The interest in cooperative action for research activities.

2. The interest in cooperative action for curriculum development activities.

3. The interest in cooperative action for horizontal curriculum extensions.

4. The interest in cooperative action for vertical curriculum extensions.

5. The interest in cooperative action to facilitate the operation of the business affairs of the districts.
Responses to Proposals for Cooperative Action

For Research Activities

Proposals for cooperative action for research activities were generally warmly received. Both the proposal concerning cooperative research for community development and the proposal concerning cooperative provision of consultant help for local action research projects received support. The first of these suggestions proposed cooperatively supported research activity which would provide participating schools with data relative to proposed industrial development in the area, proposed housing developments, possible changes in zoning laws, and related developments of the wider community having implications for pupil enrollment as well as for changes in the tax duplicates for the several districts.

Consultant service for local action research projects was proposed as an aid to the faculties of the participating districts. This function was suggested as that of stimulating teachers to develop and to carry out research of significance to their particular schools. This might imply a consultant who would be a person capable of aiding and advising the teachers in the techniques and methods of research activity.

For Curriculum Development

Curriculum development activities is a phrase used to describe the second group of proposals. It should be interpreted to mean those activities designed to enable the teachers of the participating
TABLE 1

INTEREST IN COOPERATIVE ACTION FOR RESEARCH ACTIVITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metropolitan Areas</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Districts Responding</th>
<th>Community Growth and Development Research</th>
<th>Consultative Service for Local Action Research</th>
<th>Total Districts Showing Interest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Akron</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canton</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayton</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorain</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lima</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toledo</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youngstown</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

districts better to perform the teaching functions in which they are already engaged. Two proposals for cooperative action in this regard were made. The first of these was that cooperative action to develop a teaching materials center be instituted. This idea proposed that, at a central location, the widest possible range of such materials as films, film strips, models, charts and graphs and all other materials designed to aid the teaching-learning process be collected. These materials would be available for use by all of the teachers of the participating districts.
TABLE 2
INTEREST IN COOPERATIVE ACTION FOR CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metropolitan Areas</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Districts Responding</th>
<th>Teaching Aids Materials Center</th>
<th>Inter-Faculty Study Groups</th>
<th>Total Districts Showing Interest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Akron</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canton</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayton</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorain</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lima</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toledo</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youngstown</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second proposal in this category was that the cooperating districts establish and encourage inter-faculty study groups among the teachers of their systems. These groups, established on whatever bases seemed appropriate to those participating, would be designed to give classroom teachers increased opportunities to share experiences, methods and techniques, resources, and interests in order that each might continually improve. While this activity should hardly supplant the in-service activities of the participating districts, it might well supplement and strengthen them.
Horizontal curriculum extension is a term used to describe that group of possible ways by which districts might cooperate to provide a broader or richer program of educational activities to those students they presently enroll. Three specific proposals were made.

The first of these proposals was to institute cooperative action in order that a closed circuit educational television complex might be established. This proposal is that the cooperating schools develop a program similar to that experimental one presently in operation in Washington County, Maryland, known popularly as the Hagerstown Project.

The second proposal is that cooperating schools work together in order that some courses be presented on a joint basis. These courses would be those not presently offered by any because no one school has sufficient interested students. Many suburban schools find few of their students who want specific vocational courses, yet most have some children for whom these courses would be appropriate. Conversely, some suburban schools have an insufficient number of children interested in college preparatory work fully to justify its inclusion in their course of study. Pressures from the community as well as concern for the development of their students create desires among the faculties of these schools for appropriate programs for all of their students.

The establishment, within the past few years, of the Advanced Placement Program as developed by the Educational Testing Service at Princeton, New Jersey, has stimulated a related concern. Many suburban communities where a great proportion of the students desire and qualify
TABLE 3

INTEREST IN COOPERATIVE ACTION FOR HORIZONTAL CURRICULUM EXTENSION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metropolitan Areas</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Districts Responding</th>
<th>For Educational Television</th>
<th>For Special Course Offerings</th>
<th>For Advanced Placement Program</th>
<th>Total Districts Showing Interest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Akron</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canton</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayton</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorain</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lima</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toledo</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youngstown</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

for college preparatory work still find themselves blocked from enabling their students to participate in this program because they simply do not have enough students in any one category to offer the special courses required for participation. The accompanying table indicates the degree of interest in cooperative action to this end.
For Vertical Curriculum Extensions

Vertical extensions of the curriculum are defined as those extensions designed to provide adequate educational opportunities appropriate to their needs to groups not presently enrolled in school. Two suggestions were made as possible ways schools might cooperate to provide such programs.

The first of these suggestions dealt with the possibility of cooperative action in order to provide adult education programs to the members of the related communities. The inclusion of this suggestion can be defended in relation to a developing philosophy of the role of the public school in the community in which it serves, i.e., the community school concept. There is a rapidly expanding number of public schools offering programs of this sort on one basis or another. The accompanying table indicates, however, somewhat less interest in this possibility for cooperative action than in other suggestions.

An increasing percentage of the youth of our country are going to school for longer and longer periods of time. The present overcrowding of some of our colleges coupled with increasing concern for the availability of facilities have sparked a search for new institutions to provide education beyond the present twelve years. One of the proposals for an institution to meet this need is that secondary education be extended to a thirteenth and fourteenth year. A proposal for doing this is the community college. As can be seen from the table, a number of districts in several of the metropolitan areas are interested in the possibility of cooperative action to this end.
TABLE 4
INTEREST IN COOPERATIVE ACTION TO PROVIDE VERTICAL EXTENSIONS OF CURRICULUMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metropolitan Area</th>
<th>N Districts Responding</th>
<th>For Adult Education</th>
<th>For Community College (Grades 13 and 14)</th>
<th>Total Districts Showing Interest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Akron</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canton</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayton</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorain</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lima</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toledo</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youngstown</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For Business Affairs

Less interest was shown in the last group of suggested activities than in those previously discussed. This group is designated as those activities designed to aid districts in the operation of their business affairs. Three activities were suggested.

The first suggestion was that the districts might cooperate to purchase and use special business machines which could automate some of their operations. Such machines as check writing machines,
TABLE 5
INTEREST IN COOPERATIVE ACTION TO FACILITATE THE OPERATION OF BUSINESS AFFAIRS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metropolitan Area</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Districts Responding</th>
<th>To Utilize Special Machines</th>
<th>To Share Bus Maintenance</th>
<th>To Make Quantity Purchasing Feasible</th>
<th>Total Districts Showing Interest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Akron</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canton</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayton</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorain</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lima</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toledo</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youngstown</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

accounting machines, and addressographs are examples of this. Only in the Cleveland and Warren areas was much enthusiasm indicated.

The second proposal was that districts cooperate to share a central facility for the maintenance of school buses. Putting this suggestion into operation would require the development of a plan to equip and staff a central garage. The buses from each participating district then would be serviced according to a regular schedule or as special need arose by this agency. Again, Cleveland and Warren areas
contained districts indicating some interest, but little was shown by the rest of the state.

Finally, the proposal was made that districts plan to purchase supplies cooperatively and establish a warehouse arrangement so that possible discount savings for mass purchasing could be achieved. This proposal received virtually no support except from schools in the Warren metropolitan area where two out of three indicated interest.

For Special Services to Pupils

The last table indicates the responses of the superintendents of the districts involved in this study to a general question as to the interest and need in providing for special services to the pupils of the district. Later tables indicate the specific nature of the services identified by the superintendents as important in their view to their district.

Summary of Responses

The first two questions posed at the beginning of this chapter dealt with the identification of need and interest on the part of superintendents of schools of the independent suburban school districts of Ohio. Do these superintendents perceive the circumstance of their district as such that cooperative action with similar neighboring school districts seems to them to be a promising suggestion?

Table 7 indicates that the answer to this question insofar as this answer can be given in terms of responses to general proposals is yes. A median of six to seven affirmative answers to the generalized
proposals is shown. Some districts indicated that they just were not interested in any of the suggested forms of cooperation, nor did they suggest any ways for cooperative action in which they would be interested. Several districts did not return the questionnaire. If one made the most rigorous and unfavorable assumption that every one of those who did not return the questionnaire by the time the tabulation of data began refused their response because they were opposed to the suggestion of inter-district cooperation, one would tally a total of thirteen districts in the state opposed to this proposal. Forty-two districts in the state have indicated a positive interest in this sort of action.

### TABLE 6

**INTEREST IN COOPERATIVE ACTION TO INCREASE THE PROVISION OF SPECIAL SERVICES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metropolitan Area</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Districts Responding</th>
<th>To Expand Provision of Special Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Akron</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canton</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayton</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorain</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lima</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toledo</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youngstown</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As the table indicates, the great majority of these districts favor cooperative action in several possible ways.

**TABLE 7**

TOTAL NUMBER OF OPPORTUNITIES FOR COOPERATIVE ACTION IN WHICH INTEREST HAS BEEN INDICATED BY SCHOOL DISTRICTS, BY METROPOLITAN AREAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metropolitan Area</th>
<th>1 2 or 3</th>
<th>4 or 5</th>
<th>6 or 7</th>
<th>8 or 9</th>
<th>10 or 11</th>
<th>12 or more</th>
<th>Total Interested Districts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Akron</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canton</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayton</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorain</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lima</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toledo</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youngstown</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary**

A number of suggestions were made to superintendents about possible ways they might cooperate with adjoining districts with similar circumstances. The ways suggested were developed out of consideration of the problems frequently faced by the relatively small independent suburban school system. Specific proposals as suggested were presented
in such ways as to serve as a possible approach to meeting these problems without interfering with the tradition autonomy of these districts.

Each of the metropolitan areas of Ohio presents a distinct area for consideration. If cooperative action is to be undertaken in order to meet any of these problems, it is necessary to have sufficient interest among the districts of a given area to make cooperation possible. Hence, area by area consideration of responses has been made.

The specific proposals have been grouped into six categories of ways for cooperative action. This grouping was done by similarity of function. Similarity is important because, in most instances, the development of an administrative structure to enable cooperation for one of the suggestions of the group would largely fulfill the requirements for cooperative action of the others in that same grouping.

Every one of the groups of suggested actions received enough support from at least one metropolitan area to suggest that further consideration might be given to the development of cooperative action along these lines. Great interest was shown in those suggestions relating to the cooperative establishment of ways to improve research activities so that the districts might have the benefits of wider and more accurate data upon which to base their decision making. Proposals leading to cooperative action designed to enable teachers to do the jobs they are now doing more effectively through curriculum development activity were widely supported. Interest sufficient to encourage further consideration of cooperative action was indicated in nearly
every metropolitan area in proposals designed to enable the offering of educational opportunities to groups presently not being served. Many independent districts have shown that they would like to explore the possibilities of cooperative action to enhance the quantity and quality of special services which they can make available to the patrons of their schools.

Forty-two of the fifty-five districts in Ohio support the desirability of cooperative action along at least one of the lines suggested. In those areas where more districts exist in close proximity the approval is nearly unanimous!

Variations among Districts

Two important dimensions exist which are frequently used to distinguish between school districts. The first of these is size. The size is considered in terms of pupils in average daily membership. This dimension has profound significance in considering the program, staffing, housing, financing, and nearly every other phase of school operation.

The second dimension is that of expenditure. All of the important factors about a district listed above are equally affected by the amount of money per pupil spent on the educational program. It should be noted that some interrelation exists between these dimensions. Districts which are relatively small in pupil population can, as a general rule, offer some services only by spending a far greater amount per pupil than can larger districts. This is especially true of those things which affect only a portion of a normal school population. Special services are particularly good examples of this.
These two dimensions were selected to be used in this study in order to see if districts vary in their interest or perception of needs for cooperative action according to these factors. An arbitrary dividing point was established. In the case of pupil population, an enrollment of 2000 pupils in average daily membership was chosen as that line to divide those classified as large districts from those classified as small ones. A second arbitrary division was made in regard to per pupil expenditure for Ohio districts in 1959 was chosen. This was $300.00 per pupil. Thus districts spending above this figure were classified as those with high per pupil expenditure, and those below as low in this dimension.

Tables 8, 9, and 10 indicate the division of the independent suburban districts of Ohio in this fashion.

TABLE 8

CLASSIFICATION OF INDEPENDENT SUBURBAN SCHOOL DISTRICTS ACCORDING TO PER PUPIL EXPENDITURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditure Per Pupil Per Year</th>
<th>Exempted Villages</th>
<th>Cities</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below $300.00</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above $300.00</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The degree to which the consideration of the data by these dimensions is important is determined by the degree to which metropolitan areas, the basic unit of this study, are composed of districts with
TABLE 9
CLASSIFICATION OF INDEPENDENT SUBURBAN DISTRICTS ACCORDING
TO PUPIL POPULATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pupil Population</th>
<th>Exempted Villages</th>
<th>Cities</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below 2000</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 2000</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 10
NUMBER OF DISTRICTS ACCORDING TO BOTH PUPIL POPULATION
AND PER PUPIL EXPENDITURE

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High in Pupil Population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High in Per Pupil Expenditure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low in Pupil Population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low in Per Pupil Expenditure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low in Pupil Population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High in Per Pupil Expenditure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low in Pupil Population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low in Per Pupil Population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

similar characteristics. Thus it may be asked, Do metropolitan areas vary by the nature of the independent suburban districts found within them? Determination of the existence of such variance lends some credence to generalizations about what might be the nature of interest and perceived need within these districts in the future. This sort of
judgment is important in considering long range planning of the sort discussed in this study. If a metropolitan area has a future likelihood of changing from a group of small high expenditure districts to one of large high expenditure systems, the nature of interest of existing large, high expenditure district areas should be considered in the planning.

Ohio's metropolitan areas do show some definable characteristics by these dimensions. The greatest internal similarities exist in the case of the Cleveland area and the Cincinnati area, the two largest metropolitan areas studied. Cleveland has eight out of twelve districts with characteristics defined here as being high in per pupil expenditure and high in pupil population. By combining factors, it is seen that ten out of twelve districts are similar in one dimension, that of per pupil expenditure.

Cincinnati, on the other hand, is predominantly an area of small suburban districts. Nine of the sixteen districts are high in per pupil expenditure and low in pupil population. A combination of factors here indicates that fifteen out of the sixteen districts can be characterized as low in per pupil population. Table 11 indicates complete data for the independent suburban districts of the state.

The six general categories of ways in which districts might engage in cooperative activity which have been used previously in examining the metropolitan area interest have been re-used in order to provide similar structure for consideration of perceived need and interest according to these characteristics. The use of the two dimensions, considered concurrently, provides a quadrant construct which
enables observation of the variance according to these dimensions in interaction with the data and with each other.

TABLE II

CHARACTERISTICS BY PUPIL POPULATION AND BY PER PUPIL EXPENDITURES OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS BY METROPOLITAN AREAS IN OHIO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metropolitan Area</th>
<th>Districts High in Per Pupil Expenditure, High in Pupil Population</th>
<th>Districts High in Per Pupil Expenditure, Low in Pupil Population</th>
<th>Districts Low in Per Pupil Expenditure, High in Pupil Population</th>
<th>Districts Low in Per Pupil Expenditure, Low in Pupil Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Akron</td>
<td>1 0 0</td>
<td>1 0 0</td>
<td>1 0 0</td>
<td>1 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canton</td>
<td>1 0 0</td>
<td>1 0 0</td>
<td>1 0 0</td>
<td>1 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>16 0 9</td>
<td>1 0 6</td>
<td>1 0 6</td>
<td>1 0 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>12 8 2</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>5 1 1</td>
<td>3 0 0</td>
<td>3 0 0</td>
<td>3 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayton</td>
<td>7 2 1</td>
<td>1 3 1</td>
<td>1 3 1</td>
<td>1 3 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorain</td>
<td>3 0 2</td>
<td>0 0 1</td>
<td>0 0 1</td>
<td>0 0 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lima</td>
<td>2 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 2</td>
<td>0 0 2</td>
<td>0 0 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toledo</td>
<td>2 0 1</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren</td>
<td>4 1 1</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youngstown</td>
<td>2 1 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following tables express responses indicating present interest in the state by districts in these quadrants. The N of these tables represents the number of districts with these characteristics. In order to provide statistical bases for consideration of these data, a decimal figure representing the proportion of districts expressing interest is given in each table. In order to provide the most rigorous possible
testing of these data all cases of non-response are treated as if this were a definite statement of dis-interest. It is certain that some factors other than a negative reaction have caused the non-response. Some questionnaires were received after the data were processed substantiating this belief. Nevertheless, these data are treated so that only positive responses are counted and reported and proportions are calculated as if all others were negative in their response.

Statistical Treatment of Data

Statistical methods were applied in order to test the significance of difference between each possible pair of proportions. The question at issue is, Is the difference between the proportions sufficient to demonstrate due cause rather than mere chance?

The t-test was used to determine the significance of the difference between two proportions. The proportion expressing interest in each proposed way of cooperative action is compared with all three other proportions. Hence, for instance, the proportion of districts which are high in population and high in per pupil expenditure which have exhibited a positive response is compared with districts low in population but high in expenditure; with those low in expenditure but high in population; and with those low in both factors. This same comparison is made for every possible combination. A further comparison is then made. In this case the proportion of those with high population is compared with those of low population regardless of the circumstance relative to expenditure and so on throughout all possible combinations of the single factor.
The rationale for the application of this statistical test is that it seems helpful to know if different characteristics of districts bear upon the receptivity of their administrators to suggestions for cooperative action. The nature of the statistical test used is such that only in a few instances can it be said that evidence exists to substantiate this. Nevertheless, inspection of the results indicates some trends in this regard.

In every case but one, the highest proportion of interest expressed in cooperative action came from districts either high in pupil population and low in per pupil expenditure or from districts which were high in per pupil expenditure and low in pupil population. These might be considered the mixed characteristic districts. They are not the large and wealthy, nor are they small and poor. At the other extreme it is interesting to note that the districts which have relatively few pupils and who spend less on their educational program are those districts with the lowest expression of interest in cooperation in every instance. This is somewhat surprising. These districts are those which one might surmise have the most need for improvement of program and services to their communities. The reasons for such consistently negative reaction lie outside the scope of this study.

For Research Activities

Proposals for cooperative action for research activities were met with favor by 75 per cent of those districts with low expenditures and with relatively high pupil populations. This total is primarily a result of interest in cooperative action to carry on continuous research
to study the development of the broader community they all share, the metropolitan region. This same greater interest in this phase of the proposed activity generally is evident for the other types of districts. Those districts that are high in pupil expense and low in pupil population showed nearly as great an interest in this suggestion. Considerably less interest seems to exist in the other two types of districts.

**TABLE 12**

INTEREST IN COOPERATIVE ACTION FOR RESEARCH ACTIVITIES BY DISTRICT CHARACTERISTICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Characteristics</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Community Growth and Development Research</th>
<th>Consultative Service for Local Action Research</th>
<th>Total Districts Showing Interest</th>
<th>Proportion of N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Per Pupil Expense; High Pupil Population</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Per Pupil Expense; Low Pupil Population</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Per Pupil Expense; High Pupil Population</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Per Pupil Expense; Low Pupil Population</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For Curriculum Development

Two out of the four significant differences in proportions occurred in reactions to the second general proposal. This proposal dealt with suggested cooperative activity to the end of curriculum development for the cooperating districts. Eighty-three per cent of the districts which are low in pupil expense and high in pupil population expressed a positive interest in this form of cooperative activity. Similar interest was expressed by 78 per cent of the districts which are high in per pupil expense and low in pupil population. Both of these figures are significantly greater than the low proportion of 25 per cent. This was the proportion of districts characterized by being low in pupil population and low in per pupil expense. These differences are shown in Table 13 existing between characteristics number two and number four as well as between number three and number four.

Of the different suggestions which make up this group, little distinction is shown between either of the two proposals. Those districts that would like to cooperate with their neighbors to increase the opportunities available to the teaching staffs in curriculum development activities seem interested both in the development of a cooperative teaching materials center, and in establishing inter-faculty discussion groups.

For Horizontal Curriculum Extensions

Proposals for cooperative action to enable horizontal curriculum extensions were widely approved by the districts with mixed characteristics. Seventy-five per cent and 72 per cent respectively of those
### TABLE 13

**INTEREST IN COOPERATIVE ACTION FOR CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT BY DISTRICT CHARACTERISTICS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Characteristics</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Teaching Aids Materials Center</th>
<th>Inter-Faculty Study Groups</th>
<th>Total Districts Showing Interest</th>
<th>Proportion of N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. High Per Pupil Expense; High Pupil Population</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. High Per Pupil Expense; Low Pupil Population</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Low Per Pupil Expense; High Pupil Population</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Low Per Pupil Expense; Low Pupil Population</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

districts with low per pupil expense and high pupil population and those with high per pupil expense and low pupil population demonstrated positive interest in the suggestions. Even the districts with low per pupil expenditures and low pupil population, those which consistently show less interest in cooperative action, reacted with interest to these proposals. Forty-two per cent of these districts indicated favorable response.
Little difference existed between the amount of interest shown for any one of the possible ways of cooperating for curriculum extension. It seems that districts which would like to move in this direction are interested in trying all of the suggested ways by which this might be effected.

For Vertical Curriculum Extensions

Providing public secondary education to groups not presently being served is the purpose of proposing vertical extensions of the
curriculum. Two major groups in this category are those which have just completed their secondary education as it is now offered in many communities, and adults who have needs and interest for secondary education activities. Two proposals designed to elicit interest in cooperative action to attempt to meet the needs of these two groups were made to the superintendents.

The third case of a significant difference between two proportions was established here. Those districts which have the characteristics of being high in per pupil expense and low in pupil population, i.e., the small, relatively wealthy suburban district predominating in the Cincinnati metropolitan area, but found to some degree in most areas indicated strong interest. Seventy-eight per cent of these districts favored cooperative action to make these extensions possible. This proportion varied significantly from the 25 per cent proportion of interest in the small districts with low per pupil expenditures.

Of the two possible ways of extending the curriculum vertically proposed, the major interest was shown in the community college concept.

The final case of a significant variance between two proportions is found in these data. When the factor of pupil population is ignored and a comparison made solely on the basis of expenditure per pupil, it is found that 65 per cent of those districts presently spending above the state median, the high expenditure group, favor cooperative action to enable themselves to establish this kind of vertical curriculum extension. Districts which presently spend below the median, the low expenditure group, in this study favor such action by a lower proportion.
TABLE 15
INTEREST IN COOPERATIVE ACTION TO PROVIDE VERTICAL EXTENSIONS OF THE CURRICULUM BY DISTRICT CHARACTERISTICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Characteristics</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>For Adult Education</th>
<th>For Community College (Grades 13 and 14)</th>
<th>Total Districts Showing Interest</th>
<th>Proportion of N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. High Per Pupil Expense; High Pupil Population</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. High Per Pupil Expense; Low Pupil Population</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Low Per Pupil Expense; High Pupil Population</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Low Per Pupil Expense; Low Pupil Population</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only 38 per cent of the districts in this group indicated approval of the suggestion. This difference established a t-ratio of 2.077*, sufficient to be significant at the .05 level. The difference appears in Table 15 between characteristics number two and number four.

The difference between the proportions of 78 per cent of the group referred to previously and that of 46 per cent of the group of districts which are high in pupil population and high in expense as well as the difference with the group which is low in per pupil expense and high in pupil population is not significant since a t-ratio of approximately .1 is present. This difference is high however, nearly to
the point of significance in each case. Thus in the question of cooperative action to provide vertical extensions to the curriculum, near significant differences exist between the high expense, low pupil population districts and all other groups.

For Business Affairs

Somewhat less interest was shown in proposals for cooperative action to carry out the business affairs of the school districts. The highest proportion of interest was still below one half of the group. Little difference existed between the response proportions of each of the groups; nothing even approaching significance.

Three proposals were made. What little interest was shown, was predominantly in the suggestion that districts might cooperate to purchase and utilize special business machines to automate some of their processes. Mass purchasing and subsequent warehousing-distribution activities among cooperating districts received the least support.

For Special Services to Pupils

The question of cooperative action to provide special services to pupils is explored in more detail in another portion of this report. A question was asked in a broad fashion here, however. The proportion of responses from the different groups of districts ran highly in favor of cooperative action along this line. Three of the four groups of districts recorded a higher proportion of districts in favor of this type of cooperative action than any of the other forms suggested. The fourth group was that characterized by being low in per pupil expense and high in pupil population. Interestingly enough, this group in the
### TABLE 16

**INTEREST IN COOPERATIVE ACTION TO FACILITATE THE OPERATION OF BUSINESS AFFAIRS BY DISTRICT CHARACTERISTICS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Characteristics</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>To Utilize Special Machines</th>
<th>To Share Bus Maintenance</th>
<th>To Facilitate Mass Purchasing</th>
<th>Total Interest</th>
<th>Proportion of N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Per Pupil Expense; High Pupil Population</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Per Pupil Expense; Low Pupil Population</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Per Pupil Expense; High Pupil Population</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Per Pupil Expense; Low Pupil Population</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other instances generally favored cooperative action. More than half of the districts indicated interest in this form of cooperation. The proportion, however, was smaller than it had been for some other proposals.

While no significant differences in the proportions can be shown, inspection of the percentages shows that the small, high expense district noticeably is a greater supporter of this kind of cooperative action than any other type of district. All others tend to have similar proportions of their districts favoring the proposal.
### TABLE 17

**INTEREST IN COOPERATIVE ACTION TO ADD TO THE PROVISION OF SPECIAL SERVICES BY DISTRICT CHARACTERISTICS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Characteristics</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>To Provide Special Services</th>
<th>Proportion of N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Per Pupil Expense; High Pupil Population</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Per Pupil Expense; Low Pupil Population</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Per Pupil Expense; High Pupil Population</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Per Pupil Expense; Low Pupil Population</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summation**

The fifty-five independent suburban schools existing in Ohio were divided into four categories for study. These categories were developed by dividing the group in two ways. The first division was done on the basis of pupil population. Districts with over 2000 pupils in average daily membership were classified as large districts. A second division was made on the basis of per pupil expenditure. Those districts spending above $300.00 per pupil per year were classified as high expenditure districts. Thus the entire group, by combining factors, were placed into a four-quadrant construct.
There exists a significant difference in the proportion of districts interested in some different forms of cooperative action proposed. These differences were established by comparing one quadrant with all others for each of the proposals. Secondly, districts were compared by each of the single divisions. The results of these comparisons are sufficient to support the statement that, in some instances, the differences between the proportion of districts interested in ways of cooperating with other districts varies according to the characteristics of the groupings.

Further, it can be shown, that those districts which either are low in pupil population and high in expenditure, or which are high in pupil population and low in expenditure tend to favor suggestions for inter-district cooperation more than do those districts which are large and have high expenditure, or those which are small with low per pupil expenditures. This would suggest that metropolitan areas composed of districts with certain characteristics might be more fruitful places for the instigation of plans for inter-district cooperative action than are others with other types of districts.

Responses Relative to Special Education Programs

Consideration of inter-district cooperation possibilities leads many to think in terms of the needs of districts for special education personnel and facilities. Public expectations have developed to the point where residents indicate their feelings that educational opportunities should be provided through the public schools for children with handicaps requiring special education. Research and developing
practice have demonstrated techniques and results accomplished in this regard.

Special education provides a difficult problem for the relatively small independent school district. Neighboring metropolitan cities with their large pupil base and frequently more substantial tax base often provide a broad program of special education. Other neighboring districts which are local districts of the county school system have resources through the county office available to them which make it possible for them to care for their atypical children in an increasingly adequate manner.

The residents of the small independent schools with their normally high expectation of educational service look to their schools to provide similar opportunities to their children. Yet, the district frequently seems to be blocked in meeting this expectation due to the fact that they have only a few children with any one of the special needs. While the total incidence of need may be less in suburban areas than might be predicted on the basis of figures developed from an unselected population, and the number with any one handicap be small, still the total of the children for whom special education is needed may be considerable.

Some suburban districts have attempted, frequently successfully, to meet their immediate needs in this regard by utilizing, on a tuition basis, the facilities for special education of the neighboring core city. Two difficulties seem inherent in this procedure, however. The first of these is that the use of this resource is totally dependent upon the fiat of the core city. Generally, the city takes a position
that so long as there are unused facilities, neighboring districts may send pupils on a tuition basis. This makes planning virtually impossible. The suburban district must wait, often until the school year is in progress to know if their needs can be met. Unfortunately, the answer sometimes is no. For suburban districts to continue to view this arrangement as a satisfactory long term solution to their needs seems, in most circumstances, to be difficult to justify.

A second drawback lies in the fact that the use of the program of another on a tuition basis removes from the local community any control over the objectives, staffing, finances, program or other aspects of the education of these children. Difficult issues are present in regard to special education. Most communities support the traditional belief in the desirability of local control over the education of their children. The ones with special needs are no less their children.

If the independent suburban community wants to be secure in doing long range planning for the care of their children with special needs, and if they wish to exercise control over the program for these children, they will have to provide their own program for their own children. Yet, as has been discussed, the arithmetic of pupil population base virtually makes this impossible for many of these districts.

These considerations point up the reasons for the interest among leaders of these districts in the cooperative development and presentation of special education programs. In Ohio, seven disabilities are recognized currently by the Foundation Program as needing special education and being eligible for additional assistance from the state
for this purpose. These are special education for the blind, the partially sighted, the deaf, the hard of hearing, the crippled, the gifted, and the slow learners. Superintendents of the independent suburban districts were asked several questions designed to establish a picture of the current status with regard to need and present provision for children with these handicaps of their districts. The following tables represent an effort to conjoin these data into a comprehensive picture.

For the Blind

The incidence of blind children mercifully is small. The numbers reported from the metropolitan areas suggest either that the incidence in suburban communities is much smaller yet than research would indicate likely, or that all children with this disability have not been identified. Nevertheless, some need is present. Most districts depend upon outside agencies to provide the education opportunity for these children. Relatively little dissatisfaction is presently felt with these arrangements, at least by the superintendents.

For the Partially Sighted

Larger numbers of children have been identified in each of the districts who are classified as the partially sighted. These are children for whom some special education needs to be provided, but also who can and do profit from experiences within the regular classroom with their agemates. Opportunities for effective cooperative action are particularly promising in this area. The use of itinerant teachers to
TABLE 18
CIRCUMSTANCES RELATIVE TO SPECIAL EDUCATION OF BLIND CHILDREN
BY METROPOLITAN AREAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metropolitan Area</th>
<th>N (Number Reporting)</th>
<th>Number Children Reported</th>
<th>Number Districts Using Outside Agencies</th>
<th>Number Districts Whose Superintendents Express Dissatisfaction with Opportunities Their Districts Present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Akron</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canton</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayton</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorain</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lima</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youngstown</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

provide the special experiences needed by these children for several schools seems to be an effective way to work toward meeting their needs. The children then may go back to their regular classrooms for the remainder of their work.

Table 19 shows that together with the increased number of children with this need, there exists an increased amount of dissatisfaction with the present methods of working to meet this need. Some superintendents in all of the larger metropolitan areas with the exception of Dayton express this dissatisfaction. The multiple numbers of superintendents who are dissatisfied in Cleveland and Cincinnati indicate a present possibility of instituting cooperative action.
### TABLE 19
CIRCUMSTANCES RELATIVE TO SPECIAL EDUCATION OF PARTIALLY SIGHTED CHILDREN BY METROPOLITAN AREAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metropolitan Area</th>
<th>N (Number Reporting)</th>
<th>Number Children Reported</th>
<th>Number Districts Using Outside Agencies</th>
<th>Number Districts Whose Superintendents Express Dissatisfaction with Opportunities Their Districts Present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Akron</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canton</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayton</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorain</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lima</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toledo</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youngstown</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the Deaf

The circumstances relative to special education provisions for the deaf children seems to be similar, in general, to those reported for blind children. Relatively few children with this handicap are reported from these suburban districts. A great deal of dependence is placed upon the use of outside facilities to care for their education. In general, the superintendents are satisfied with the present state of affairs in this regard.
TABLE 20
CIRCUMSTANCES RELATIVE TO SPECIAL EDUCATION OF DEAF CHILDREN
BY METROPOLITAN AREA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metropolitan Area</th>
<th>N (Number Reporting)</th>
<th>Number Children Reported</th>
<th>Number Districts Using Outside Agencies</th>
<th>Number Districts Whose Superintendents Express Dissatisfaction with Opportunities Their Districts Present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Akron</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canton</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayton</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorain</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lima</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toledo</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youngstown</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the Hard of Hearing

Observation of the status of need for special education opportunities for hard of hearing children is somewhat confusing. Relatively larger numbers of children have been identified as needing special education services. At the same time, the opportunities for outside resources to be used to meet this need is apparently not large. Yet, in the face of this, little dissatisfaction is expressed by superintendents with the opportunities their districts present for their residents.
### TABLE 21

**CIRCUMSTANCES RELATIVE TO SPECIAL EDUCATION OF HARD OF HEARING CHILDREN BY METROPOLITAN AREA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metropolitan Area</th>
<th>N (Number Reporting)</th>
<th>Number Children Reported</th>
<th>Number Districts Using Outside Agencies</th>
<th>Number Districts Whose Superintendents Express Dissatisfaction with Opportunities Their Districts Present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Akron</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canton</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayton</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorain</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lima</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toledo</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youngstown</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One conclusion which might be justified is that this is an area in which, perhaps because of the lack of visibility or dramatic nature of the disability, the need for special services has not been so widely accepted. This is speculation. At any rate these data seem to show relatively little present interest in cooperative action to provide this special education opportunity for the children of these districts. Although the accompanying table does not specifically so indicate, inspection of the raw data indicates that in the suburban districts...
studied a total of 69 hard of hearing cases have been identified and are reported for which no special education provisions of any sort are reported. This circumstance alone would seem sufficient to engender more dissatisfaction with the status quo than is evident.

For Orthopedically Handicapped Children

Although relatively larger numbers of orthopedically handicapped children are reported by the districts, little concern for developing new ways of meeting their educational needs is expressed. Three districts in the Cleveland metropolitan area report dissatisfaction. Two in the Cincinnati area concur. The superintendents of the other districts have, at least for the present, apparently established satisfactory ways of caring for these responsibilities.

For Gifted Children

More concern for and dissatisfaction with present circumstances was expressed by the superintendents in regard to providing for the gifted children in their districts than in any other category of special education needs. The current concern for the maximum development of talent has apparently sensitized many to this need. In four of the eleven metropolitan areas, sufficient dissatisfaction now exists without further exploration of the problem to indicate a possibility of cooperative action to this end.

Some variance in the application of the criteria to establish just what is a gifted child probably accounts for the wide discrepancy in the numbers and proportions of children so reported by various
TABLE 22

CIRCUMSTANCES RELATIVE TO SPECIAL EDUCATION OF ORTHOPEDICALLY HANDICAPPED CHILDREN BY METROPOLITAN AREA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metropolitan Area</th>
<th>N (Number Reporting)</th>
<th>Number Children Reported</th>
<th>Number Districts Using Outside Agencies</th>
<th>Number Districts Whose Superintendents Express Dissatisfaction with Opportunities Their Districts Present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Akron</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canton</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayton</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorain</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lima</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toledo</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youngstown</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

districts. This would be a serious fault if the purpose of this aspect of the study were to conduct a census of gifted children. For the purposes of this study, however, what is important is the perception held by those responsible for determining the educational program. If they perceive a child as needing special education because of his degree of giftedness, and would be interested in cooperative action with neighboring districts to this end, it becomes inconsequential whether or not the criteria they use to come to this decision is exactly the same as others might use. The importance lies in the fact that they
want to provide facilities and resources above what is now available to
the children of their district. Their perception of this need,
especially as it is a reflection of the perception held by their com-
community, establishes the existence of the need, and hence the foundation
for exploration of the possibilities of cooperative action to meet it.

TABLE 23
CIRCUMSTANCES RELATIVE TO SPECIAL EDUCATION OF GIFTED
CHILDREN BY METROPOLITAN AREA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metropolitan Area</th>
<th>N (Number Reporting)</th>
<th>Number Children Reported</th>
<th>Number Districts Using Outside Agencies</th>
<th>Number Districts Whose Superintendents Express Dissatisfaction with Opportunities Their Districts Present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Akron</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canton</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1374</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>983</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayton</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorain</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lima</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toledo</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youngstown</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For the Slow Learners

Much the same comments as were made relative to the establishment of programs for the gifted can be made in relation to programs for the children with learning handicaps. Considerable dissatisfaction with present resources exists. In the Cincinnati metropolitan area, for instance, five superintendents presently indicate their dissatisfaction. Additional research to this particular problem would need to be made in each area in order to establish the degree to which the need is perceived to lie with those identified as moderately retarded and those classified as mildly retarded. Obviously, specific cooperatively organized programs would have to be established on these more definite bases.

Summation

The preceding tables record widespread, though somewhat scattered dissatisfaction on the part of superintendents of the independent suburban school districts studied. This dissatisfaction is with the opportunities offered by their districts for special education as needed by children in the communities.

The existence of this dissatisfaction leads to the question as to the reason or reasons which can be identified as causal factors. Why, if the leaders are dissatisfied, are the districts not correcting these weaknesses?

Inquiry into the reasons as perceived by the superintendents resulted in widespread agreement. In general, the primary reason seems to lie in the relatively small pupil population of the independent suburban school districts. A given district may have a number of
TABLE 24

CIRCUMSTANCES RELATIVE TO SPECIAL EDUCATION OF SLOW LEARNING CHILDREN BY METROPOLITAN AREA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metropolitan Area</th>
<th>N (Number Reporting)</th>
<th>Number Children Reported</th>
<th>Number Districts Using Outside Agencies</th>
<th>Number Districts Whose Superintendents Express Dissatisfaction with Opportunities Their Districts Present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Akron</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canton</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayton</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorain</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lima</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toledo</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youngstown</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

children with needs for special education. Yet, the fact that there are many forms of disability normally divides this total into many different needs. Districts with small total pupil populations find that they do not have enough children in any one category of need for special education to make it feasible for them to establish a program.

Some superintendents did not choose to identify a reason.

Predominantly, it was the superintendents of districts in the five metropolitan areas with larger numbers of districts who did identify the
reasons as they saw them. The following table indicates the percentage of responses which identified the small numbers of children with any one disability as the primary cause of a lack of a satisfactory program to meet special education needs. The Columbus area, for instance, has superintendents who, with one exception, feel that this is the primary reason in every case. In nearly every category over the entire state, over one half of the superintendents see the need for a greater student personnel base as necessary in order to make it possible to develop special education programs to meet the educational requirements of the children within their own district.

Responses Relative to the Utilization of Specialized Personnel

Many superintendents of independent suburban districts would like to have additional specialized personnel on the staffs of their district in order to provide special services to students of their communities. They were asked if, assuming the service could be provided for a per pupil cost similar to that of cities with a larger pupil population, they would favor the addition of various specialized personnel on either a full-time or a part-time basis.

Manifestly, in those cases where the superintendents would like to have these resource people on a full-time basis, and do not presently have them, something is blocking them. It seems reasonable to assume that in those cases, the expression of desire for a full-time person can be regarded as a measure of the need. If they are blocked from having these people full time, presumably they would prefer having them on a part-time basis to doing without their services altogether.
TABLE 25

PER CENT OF SUPERINTENDENTS IDENTIFYING SMALL STUDENT POPULATION AS REASON MORE SATISFACTORY SPECIAL EDUCATION PROVISIONS NOT PRESENTLY AVAILABLE IN THEIR DISTRICT (PER CENT CALCULATED OF THOSE EXPRESSING A REASON IN RESPONSE TO ITEM #8 IN QUESTIONNAIRE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metropolitan Area</th>
<th>Blind</th>
<th>Partially Sighted</th>
<th>Deaf</th>
<th>Hard of Hearing</th>
<th>Crippled</th>
<th>Gifted</th>
<th>Slow Learning</th>
<th>Speech Impairment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Akron</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canton</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayton</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorain</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lima</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toledo</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youngstown</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Many other cases appear wherein the superintendents feel that they do not have a need sufficient to employ personnel of these types full time, but might welcome an opportunity to have them part time. For the purposes of studying the desirability of cooperative action to this end, both expressions of desire to have these personnel full time and
part time can then be treated as potential interest in cooperative action to share such specialists.

Ten districts in the Cincinnati area would like to have a school physician on a part-time basis. This would seem to be a case where more than one person is needed. At least one physician might be shared by the four districts in Cleveland who desire to do so. A school dentist, or perhaps a dental technician is desired on a part-time basis by eight schools in the metropolitan Cincinnati area. Again, four schools in the Cleveland area would like to share this service.

Less interest exists in the possibility of sharing the services of a school nurse has been exhibited. Nevertheless, inspection of these data would indicate that three metropolitan areas contain at least two schools which would like to share this service. In Cincinnati there are five.

Five of the eleven metropolitan areas contain as many as two districts which indicate that they would be interested in sharing the services of a school psychologist. Somewhat less interest is expressed in similar action for a school psychiatrist. Still, five districts in the Cleveland area and four in the Cincinnati area would like at least to explore this possibility.

A speech-hearing therapist is desired on at least a part-time basis by districts in eight of the eleven metropolitan areas. A total of nine of the independent suburban districts in the Cincinnati area would be interested in exploring the possibility of sharing such a person.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Canton</th>
<th>Cincinnati</th>
<th>Cleveland</th>
<th>Columbus</th>
<th>Dayton</th>
<th>Lorain</th>
<th>Lima</th>
<th>Toledo</th>
<th>Warren</th>
<th>Totals</th>
<th>Par Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Full Part Time</td>
<td>Full Part Time</td>
<td>Full Part Time</td>
<td>Full Part Time</td>
<td>Full Part Time</td>
<td>Full Part Time</td>
<td>Full Part Time</td>
<td>Full Part Time</td>
<td>Full Part Time</td>
<td>Full Part Time</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physician</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentist</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurse</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychologist</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychiatrist</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech-Hearing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therapist</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychometrist</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject Matter</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultants</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homebound</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Several other possible specialized resource people were suggested. While less interest was expressed, still a number of possibilities exist in areas which have at least two districts which would be interested in such an arrangement.

It is not surprising to note that those metropolitan areas having the larger numbers of independent suburban districts have the greatest amount of opportunities presented for cooperative action to provide these resources. Cincinnati, with sixteen districts of this type, is the most prominent example. On the basis of needing two to cooperate, there is potential for cooperative action to employ at least one of every one of the suggested kinds of specialized personnel in this metropolitan area. The Cleveland area presents possibilities for cooperative usage of specialized personnel in all but two of the proposed types. Districts in the Columbus metropolitan area perhaps could cooperate to employ and share the services of personnel in the seven spheres of common interest they share.

**Travel Time**

These data as have been presented and discussed in the preceding pages have focused on the question of the possibilities for cooperative action among independent suburban school districts in Ohio in order that some functions might be performed which now seem blocked from the districts. It is not enough to establish that such cooperation is desirable or even desired. It is also necessary that it be possible from practical considerations of time, distance, and accessibility to engage in the desired cooperative activities.
It is expensive to pay salaries to persons for time spent going to and from the places at which they perform the functions for which they are paid. Nevertheless, the concept of sharing the services of persons, or sharing cooperatively established facilities implies that some people are going to spend some time traveling. The determination of the answers to the questions implied here is one which must be made by each district which might consider engaging in these kinds of activities. Some guide lines may be established from data gathered on the basis of thirty minutes time required in normal driving from the central office of one district to the central offices of other districts.

In Cincinnati's environs, eleven of the sixteen districts are so situated that they report it possible to drive from their central office to the central office of at least seven other similar districts in this time. Four suburban districts in this area are arranged so that one may drive to any one of thirteen other independent suburban districts in one-half hour. Surely considerable possibilities for interaction between the districts exists here.

It does not seem too difficult to travel between independent suburban districts in the Cleveland area. Nine of the twelve districts existing in this area report that one can travel in thirty minutes to any of five neighboring suburban districts. Other metropolitan area reports indicate that most school systems in metropolitan areas are so situated that they are within thirty minutes driving time of at least one other suburban district, and the great majority are so situated that this relationship exists with several districts.
Considering Ohio's independent suburban districts as a whole, it can be seen that this is substantiated. Of forty-five districts which reported, a median response of seven to eight districts which may be reached in one-half hour exists.

**TABLE 27**

**NUMBER OF SUPERINTENDENTS REPORTING OTHER INDEPENDENT SUBURBAN DISTRICTS AS BEING ACCESSIBLE ENOUGH THAT LESS THAN 30 MINUTES DRIVING TIME NORMALLY IS REQUIRED BETWEEN BOARD OF EDUCATION OFFICES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metropolitan Area</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>1 or 2 Districts</th>
<th>3 or 4 Districts</th>
<th>5 or 6 Districts</th>
<th>7 or 8 Districts</th>
<th>9 or 10 Districts</th>
<th>11 or 12 Districts</th>
<th>13 or more Districts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Akron</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canton</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayton</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorain</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lima</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toledo</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youngstown</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary

Nearly all of the independent suburban school districts in Ohio face the problem of providing adequately for the special education needs of atypical children in their communities. Nearly every district reporting in this study has at least one individual of school age in its community who should have special education opportunities of one or more of the types identified and supported by the Division of Special Education of the state.

A common problem exists in this regard among many of the districts studied. They have children whom they feel should have special education programs. The parents of these children, as well as the communities as a whole, expect the schools to provide for these children in many cases. Yet, so few children with any one need exist that it is impossible to provide these opportunities for them without undertaking costs and establishing programs well beyond the generally accepted criteria of efficient operation.

The expedient being used frequently is to turn to facilities established for special education by the core cities. This places the suburban community in a position where the availability of facilities to meet their responsibilities depends upon factors over which they have no control. This and related circumstances have led some superintendents to indicate their dissatisfaction with the present opportunities open to them.
Large percentages of those administrators questioned who have identified the blocks to improved local programs place the reason as a function of the small student population of their districts. In making this identification, they rejected such factors as insufficient funds, insufficient willingness of their communities to provide this educational opportunity or any other reason. These are not the causes of the problem. An insufficient population base is, the superintendents say.

Interest exists in the possibility of sharing specialized personnel who have a contribution to make toward the establishment of a full program of pupil personnel services. Investigation of interest in varying kinds of special personnel reveals that from about 20 per cent to nearly 50 per cent of the independent suburban districts would like, at this time, to explore the possibility of sharing personnel to perform such services.

The problems involved in travel to and from neighboring districts interested in sharing or cooperating in various ways has been considered. If the assumption that thirty minutes travel time between districts is acceptable for cooperative purposes, considerable numbers of metropolitan districts could engage in such activity.
CHAPTER V

CRITERIA FOR RECOMMENDATIONS FOR
INTER-DISTRICT COOPERATION

Data gathered as a part of this dissertation suggest twenty-three ways for independent suburban school districts to improve their programs through cooperative action with neighboring districts. Superintendents of schools of some independent suburban districts indicate interest in each of these ways. No cooperative program can be established unless, in a given area, at least two school district leaders are interested in cooperative action and have the same or similar needs. Conversely, where at least two districts express interest in the joint solution of a common problem prima facie evidence exists that inter-district cooperation is possible.

This establishes the need for criteria. The criteria which follow should be considered as operational for the purpose of this study. Their purpose is to aid in the establishment, for each metropolitan area, of a definitive statement. This statement will outline what forms of cooperative actions are appropriate for each metropolitan area in Ohio. This appropriateness will be determined by the data of this dissertation considered in light of the criteria here established.
General Criteria

Three general criteria are to be applied in each one of the cases to follow. The first of these relates to its legality. Each of the proposed ways of inter-district cooperation is legal under the laws of the State of Ohio. In some cases, particularly in relation to the establishment of programs of special education, specific legal requirements must be met in order to qualify the program for assistance under the Ohio Foundation Program (Revised Ohio Code 3323). In these cases, the legal aspects of the proposed criteria are considered separately.

The second general criterion is that there be some experience in the cooperative operation of such a program, or that experience in single districts of sufficient size to develop such a program can be applied. In considering this criterion it should be remembered that the interest expressed was predicated upon the assumption that the program could be provided at a cost per pupil similar to that of districts presently offering such a program. Therefore, continued interest in cooperative action could not be assumed if unusually high per pupil costs were involved.

The third criterion is that an apparent dissatisfaction with the present means of meeting a need, or a willingness to explore cooperative action be present in the metropolitan area. This has been established, where it exists, through the replies of superintendents of schools to the questionnaire of this study.

Specific criteria are organized into three general groups. Group One is organized around a variety of proposals for different ways
of possible inter-district cooperative action. The labels represent classifications of two or more suggested specific proposals into a cluster which represents a general activity. In some cases the personnel or facilities are interrelated to the extent that the proposals should be considered as a group. In other cases, districts could develop one method of cooperative action without concurrently adopting others of the same group.

Group Two represents proposals for cooperation based upon needs for special education. Objective criteria in this case are established in terms of numbers of children identified or total population from which normal incidence can be assumed.

Group Three represents suggestions for inter-district cooperation to share the services of various specialized professional persons. Persons of this sort can make valuable contributions to a school program on a part-time basis in circumstances where there is not so large a student population to be served that full-time attention is needed.

Each of these types of proposed inter-district cooperation has been tried in some way. Perhaps the most common example of this is in those county school systems which have accepted fully the concept of the county district as a service agency for the local school districts. In such cases the county office serves as an organizational and coordinating agency which makes possible the sharing of the various resources both human and material.
Special Criteria

The criteria as used in this study were developed according to the following procedure. First, the groupings of proposals for cooperative activity were made. The generalized criteria for all activities and the specific criteria for each distinct way of cooperative action were then developed.

The literature of the field was used as a source of proposed criteria. Careful reading sometimes established evidence about programs of the type suggested for cooperative action presently in force. Other times research data relative to the needs of satisfactory programs of this type were found. These data from literature were used to develop specific criteria in each instance. These criteria were then proposed to a jury of persons deemed to be especially knowledgeable about the operation of these kinds of programs in Ohio. Criteria, as finally used in this study, represent that developed from research or present practice as modified by the judgment of members of the participating jury.

The jury was composed of two sub-juries. The first of these was selected from those knowledgeable about administrative organization. This jury was composed of the members of The Center for Educational Administration, The Ohio State University. Members of this portion of the jury included Dr. Walter Hack, Dr. T. J. Jenson, and Dr. William Frederick Staub. This portion of the jury was asked to study and approve or suggest modifications to those criteria proposed for Group I and Group III.
The second portion of the jury was composed of members of the Division of Special Education, The Bureau of Educational Research and Service, The Ohio State University. Their responsibility was to approve or suggest modifications of the criteria used in Group II. Some members of this jury also reacted informally to parts of Group III in which they had special competence. This portion of the jury was composed of Dr. Viola Cassidy, Dr. Donald Smith, and Dr. Wilda Rosebrook.

To reiterate: The criteria to be used in the determination of recommended ways of inter-district cooperation have been developed through four steps. First, the literature of the field was searched to find appropriate descriptions of satisfactory experience with activities of this sort. Research reports about criteria for desirable programs were also sought. Secondly, these data were translated into specific criteria for each of the proposed ways of inter-district cooperation. Next, these criteria were reviewed by a jury of persons with special competence and knowledge in order to test the practicality for application in Ohio and as criteria for inter-district cooperation. Finally, the proposed criteria were modified in accordance with suggestions of members of the jury.

**First Group of Criteria**

General administrative organization and structure describes those activities included in Group I. A number of suggested ways in which districts might effect cooperative action have been suggested to the superintendents participating in this study. The ways relating closely to the responsibilities of administrative organization include
research activities and a variety of curriculum activities. These comprise Group I.

Within this grouping, ways of cooperating are sub-grouped into classifications organized around similarity of function. For instance, several ways of cooperative action to extend the curriculum vertically are grouped together. In some cases, a sub-group function requires cooperative activity as a group. In other cases, districts might cooperate in one way but not in another. The criteria as developed are either for the entire sub-group or for each activity according to judgments as to this necessity.

To Share Research Activities

Two partially distinct activities are grouped under this category. One form of research activity proposed was that to result in continuous information about community development. The second activity provides consultant help to faculty members of participating districts who wish to engage in action research projects. In both of these functions a research person is required.

Community development research requires wide participation of districts because of the necessity to have data covering relatively large areas. Many districts would have to cooperate in order for the composite data to have real value. A second consideration is that unless rather widespread participation were achieved, the unit cost of providing a person to perform these services would be relatively high.
In considering the role of the research person in working with classroom teachers one must consider the amount of opportunity he might have. Teachers are limited in the time they can devote to projects of this sort. The numbers of teachers who are interested in taking on obligations of this type are also somewhat limited. Thus again, the research program would seem to need to be rather widely based.

In the light of these considerations, the criterion for a metropolitan area is suggested:

That at least one-half of the districts of the area participate, and that this total be not less than three districts.

On this basis, for example, if the budget for personnel plus costs of operation were to be $7,000, each district would be able to have the benefits of research services at a maximum of slightly in excess of $2,000 for each district. Considering the size of many of these districts it seems likely that a per pupil cost less than $1.50 might be estimated.

For Curriculum Development

Two separate proposals are joined under this classification. The first of these suggests cooperation to provide a teaching aids center where materials appropriate to various grade levels and activities can be gathered. While it is quite true that a great deal of money could be spent in the full development of such a center, it is equally true that the mere centralization of presently existing materials such as film strips, models, charts, resource materials, and catalogues of human resources could represent perhaps a doubling of that available to
one district when only two districts share that material presently on hand.

The second proposal is for inter-faculty study groups to be organized so that teachers may have a structured, regularly scheduled opportunity to meet with colleagues from other schools to exchange ideas, research results, procedures, and experiences with different problems. Clearly, little cost is involved here. What really is needed is the development of an atmosphere conducive to this activity through the exercise of leadership to this end. The primary requirement for each of these proposals would seem to be that the travel time either to meetings or to draw material from a teaching aids center be sufficiently short as not to inhibit the participation. Consequently the criteria are suggested that:

1. At least two districts participate

2. These districts exist in such juxtaposition as not to require more than thirty minutes travel time between their central offices under normal conditions.

For Horizontal Curriculum

Three proposals have been made in this general area. While the area represents a similarity of interest, separate criteria need be developed for each of the component parts. The first of these proposals is for cooperative action in order that closed circuit educational television be shared. Costs necessarily run high in this regard. Perhaps the most widely known experience in this regard is that of Washington County, Maryland, known as the Hagerstown Project. Eight
schools participated in the original establishment of a closed circuit system for instructional purposes. An estimate of their costs has been reported:\footnote{L. L. Lewis, "Equipping the Hagerstown ETV Project," \textit{American School Board Journal}, Vol. 13 (January, 1958), 39-41.}

\begin{itemize}
\item First transmitting studio \ldots \ldots \$30,000
\item Supplemental studios (two) \ldots \ldots \$26,000 ea.
\item Television film system \ldots \ldots \$15,500
\item 200 receivers (equipment and installation \ldots \ldots \$42,000
\end{itemize}

Similar experience in the Evanston, Illinois schools indicates a cost pattern of about \$1,500 per room served.\footnote{William G. Carpenter \textit{et al.}, "Closed Circuit Television Is Used at Evanston Township High School," \textit{The Bulletin of National Association of Secondary School Principals}, Vol. 42 (January, 1958), 19-54.} While, to be sure, these costs can be amortized over a long period of time, it is equally clear that sufficient schools will need to participate in the original establishment of facilities so that some spread of the costs of establishing transmitting centers which serve all participating schools can be made.

Reasonable prudence would seem to suggest, in view of these facts, that the following be established as a criterion:

That at least five school districts participate.

This determination is made in consideration of the fact that it is likely that any one school system will desire to begin relatively slowly to integrate this teaching-learning resource into its program, and that perhaps as few as three classes will originally be programmed. If this were to be the pattern, then some fifteen classrooms might be a
reasonable expectation as beginning participants. Experience has shown this to be about the minimum number economically feasible.

An exception to this criterion and its rationale should be made if the central core city should participate. If this were to be the case, a number of additional factors would need to be considered. It is possible that with this participation an open circuit educational television system might be preferable. Cost considerations, legal aspects, financing possibilities and techniques employed in such a circumstance are beyond the scope of this study. It is necessary to say, however, that the total planning in such a case is radically different, and the foregoing discussion inapplicable to such a circumstance.

The second and third proposal in this group consists of suggestions for cooperation between districts so that additional educational experiences may be presented to students at the high school level. On one hand, these proposals make possible the presentation of the Advanced Placement Program in which special courses are offered in high school. These courses result in the granting of college credit for work done while still attending high school. The other possibility suggested is that districts cooperate to offer those special courses, particularly of a vocational nature, which none presently can do because no one school has enough students with common interest to make it possible for classes to be organized.

In each of the above, the number of students one might reasonably expect to find out of a suburban high school population who would desire to participate in such a program were one organized is the essential factor.
Rockland County, New York, represents an example of a fully operational program designed to permit districts to share in the offering of a complete program of vocational education. In this instance, different participating schools offer parts of the total program. The students shift for a portion of the school day to schools which are equipped and staffed to offer the program in which they are enrolled. Seven schools participate offering nineteen separate vocational courses. A total enrollment of about 5,000 students is involved, of which some 12 to 14 per cent are engaged in vocational preparation. These schools report that the programs, after deducting the assistance available through the federal grants for vocational education, can be offered at a per pupil cost of $380.00 per pupil per year, only slightly above the per pupil cost of the rest of the school program. The guidance of this experience would indicate a satisfactory criterion to be:

At least three districts participate

Virtually any combination of three independent suburban school districts in Ohio would result in the establishment of a total student population of at least 3,000 students, or one half the number utilized in the establishment of the complete program of Rockland County. It would seem to be likely that if as many as five districts were to join in the coordinate effort that the program of Rockland County could be duplicated if not surpassed.

Only an adaptation of the actual courses offered would be necessary in order that the machinery to effect cooperation to offer vocational programs on this basis be equally suitable for the offering of programs leading to participation in the Advanced Placement Program. The figures for Rockland County which show nineteen forms of vocational education for twelve to fourteen per cent of the student population would indicate that on an average, with this base, courses are feasible for one per cent of the student population. Thus, since the method is the same, an interest on the part of the students equal to one per cent of the student population desiring to participate in the Advanced Placement Program in any one subject area would seem to justify its establishment through this means. The same criterion would then be valid for this part of the proposed program.

Vertical Extensions of the Curriculum

Two ways of providing for vertical curriculum extensions have been proposed for inter-district cooperation. The first of these is that the districts combine their efforts in order to provide or to augment existing programs for adult education.

Connecticut has established criteria in this regard through state law. The state requires that an adult education program be established and maintained under certain circumstances. The law requires that every

---

community with a population of 10,000 or more persons establish and maintain an adult education program with a full-time director.

This same figure can be applied as a criterion for inter-district action.

Cooperative establishment of an adult education program can be justified where the combined populations of the districts involved total or exceed 10,000 persons.

Since persons will not be inclined to travel too far or for too long a period of time in order to attend adult education classes, some consideration needs to be given to a criterion covering this factor.

Thus:

The central office of participating districts be located in such a way that travel time between any two of them not exceed thirty minutes under normal circumstances.

Consideration of the need for an upward extension of the educational facilities available to the youth of Ohio has been made. One of the most authoritative of these is Eikenberry's. He quotes as realistic figures from a study made in New York. This indicates that eighteen per cent of the eighteen to nineteen year old group can reasonably be considered as prospects for a two-year program beyond the twelfth grade. If one assumed that a program could be defended on the same basis Ohio uses to charter high schools, i.e., sixty students per grade, then 120 students would be a minimum number for which a program

---

5D. H. Eikenberry, "The Need for the Upward Extension of Secondary Education in Ohio" (monographed, College of Education, The Ohio State University, 1954). (Mimeographed.)
should be planned. Using the eighteen per cent figure from the New York study, it seems reasonable to establish the following as the criterion:

The districts graduate on an average 350 students per year from their present twelfth grade, or that the districts have high schools with a total population in average daily membership of 2000. (This latter figure assumes high schools to include grades nine through twelve.)

Second Group of Criteria

Incidence of Need for Special Education

Consideration of the problem of establishing criteria for cooperative action to develop special education programs must be based upon the incidence of children with these problems. It is true that incidence figures are based upon general experience with unselected populations. Each district needs to make a head count in order to know what their needs are. At the same time, if cooperation is to be initiated, some consideration needs to be given as to whether the circumstances at a particular time are typical or atypical. It is in this regard that statistics of incidence can be helpful.

Heck has established an expected incidence as shown in the table on the following page.6

Research done by the Division of Special Education of the Ohio Department of Education has indicated the following as expected incidence for this state.\(^7\)

### TABLE 28

**EXCEPTIONAL CHILDREN PER 1000 SCHOOL POPULATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Incidence Per 1000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impaired hearing</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defective speech</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crippled</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blind</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially sighted</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 29

**PERCENTAGES OF EXCEPTIONAL CHILDREN IN THE SCHOOL AGE POPULATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blind</td>
<td>0.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially sighted</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deaf</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard of hearing</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech impairment</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crippled</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Objective criteria serve a real purpose in making it possible to come to decisions about the feasibility of inter-district cooperation. It must be remembered, however, that meeting these criteria in no way

---

\(^7\)Division of Special Education, State Department of Education, Columbus, Ohio.
can be construed as a basis for the actual development of cooperative programs. The criteria can be used to help judge whether it is sensible for districts to plan a cooperative attack. Subsequently, other considerations must be thought through by administrators seriously planning such cooperation.

Additional Considerations

Programs for blind and for partially sighted children, for instance, are difficult. An itinerant teacher can make a contribution in teaching such skills as Braille reading, in counseling, and in helping their regular classroom teacher devise learning experiences appropriate to the needs of these children. On the other hand, success depends largely upon the willingness and ability of the regular classroom teacher to adapt her program. The advantage in this approach is in the fact that it is possible for these children to live at home, be in contact with others who are not handicapped, and thus to share experiences of other children. Itinerant teaching services must be, to be effective, closely coordinated and integrated with the regular program. Each child must be contacted frequently. A shared program which is too limited, whose teacher's time is too widely spread, can hardly succeed.

The children who are handicapped in hearing or speech also can profit from itinerant teaching programs. Here, too, careful planning including the full cooperation of the regular teacher is very important. Homonyms, for instance, are difficult for most children. They present special problems for those with speech or hearing difficulties.
The use of an itinerant teacher also implies the participation of children in the activities of the regular classrooms. Such experiences often need special planning. For instance, many classroom experiences involve discussion, committee reports, panels, and similar activities. The child with hearing difficulties should be seated in such a way as always to be able to see the speaker if lip reading techniques are to be employed. This is difficult at these times. It is not so serious a problem in those cases where the use of hearing aids is possible.

Perhaps the most difficult problems exist in the education of children who are the orthopedically handicapped. Each case presents unique problems. The decision of the attending surgeon as to need for the child must be a primary consideration for any form of therapy. In order for districts to cooperate in a program of this sort either each would need to establish specially equipped rooms, or the cooperating districts would need to arrange to transport all of their children to a central location. The provision for occupational and physical therapy is, under the best of circumstances, difficult and expensive. The provision of educational experiences for orthopedically handicapped after their dismissal by the orthopedic surgeon should, of course, be planned. This normally involves only making it possible for children to get to the place where instruction is to take place. Elevators in multi-story buildings help.

In every case where cooperative action is planned to develop special education programs, one additional consideration must be kept in mind. In order for the program to be successful, and in order to
qualify for Ohio Foundation Program assistance, care must be exerted in
the identification of pupils to participate. It is necessary for a
school psychologist to establish, through careful evaluation, that
children can profit from the experience planned. If one were not
available one would need to be secured. Perhaps a better suggestion
would be that the cooperative action of participating districts be
extended to the hiring and use of such a person.

The above cautions must be considered concurrently with the
objective criteria to follow. In a circumstance where several districts
desired to cooperate to establish a special education program, the
objective criteria need to be applied as in this dissertation. The
leaders of these districts then must think through the necessities
for the development of a desirable program tailored to their specific
needs which will accomplish their objectives. The brief discussion
above is designed to suggest these concerns.

For the Blind

Ohio State eligibility for Foundation Program assistance
establishes the following as the definition of educationally blind:

a) One who has no vision
b) One whose vision is such that he cannot use it as his
   chief channel of learning
   c) One whose eye use is prohibited for pathological reasons

This same law establishes a unit size for an educational program
for the blind as five children, organized such as to permit the
maximum participation in the regular classroom environment with such
utilization of the special classroom or resource room as is necessary in
each case. This room is used especially for classes in Braille skills.
The criterion of importance here then is that sufficient numbers of children needing this care have been identified. The experience in Ohio is such as to suggest that out of 10,000 children, two may normally be expected to be blind. Thus:

1. At least five children presently residing in the area be identified as blind within the definition of the Ohio Department of Special Education.

2. In the absence of identified children, a population of 25,000 children of school age.

For the Partially Sighted

Ohio regulations for Foundation Program assistance for educational programs for partially sighted children defines them as:

a) Those who cannot read more than 20/70 on a standard Snellen chart in the better eye, or who cannot see well enough to read the regular texts provided at his grade level.

b) Children who have more than six diopters of myopia and under ten years of age, also those who have three diopters of myopia where it is progressive

c) Children with hyperopia who have symptoms of asthenopia and whose vision in the better eye falls below 20/70.

d) Children who have an astigmatism of more than 3.5 diopters and whose vision cannot be brought up to more than 20/70 in the better eye.

e) Children with corneal opacities whose vision is 20/50 or less in the better eye.

f) Children with inactive keratitis where vision is 20/50 or less in the better eye

g) Children having congenital cataracts, secondary cataracts, malformation or fundus lesions where no acute condition is present, with vision of 20/50 or less in the better eye.

h) Children whose visual handicap does not fall within the above categories are viewed as the responsibility of the regular school program. However, there may be children
outside these categories who in the opinion of the vision specialists would benefit from placement in special education units. Pertinent data concerning vision, mental ability, and school achievement should be submitted to the Division of Special Education for consideration before placement is made.

A unit of ten children is established by law as being eligible for organization and to receive foundation assistance on an itinerant program basis. One may assume an incidence of children with such need of two children per 1000 student population. Criteria for suggesting the organization of a cooperative program for this purpose is then suggested as:

1. At least ten children who have been identified as eligible for this program according to the regulations of the Ohio Department of Special Education.

2. In the absence of identified children, a population of 5,000 children of school age.

For the Deaf

A deaf child is defined as one who—

a) Does not have sufficient hearing to acquire speech through auditory stimulation, or

b) Has an average loss in the speech range of 60 or more decibels in the better ear.

A teacher unit for deaf children has been established as six children. As in other special education areas, the program should be established so that the children will spend as much time as possible within the regular grade rooms with children of their age.
The criteria for a metropolitan area then would be:

1. At least six children who have been identified as eligible for this program according to the regulations of The Ohio Department of Special Education.

2. In the absence of identified children, a population of 6,000 children of school age.

For Those with Speech and Hearing Problems

Speech and hearing disorders do not lend themselves well to generalized statements of eligibility of children for special education programs. Consequently, the Ohio Department of Special Education standards specify that eligibility shall be determined by a therapist on the basis of the facts of each individual case. Since this is the case, the therapist must be provided before the number of cases which need this special treatment are determined. The Department suggests that one therapist for each 1500 school age children be used as a basis.

The nature of the problem of providing for special education help in this area is such that the sharing of this service between schools has been widely used. The Department recommends that not more than six school buildings be visited by one therapist. In those cases where enrollments exceed 700 students, three or four buildings should be considered as a maximum.

In the suburban independent systems considered here the following criteria would seem justified:

1. That at least two districts desire to share this service.

2. That these two districts represent a total student population of at least 1500 students.
For the Orthopedically Handicapped

Eligibility for a program designed for crippled children is conditioned upon the specific diagnosis of the attending physician and his report to the State Department of Special Education establishing the need for such a program.

The regulations of the Department establish a minimum number of children at eight in order to justify the establishment of a special education unit. In the case of a multi-graded unit, not more than four grades are to be organized under the responsibility of a single teacher.

Thus the following criteria seem necessary:

1. At least twenty-four children who have been certified by an attending surgeon as needing special education of this type have been identified.

2. If the circumstances are such as to require centralized location of shared facilities, that these be located in such a way as to avoid undue travel time or hardship for such children who are to utilize these facilities.

Third Group of Criteria

The third group of criteria needed is that which can be applied to determine the appropriateness of the utilization of a variety of specialized professional personnel. In this instance, the primary additional criteria can best be stated in terms of the base of student population to be served by these special persons.

Two publications provided the criteria originally proposed to the jury. The first of these was prepared by the Connecticut Association of
Public School Superintendents.\textsuperscript{8} This was published in 1954. The second was developed by the United States Office of Education.\textsuperscript{9} In cases of some of the criteria, modifications were made at the instance of the jury.

The following listing represents those ratios deemed desirable and economical as ratios between professional personnel as described and students served:

To share the services of a school physician:

One physician for the first 2500 students. If additional physicians are to be employed, a ratio of one for each of the next 4000 students should be used.

To share the services of a school dentist or a school dental hygienist:

One of either of these personnel for each 2500 students

To share the services of a school nurse:

One nurse for each 1500 students

To share the services of a school psychologist:

One psychologist for each 2500 students

To share the services of a guidance counselor:

One counselor for each 500 students

To share the services of subject matter supervisors or consultants:

A minimum ratio of one supervisor for each forty teachers

\textsuperscript{8}Connecticut Association of Public School Superintendents, Guide to the Development of Educational Administrative Units (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Cooperative Program in Educational Administration, 1954).

To share the services of a visiting teacher:

One visiting teacher to serve a school population of a minimum of 1500 students

To share the services of a lunch consultant or dietician:

One dietician or consultant for every 2500 meals served daily

To share the services of a teacher for the homebound:

One teacher to serve a school population of a minimum of 15,000 students

The preceding criteria are designed to serve only one purpose. If in a given metropolitan area some superintendents are interested in planning cooperative action in order to provide services, these criteria can apply. If the combined circumstances of the districts considering cooperative action equal or exceed the criteria outlined above, it seems reasonable that this action may be undertaken economically and in such a manner as to be consistent with what is recognized as acceptable practice.

Summary

The criteria previously described are designed to be operational for purposes of this dissertation. They are to serve as a basis upon which judgments about each of the metropolitan areas can be made. Objective data exist about the number of pupils, programs of schools, and perceptions of need as held by the superintendents of the independent schools of the areas. These criteria are designed to help make it possible to help those superintendents who indicate that they would like to cooperate with neighboring districts to improve the programs
or offerings of the districts. The product of this research is to be statements recommending further exploration of cooperative effort in those cases where interest exists and where circumstances will permit. This product will be developed in the final chapter.

A summary of the criteria as developed is presented below. For each projected way in which districts might cooperate, three general criteria have been met. First, that the action is legal under existing Ohio legislation. Second, that some experience exists with programs of this sort. Third, that some dissatisfaction presently exists among the districts studied with the present ways in which needs are being met.

The following specific criteria then need to be applied as appropriate:

1. For Research Activities
   1. At least one half of the districts of the area participate, and that this total be not less than three districts.

2. For Teaching Materials Center
   1. At least two districts participate.
   2. These districts exist in such juxtaposition as not to require more than thirty minutes travel time between their central offices under normal conditions.

3. For Inter-Faculty Cooperative Study Groups
   1. At least two districts participate.
   2. These districts exist in such juxtaposition as not to require more than thirty minutes travel time between their central offices under normal conditions.

4. For Closed Circuit Educational Television
   1. That at least five school districts participate.

5. For Establishment of Cooperative Vocational Programs
   1. At least three districts participate.

6. For Establishment of Cooperative Advanced Placement Programs
   1. At least three districts participate.
| 7. For Cooperative Adult Education Programs | 1. A combined population total in the cooperating districts of at least 10,000 persons. |
|                                           | 2. That the central office of participating districts be located in such a way that travel time between any two of them not exceed thirty minutes under normal circumstances. |
| 8. For Establishment of Community College Program | 1. The districts graduate on an average of 350 students from their present twelfth grade, or that the districts have high schools with a total population in average daily membership of 2000 (grades 9-12). |
| 9. Special Education Programs for the Blind | 1. At least five children presently residing in the area be identified as blind within the definition of the Ohio Department of Special Education. |
|                                           | 2. In the absence of identified children, a population of 25,000 children of school age. |
| 10. Special Education Programs for the Partially Sighted | 1. At least ten children who have been identified as eligible for this program according to the regulations of The Ohio Department of Special Education. |
|                                           | 2. In the absence of identified children, a population of 5,000 children of school age. |
| 11. Special Education Programs for the Deaf | 1. At least six children who have been identified as eligible for this program according to the regulations of The Ohio Department of Special Education. |
|                                           | 2. In the absence of identified children, a population of 6,000 children of school age. |
| 12. Special Education Programs for Those with Speech or Hearing Problems | 1. That at least two districts desire to share this service. |
|                                           | 2. That these two districts represent a total student population of at least 1500 students. |
| 13. | Special Education Programs for the Crippled (Orthopedic) | 1. At least twenty-four children who have been certified by their surgeon as needing special education of this type have been identified.  
2. If the circumstances are such as to require centralized location of shared facilities, that these be located in such a way as to avoid undue travel time or hardship upon children who are to utilize these facilities. |
| 14. | Employment of a School Physician | 1. A minimum of 2500 students to be served. If additional ones needed, one additional for each of the next 4000 students. |
| 15. | Employment of a School Dentist or Dental Hygienist | 1. A minimum of 2500 students to be served. |
| 16. | Employment of a School Nurse | 1. A minimum of 1500 students to be served. |
| 17. | Employment of a School Psychologist | 1. A minimum of 2500 students to be served. |
| 18. | Employment of a Guidance Counselor | 1. A minimum of 500 students to be served. |
| 19. | Employment of Subject Matter Supervisors of Consultants | 1. A ratio of one supervisor for each forty teachers to be served should be maintained as a minimum. |
| 20. | Employment of a Visiting Teacher | 1. A minimum student population of 1500 students to be served. |
| 21. | Employment of a Lunch Consultant or Dietician | 1. A minimum of one for every 2500 meals served daily. |
| 22. | Employment of a Teacher for the Homebound | 1. A minimum student population of 1500 students to be served. |
CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In Chapter I of this report two purposes for this research were identified. The first of these is to bring empirical evidence to bear concerning the problems and needs of Ohio independent suburban school districts. At earlier points in this report this evidence has been summarized and recorded. The second purpose of the study is to suggest, in terms of this evidence, ways in which districts might cooperate in order to enable themselves to accomplish ends from which they presently seem blocked due to their relatively small student populations.

In Chapter IV the circumstances of the independent suburban schools are detailed. Measures are reported of the extent to which superintendents express interest in inter-district cooperation in twenty-three distinct ways. Evidence has been collected and reported bearing upon the objective facts of the numbers of children with special education needs which presently have been identified as residents of these districts. Data indicating the special personnel whose services are not available but desired by superintendents of independent suburban school districts are reported.

Chapter V is devoted to reporting the development of criteria for use as a part of this study. These criteria have been developed to serve a single operational purpose for this research. Data exist for each of the metropolitan areas of Ohio. School districts through their
superintendents have reported objective facts as well as the perceptions of needs they hold. It is now possible to say for each metropolitan area: there are so many districts without given programs; there are so many superintendents who have expressed interest in inter-district cooperative action in one or another of the proposed ways; there are so many superintendents who would like to share the services of certain specialized personnel operating on an itinerant basis. The existence of the desire for such cooperative inter-district action meets the first factor established as necessary. This is that such cooperation be feasible. Cooperation is only feasible when at least two persons or groups desire to cooperate.

The second factor established as necessary is that such cooperation be practical. If distances are too great itinerant personnel lose effectiveness. Program cost factors climb when too few students with special needs exist. The first of the contributions of established criteria then is to provide a benchmark against which the practicality of such cooperation may be judged.

The final requisite factor is that such programs be acceptable. Acceptability in this sense means that programs established through inter-district cooperation be good programs. It is indefensible to establish, through cooperative action, a service or program which is unworthy, which purports to meet a need when in fact such cooperation does not result in improved educational advantages for the children affected. These criteria make it possible to judge the acceptability in each instance of the proposed inter-district cooperative programs. The
opinion of persons with established competence in each area provide guidance.

Recommendations to the independent suburban school districts will be made in this chapter. As indicated above, these recommendations will result from the application of the established criteria to the data as collected. It should be emphasized that these recommendations are limited as the scope and purpose of this study are limited. No intention exists nor should the conclusion be drawn that the making of any given recommendation is to be interpreted as saying to the schools of that area, this is something that you should do. No such prescriptive role has been designed. The purpose of this study has been to find out where interest in and need for such inter-district cooperation exists. Presumably neighboring districts might each have the same desire to cooperate with someone to accomplish some end, without knowing of the other's feeling. This study should be interpreted as a means of collecting, analyzing, and reporting the existence of present fertile possibilities for such inter-district cooperation. Once a superintendent knows that another neighboring superintendent shares his interest, the function of this study will have been partially achieved. The specific ways in which such cooperation is to be affected is something that these superintendents will need to agree upon among themselves. If, in trying to reach such agreement, the principals find conditions which seem to them to outweigh the advantages they thought they saw in cooperative action, then this is a decision they must make. Urging a specific course of action upon them is not the purpose of this research.
Certain limitations must be established relative to the recommendations which will follow:

1. These recommendations are based upon the existing circumstances as reported for the 1959-1960 school year.

2. The recommendations are based upon the opinions of the superintendents serving the districts during the 1959-1960 school year. Changes in administrators may mean changing opinions on one or more of the implied issues.

3. The criteria for the recommendations has been developed consistent with authoritative views at this time. What is considered to be good practice is never fixed. Those rendering judgments in assisting with this study may well change or modify in some degree their opinions in light of new knowledge or increased experience with these kinds of problems.

4. The recommendations are not inconsistent with Ohio Statutes or the regulations of the Ohio Department of Education in 1960. At later dates, this would need to be reviewed.

Three of the suggested possible ways in which districts might cooperate have been omitted from these recommendations. These are: cooperation in the carrying out of the business affairs of the districts, in providing classes for slow learners, and in providing special education opportunities for the gifted. This omission has been made in spite of the fact that some superintendents have reported that they would be interested in such cooperative action. In the case of the group called "cooperation to facilitate the operation of business affairs," relatively few superintendents indicate interest. A large number of superintendents indicated that they were dissatisfied with the present provisions for education of slow learning children as well as gifted children in their areas. However, careful investigation failed to establish useful standards for or experience with cooperative programs.
between districts to provide such an opportunity. Some expression of opinion in the questionnaires from superintendents indicated also that while they were dissatisfied with their present programs they felt that improvement could best be accomplished within their own school rather than as an inter-district cooperative program. For these reasons criteria were not developed and consequently recommendations will not be made for the cooperative provisions of such programs.

As has been previously discussed, the twenty-three projected ways in which districts might cooperate were organized into clusters of similar activities, e.g., the cluster identified as "for research activities." In the application of the criteria it is, in some cases, deemed better to consider this cluster in a unitary way. This decision was reached in those cases when the resources for providing any one of the individual activities could, without additional resources, also provide the others. In the case of the cluster "for research activities," a person to carry on the activities necessary for research relative to community development could also serve as a guide for teachers engaging in local action research projects. In such a case, the cluster is treated as a single activity. In other cases the provision of one form of cooperation would have little bearing upon the provision or lack of it of others of that cluster. Hence, separate criteria are applied in such instances.
Recommendations for the Various Metropolitan Areas

Akron. Only one independent suburban school district exists in the Akron area. No return was received from this district. Obviously, no possibility exists for cooperative action unless such might be achieved with either the Akron City Schools or through some relationship with the Summit County Schools. Either of these alternatives is outside the scope of this study. Therefore no recommendation can be made for this area.

Canton. The circumstances in the Canton metropolitan area are similar to that of the Akron area. At the beginning of the study it was hoped that perhaps in spite of the rather great distance between the one independent suburban district in the Akron area and the one in the Canton area, some marginal form of cooperative activity might be possible. North Canton did express interest, but in absence of the possibility of cross area cooperative activity no recommendations can be made.

Cincinnati. Cincinnati has more independent suburban school districts than does any other metropolitan area in Ohio. A great deal of interest exists in the proposals made in the survey questionnaire. One half or more of the sixteen districts in this area express interest in developing cooperative action in six different ways. Those instances
where interest has been expressed which meet the established criteria for inter-district joint action are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Activity or shared service meeting the criteria and hence recommended</th>
<th>Number of districts expressing interest in this form of cooperative action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Research Services</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Curriculum Development</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. To offer special courses</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. To establish Advanced Placement Program</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. To establish adult education program</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. To establish community college</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Speech-hearing therapist</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. School physician</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. School dentist or dental hygienist</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. School nurse</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. School psychologist</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Guidance counselor</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Subject matter consultants</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Visiting teacher</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Cincinnati, the superintendents of four districts indicated that they would like to establish some relationship whereby they could share the services of a psychiatrist. It was impossible to establish criteria from the literature relative to the number of students needed to make this practical. Consequently, it is further recommended that
districts interested in this service engage the assistance of a psychiatrist to judge with them whether this might be practical in light of their particular needs.

Cleveland. Nearly as many independent suburban school districts exist in the Cleveland area as do in Cincinnati. Like the Cincinnati area, considerable interest in cooperative action is present. As has been pointed out earlier in this study, the districts in Cleveland have larger student populations than do the districts in Cincinnati, or for that matter any of the other metropolitan areas. Those generalizations about kinds of interests particular to districts with large populations who spend relatively larger amounts per pupil are frequently appropriate to the Cleveland metropolitan area. Several recommendations for development of inter-district action in this area are made:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Activity or shared service meeting the criteria and hence recommended</th>
<th>Number of districts expressing interest in this form of cooperative action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Curriculum Development</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. For provision of closed circuit television instruction</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. To offer special courses</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. To establish Advanced Placement Program</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. To establish adult education program</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. To establish community college</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Speech-hearing therapist</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. School physician
9. School dentist or dental hygienist
10. Subject matter consultants
11. Visiting teacher

As in the case of the Cincinnati metropolitan area, several districts, five in all, indicate that they would like to share the services of a school psychiatrist. The same recommendation is made in this case. The particular details of the need as identified by those responsible for developing programs in these districts should be discussed with a psychiatrist in order to determine whether this might be established on a basis satisfactory to those concerned.

Columbus. The two previous metropolitan areas have more independent suburban districts, and consequently more opportunities for similar problems and interests to occur. Columbus, with far fewer districts, however, is an area in which many possibilities for inter-district cooperation exist judging from the reactions of the superintendents to the proposals made in this study. There are only five independent suburban districts existing in the Columbus area. A sixth district meets almost all of the requisite conditions for inclusion in this listing except that it has a slightly larger total population than the upper limit established by the U. S. Census Bureau and used in this study. For practical purposes, however, this district certainly can be
considered as a possible cooperating district in projected plans. Several areas are recommended for further planning to effect cooperative action:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Activity or shared service meeting the criteria and hence recommended</th>
<th>Number of districts expressing interest in this form of cooperative action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Research Activities</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Curriculum Development</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. For provision of closed circuit television instruction</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. To offer special courses</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. To establish Advanced Placement Program</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. To establish community college</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Speech–hearing therapist</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. School dentist or dental hygienist</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. School psychologist</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Subject matter consultants</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dayton. The Dayton area has seven independent suburban school districts. Only four of these districts indicated an interest in the proposals which were made. This may, in part at least, be attributed to the fact that several independent districts are more like distinct small cities than suburban communities as the term commonly is used. This smaller degree of interest in inter-district may result from the greater distances separating these districts. It may also reflect the fact that
superintendents in these districts do not have a feeling of sharing a common metropolitan area to the degree present in other areas. At least, less interest exists. Still, some possibilities for joint action seem to be present. The four districts responding indicate interests which might be met by shared action and resources as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Activity or shared service meeting the criteria and hence recommended</th>
<th>Number of districts expressing interest in this form of cooperative action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Research Activities</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Curriculum Development</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. To establish adult education program</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. To establish a community college</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Speech-hearing therapist</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. School psychologist</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Lorain.** Three independent suburban districts exist in the Lorain metropolitan area. All three of these districts indicate interest in a cooperative shared approach to problems common to them. It is evident, of course, in those areas in which few districts exist, the likelihood of common problems as well as the likelihood of meeting the established criteria for the establishment of shared services or joint action is reduced. Thus in the Lorain area as well as in other areas with few independent suburban districts, less opportunities seem presently to exist for this kind of action than is the case in the larger areas. Following are recommended joint actions for the Lorain area.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Activity</th>
<th>Number of districts expressing interest in this form of cooperative action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research activities</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To establish adult education program</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech-hearing therapist</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School nurse</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidance counselor</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting teacher</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Toledo. There are only two independent suburban school districts in the Toledo metropolitan area. Both of these districts indicated substantial interest in the development of cooperative approaches to common problems. In a circumstance of this kind both districts must express an interest in any proposed activity, and then this activity must pass the tests established by the criteria established for this purpose. As in the case of other metropolitan areas with few independent suburban districts, fewer opportunities exist for cooperative action than is the case in the larger areas. Four distinct proposals have been identified by the superintendents as problems in which they might be interested in a joint effort. These all meet the outside criteria and hence are recommended.
### Category of Activity or shared service meeting the criteria and hence recommended | Number of districts expressing interest in this form of cooperative action
--- | ---
1. To establish inter-faculty study groups | 2
2. School physician | 2
3. School dentist or dental hygienist | 2
4. School psychologist | 2

**Warren.** Three of the four independent suburban school districts in the Warren area have been identified by their superintendents as prospective participants in inter-district cooperative action. These three are particularly well suited, geographically, in that they are located close to each other. They have relatively little traffic problems to make travel between them difficult. A structure for professional communication presently exists. The superintendents of two of these districts meet regularly as a part of a superintendents organization in the area. The following is recommended:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Activity</th>
<th>Number of districts expressing interest in this form of cooperative action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. To establish a center for teaching aids and similar materials</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. To establish a community college</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Speech-hearing therapist</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Subject matter consultants</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Two superintendents in the Warren metropolitan area indicated an interest in those activities grouped as research activities. The circumstances here are such that the criteria for recommendation are not met. Consequently, this activity is not included. Nevertheless, the fact that such interest exists between the leaders of two districts closely situated to each other should be noted. A possibility is present that should these persons explore carefully their common needs together with the resources they could marshal for such joint action, they might still find it advantageous to establish such a program. This possibility should be considered.

Youngstown. Only two independent suburban districts exist in the Youngstown area. Of these, only one responded to the survey instrument to indicate interest in joint action. Consequently, only minimal possibilities for such action are present in this area. As reported earlier, some inter-district cooperation is recommended for the Warren area. The Warren area meets the criteria for cooperative action to establish a community college. The one district in the Youngstown area which responded indicated that this was one of the ways in which this superintendent would be interested in joint action. Thus it can be recommended that, in this instance, inter-metropolitan area cooperative arrangements might be explored in order to make it possible for the one district to participate in this manner. This is possible here since the Youngstown-Warren region is nearly a single metropolitan area in many respects.
Conclusions from the Data of This Study

Utility of Conclusions

Four major questions were posed in Chapter I of this study. The conclusions to be drawn are conclusions which answer these questions. Four major purposes are served by this.

First, these conclusions serve a predictive purpose. A basic assumption of this study is that under some conditions it is desirable for those responsible for educational programs in independent suburban districts to engage in joint cooperative action with neighboring district staffs in order to improve the educational services to the students. Voluntary action of this kind implies the necessity for shared interest leading to shared planning. Were two or more districts to engage in some joint venture which was not widely approved as desirable, such cooperation would only be assured during the term of office of those persons responsible. On the other hand, joint activity which has broadly based professional approval likely would survive personnel changes. Thus planning and investment of resources is made sounder when it can be shown that widespread approval of such action exists. If a proposed course of action is one which is generally approved by persons presently responsible for administering programs of education, it is more likely to survive changes in personnel than one which is widely rejected.

These conclusions may serve a stimulatory purpose. It is often difficult to see how improvements may be made in those cases where one is used to thinking that difficulties are inherent in the nature of the
circumstance. Savages ignorant of fire hardly can imagine a solution to the problem of cold. Only recently has most of mankind been able to think constructively about solutions to many age old problems. In the same way, administrators sometimes accept limitations of program growing from small pupil populations as "one of those things." It is in circumstances of this kind that the stimulation of new ideas is needed. Perhaps established agreement that a given course of action has promise will affect the opinion of others who, at first, were doubtful. If this second look is caused, then the conclusion has served a stimulatory purpose.

A third purpose of these conclusions is reportorial. The data resulting from the investigation are all recorded in an earlier chapter. The conclusions draw upon that data. Thus, the broad findings of the study are reported. These conclusions report the considered professional opinion of a group of superintendents of schools. All of these serve districts with the common characteristics of independence and of being suburban in nature. A number of specific proposals were advanced to test what kind of joint action would be considered by these superintendents as being helpful to them. Their combined judgment is reported here.

Finally, these conclusions serve the research design by providing empirical generalizations. They report some degree of uniformity. Broad inferences from these generalizations are dangerous because no attempt has been made in this study to establish why such uniformity exists. As generalizations, they are true among the participating
districts at the time of the study. Since no further investigation of them has been made, they rest at this level— as empirical generalizations.

Statement of Conclusions

The conclusions stated here are the result of data gathered in this study. These data represent the responses of the superintendents of schools of independent suburban school districts in Ohio. A variety of proposals were made to them. Each of these represented directly, or by implication, a way in which two or more districts might cooperate to do jointly what each was blocked from doing separately. The conclusions, then, reflect the opinion of these superintendents as to the usefulness of this proposal, not abstractly, but in relation to the specific problems of their specific district.

1. **At present more interest exists in joint action to extend the curriculum horizontally than in any other group of activities.** Horizontal extensions as used here embrace such additions to the curriculum as to enable the school to broaden the experiences available for the student population it presently has.

2. **Nearly as great interest exists in proposals designated as research activities and as curriculum development activities.**

3. **No one specific proposal for cooperative action received a great deal more support than did all others.** Of all of the proposals made, over one half were supported by over one half of the administrators as of interest and desirable for their district.
4. In general, superintendents who are interested in any one form of proposed joint action favor several forms.

5. It is possible to distinguish differing degrees of support between superintendents who serve differing kinds of districts.

6. Superintendents who serve districts spending relatively large amounts per pupil and which have relatively small pupil populations tend to support proposals for inter-district joint action.

7. Superintendents who serve districts which have relatively large populations, and which spend relatively a small amount per pupil tend to favor suggestions for cooperative action.

8. Superintendents who serve districts which are small and which spend relatively little per pupil tend to be far less interested in proposals for cooperative action than any other group of superintendents.

9. When proposals relative to cooperative action in the areas of curriculum development and for vertical curriculum extensions were made, significant differences in proportion of superintendents supporting the proposals existed.

10. Where dissatisfaction exists with the program of special education, the small size of the student population is widely identified as the block to improved operation.
11. Four kinds of specialized professional persons are widely identified as needed additions to staffs. These are psychologists, physicians, speech-hearing therapists, and dentists or dental hygienists. Several other persons are also widely sought although to a lesser degree.

12. Independent suburban school districts exist in such juxtaposition that for most, several other similar districts exist within thirty minutes travel time.

Consideration of Major Questions

Four major questions were posed at the beginning of this study. It was felt that the answering of these questions would provide useful guidance toward the achievement of the testing of the hypothetical solution which is the purpose of this study. Those conclusions reported above contain the essence of the empirical knowledge resulting from this research. From these conclusions need be drawn the answers to the questions.

Question 1. Are the superintendents of independent suburban school districts in Ohio satisfied with the provisions in their districts of——

(a) extensions or adaptations of the conventional educational program in order to meet the specific needs of individual students?
(b) curriculum development activities designed to study and improve the quality of educational services presented?
(c) specialized professional personnel qualified to perform various pupil personnel services?
(d) economical business administration practices?

Clearly no such complacency exists among these superintendents. This is especially true in those instances where the educational program
is directly involved. Fourteen proposals were made to these leaders of ways in which they might engage in new activities unusual in nature and requiring much planning, organization, explanation, and administration from them if they were to be adopted. The only rationale for these was that they might make possible a better program of education for the boys and girls of the districts. Excepting those metropolitan areas containing only a single independent district, every area contains wide support for these proposals. Columbus, Cincinnati, and Cleveland metropolitan areas contain possibilities for six jointly operated programs each. In these three areas alone, over twenty-two separate districts indicate present interest in establishing programs along the lines proposed. In all but one of the metropolitan areas of the state present interest exists in cooperative action to enable districts to participate in joint curriculum development activities.

Multiple opportunities for establishing itinerant programs to enable the utilization of special professional personnel exist. Each of these opportunities reflects the expressed dissatisfaction of superintendents of schools with the resources presently being brought to bear upon the educational problems of the several districts. Speech-hearing therapists are particularly in demand. Over forty per cent of the independent suburban school districts in Ohio have unmet needs for this type of personnel. Nearly as much need exists for school physicians, school dentists, and school psychologists.

Considerably less concern is felt for the business administration of the districts. Proposals were made which implied the possibility of
utilizing more machine operations and sharing personnel resources. Superintendents were much less interested in these proposals, reflecting lessened concern for improving ways of carrying out this responsibility. Some interest exists, particularly in the Cleveland and Warren metropolitan areas. Nevertheless, it seems fair to conclude that superintendents of independent suburban districts feel little present impetus to modify these operations.

Question 2: Are there differences in viewpoints of superintendents of independent suburban school districts which vary in accordance with the size or wealth of the districts they serve?

The posing of this question implies two things. Either that differences exist because of variety in the nature of the problems superintendents from differing districts face, or that the alertness and aggressiveness in identifying problems on the part of superintendents varies as districts vary. No attempt to push this question was made in this study. Careful attempts to establish whether differences did exist were made, however. One might assume that districts with small pupil populations and which spend relatively little per pupil would be most in need of sharing joint facilities or resources. This assumption would lead one to the belief that the greatest interest in proposals to improve programs by sharing resources might be found among superintendents of districts of this kind. Such is not the case. Consistently, and in some cases significantly, less interest and support for these proposals was received from superintendents of these districts than from any of the other three categories. Simply stated, joint activity or shared resources is only slightly accepted by superintendents of these
districts as a desirable plan for their districts. The reasons for this seeming contradiction lie outside the scope of this study, but perhaps provide a clue as to needed additional research.

Two groupings of superintendents provided consistently greater support for the multiple proposals made in this study. Those serving districts with small pupil populations, and which spend relatively large amounts per pupil, generally are interested. One might surmise that their expenditure level reflects high community support for and expectation of their schools. Where superintendents of these districts find themselves blocked from providing high quality education by inadequate pupil population bases, they are receptive to suggestions for increasing the population base through combined action with neighboring districts.

The other group of superintendents generally favoring inter-district cooperative action were those serving school districts spending little per pupil relatively but which had a large pupil population. Their problem seems to be similar but reversed from the preceding group. One can surmise that faced with inadequate budgets to provide full programs from their students, these men are thus ready to consider favorably proposals which may make it possible for them to expand their offerings more economically than they might acting alone. If this analysis is correct, these are the natural allies of the previous group.

Superintendents of schools of districts which presently spend much per pupil and which have relatively large pupil population bases are interested in joint action with other districts, but to a lesser
Data of this study indicate that the reason for this is that these districts presently have programs of the type proposed for joint action. Where they do not presently have such programs, they exhibit interest. Presumably, had more proposals of programs not presently in operation been made this group, their interest would have been greater.

**Question 3.** What blocks are identified by superintendents of these districts as hindering the achievement of the level of educational services they desire for their districts to provide?

Blocks were identified specifically in relation to the program of education for exceptional children in the construction of the questionnaire used in gathering data. Superintendents were asked to indicate the extent of satisfaction-dissatisfaction with these programs. Those indicating dissatisfaction were then asked to indicate the reason something to improve this unsatisfactory situation had not been done.

An inadequate pupil population base was identified far more frequently than any other reason as blocking this improvement. In many of the cases this was identified by one hundred per cent of the respondents as the major cause. With few exceptions, this reason was cited more frequently than all other suggested reasons combined.

**Question 4.** Would cooperative or joint action be perceived by these superintendents as a promising solution to their problems?

This question represents the nub of this entire study. This project was designed to test a hypothetical solution to an identified problem. The problem, broadly stated, was involved with difficulties experienced by relatively small suburban schools in trying to provide a complete modern educational program. The hypothesis tested was that
superintendents with problems growing out of the relatively small student population base might be able to do some things jointly on a cooperative basis with similar neighboring schools that could not economically be done autonomously. A popular song declares that it "takes two to tango." So it takes at least two to establish any form of joint activity. Unless several superintendents in a given area agreed to join, some cooperative joint activities would be impossible. Unless at least one other was interested, no joint action would be possible no matter how interested any one superintendent might be in such a possibility.

Casual inspection of the data reported earlier in this study is sufficient to lead one to accept that superintendents do see joint activity or shared services as desirable and as appropriate to the problems they face. Careful examination of these data substantiates the fact that in nearly every metropolitan area sufficient interest is reported to make it possible to recommend a number of specific forms of joint action. The data establish the fact that there exists sufficient students in two or more districts, located sufficiently close together, whose superintendents favor specific forms of cooperative action, that such is feasible, practical, and acceptable.

Thus it seems possible to give a qualified yes as the answer to this question. No superintendent sees joint action as the solution to all of the problems he faces. None agree that all of the proposals would be helpful and pertinent to their district. Some are not interested in this approach at all. Yet, the majority of superintendents of independent suburban schools agree that there are some ways in which
their school program could be improved if it were possible for them to work out means to work with their neighbors to this end. The facts of many of these situations indicate that, judged by criteria established in this study, it is possible for this to be achieved.

**Implications of This Study**

Several implications of a general nature require attention prior to the discussion of the specific implications of establishing programs recommended in this study. These general implications result from an evaluation of the climate of opinion which presently exists among the superintendents of schools of Ohio's independent suburban school districts.

Factors exist in American education which seem inexorably to be pushing the intermediate unit of administration toward acceptance of a role as a service center to its subordinate districts. Studies of this tendency reflect the existence of this trend as well as document its source. Needs for specialized personnel, consultative help, and centralized resources spark this movement.

The responses of the superintendents polled in this study indicate that the same needs exist among small independent suburban communities. Those factors which impel small county schools to look to their county office for special services also demand action from independent schools. It seems clear that some way of broadening programs, utilizing more specialized personnel, and providing for special education needs is presently felt by educational leaders.
Their alacrity in indicating interest in the proposed solutions of this study testifies to this.

An assumption was made in inaugurating this study that citizens expect suburban schools to provide a full, high quality educational program. Many of the residents of suburbs recently have moved from the central core city. They are used to all of the special services that large metropolitan school systems provide, and consequently tend to expect the same quality and quantity of services from the suburban district. This assumption seems to have been born out. In no case did a response indicate that the proposals for expanding the services elicit any indication that the educational leaders saw no reason or justification for such expansion even where little interest for joint activity existed.

Proposals for joint action were not, as the reported data indicate, universally welcomed. A high percentage of superintendents, however, committed their districts to at least a willingness to study proposals of this kind. This implies that the jealously guarded autonomy of the independent districts is not an "iron curtain." Persons working in this area must realize that many of these districts achieved independence from county school administration with some difficulty. This independence is prized. However, such an opinion does not preclude cooperative action of the kind proposed in this study. A heartening degree of communication between districts exists. Many superintendents reported that they met regularly with neighboring superintendents to engage in professional discussions. This existing
communication channel provides a start from which cooperative action may readily develop.

This study seems definitely to indicate that a master plan for inter-district cooperative action can only be suggested in broad generalities. Each metropolitan area is a complex of independent districts. Each complex has characteristics of its own. Radical differences exist between the districts in one metropolitan area and those of another. One area may be composed of relatively small, wealthy districts. Another contains large units. A third is composed of a mixture of types. Since the needs and interests in inter-district cooperative action are affected by the size, wealth, and geography of the potentially participating districts, specific planning must be done in each metropolitan area. A workable plan for one area easily may be completely irrelevant for another.

Legal implications exist which must be carefully considered by persons who embark upon a course of action such as that advocated in the recommendations of this report. This is uncharted ground in Ohio. A number of considerations must be thought through.

School districts in Ohio have broad implied powers. All of the activities proposed for joint implementation can be and are engaged in by individual districts. Some question might be raised as to whether districts may act jointly in those ways in which they may unilaterally. Courts have consistently upheld that boards of education possess the necessary powers to do those things required for the accomplishment of the purpose for which they exist. Little doubt exists that shared or
joint activity is legally possible. Statutory enactment specifically enabling such action would be desirable, however, and in addition perhaps would stimulate further exploration in this area. Legislation of this kind should establish specifically that it is legal for boards of education to engage in joint, shared, or cooperative programs to be jointly financed and controlled. Statutory enactment of such permissive legislation, together with necessary requirements for its organization, would be desirable.

One of the shortcomings in present operation is that many districts cannot provide special education for children because they cannot qualify for assistance through the State Foundation Program. From the standpoint of the local districts, this is wasteful. When financial resources have been appropriated, failure to qualify for sharing this resource represents a wasted resource to the district. A real advantage would be gained if several districts acting cooperatively could qualify for Foundation Program assistance where none individually could so qualify. Participation in the Foundation Program requires certain conditions. As the statutes presently are worded, payments may be made to local, exempted village, or city school boards only. Clearly, this implies that joint action under the present law would have to be so arranged that a quasi-corporate school district assumed responsibility for the program. This is possible, of course. One district could agree to organize, staff, house, administer, and finance a given special education program. Cooperating districts then could send their children on a tuition basis in accordance with Ohio
Revised Code Section 3317.08. It seems likely that for the present this
would be satisfactory.

Experience in New York where specific legislative enactment has
established cooperative school districts is pertinent. Cooperative
districts are financed by payments from quasi-corporate districts.
State aid is received by the cooperative district calculated according
to the valuation of the home district of each pupil. Officials in New
York indicate their opinion that it is a cleaner financial arrangement
for the funds to be returned by the cooperative district to the quasi­
corporate district. Single payments of entire shares are then made
back to the cooperative district in order to finance the program.¹

Many of the proposals for cooperative action imply the necessity
for the sharing of personnel not presently employed by participating
districts. Problems of staff organization and utilization are present.
If two or more districts are to share certain personnel, several
questions must be answered. How are these persons to be supervised and
by whom? From whence shall come the policy decisions which will give
scope and direction to their work? Who shall be responsible for the
hiring of the individuals to be used? What relationships shall exist
between these persons and the present instructional staffs of the
participating districts?

¹Letter from Dr. Harry W. Langworthy, Associate in School
District Organization, The State Education Department, Albany, New
York, October 13, 1959.
Two alternatives present themselves. The first of these is, as implied in the discussion above, that one district shall add these personnel to its staff as regular staff members. Participating districts then might utilize this resource on a tuition basis, delegating, by implication, responsibility for all staff personnel to the one district.

The other alternative would require legislative enactment. Action of this type has been taken in New York. In that state cooperative districts exist. They are operated by a board composed of members of boards of districts participating in the cooperative action. This board makes policy, hires personnel as needed and provides the necessary administration and executive personnel to carry out the functions of the cooperative district. It would seem desirable that some experience in shared activity be gained in Ohio prior to the establishment of such a formalized structure. Certainly, however, as districts try cooperative action, they may find it to their advantage to study a plan similar to that of New York to test its applicability to the needs in Ohio.

The Confederation Principle

Intermediate units traditionally have exerted authority over subordinate districts. When an agency of this type provides services, the arrangement necessarily is tinged with paternalism. Generally, the resource is provided because, in the judgment of the intermediate unit, this is desirable. Hopefully, the local districts participate in such a decision. The fact of a superior-subordinate relationship can rarely be ignored, however.
The proposal developed in this study would result in a new kind of relationship between an intermediate unit and those districts receiving the services. In this case, the locus of authority is different. The intermediate unit would derive such authority as it exercised from the districts it serves. In a sense, authority would bubble up rather than come down. Joint action would be established in the way and at the time the leaders of the participating districts determined.

This is the confederation principle. Autonomous districts operating under this principle would retain full authority over every aspect of their program. They would delegate to an intermediate unit only such authority as was specifically required to do a particular job. The nature of this task would be defined by the independent districts. Each district would retain full rights to join, abstain, or cooperate in part with such an intermediate agency.

Confederation implies a certain looseness or lack of formal structure. This would characterize the unit proposed here. In many instances, one district might fully operate a program and make its benefits available to others on a tuition or even a quid pro quo basis. Perhaps no additional superstructure of administration would be needed at all.

To some such an arrangement is suspect. They question the lack of binding commitments, compulsion, and external supervision. They see looseness as an avenue for laxity of performance. It may be, however, that an opposite effect would result. It is conceivable that an invitation to join other districts to achieve a goal might energize a
slow leader or conservative district. Perhaps the opportunity to participate freely and withdraw easily would encourage those who recoil from firm obligatory agreements. Apparently the challenge of a new approach to the solution of common problems conjointly with respected neighbors has a strong appeal to the leaders of suburban districts.

As discussed earlier, little likelihood seems to exist that independent suburban schools will voluntarily return to the status of a local district in the county system. Most reject suggestions that they consolidate into larger suburban districts or else merge with the metropolitan city. With these rejected, an alternate proposal seems mandatory. The application of the concept of a loose confederation of independent districts might serve the purpose.

Additional Research Needed in This Area

The research reported here is, at least in one sense, a pilot study. A hypothetical solution to an established problem has been tested. The feasibility, practicality, and acceptability of this hypothetical solution have been studied insofar as this is possible through measuring the opinions of the chief administrators of the appropriate districts. It is apparent that much additional research needs to be carried out in this area. Following are several instances which in the opinion of the writer represent opportunities to fill in the present gaps in our knowledge.

1. Each of the metropolitan areas should be the object of individual depth studies designed to tailor specific
recommendations and programs for the implementation of these recommendations. This work should be designed to achieve three primary goals. First, a definite program representing the agreed upon joint or cooperative action deemed appropriate for the area by the superintendents involved should be established. Secondly, administrative processes appropriate to this function must be studied. Finally, a written plan designed to outline in detail the project should be developed. This plan should be developed to serve two functions. It should be designed so that it can be presented to boards of education of the districts to participate in the study. It also should be appropriate for use as an outline for a program of public relations designed to inform the publics of these districts.

2. Depth studies of the experiences in other states which have established programs for inter-district cooperative action should be undertaken. New York and California have gained attention in this area. These programs should be investigated in order to establish an evaluation of their effectiveness. Four major factors of this operation should provide the focus of such investigation. The unit cost on a per pupil basis should be studied. Cost characteristics relative to numbers of students from a given district and the effect of numbers on per pupil costs should be investigated. Careful appraisal of the effectiveness of the educational services presented to pupils on a cooperative basis in
comparison with these same services as presented by individual districts should be made. The reaction of pupils and the school community to participation in joint programs is an important aspect. Finally, some investigation of the reaction of those persons working as staff members in a cooperative inter-district program should be undertaken.

3. The question of just how many children with a given need should be present in order to justify the reasonable establishment of a special education program for them is difficult to answer. The difficulty lies in the fact that research evidence is scarce. Much of this question implies the degree of concern held by the leaders of a given district. Nevertheless, factual information relating numbers of pupils, unit cost of program, and effectiveness of the operation should be established to guide districts faced with this problem.

4. The research reported here is based in part on an assumption that persons living in suburban areas have higher expectations of the schools of their area than do some others. Research designed to contrast and compare the expectations of suburbanites with those of exurbanites, urbanites, rural and perhaps other demographic classifications is needed. Do people in suburbs perceive their schools differently? If so, what is the nature and extent of such difference. If such differences exist, what is their implications for
curriculum, staff characteristics, school-community relations, extent of lay participation, and extent of financial support deemed reasonable as well as other concerns.

5. The study reported here indicates some desirability in beginning joint action modestly and informally. Presumably there is a point at which the purposes of such action can better be served through a more formal structure. New York's cooperative boards are an example of such more formalized structure. Research evidence to suggest points at which those participating in inter-district cooperative action would need to consider whether their program is large enough to warrant such formalization is needed. A variety of factors would enter into such a decision. These should be identified and discussed in terms of their implications for the program.
APPENDIX

The Ohio State University

December 9, 1959

Dear Superintendent:

For some time the Center for Educational Administration has been interested in helping school districts seek new ways of providing educational services. Differing community circumstances seem to require differing approaches to these problems. A study is presently underway which is designed to explore ways and means by which independent suburban school districts can augment their capacities to do this.

Mr. Robert L. Walter, a research assistant at the Center, has evidenced sincere interest in this problem. His experience in public education has been in districts of this type. Consequently, he is undertaking research focused upon this aspect of educational administration for a doctoral dissertation.

In order to carry out the design of this project, a questionnaire is enclosed. Your help is needed in supplying the information requested. We believe firmly that the results of this study will benefit the administrators working in independent suburban school districts. This study of organizational methods to provide better tools for administering public education is an opportunity for superintendents in the field to give of their knowledge and experience in cooperation with university based research to the furthering of our common aspirations.

We solicit your cooperation in this study with the promise that, if you desire, you will be supplied with a report of the findings.

Very sincerely yours,

John A. Ramseyer
Professor of Education
Dear Superintendent:

The questionnaire which follows is a part of a study designed to determine how and if ways might be developed so that the relatively small independent suburban school district might cooperate with similar neighboring districts in order to help solve some vexing problems. The problems which are being considered are those which could be handled more easily if the district were larger, or had a greater number of students.

The questions are designed to explore two topics:

1. What is your present opinion about possibilities for cooperative action with districts close to you?

2. What is the current status in your district in caring for that small group of exceptional or handicapped children which are present in most districts?

At some later time, after these data are compiled, I will want to talk with some of the group of superintendents who complete this questionnaire. This will be especially true in cases where several from a given area indicate an interest in cooperative action to help with the same problem. This fact makes it necessary for me to ask that you identify yourself and your district in the data sheet. Please be assured that no identification of specific districts will be made in reporting the results of the study, and that your opinions will be held in strictest confidence.

SUGGESTIONS:

In answering the first part, please make the following assumptions:

1. That some organized method for carrying out these cooperative actions can be devised.

2. That this cooperation would be open to your district in conjunction with neighboring districts of similar size and organization.

3. No sacrifice of the independent authority of your district is implied.

I would like personally to thank you for your help in completing this form. Attempts to solve practical problems through research techniques depend upon the guidance of those such as yourself who are working on the scene.

Sincerely yours,

Robert L. Walter
Research Assistant
OPPORTUNITIES AND NEEDS FOR COOPERATIVE ACTION SCALE

Possible Opportunities for Cooperative Action

DIRECTIONS: Please check those instances which you feel would interest you at least to the degree of wanting to explore the possibilities further.

1. Two or more districts might cooperate in order to do research in such areas as population trends, industrial growth, possible changes in zoning, and contemplated real estate developments.

2. Two or more districts could, perhaps, cooperate in the development of a teaching aids center. Thus, a library of motion picture films, recordings, filmstrips, models, microscope slides, etc., could be jointly developed and utilized.

3. Two or more districts could cooperate to utilize the services of such highly specialized professions as school physicians, dentists, nurses, psychiatrists, and group testing technicians who might be hired on the basis of devoting agreed upon amounts of their time to each of the cooperating districts.

4. Two or more districts might cooperate in order to utilize expensive machines which can automate some processes. Accounting machines, check writing machines, addressographs, and data processing equipment are examples of machinery of this type which are applicable to school use.

5. Two or more districts might cooperate to organize inter-school faculty study groups. Through an arrangement of this kind, for instance, all of the teachers of a given subject or grade could meet from time to time to exchange ideas, techniques, and perhaps, teaching materials. This would supplement the in-service training programs going on in each individual school system.

6. Two or more districts might jointly operate a bus maintenance garage. Thus one or more trained mechanics could be hired to devote all of their time to servicing and repair of buses of the cooperating districts.

7. Two or more districts might cooperate in purchasing and distributing supplies. Some arrangement might be made wherein the cooperating districts purchase at least those items which they each already purchase separately on a joint basis in quantity lots when discounts can be secured by such mass purchasing.
8. Two or more districts might cooperate to utilize the services of a director of research. This person might work with staff members by serving as a consultant for local action research projects to aid faculty members who desire this sort of help.

9. Two or more districts might cooperate to make possible the use of educational television on a closed circuit basis in order to augment the regular program of instruction.

10. Two or more districts might cooperate to share special curricular offerings which are desired by only a small number of students. Examples might be that of advanced courses such as accounting, or trades and industries courses such as television repair or beautician training.

11. Two or more districts might cooperate in order to present the suggested Advanced Placement Program which leads to the earning of college credit while still in high school.

12. Two or more districts might cooperate to organize, staff, and present a program of adult education for the people of the cooperating communities.

13. Several districts might cooperate to offer a community college, or thirteenth and fourteenth year of secondary education for those young people of the cooperating districts who need and desire this type advanced education.

14. Please indicate below any other ideas you might have for possible ways through which cooperative action between districts such as your own might make possible the utilization of resources, or the achievement of economies which are otherwise difficult for you due to size factors. Any other reactions to the possibilities of cooperative programs will also be appreciated.
**Special Education Needs in Your District**

**DIRECTIONS:** Please fill in the data requested in the appropriate boxes. If you cannot supply all data exactly, please give your best estimate. The classifications are as they are used by the Ohio Division of Special Education.

1. 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification of need</th>
<th>Normal expectancy for Ohio</th>
<th>Total Number of children in your Grades 1-6</th>
<th>Number in this category—Grades 1-6</th>
<th>Total Number of children in your Grades 7-12</th>
<th>Number in this category—Grades 7-12</th>
<th>Source of these data (Please check)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blind</td>
<td>.2 per 1000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Statistics on file</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially Sighted</td>
<td>2 per 1000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Your best estimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deaf</td>
<td>1 per 1000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard of Hearing</td>
<td>10 per 1000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech Impairment</td>
<td>50 per 1000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crippled</td>
<td>5 per 1000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifted</td>
<td>25 per 1000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slow Learning</td>
<td>25 per 1000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. In meeting the needs described in the immediately preceding form, or in order to provide special services to pupils of the district, or to provide administrative assistance, some districts employ specially trained personnel. Assuming that these specialists could be hired so that the per-pupil cost was about what it is for large city systems which employ these specialists, indicate by checking the appropriate space those whose services you would welcome as needed and valuable resources on either a part-time or full-time basis. If you presently use persons of this sort, please so indicate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would like to have</th>
<th>Would like to have</th>
<th>Use Now (Paid by our board)</th>
<th>Use Now (On some other basis)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>full-time</td>
<td>part-time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Physician</td>
<td>School dentist</td>
<td>School nurse</td>
<td>Psychologist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychologist</td>
<td>Psychiatrist</td>
<td>Speech and hearing therapist</td>
<td>Guidance counselor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject matter consultants</td>
<td>Visiting teacher</td>
<td>Homebound teacher</td>
<td>Consultant in corrective physical education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School lunch consultant (or dietician)</td>
<td>Others (Please list below)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Financial aid through the Ohio Foundation Program in providing for special education needs is presently being received (or has been applied for) in order that we may establish (or continue) special education classes in the following areas: (please check)

- Blind
- Speech impairment
- Partially sighted
- Crippled
- Deaf
- Gifted
- Hard of hearing
- Slow learning

4. In some situations, outside resources offer opportunities for special education. If, in your case, you have such an agency which in your opinion, makes it unnecessary for the public schools to offer such a program, please indicate the circumstances by checking appropriate boxes below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Public Agency</th>
<th>Private Agency</th>
<th>Semi-private Agency*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Tuition</td>
<td>No Tuition</td>
<td>No Tuition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tuition paid</td>
<td>Tuition paid</td>
<td>Tuition paid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>by board</td>
<td>by board</td>
<td>by board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>parents</td>
<td>parents</td>
<td>parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blind</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially Sighted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deaf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard of Hearing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech Impairment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crippled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slow Learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*An example might be one supported at least in part through funds available through the Community Chest.
5. If you are presently engaged in developing specific plans to provide special education facilities not presently provided for, please list them together with target dates for starting them.

6. If special classes for exceptional children are not available, please indicate briefly any other provisions you are using presently to give special help to these children.
7. Please indicate the degree of satisfaction you feel concerning the present special education services available in your district. In each case please circle the symbols which represent as follows:

1. **Highly satisfied** - I feel that this need is met fully.

2. **Fairly well satisfied** - I feel that more needs to be done although our children are better cared for than in most similar districts.

3. **Partially satisfied** - I feel that we are doing about what most good districts do.

4. **Generally dissatisfied** - I see the need for considerable improvement and additions to the program to reach minimum levels of satisfactory care.

5. **Greatly dissatisfied** - I feel that this problem is in need of greatly increased resources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provision for the blind</th>
<th>1 2 3 4 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provision for the partially sighted</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision for the deaf</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision for the hard of hearing</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision for those with speech impairments</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision for the crippled</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision for the gifted</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision for the slow learners</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. If you have indicated further improvement is needed in your judgment by circling either 4 or 5 of the previous question, please indicate below your opinion of the reason or reasons additional action has not been taken in your district. Please indicate this by circling:

1. If your board is not willing to accept this as a legitimate and necessary function of public education.

2. If your board is willing, but the community is not as yet ready to accept this as a legitimate and necessary function of public education.

3. If your board is aware of the need and anxious to improve the situation, but it has been impossible to secure appropriate qualified personnel.

4. If your board is aware of the need and anxious to improve the situation, but is blocked by problems of shortages of space needed to house the programs.

5. If your board is aware of the need and anxious to improve the situation, but even with the additional funds provided for through the foundation program, is blocked by problems of financing the program.

6. If you simply do not have enough children in these categories, in your opinion, to make it feasible to organize special education programs through the public schools.

7. If there is some other reason or combination of circumstances which hampers further development of a program to meet these needs. (If so please describe these circumstances below.)

Provision for the blind

Provision for the partially sighted

Provision for the deaf

Provision for the hard of hearing

Provision for the crippled

Provision for the gifted

Provision for the slow learner

Provision for those with speech impairments
DATA SHEET

DIRECTIONS: The information requested below is necessary in order that the data you have supplied can be tabulated and organized systematically. No identification of any specific district in treating these data is desired, would be of any use in this research, or will be made. It is important that you answer these questions fully and accurately.

1. The district you serve is:
   _____ An exempted village district   _____ A city district

2. Please indicate by checking the appropriate place, the pupil population of your district.
   _____ under 1,000              _____ 3,000 to 3,500
   _____ 1,000 to 1,500           _____ 3,500 to 4,000
   _____ 1,500 to 2,000           _____ 4,000 to 4,500
   _____ 2,000 to 2,500           _____ 4,500 to 5,000
   _____ 2,500 to 3,000           _____ over 5,000

3. Please indicate the number of neighboring independent suburban district superintendents to whose office you normally could drive in 30 minutes ______(Omit those of cities of 25,000 or over)

4. Do you regularly get together with superintendents of similar neighboring districts through some form of organization to discuss professional matters? _____ Yes _____ No

5. If yes, what is the name of this organization (or how do you generally refer to it)? __________________________________________________________

6. Please indicate the name and address of your district:
   ____________________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________________

Thank you very much for your cooperation. If you would like a digest of these data, please check ____ and I'll be happy to send it to you when it is compiled.

Cordially (and thankfully) yours,

Robert L. Walter, Research Assistant
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