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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION TO STUDY
AND PRESENTATION OF THE PROBLEM

The public schools are a political enterprise because education must compete with other governmental functions for limited resources . . . . The decision of "who gets what, when, and how" is a political one. 1

This study is concerned with organizations which have joined together to promote legislation for public schools. By doing this they have recognized the truth of Usdan's statement above. They have expressed concern about decisions that have been made especially in relation to state aid to local schools.

State aid has been made available by a basic state formula. In Ohio, this is referred to as the State Foundation Program. The formula in Ohio differs from that in other states as there has been no uniform procedure established among the the states for supplementing the financial effort of the local schools. Concerning state foundation programs, Stephen Bailey remarked:

1Usdan, Michael D., The Political Power of Education in New York State, Teachers College, Columbia University, in 1963, p.2
The nature of these formulae and the amounts spent under them are products of political conflict and resolution. If state aid to education is to continue at its present rate, or is to expand, it will be because politically active schoolmen have the knowledge and skill to marshal effective political power. 2

This need for financial support of the schools has placed the public schools in competition with other branches of state government, such as health and welfare, highways, correctional institutions and law enforcement.

With school boards experiencing increased resistance to additional taxation of real estate, they must turn to the state government for more assistance. In doing this, they enter into competition for the tax dollar. This means they must become involved with those making the decisions concerning educational support.

Stephen Bailey headed a study of some states in the northeastern part of the United States. At the end of the monograph he states: 3

Here, then, are the political realities of state aid to education. For those who believe that state governments must share an even larger burden of the cost of public education in the years ahead, the lesson is clear. The road to increased state aid is political. Those who travel this road successfully must understand the political process in all its ramifications.


3Ibid p. 108
They must develop intellectual, private interest group, bureaucratic, and political leadership capable of defining goals and of mobilizing effective power for the realization of those goals.

To do all this it is imperative that those interested in public education become lobbyists for the cause of education. In becoming lobbyists, they become involved with pressure groups.

Any group of persons which exists primarily for the purpose of exerting pressure on legislative and administrative officers may be called a pressure group. 4

The amount of money to be spent through the foundation programs has been the focal point of many debates in the legislative bodies. The educators have stayed out of politics because of the implication that to enter politics is "self-seeking", 5 To some educators, to be involved in politics would tend to ruin the reputation of the educators.

For generations education has bathed in an anti-political atmosphere. The cultivation of the proposition that schools should be "kept out of politics" is itself one of the most fascinating political items of American history. 6

Educators have become indirectly involved on the

---

5 Bailey, Op. Cit. p. ix
6 Bailey, Ibid. p. viii
political scene through their education associations. These associations have been active in sponsoring bills for the benefit of the public schools through friends in the legislative bodies.

Through their research programs they have tried to keep the legislators informed of the state's educational needs. In New York State, Usdan stated that:

If our educational program is to achieve its goals, our state legislatures must understand the issues and problems confronting educators. For, despite the attention being paid to the possibility of increased federal aid to education, it must be remembered that state responsibility for education is firmly imbedded in state constitutions, national traditions, and court decisions. 7

When associations of educators have expressed the educational needs of the state, they have been accused of promoting their own interests. Hence, they have sought to join with other groups to avoid this image.

To do this they have worked with other organizations, forming ad hoc groups or a formal type of council or committee. The organizations which have most frequently joined with the education associations to aid them in the competition for the tax dollars for the benefit of public education, are the school boards

7Usdan, Op. Cit. p. 1
association and P.T.A.

The education associations have been made up of educators and school employees of varying interests. Financial assistance to schools in the form of more adequate teachers' salaries and the flat rate of classroom guaranteed support has been of common interest. The classroom teachers, vocational teachers, guidance counselors, elementary and secondary principals, and superintendents form some of the departments in these associations.

The school boards associations are composed of elected officials who have common interests with the educators in the tax dollar as to the total made available to the state department of education for distribution to the school districts. They may differ as to how the money is divided between rural and urban, big and small districts, and the amount of the guarantee per classroom, but there are no large differences of opinion that would cause distrust of the other members. They would like more state aid in order to avoid going to the tax payers for additional money and to enable them to keep good teachers and administrators.

The P.T.A. groups have a high interest in the welfare of public education and what it does for the children of America. They work without any hope for personal
gain or release of pressure on them for obtaining money for schools. They have a wide membership which can be mobilized to act as a strong, grass roots pressure group.

Other organizations that seek to obtain more tax money for schools are the school employees, the school business officers, the bus drivers, the League of Women Voters, the American Association of University Women and the American Legion.

In a study of the northeastern states, Stephen Bailey found formal and informal groups that supported education, often to the distinct advantage of education. These groups were composed of educators, parents and other interested groups that saw a need to combine their efforts to improve education.

Bailey explains it in this manner:

Given such a diverse array of factors in the twilight zone between officialdom and public, it is not surprising that we find schoolmen in most of our states striving for some form of collaborative endeavor. The coalition may express itself as a permanent organization; it may be a strategic device of a state department of education, as appears to be the case in Rhode Island and possibly New Hampshire; or it may be an ad hoc one time affair as in Massachusetts. But the need is obvious and the trend toward cooperative action unmistakable.

For years the Ohio General Assembly had only one major organization speaking out for public education.

This was the Ohio Education Association (O.E.A.). The O.E.A. has for many years worked directly with the General Assembly on legislation and is responsible for the pressure that has led to the enactment of most of the State's major educational legislation since 1930. The State's Foundation Program is one of the major accomplishments of the O.E.A. Other credits are in the areas of the retirement system, tenure, certification, and an independent State Department of Education. Coalitions with other organizations in legislative action had been of a temporary nature. In a three legislative sessions study of O.E.A. activities, MacNaughton found:

... the record shows a high rate of enactment of O.E.A. bills which did not require extensive outlay of funds at the state level. Over the years most key O.E.A. bills not requiring expenditures have passed. 12

This indicates that when it came to obtaining additional money for schools, O.E.A. needed help from

10 MacNaughton, Robert, A Case Study of the Ohio Education Association, the Center for the Study of Educational Policy, School of Education, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana, 1968, p. 45

11 For many years the Superintendent of Public Instruction was appointed by the Governor. In 1955, an elective State Board of Education was provided for by the adoption of a constitutional amendment making the educational function "independent" of the Chief Executive. However, he continues to control the state budget which includes the Foundation Program. The Superintendent was then appointed by the State Board of Education.

12 MacNaughton, Op. Cit. p. 45
other organizations. In recent years this help has come from the Ohio School Boards Association (O.S.B.A.) and the Ohio Congress of P.T.A.

O.S.B.A. has been recognized as an authority group which represented the management or directors facet of public education. The Ohio Congress of Parents and Teachers has represented the parental viewpoint to the Ohio General Assembly.

Three or more organizations would propose bills through friends in the legislature. The Governor would have a bill for education. Other special interest groups would propose bills for better education, such as requiring all students to take driver education, or teaching communism only to high school seniors. All these pressure groups, while sincere in their proposals, presented an uncoordinated approach to the needs of education.

The legislators used this difference of opinion and goals to offset the influence of one organization against the others. In this way the educational bill of the dominant party usually was the one which became law.

New York State is frequently cited for its financial support of education. Much of this is due to the efforts of the New York Education Conference Board (NyECB). This board is composed of educators as well as board members and other lay persons interested in the
promotion of public education. Usdan stated:

The Conference Board was formed partly because the leaders of public elementary and secondary school organizations felt that the Board of Regents and the State Education Department were not providing adequate leadership in serving the educational needs of the state's youngsters. 13

According to Bailey's report, the NYECB was formed to coordinate efforts and secure better understanding between board members and teachers so they could work cooperatively to promote more state aid. It has been successful in this purpose.

To achieve a similar objective in Ohio and to facilitate communication among teachers, administrators, board members, university professors, and parent organizations, the formation of the Ohio Council for Education was proposed in 1962.

This study is concerned with this coalition.

**Problem Statement**

The Ohio Council for Education became a reality on the Ohio Educational-political scene in 1962. This study of the historical development of the O.C.E. was made to record what happened and why.

With the present militant attitude of teachers with negotiations and strikes causing what seems to be a division in education into labor vs. management,


an organization is needed to serve as a unifying agency. It is hoped that this study may serve:

1. To preserve the history of the Ohio Council for Education.

2. To compare the O.C.E. with similar organizations in the other states.

3. To give some guidelines for the future of the Ohio Council for Education.

4. To furnish guidelines for other states interested in councils for education.

Significance of the Study

Very little information was found to be available at the outset of this study as to what was happening in the United States where combined forces had been formed to promote legislation for education. The New York Conference Board was the only council that had extensive information written about it.\(^{15}\)

A survey of the northeastern part of our country was done by Stephen Bailey and others.\(^{16}\) While lacking in detailed information, it listed the different kinds of coalitions taking place elsewhere to meet the need for a unified effort.

By recording the growth and development of the

\(^{15}\)Usdan, Op. Cit.

\(^{16}\)Bailey, Op. Cit.
O.C.E. and comparing it with other organizations, it is hoped that this study may serve in the future as something of a guide to other interested states as to what to expect so that they may be prepared to meet the problems which will inevitably arise; and that the O.C.E. may be able to profit from the experiences of others and have a longer and more effective life.

Basic Assumptions

1. Other states than Ohio are experiencing the same demands for state aid in the day to day operations of their schools.

2. State legislative bodies show the same blindness to the needs of education in other states as they do in Ohio.

3. The leadership in the Ohio Council for Education was of equal quality to that of other states.

Scope of the Study

There are three kinds of coalitions: (1) ad hoc (self-formed for a single purpose); (2) those appointed by legislators and/or governors; and (3) a formally organized, politically independent and reasonably permanent council working for the improvement of education.

This study was concerned with the formally organized, politically independent council in Ohio. It also compares this one with the councils in other states which were still functioning during 1968.
A detailed study was made of the Ohio Council for Education's minutes and the perceptions of O.C.E. by members and staff prior to joining the organization and after they had been involved for a while, as related during interviews with the writer.

Thirteen other councils from other states with organizations similar to that of the O.C.E. were studied. They were asked to send their constitutions and/or by-laws. Three members of the council in each state were sent questionnaires.

Limitations of the Study

1. The historical development of the O.C.E. does not include all the details of the Issue I campaign. Issue I was the Plan for Education Progress bill that was placed on the November, 1965, ballot by O.C.E. by use of the initiative process provided in the Ohio Constitution.

2. The writer had to depend upon the questionnaires to find what was being accomplished in other states. Many councils sent legislative proposals that were under consideration. These are not included in the study.

3. No attempt was made to locate and find persons associated with councils which were no longer in existence for information on the reasons for their demise.

4. The observation of the O.C.E. meetings that
the writer was privileged to attend was continued from February, 1965 to December, 1967.

**Design of the Study**

The study was divided into four areas. The first area was a survey of the other states to find what other similar councils there were and what they were doing. The second area was the history of the O.C.E. The third area was the comparison of the O.C.E. with the other councils (that met the requirements of this study in similarity with the O.C.E.). The fourth area was the preparation of a summary and recommendations for the O.C.E. and a summary of the study.

**Survey of Other States:**

To find other councils similar to the Ohio Council for Education, all fifty states were contacted. All states responded. From the information received from these responses, the councils were written to secure the names and addresses of persons who would complete a questionnaire. The questionnaires were sent to three persons representing three different organizations in each of the thirteen states reporting the existence of councils such as the O.C.E. The three persons were to represent the educators, board members, and a lay person not directly associated financially with the field of education.

The questionnaire was designed to cover five
basic areas concerning:

1. The organizations which were involved as the councils were started and what their attitudes were toward the council as conceived by its founders.

2. The constitution and/or by-laws, showing particularly any change of purpose and what provisions were made concerning membership.

3. Finances, including sources of income and the basis for the allotment of the cost of operation.

4. As to whether the amount of contribution by a member group tended to give it more influence within the council.

5. The amount of influence the council had on legislators, governors, and others.

6. The extent of influence that professional educators had as compared to non-professionals within the council and in political situations when promoting legislation.

A constitution and/or by-laws were requested from all the councils in the study. These were studied as to organization structure, purposes and procedure.

**History of the O.C.E.:**

The minutes, letters and reports as presented in the meetings and found in the O.C.E. files were very helpful in establishing the chronological development of the O.C.E.; to identify the persons involved; and to
discover the expressed reasons for action taken by the Council.

The personal observation of the proceedings of the Trustees and Council meetings by the writer gave insight into the inter-action of the Trustees, in leadership and in the attitudes of the members of the Council.

The Comparison:

A comparison was made between the councils in other states and the O.C.E. to find if there seemed to be ways of improving or accomplishing more in Ohio.

Summary and Recommendations:

From all these areas the information was summarized and the conclusions given, with the recommendations of the writer for presentation to the O.C.E.
CHAPTER II
OTHER STATE ORGANIZATIONS

The chief school officers and the executive secretaries of the education associations in all fifty states were sent letters to find which states had organizations similar to that of the Ohio Council for Education.

Based on the answers from these officials, letters were sent to each such group requesting a copy of the constitution and/or by-laws under which the organization functioned. Questionnaires were sent to three of the member organizations in those cases where the state organization had a constitution. Wherever possible these persons were the officers or representatives of the education association, school board association, and the Congress of Parents and Teachers in such cooperative organizations.

The replies from the fifty states were placed in four categories: (1) those having voluntarily organized groups with constitutions or by-laws; (2) ad hoc groups; (3) those appointed by the governor or legislature of their state; and (4) states where no coordinating action
was reported.

Of the twenty-four states which reported some co-operative action, there were thirteen which operated under a constitution or by-laws (Arizona, Florida, Idaho, Iowa, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, South Dakota and Tennessee); six (Arkansas, Colorado, Georgia, Illinois, Nevada and Oregon) where the organizations were either appointed by the governor or the state legislature, and were given a budget for their operation. The remaining five reported ad hoc groups which meet to discuss mutual concerns, but took no action as a group to promote legislation. In many states, education associations reported coalitions with other groups when there was a strong mutual interest. As soon as the mutual interest had vanished, the organizations went their different ways. The state boards of education and P.T.A. were the organizations most frequently mentioned. The mutual interest could be a proposed change in the state foundation laws to increase the state's support of public education.

In the statements of purpose of the thirteen state councils which had formal structures, three categories were established:

1. Action groups formed to prepare, promote, and lobby for legislation in the interest of public education.

2. Study groups to call the members together to
review and discuss legislation being proposed by one of the groups, or legislation being considered by the legislative body.

3. **Information, research, and/or publishing groups** to conduct research, present data to discussion groups, and publish their findings to the members. Often the membership authorizes release of such publications to persons who can be influential in the passage of legislation.

Action groups were also of necessity involved in the other two purposes: discussion and study or research and publication.

If the organization was a study group, it was usually for the exchange of ideas upon proposed legislation. The purpose was to gain the support of the member organizations by mutual understanding of the reason for and form of the bill being presented. The study group usually did some research and releasing of information.

In doing research, the organizations used one of two methods: (1) let one of the members do it or (2) hire someone to prepare the information for them. The same two procedures were used in publication of the findings.

Of the thirteen constitutions studied, seven made it possible for the groups to serve primarily as action groups. They were Arizona, Idaho, Louisiana, Maine,
North Carolina, South Dakota and Tennessee.

The other six indicated combined study and dissemination of information as the basic purpose.

Membership in eight councils was restricted to those organizations having as their only purpose the improvement of public education. The number of members ranged from three to nine. Four states (Iowa, Maryland, North Dakota and South Dakota) had open membership in their councils, ranging from seventeen in South Dakota to seventy-six in Maryland. Open membership permitted organizations with secondary interest in education to be accepted as members of the organization, for example, the American Legion.

Where membership was restricted, the organizations usually were the education association plus three to five of its departments, such as superintendents, county superintendents, secondary principals, elementary principals and classroom teachers. Other members were the school boards association and the state congress of parents and teachers. Other organizations which have joined to help public education were the colleges and universities, American Association of University Women, League of Women Voters, Granges, veteran groups, farm bureaus, civic groups and chambers of commerce. In examining the list of seventy-eight from Maryland, it is difficult to find any type of organization that is not represented.
Related to membership was dues. Only six councils in the study required dues. Four of the states having open membership required dues. The other state councils depended on donations of money or services, or both, to meet the commitments of their operation. Only Arizona and Maryland indicated in their questionnaires that the expenses were shared equally. The education associations in seven states contributed from 40% to 60% or more to the support of the budget. In two states, Maine and Massachusetts, the education and school boards associations shared equally in two-thirds of the budget, and the other organizations assumed the remaining third.

The voting power was usually delegated to the organizations and not to the individuals representing them. In eight states only one vote was given the organization. The president and a delegate were asked to attend the meetings. In other states one to four votes were given according to the number of representatives allowed by the constitution. The only state that provided for four votes was Minnesota, where they were given to the lay organizations: Congress of Parent and Teachers and Minnesota Citizens Committee for Public Schools. This may have been designed to balance the voting power between the professional and lay groups.

In just three states unanimous agreement was required before the group could endorse any action. They
were Maine, Massachusetts and New York. Louisiana was the only one to require a two-thirds vote. In all the others a voting majority was not mentioned, so it was assumed a simple majority vote was all that was needed to endorse any legislative bill.

The usual officers listed in the constitutions were a president or chairman, vice-president or assistant chairman, and the secretary-treasurer. Occasionally the latter office was separated into two positions. Except for a two-year term established in Minnesota, North Carolina and North Dakota, the term of office was one year. The same officers could be re-elected. Eight of the organizations operated with executive committees that constituted the work group; seven operated as one body.

There were no provisions in any of the constitutions for an administrative or executive director.

**Questionnaire Survey**

Questionnaires were sent to three representatives of each council. This was done to find how their councils were started, how they operated, and their attitudes toward the council's procedures.

The questionnaires were divided into five areas. The first was about the starting of the organization, by whom, and who participated. The second was concerned with the purpose and membership regulations. Financial
support was the third area. Influence within the council and the council's aim as a group was the fourth area. The rating of professional educators as to their effectiveness within the membership and in the area of political activities was the fifth area.

The following pages report the responses given to the questionnaires.

Summary of Questionnaires

Questionnaires sent to 13 states included in the study revealed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire Type</th>
<th>Mailed Out</th>
<th>Returned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educators (E)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board Members (B)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lay Persons (LP)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>LP</th>
<th>T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Did you participate in the first meeting?</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Who called the meeting?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Association</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board Association</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educ. and Bd. Assoc.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educ. Asso. and College</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bd. Assoc. and College</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educ. Assoc., Board Assoc. and Lay Persons</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>LP</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. (Continued)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept of Ed. (N.D.)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grange (N.C.)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nat. Citizens Comm. (Texas)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Response</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Was there any reluctance on the part of your organization to join?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. Which of the following organizations participated in organizing this joining of educators and lay persons?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers Educational Assoc.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of Educ.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc. of School Bds.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cong. of Parents &amp; Teachers</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Legion</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendents Assoc.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elem. Principals Assoc.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Principals Assoc.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public School Employees</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Bus Drivers Assoc.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Teachers Assoc.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federation of Women's Clubs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universities &amp; Colleges</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governor's Advisory Comm.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. A. U. W.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Com. Assoc.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
II. Constitution:

Has the organization been operating in accordance with its stated purpose?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>E</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>LP</th>
<th>T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VI. Is membership to the organization restricted?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>E</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>LP</th>
<th>T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VII. Are you in agreement with this policy?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>E</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>LP</th>
<th>T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VIII. Finances:

Many state organizations find financing of their projects one of their major problems. Check below the sources of revenue for this organization by estimating the per cent of income from the different sources: (Report is given by frequency mentioned).

(Continued next page)
VIII. Finances: (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>LP</th>
<th>T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Membership</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donations from members</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution of services from members</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donations from other sources</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sale of research reports</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subscription to a magazine or publication of some kind.

IX. Do you find one member contributing more than the others? Listed below are organizations. Please estimate the per cent of the total budget their contribution makes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All share equally:</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Influence:</th>
<th>25-30%</th>
<th>30-39%</th>
<th>40-49%</th>
<th>50-59%</th>
<th>60+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers Assoc.</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>LP</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cong. of Par. &amp; Teachers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sch. Boards</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

New York State was the only state where the questionnaires were in total agreement on financing. Idaho and Massachusetts had two of three in agreement.

X. Area of Influence:

Has the amount of contribution
X. (Continued)

of any one organization
tended to give that member
more influence in the deci-
sion making? Yes 4 3 1 8
No 7 6 6 19
No Resp. 1 1 1 3
Total 12 10 8 30

XI. Which organization has the
most influence?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>LP</th>
<th>T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education Association</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Boards Assoc.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lay Persons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Educ.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal influence</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(3 Board members marked Education Association and School Board Association as equal.)

XII. Is this due to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>LP</th>
<th>T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial contribution</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: Members</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

XIII. At what level has the organi-
zation tried to be the most
influential. (Records by fre-
quency of markings)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>LP</th>
<th>T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Legislators</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Dept. of Education</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
XIII. (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>E</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>LP</th>
<th>T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governor</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Public</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

XIV. Over the years how would you rate the organization's influence upon the following groups:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V. Strong</th>
<th>Strong</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Little</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>LP</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Legislators</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Dept. of Educ.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governor</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Public</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

XV. Rating of Educators:
To what extent has the organization been dependent upon educators for leadership in order to be an effective group?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>E</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>LP</th>
<th>T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All members are mutually dependent</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very dependent on educators</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Could operate without them</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

XVI. In your opinion, how would you rate the contribution
XVI. (Continued)

of educators in the following areas as compared with other members:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>More</th>
<th>Same</th>
<th>Less</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational Work</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Campaign Planning</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fund Raising</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decision Making</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Execution of Campaign Plans</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Influencing Others</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

XVII. In your association with educators, how would you rate their behavior in the following characteristics:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strong</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decisiveness</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Flexibility</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exchange of Ideas</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Soundness of Opinions</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Willingness to Compromise</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Firmness of Ideals</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Knowledge of Politics</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effectiveness in Politics</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
XVII. (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strong</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EBPT</td>
<td>EBPT</td>
<td>EBPT</td>
<td>EBPT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability Under</td>
<td>3 2 4 9</td>
<td>7 5 0 12</td>
<td>0 1 0 1</td>
<td>2 2 3 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation of</td>
<td>9 1 2 12</td>
<td>2 3 2 7</td>
<td>1 4 0 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sources of good</td>
<td>10 4 3 17</td>
<td>2 1 2 5</td>
<td>0 3 1 4</td>
<td>1 2 2 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to get</td>
<td>3 3 3 9</td>
<td>8 3 2 13</td>
<td>0 1 1 2</td>
<td>2 3 2 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>job done</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The governors of the states involved in this study were written letters asking two questions:

1. When you need reliable information concerning the public schools, to what organization or organizations do you turn?

2. Is there one person you turn to for reliable information concerning public schools? If there is one person, what is his position?

The response from the letters was excellent (100%) but often it was from a person other than the governor. Seven of the letters were referred to an assistant to answer. All of them mentioned the State Department of Education as the major source of information. Only two referred to other sources of information. One of the two mentioned the council operating in that state. One governor referred the writer to the state superintendent of public instruction, local boards of education and a research bureau for the answers. Seven named the commissioner or superintendent of public instruction as the
person they consulted. On governor replied there was no one person but several depending on the problem. Another governor mentioned the statistician in the state department of education first and the superintendent second.

Similar questions were asked of the chairmen of education committees in both houses of the legislative assemblies. The responses by the legislators were three out of twenty-six. Their answers indicated agreement with the governors as to the state departments and commissioner or superintendent of public instruction.

In the eighteen responses, there was only one time that a council was mentioned. The governors and chairmen all mentioned the department of education and superintendents of public instruction, the established state organizations for that function. This could be one branch of the government supporting the other. It could be an honest estimate that the departments of education were doing a good job.

The letters did prove the governors see that their mail is answered.

The responses from the members of the councils gave the council's main function as fact finding and publishing groups. The main expenses were paid by the education association or the combined education association and school boards association.
The greatest influence in the councils was credited to the educators, partly because of their leadership and partly due to their financial contributions to the council.

In response to a request for evidence of success of a council, only qualifying statements were received. It would be difficult for any one organization to claim credit when others were working for the passage of the same bill.

While there was no concrete evidence of success given, the items mentioned as accomplishments would indicate that the coalition of organizations of professional educators and lay persons has been successful.
CHAPTER III
HISTORY OF THE
OHIO COUNCIL FOR EDUCATION

The Ohio Council for Education was formed to meet the need for communication and exchange of ideas of the organizations which were interested in promoting state legislation for public education.

It was felt by leaders of the different organizations that the members of the legislature were using the conflicting viewpoints presented as an excuse to do nothing or to do as little as possible for education.

Two men deeply concerned over the situation were Dr. Lewis Harris, Executive Secretary of the Ohio School Boards Association, and Thomas G. O'Keefe, Executive Secretary of the Ohio Education Association. Each without the knowledge of the other had made inquiry as to the organization and operating of the Educational Conference Board of New York State.

Philip C. Drake, Chairman of the Legislative Study Committee of the Ohio School Board Association, on April 13, 1962, sent letters to other educational organizations "To establish a means of coordination of efforts
and possible agreement on the major needs of education which may result in legislative action." The letters were sent to Ohio Education Association, State Teachers Retirement System, the Ohio Congress of Parents and Teachers, Inc., Ohio Education Association, Department of Classroom Teachers, Ohio County Superintendent Association, Ohio Department of Elementary Principals, Ohio Association of Secondary School Principals, Ohio Association of Public School Employees, Public School Employees Retirement System, and Ohio Association of School Administrators.

The replies expressed interest. No reply letters were found in the records from the State Teachers Retirement System nor the Public School Employees Retirement Systems.

Before further action was taken by Mr. Drake's committee, an invitation was issued by the Ohio Congress of Parents and Teachers dated July 28, 1962 to a meeting on Monday, August 13, 1962 at the Deshler-Hilton Hotel in Columbus, Ohio, Room 216 at 1:00 P.M. These letters went to all the organizations mentioned before with the exception of the two retirement systems. Dr. E. E. Holt, Superintendent of Public Instruction for the State of Ohio, and representatives of the Ohio College Association were invited to attend. The Ohio College Association declined the invitation due to the many other
activities in which their members (the college presidents) were involved.

The minutes of the August 13, 1962 meeting (see appendix) noted that thirteen persons were present:

Mrs. Smith H. Witter, President, Ohio Congress of Parents and Teachers Association (PTA)
Mrs. Hubert M. Kinney, Legislation Chairman, PTA
C. L. Dumaree, Second Vice-President, PTA
T. G. O'Keefe, Executive Secretary, Ohio Education Association (OEA)
Dickinson Guiler, President Elect, OEA
Edward C. Schumacher, President, Ohio School Boards Association (OSBA)
Philip C. Drake, Chairman, Legislative Committee, OSBA
Lewis Harris, Executive Secretary, OSBA
Carl Baden, President, Ohio Association of School Administrators (OASA)
H. Fornier, President, Ohio Association of Secondary School Principals (OASSP)
Charles B. Harris, President, Ohio Department of Elementary Principals (ODEP)
Jeanette Riddle, Vice President, ODEP
Fred H. West, Treasurer, ODEP
Robert Dowling, President, Classroom Teachers
Ralph Tullis, President, Ohio County Superintendents' Association.

Mrs. Smith H. Witter served as acting chairman for the meeting. There was an "unanimous expression of all that coordination of effort is greatly needed." Mr. O'Keefe of O.E.A., Dr. Harris of O.S.B.A., and Mrs. Witter of P.T.A. were selected to draft the basic principles by which the group could operate. The next meeting was set as Thursday, September 13, 1962 at 1:00 P.M. at the Deshler-Hilton Hotel, Room 216, Columbus, Ohio.

According to the minutes (Appendix B, p. ), the meeting of September 13, 1962 resulted in the acceptance
(pending approval of participating organizations) of the Policy Statement for the Ohio Council for Education as submitted by the sub-committee; the adoption of the name "Ohio Council for Education" as the name of the organization; the electing of Mrs. Witter as acting chairman until the annual December meeting; and the establishing of the next meeting to be Friday, December 7, 1962, 10:00 A.M. at the same place.

A review of the "Policy Statement for the Ohio Council for Education", (which in reality was a constitution) seems appropriate. It is as follows:

Policy Statement for the Ohio Council for Education

I. Purposes of the Council

1. To promote the interests of public education in Ohio.
2. To provide the machinery for coordinating the efforts of organizations.
3. To supply information to the legislators and state administrative officials relative to legislative proposals which are acceptable to and will be supported by the Council's member organizations.

II. Basic Operating Principles for the Council

1. The Council will serve as a clearing house for reaching agreements on legislation of common interest.
2. The Council will not initiate direct action.
3. The support of agreed legislation will be taken through action by the constituent organizations in their own names, but reference should be made by each group to the agreed program of the Council.
4. Agreement to a program by member organizations of the Council will commit each
organization to a policy of active support for all items in the agreed program.

5. Concurrence by member organizations on a Council-agreed program will not preclude independent action by the constituent organizations on their own or other programs.

6. Agreed program or program items should wherever possible, be related but not limited to the recommendations of the State Board of Education.

III. Basis for establishing Agreements

1. Each member organization will submit in writing for Council consideration, well-defined statements of proposals.

2. To enable the Council to determine those areas of agreement or support of the legislative program of the State Board of Education, the Superintendent of Public Instruction, or his representative, shall be invited to submit an outline of such program.

3. The announced agreed program of the Council must have the unanimous support of all member organizations. Failure to reach unanimous agreement on a particular item or items will not preclude member organizations from supporting such item or items in their own behalf.

4. The Council may assign responsibility for collecting research data to one of the member organizations or to any other institution or agency of its choosing.

IV. Basis for Representation

1. Membership in the Council will be restricted to those organizations or institutions committed to the development and improvement of public education in Ohio. Any educational organization, or its departments, who have an independently elected set of officers or board of directors will be eligible for membership in the Council. New members may be admitted by a three-fourths vote of those eligible to vote on the Council.

2. Charter membership on the Council will be the Ohio Congress of Parents and Teachers, the Ohio Education Association, the Ohio School Boards Association, the Ohio Association of School Administrators, the Ohio County
Superintendents Association, the Ohio Association of Secondary School Principals, the Ohio Department of Elementary Principals, the Department of Classroom Teachers.

3. The State Department of Education and a representative of the Inter-University Council shall be eligible for either active participation or consultant representation, as they may determine.

4. Those eligible to vote at a Council meeting will be the president, elected head or president-elect of the member organization, the legislative chairman and the executive secretary or an elected official in lieu of the executive secretary of each member organization, provided that departments of a parent organization shall be represented by the president or president-elect and legislative chairman only; and provided further that each representative of a member organization shall designate an alternate who shall serve in his absence. These representatives will serve until their successors are elected and qualified.

5. The Council may, in its discretion, invite individuals or organizations to participate as observers or consultants in its deliberations.

V. Organization of the Council

1. Officers: The Council shall elect a state chairman and vice-chairman, both of whom shall be an active member of one of the participating organizations. No paid staff member of a participating organization will be eligible to hold these offices.

There shall be no elected treasurer, but any disbursements will be made from a special fund to be created for specific purposes through a member organization acting in behalf of the Council.

The secretary of the Council may be a salaried employee of any participating organization and shall be designated by the Chairman from meeting to meeting.

2. Term of office: Officers shall be elected by a majority of the voting members of the Council for a term of one year. Officers
may be re-elected, so long as they retain their affiliation with member organizations, either as officers or members.

3. Meetings: The Council shall hold an annual organization meeting and may meet at any other time deemed advisable, at the call of the chairman, or at the written request of a majority of the members.

4. Financial support: The Council shall operate without a budget. Expenses of participants in Council deliberations shall be borne by the constituent organizations.

The Council may accept gifts for specific purposes, such as research projects.

The intent of the Council was clearly defined as a "clearing house" and it was not to become an action group. Mutual support of proposals accepted by the O.C.E. was the obligation of each member organization. A unanimous agreement for any action had to be obtained before it was given the O.C.E. stamp of approval and support. Both of these areas were to come under revision as the thinking of the Council changed in a few months.

A representative of the State Department of Education and Inter-University Council were invited to attend as an active participant or as a consultant, whichever role seemed desirable. The State Department accepted the opportunity to have a representative present. The Inter-University Council (responding in March, 1963) had William B. Coulter, its Executive Secretary, serve as a liaison person with the Council.

News releases from the O.E.A. monthly publication
The Report Card told of "A United Front," This was the first introduction of the O.C.E. to the entire teachers organization. It was followed on September 24, 1962 by a short radio news "spot" release produced by the O.E.A. and N.E.A. The title was "A New Movement" with the credit line going to Robert Old of the O.E.A. Credit in both releases was given to Mrs. Smith Witter (PTA) for calling the leaders together to form this council. Mention was made of the success of a similar organization, The New York Conference Board.

The next meeting was held January 11, 1963, and the first officers were elected for the year: Mrs. Smith H. Witter, Chairman; Dickinson T. Guiler, Vice Chairman; and Mrs. Jean W. Kinney to serve at the pleasure of the chair as Secretary to the Council.

A request from the Ohio Vocational Association for membership was refused on the basis that it was represented by O.E.A. and the Department of Classroom Teachers. It was the opinion that if they were admitted, all the other departments of O.E.A. would seek admission. This would give the educators predominant control and create a lack of balance in the Council between professionals and laymen.

The Ohio Association of School Business Officials

also requested membership in the O.C.E., but its request was deferred, and an invitation was extended to its parent organization, the Ohio Association of Public School Employees.

The minutes record the Council's approval of the State Board of Education's proposals to the legislature. E. E. Holt, State Superintendent of Public Education, had presented the Board's position to the Council.

The discussion of the State Board of Education's Foundation Proposal introduced the subject of school finances. This topic was to be discussed in practically every meeting from this meeting through the defeat of Issue One at the polls. School finance was a common ground upon which all member organizations had expressed common interest.

In determining how to let the legislators and the public know what the legislative program of the Council was, it was recommended:

1. That the representatives mention the O.C.E. when appearing before legislative hearings.

2. That a Promotion and Publicity Committee work on coordinating the activities of the members.

3. A slogan of "Schools Come First" be adopted for promoting schools, and that bumper stickers, outdoor billboards, etc. be used.

4. That a committee from the three parent
organizations obtain an appointment with the Governor to discuss the Council's purposes and program.

The first united action taken in opposition to a legislative bill was recorded on February 14, 1963. H.B. 234 which provided for the enactment of a local income tax for schools was the target of the opposition. The reasons for this were:

1. Creates a crisis in local financing of education by dividing the community into factions - for income tax or for property tax.

2. Local income tax accentuates the difference in ability of local communities to finance schools.

3. Only about 60 of the 1000 or so municipalities have exercised their right to have local income taxes giving evidence that the idea is not locked upon favorably.

4. Reverses the legislature's activities in years past to equalize financing education.

5. Business climate more unfavorable in areas having such a tax because of the cost and difficulty in administering it.

6. It does not solve the crisis facing education in Ohio. 1

Ed Hoon, (O.E.A.) presented the "Schools Come First" campaign. This included the bumper sticker, "Schools Come First - For Ohio's Economic Growth - Ohio Council for Education", billboard campaign, radio and TV releases, a booklet on financing schools, and a film-gram giving the importance of educational opportunities.

1Minutes of Ohio Council for Education, February 14, 1963
The plans presented by Mr. Hoon were accepted.

The committee delegated to meet with Governor James Rhodes reported a disappointing session on January 29th with the Governor's assistant, Dean Jauchius, Coordinator of Program and Finance. They felt that this was a deferring tactic to prevent a meeting with the Governor. The committee was urged to keep trying to meet with the Governor.

The correspondence between Mrs. Witter and Governor Rhodes clearly indicates that the Governor was not interested in meeting with the committee from O.C.E. He used the technique of suggesting that "the thinking of your organization be put on paper for my consideration." Mrs. Witter did do this in her letter of March 20, 1963. No further correspondence was found in the records.

The Council unanimously accepted its first endorsement of legislative action on "HB 95", relative to superintendent pay raises, and sponsored by Swanbeck and Mooney.

The meeting of March 14, 1963 showed that the Ohio Association of Public School Employees had accepted the invitation of the January meeting by the presence of Herschel M. Wilson, Jr. No official recognition is mentioned in the minutes other than the recording of Mr.

3 Correspondence addressed to Mrs. Smith H. Witter from James A. Rhodes, Governor of Ohio, February 28, 1963
Wilson's presence as a representative. The Public School Employees' name also headed the list of organizations on a one-sheet publication released in March, 1963 (Appendix B, p.166). This publication was a summary of the constitution stating the purposes and operation procedures of the Council.

Mrs. Witter's reply from Governor Rhodes was read. The Council urged her and the committee to keep trying to make him aware of its purpose.

Mr. Drake initiated a discussion of earmarking revenue to support the foundation program. The reaction was mixed, with no decision reached as to whether it was a good procedure. This is the first time this topic was discussed. Later, with the introduction of the Program for Educational Progress, the decision was made not to earmark the increase of sales tax for education.

The O.C.E. did pass an endorsement of broadening the sales tax base to include services and to lower the exemption of sales under 31% so the General Assembly of Ohio could meet the educational needs for the next biennium. This action was to be promoted through some publicity after the presentation of the Governor's budget was released.

The continued struggle for recognition among the legislators was emphasized in the motion that the chairman or her designate was to inform the members of the
Assembly about the organization of the O.C.E.

The proposed minimum salary schedule for the State of Ohio (H.B. 546 and S.B. 240) received the unanimous support of the O.C.E.

In the April 18, 1963 meeting, the Council endorsed H.B. 42, which requested the Legislative Service Commission to study the financial needs of school districts in relation to sudden increase in enrollment, the feasibility of collecting real estate taxes six months earlier, and the possibility of a change in the lien date.

Some time elapsed before the next meeting, which was held August 26, 1963. The $250,000,000 in state bonds to finance capital improvements was being proposed as an amendment to the Ohio Constitution. The Council, because of the benefits proposed for higher education, decided to support the issue.

The State Board of Education request for the Foundation Program was to be given strong support by all member organizations in their upcoming conventions or meetings.

Mrs. Witter reminded the Council that new officers were due to be elected in October. The Council passed an amendment to the statement of principles to the effect that the new officers should serve through the full calendar year or until a successor had been
The next recorded meeting is April 16, 1964. At this meeting new officers were elected. Dr. Robert Lucas, Superintendent, Princeton City Schools, was the new chairman. Upon assuming the chair, Dr. Lucas reported on meetings held by the major educational organizations of the state during the previous months.

Since the directions taken by the meetings held have a bearing on the history of the O.C.E., it is necessary to enlarge on the brief summary of the April 16, 1964 minutes (Appendix B, p.168).

Dr. Lucas, while serving as president of the Ohio Association of School Administrators, appointed a Blue Ribbon Committee. The purpose of the committee was to serve in an advisory capacity to Dr. Lucas in the area of financing schools in Ohio.

This committee was composed of Frank Dick (Sylvania Schools), Martin Essex (Akron Schools), Harold H. Eibling (Columbus City Schools), Wendell H. Pierce (Cincinnati Schools), Novice G. Fawcett (Ohio State University), Robert I. White (Kent State University), Paul W. Briggs (Cleveland City Schools), Walter B. Heischman (Upper Arlington Schools), Walter Nichols (Clinton County Schools), J. H. Wanamaker (Youngstown Schools), Ballard Brady (Orange Local Schools), John R. Teichert (Waverly Local Schools), Gordon G. Humbert (Canton
Schools), Thomas J. Quick (Franklin County Schools), and W. A. Smith (Amherst Schools). Many of these persons have since taken other positions. Usually Thomas O'Keefe (O.E.A.) and Lewis Harris (O.S.B.A.) were invited to attend the committee meetings. From this committee came the ideas that evolved into the P.E.P. Bill. The P.E.P. (Plans for Educational Progress) Bill was a proposed change in the Foundation Program that would increase the state's proportion of the expenses of educating the youth in the State of Ohio. The changes included increased teacher salary allowances; provided units for student services, guidance and research; increased the support for the physically handicapped; created a new allotment for culturally disadvantaged children; increased the support per classroom unit and other changes. Since this would involve an increase of $116 million, an increase of the sales tax from 3¢ to 4¢ was included.

This bill was to be introduced by the initiative process to the Ohio General Assembly. If they refused to enact the bill, it could be taken to the voters on the next state-wide election. The first step to present the bill to the Ohio Assembly required not less than 93,509 signatures. To place the petition on the ballot in November would require 93,509 additional signatures.

4Robert Lucas, personal letter
After plans for the P.E.P. bill had taken form, the committee invited other organizations to send representatives to participate in their meetings to gain their support and thinking on the bill.\(^5\)

Robert Dowling, Chairman of the Legislative Committee for O.E.A., sent a communication (January 15, 1964) to his committee members raising two major questions:

1. Should O.E.A. make a statewide effort to secure adequate financing?
2. If so, should the O.E.A. seek to amend the state constitution, initiate a bill by petition, or use some other procedure?

At the January 21st and 22d meetings of the Committee, there were three persons present who had worked on the Blue Ribbon Committee, Frank Dick, Walter B. Heischman and Thomas G. O'Keefe.

In response to the two major questions asked by the Chairman, the Committee passed a motion "that O.E.A. enter into a state-wide effort to secure adequate financing of public schools."\(^6\) This passed unanimously. This was followed immediately by a motion that "the O.E.A. initiate a bill by petition to secure adequate financing for public schools in Ohio."

Minutes of the meetings on February 4-5 and 13-14

\(^{5}\)Robert Lucas, personal letter

\(^{6}\)Minutes of O.E.A. Legislative Committee Jan. 21-22, 1964
show the development and the amount of discussion held about the problems of a statewide campaign, means of taxing to be used, and the adjustment to be made in the foundation program. The next meeting was set to be held after the March 21st meeting of the O.E.A. Representative Assembly.

On March 21, 1964, the O.E.A. released an official Report of Special O.E.A. Representative Assembly Action on O.E.A. Legislative Program. This told of a proposed bill to be initiated in the Ohio General Assembly by petition.

On March 4, 1964, Dr. Robert Lucas (O.A.S.A.) chaired a meeting that he called. Persons present were Walter Heischman (O.A.S.A.), Robert Dowling (O.E.A.), Tom O'Keefe (O.E.A.), John Hall (O.E.A.), Donna Gaynor (O.S.B.A.), Mrs. Kinney (P.T.A.), Mrs. Shapiro (P.T.A.), Hershel Wilson (O.A.P.S.E.), Vance Bell (O.S.B.A.), Lewis Harris (O.S.B.A.), and Larry Crim (O.S.B.A.). Four of the twelve were members of the Blue Ribbon Committee. The minutes state "The purpose of this meeting was not to make motions or take definite action on matters, but rather to find as many points of agreement as possible which all organizations are willing to support." The minutes are entitled "Sub-Committee on Initiated Bill."

An important statement was reported as follows:
John Hall and Robert Dowling, Ohio Education Association, stated that their association expected to contribute heavily to the funds which were necessary to support the campaign. They also stated that O.E.A. would not expect to sponsor the campaign or receive open recognition for supporting the campaign. However, they would expect that a reasonable amount of their ideas in planning the campaign would be used.

This clearly indicates which organization would be paying most of the bills. It raises the question that if they paid the bills, did they make most of the decisions. The Trustees of the O.C.E. when interviewed by the writer, felt that this was an important factor in reaching decisions. The writer did observe that the group deferred to Tom O'Keefe when there was a large amount of money involved.

The Sub-Committee found sufficient agreement to warrant a meeting of fuller representation of the committees (Full Committee on Initiated Bill) on Thursday, March 12, 1964. At this meeting there continued to be common agreement in the following areas:

1. That an independent citizens group should sponsor the initiated bill, headed by key leaders throughout the state.

2. That a tax of 1¢ on the dollar in sales tax would be the source of revenue. There was no agreement on "earmarking" the tax for public education.

7Minutes of Sub-Committee on Initiated Bill meeting of March 4, 1964.
Two items were discussed that later influenced the organization of the O.C.E. One was the hiring of a director to head the independent citizens who were to promote the initiated bill. The other was the appointment of the executive committee. The executive committee appointed was: O.A.S.A., Robert Lucas; O.E.A., Tom O'Keefe; O.S.B.A., Vance Bell; P.T.A., Mrs. Kinney; and O.A.P.S.E., Hershel Wilson; all of them members of the O.C.E.

They met April 3, 1961. At this meeting plans were made to call a meeting of the Ohio Council for Education for April 16, 1961, at 7:00 P.M., at the Athletic Club, Columbus, Ohio. For this meeting the following action agenda was formulated:

1. If the O.C.E. agreed, the O.C.E. with the five major organizations would work on the initiative petition.

2. That the membership structure of the O.C.E. be changed to allow 4 representatives per organization, but only one vote.

3. That the minutes of the Executive Committee Meeting be sent to all 10 member groups of the O.C.E.

4. That a prepared draft of the Policy Statement of the O.C.E. which would enable the Council to become an active organization which could initiate legislation, be presented to the O.C.E. for its consideration and possible adoption.
5. That an executive committee be established of 5 members, one representative from each of the following groups: O.E.A., P.T.A., O.S.B.A., O.A.P.S.E., and the O.A.S.A.

6. That an executive director would be hired.

7. That the necessary committees be appointed for finances, budget, and petitions.8

As planned, the O.C.E. met on April 16, 1964, with Mrs. Smith H. Witter presiding.

Since the last previous meeting of the Council had been held August, 1963, the first item of business was the election of officers. Robert Lucas, O.A.S.A., and Vance Bell, O.S.B.A., were elected chairman and vice-chairman, respectively. Tom O'Keefe (O.E.A.) was elected Treasurer. The previous planning of the Executive Committee was endorsed to be put into effect.

It appears that the group moved from an unstructured organization into a formally structured organization, making the formal one to suit their purposes. However, the member organizations were fully aware of what was done and why. Since this involved the same persons from the various organizations, there was full knowledge of what was happening.

The Policy Statement of the Ohio Council for

---

8 Minutes of April 3, 1964, Executive Committee - see Appendix.
Education was changed to make it an action group. Section II, No. 2 now read, "The support of agreed legislation will be taken through action by the Council."

So it was that an organization less than two years old without any previous effort of this kind and with only 7 meetings, started upon one of the most ambitious educational programs known in the State of Ohio.

The Executive Committee members who were appointed were Robert Lucas, O.A.S.A.; Jean Kinney, P.T.A.; Tom O'Keefe, O.E.A.; Herschel Wilson, O.A.P.S.E.; and Vance Bell, O.S.B.A. Working together in several meetings, they accepted the description for the position of director (May 15, 1964); asked Tom O'Keefe (O.E.A.) and Lewis Harris (O.S.B.A.) to help locate and hire a director (May 29, 1964); met with the city superintendents concerning the naming of the State Citizens Committee (May 28, 1964); met with the Blue Ribbon Committee to help draft the final content of the bill (June 10, 1964); and called a general meeting of O.C.E. for Monday, June 23, 1964 for the approval of the Proposal concerning the Foundation Program.

At the June 23, 1964 executive meeting, the "program for improving Ohio's public schools" was adopted unanimously. A negative report was given on finding a

---

9Policy Statement, O.C.E., April 16, 1964
director. B. I. Griffith, O.E.A., was instructed to begin the ground work for the circulation of the petitions and report back to the Executive Committee.

A representative of the Ohio Association of School Business Officers was in attendance although there had been no official action taken on its being accepted into membership in the O.C.E. The O.A.S.B.O. is part of the Ohio Association of Public School Employees.

During the executive meeting on July 8th, the schedule for accomplishing the various phases of the initiating process of the bill was established. This included (1) writing the bill, (2) filing it with the Secretary of the State, (3) establishing the number of signatures to be secured on the petition (they needed to be on the safe side of the required number), and (4) meeting the December 1st filing deadline for the petitions. It was suggested that in each school district a committee be made up of the president of the school board, superintendent of the school district, a president of the P.T.A., president of the local O.A.P.S.E. (if there was one), and the local affiliated branch of the O.E.A., to do the grass roots campaigning.

It was at this meeting that the first operational budget of the O.C.E. was presented and approved. The total was $9,100.00 for the first phase of the campaign. The budget included a salary for a secretary, printed
materials and office expenses. No mention was made of any income. It was assumed the O.E.A. would support the budget.

The next executive committee meeting was held August 7th and 11th to discuss and revise the draft of the proposed bill. In the latter meeting, the firm of Byer and Bowman of Columbus was mentioned as the one to do the public relations work for the initiative position. Bill Henry (O.E.A.) and Robert Olds (O.S.B.A.) were to contact them.

The slogan "PEP - Plan for Educational Progress" was adopted at the next meeting (August 18th). Details of the public relations plans were outlined defining the Council's responsibilities and those of Byer and Bowman. The search for a director continued. Mr. Griffith reported that in certain sections of the state, superintendents and board members were having problems in cooperating to hold briefing meetings. It was agreed that when these problems appeared, he would refer them to the O.S.B.A. and O.A.S.A., and they would write for the support of their members.

Lewis Harris, representing O.S.B.A., contributed $1,896.68 to the Council. This was the first contribution of many to be made by the School Boards Association.

The signing of the petitions by the executive committee was the highlight of the August 27th meeting.
This was the start of the petition drive.

The search for a director was becoming critical at this point because of the work related to Byer and Bowman's duties and the increased communication needed between the member organizations. Several fine candidates had been interviewed, but their present commitments and the short term of employment as director prevented their accepting. The members of the Executive Committee either did the necessary work or found someone in their organizations who would do it.

Since the purpose of this writing is to follow the development of the Council, the plans, promotion and activities involving the actual initiation of the bill will be recorded only when they affect the organization and development of the Council.

When the Ohio Council's Finance Committee met on September 4, 1964, it not only established a tentative budget, but made some suggestions to the Executive Committee. The budget proposed was:

**Anticipated Operational Expenses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Byer and Bowman, for Press and Legislative Meetings</td>
<td>$8,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiative Petition Campaign</td>
<td>9,100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director and Staff, budget for 6 months</td>
<td>35,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$52,600.00

---

10 Appendix B, p. 171
Anticipated Revenues from Contributions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contribution</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O.A.P.S.E.</td>
<td>$2.00 assessment from each member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O.S.B.A.</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O.E.A.</td>
<td>$200,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O.A.S.A.</td>
<td>$8.00 assessment from each superintendent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.T.A.</td>
<td>$750,000 members to help with campaign - no dollar commitment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The operational objectives recommended to the Executive Committee were that the O.C.E. establish a long range (ten-year) plan for the promoting of education. This would help in the hiring of a director. The second objective was to make the initiative petition campaign a part of the over-all plan. Further suggestions were made for implementing these objectives. One was the raising of contributions amounting to $500,000.00 from the school districts.

A lay citizen's group being formed under the leadership of Paul Langdon and Hugh Calkins was mentioned at this meeting. It was hoped that many of the lay speakers in support of the initiative bill would come from this group.

The search for a director now turned to seeking help from professional employment services. The salary range was established as $10,000 to $15,000. The range that was mentioned at the August 18th meeting was $15,000 to $20,000.

An administrative director was hired at the
Executive meeting of December 3, 1964. He was James O. Brennan, a graduate of The University of Illinois. The terms of employment were for one year starting December 7, 1964 with a salary of $11,000.00 annually, plus 9¢ per mile traveling expenses.

Following the Executive Committee meeting at 4:00 P.M. December 3d, a full Council meeting was held at 7:00 P.M., the first since June 23, 1964. This gathering of all the member organizations was used to introduce the new director and to orient them to all the activities of the Executive Committee. The first full report on the Ohio Citizens for Educational Progress Committee was given. It was organized by citizens not associated with the education profession. The purposes of the committee were:

1. Collecting and disseminating information about Ohio's educational needs.

2. Stimulating formation of a committee concerned with the educational needs of a region or local area.

3. Exchanging information and views among such committees and other organizations interested in Ohio education.

4. Studying and presenting to the public recommendations with respect to Ohio's educational problems.

5. Presenting views and information rather than lobbying.

This committee would not exceed 40 members.11

Minutes of O.C.E. meeting of December 3, 1964
The incorporation of the Ohio Council for Education as a non-profit organization was decided on by the Executive Committee at the December 11th meeting. Robert Drury and Robert Baker were to work with Mr. Brennan on this project. The resulting incorporation on December 17, 1964 made it necessary at the January 7, 1965 meeting to change the title of the "Executive Committee" to that of "Board of Trustees."

The budget was reviewed in consideration of the proposed activities and the amount of contributions made at this point. There was a pressing need for the members to implement their plans for obtaining donations from their local members.

On February 11, 1965, the Board of Trustees granted permission to William F. Rogers to attend their meetings as an observer as the history of this organization was to be part of his doctoral dissertation.

The necessary changes in the constitution were made to conform to the corporation laws. The Administrative Director was made Assistant Treasurer for the Board of Trustees.

An election of officers was held with Dr. Lucas elected to serve as President, Mrs. Kinney (OCPT) as Vice-President, and Mr. O'Keefe (OEA) as Secretary-Treasurer. Both the Treasurer and Assistant Treasurer were to be bonded. All checks were required to have the
signature of both individuals.

The progress report of the local meetings for P.E.P. showed that 32 meetings had been held. The cost of the meetings, including the film strips and other public relations handouts came to $9,329.00. At this time, 213 local school districts had not responded by appointing P.E.P. chairmen.

It was suggested to the Administrative-Director that a plan be drawn up for making legislative contacts. Member organizations were to report to Mr. Brennan their contacts with the legislators. It was recommended that a representative from each of the organizations be present at each public hearing and that they contact their legislators before coming to the meeting.

At the full council meeting that evening, two questions of organization were challenged. The first was concerned with length of time between the meetings of the full council. The discussion resulted in a change of the constitution to state, "the Council's major function shall be to set the policy of the Ohio Council for Education".

The second question was in regard to the representation on the Board of Trustees. Five of the ten organizations were represented. It was felt that all ten should be represented. The organizations not represented on the Board wanted a definite part in the decision
making. It was pointed out that a small Board could function more effectively. In answer to why the O.A.S.A. was represented, it was pointed out that they were one of the organizers of the Council. It was the opinion of this observer that while this ended the discussion, there was still resentment because some member organizations were not represented on the Board of Trustees.

Concern was expressed over the probable success of the PEP bill, and the question raised, "If we can’t sell the idea to our own organizations, how can we sell it to the public?" The Administrative Director explained about the PEP Information Bulletin that would urge the local directors to hold meetings at the grass root levels to inform the membership. All organizations expressed their support of the idea that the state organizations contact their local chapters to urge their cooperation.

Other items such as budget, influencing the legislators, and additional petitions were discussed, and approval of the recommendations of the Board of Trustees was given.

The report of John Hall, the lobbyist for O.E.A., at the March 4, 1964 meeting told the Council:

1. That the legislature was not well informed on the PEP bill.

2. The support of the labor people and retail merchants had been lost.
3. With a few exceptions, the press was not favorable to PEP.

4. There was a lack of strong interest and support from our own people who compose the O.C.E.

5. The only alternative appeared to be that the Council's proposal must go to the ballot in November.  

   James Brennan, Administrative Director, reviewed the situation of the House Education Committee, which was to stall any action on the bill because they not only did not want to have to vote on the bill on the floor, but they were reluctant to have to commit themselves as members of the Education Committee.

   The general discussion came down to the necessary preparation in order to go on the ballot in November. While a motion was made to secure the necessary signatures to go on the ballot, no commitment of this kind was made. One member stated "that no motion was needed in this regard, unless the Council intended to change its direction." This statement was not challenged so it appeared to be generally accepted by all organizations. A searching of the minutes has revealed that there was no motion made to tell how far the initiative bill would be taken. At a later meeting this topic caused some very heated discussion.

---
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Plans were presented by B. I. Griffith for the circulation of the second petitions for the signatures necessary to place P.E.P. on the November ballot. These were approved by the Trustees. All petitions were to be completed and returned by June 18th.

At the April 15, 1965 meeting, all the legislative bills concerning school finances that were before the Ohio General Assembly were reviewed. While all of them helped the public schools, none of them helped to the extent of the PEP bill. Federal aid was causing concern because some people were of the opinion that P.E.P. would be duplicating that aid. Local organizations needed to stress that there would be no duplication.

Dr. Lucas stated the Trustees position as "We must drive straight ahead in our relationship to get the best bill possible out of the legislature that we can."{14}

Plans to go ahead with the petitions, the naming of committees on finance, citizens support, endorsements, and promotion were made. All organizations were to tell the Administrative Director whom they wanted to serve on these committees. This was to be completed by April 23d.

Mr. O'Keefe proposed a resolution presenting the continuing stand of the Board of Directors, as follows:{15}

{14}Minutes of April 15, 1965 of the O.C.E.

{15}Ibid
The Board of Directors of the Ohio Council for Education, having reviewed all proposed legislation in the field of School Foundation financing, resolves to proceed with vigor to obtain its major objectives, the enactment of the Plan for Educational Progress.

The motion was seconded by Mrs. Kinney and passed unanimously. This was intended to serve as a notice (threat) to the legislature that the Assembly should do something about the PEP bill or the Council planned to take it to the people in November. Again the motion was a general statement without a definite commitment. It was the hope of the Trustees that the legislators would pass the PEP bill before the July 30, 1965 deadline so they would not have to go to all the expense of the additional promotion.

The minutes of the May 27th meeting of the full Council support the point that the preceding quote was a threat, for the following motion was approved unanimously by the Council with all the organizations represented:

... that after passage of a Foundation Bill by the General Assembly, the Board of Trustees meet informally to discuss the Foundation Bill and the advisability of proceeding with the referendum campaign. Thereafter a full Council meeting to be called to discuss the matter. A recommendation is to be taken to the parent organizations to ascertain the position of the organization. This position to

16 Ibid
be taken to the full O.C.E. Council for final decision. 17

This presents a question of doubt that was not in the minutes up to this time. The attitude was that we will go on the ballot in November if the legislature does not pass the PEP bill.

A survey of public opinion was suggested and approved by the Council. The pledge of $6,000 from the Ohio Department of Elementary School Principals made this possible financially. The expected expenditure was to be $10,000 to $12,000 for a voter attitude study and up to $17,000 for a follow up poll if necessary.

The Public Relations and Promotion Advisory Group (Bob Olds, Bill Henry, Joe Davis, and Gordon Humbert with Jim O. Brennan) presented the estimated cost of a full political campaign for the PEP bill to be $500,000. The unknown factors were the opposition of the Retail Merchants, the reaction of labor to the bill, the uncertainty of what the Governor would do against the issue, and whether the large city superintendents could support the issue. It should be noted that businesses in the cities were bringing pressure on the board members and the superintendents. They threatened to oppose the next local issues if the superintendent came out in support of the PEP bill.

17 O.C.E. Council Minutes, May 27, 1965
A special meeting of all superintendents, called by the Blue Ribbon Committee, was held on May 11, 1965. The purpose was to gain more support from all superintendents. Members of the Board of Trustees spoke urging them to take leadership at the local levels. The other organizations were looking to the administrators for their leadership to help them support PEP. The response of the superintendents was good during the meeting, but it was not enthusiastic.

The summary report of the Financial Committee showed that the total contributions to date had been $57,244.03 (OEA); $6,890.00 (OAFSE); $2,784.13 (OSBA); $1,664.00 (OASA); $370.00 (PTA); and $58.39 (miscellaneous), for a total of $68,850.55. The expenditures amounted to $56,354.15 up to May 27th.

The proposed normal operating budget of $37,644.00 was approved. Mr. O'Keefe gave the sources of revenue as "(1) donations from participating organizations; (2) donations by private foundations; (3) exploring the possibility of funds being available through the U.S. Office of Education for research studies; and (4) business organizations involved in contracting or supplying of school needs." He went on to urge the members to do what they could to finance the Council. If they have

---
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reached their limit of contributions as an organization, they might explore the possibility of soliciting contributions from the individual members.

There were several proposals to the legislators that sought to divide the members of the O.C.E. Most of these failed to get out of the legislative education committees. They had been proposed by Governor Rhodes and his Finance Director, Mr. Krabach. One of these bills was HB 773. This cut the support of many of the extra services such as special education. The reaction to this from local communities was so strong that it was quickly forgotten.

Another attempt to compromise by Governor Rhodes and Mr. Krabach was made when Governor Rhodes asked to speak to about 100 city superintendents. Mr. O'Keefe called it a "re-hash of HB 773." While the meeting was called to permit educators to discuss school finances with state officials, the ground rule of no questions to the Governor prevented any discussion.\(^{19}\)

Suggestions on compromise were extended to separate individuals, but the members of the Council stood firmly on their request for the passage of the PEP bill.

---

\(^{19}\) Tom O'Keefe's Mimeographed Letter to Superintendents, Executive Heads, Principals and Presidents of Local Organizations, O.E.A., June 11, 1965
was given as a possible solution, it was very quickly and vigorously opposed by Mr. O'Keefe (O.E.A.). The subject was quickly changed to "issuing a positive statement of continued support." This was issued by the Council.

**DAY OF DECISION**

The meeting of July 27, 1965 was held while the legislature was still in session. An education bill had not been passed. The bill under consideration which represented about 40% of the PEP bill was reported upon in the Trustees meeting. A survey of the organizations during this meeting indicated that:

1. **O.E.A.** felt it must go on the ballot
2. **O.S.B.A.** members were hesitant. They were concerned about the financing and thought a compromise should be reached.
3. **O.S.P.E.** would support going on the ballot
4. **P.T.A.** felt that they were still in favor of going on the ballot.
5. **O.A.S.A.** felt there was a division between city superintendents who would be against, and the executive heads who would be for going on the ballot.

It should be noted that while some of the city superintendents were members of the Blue Ribbon Committee, it was reported a great deal of pressure would be exerted upon them directly by local businesses and board members who were influenced by business interests. Mr.
Lucas said, "All big city superintendents have said they will not support going to the ballot." ²⁰

The general feeling of the Trustees was that they must go on the ballot, but that they had some doubts as to whether it would pass.

Lew Moore (OSBA) had sent out 60 letters to the top industrial leaders in Ohio, and received only 6 replies. All 6 said the Governor was doing a great job in Ohio; the over-all picture was good, and therefore they could not oppose him on one issue.

The problem of financing the placing of the PEP bill on the ballot was thoroughly discussed. The need for approaching their membership for additional money was very apparent. The Trustees decided to allot $392,000.00 for the campaign. The original recommendation from the P.R. committee was $500,000.00.

It was recommended to the full Council that the PEP bill be placed on the ballot in November. All member organizations voted "yes" except the O.A.S.A.

At the evening meeting (July 27, 1965) of the full Council, the Opinion Research Corporation report was given by Harry O'Neal. The corporation had been hired to conduct a survey of public opinion in accordance with the decision of the May 7, 1965 meeting. A cross section of voters was taken by interviewing 1,240 voters from 15
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cities and 19 counties, who indicated they would vote in the coming November election. The sampling included ethnic groups, labor groups, educational levels, political parties and age levels over 21 years. The interviews were conducted between June 17 and June 27, 1965.

In answer to the question, "What do you know about the PEP bill?" given to these 1,240 voters, 8 out of 10 knew very little; 8% knew a "great deal"; 13% knew a "fair amount"; 39% "very little"; 38% "nothing"; and 2% "no opinion."

When a brief explanation was given of the bill, 46% were "for" the bill; 11% "lean toward"; 27% were "against"; 6% thought they might be "against"; and 10% were undecided.\(^{21}\)

The following "Highlights" were given as a preface to the report submitted by Mr. O'Neal:

**Highlights**

1. Familiarity with the PEP Proposal is very low among Ohio voters - only one voter in five claims at least a fair amount of knowledge about the Proposal.

2. The majority of voters favor the PEP Proposal when given a brief explanation of it, but a third register opposition.

3. There is evidence that the chances of the PEP Proposal winning voter approval at the

polls are diminished if voters are also faced with local school levy or bond issues.

4. Most voters say they would vote for a tax bill if they thought it would improve public schools even though Governor Rhodes has taken a stand against any new or additional taxes at this time.

5. Ohio voters see as the most pressing need, both statewide and in their own communities, the providing of more vocational training for students who are not going to college.

6. Most Ohio voters think the State should increase its share of local school costs, and there is fairly strong feeling that the State should pay most of the local school costs.

7. Less than one voter in five, however, thinks the State now needs any new or additional taxes.

8. If the State had to have additional tax revenue, voters would prefer a higher tax on business or a sales tax increase to either a state income tax or higher property tax.

9. High property taxes are viewed as a particularly serious problem. 22

The opinion survey reported that the five most needed school improvements were:

1. Provide more vocational training for students who are not going to college.

2. Provide all children with better guidance and counseling.

3. Raise the quality of teachers.

4. Reduce the dropout rate.

22 Ibid p. 3
5. Give more attention to children who are physically handicapped.  

The Opinion Research summarized their report in the following manner:

**Significance for the Ohio Council for Education**

The survey results do not present a complete picture as to the possibility of carrying a referendum statewide on the PEP Proposal.

On the positive side:

- Improvement in education is the best possible issue - people are for better schools and see specific needs of various kinds.
- Voters do not think that recent federal funds have reduced the need for more state aid to public education.
- Voters would like to see the state carry a higher share of local school costs.
- When the PEP Proposal is explained to voters, a majority react favorably.
- The sales tax increase approach is an acceptable method compared with other tax approaches, such as an income tax or higher property taxes.

On the negative side:

- Only a relative handful of voters are familiar with the PEP proposal as of now. A massive information campaign would be necessary to reach the Ohio electorate in any depth.
- The fact that the PEP Proposal would be coincident with many local bond issues is an extremely serious deterrent to its possible passage. Many voters would favor the local issue.
- Only a minority of voters say their vote

---
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on a tax bill would be affected by Governor Rhodes' position. Nevertheless, strong opposition on his part would cut into support for the PEP Proposal, if only to a limited degree.

Despite concern over educational problems, people think the state taxes are already high enough and oppose new or additional taxes of any kind.

In sum, it is our judgment that the PEP Proposal might pass if a large-scale campaign were undertaken to press it. This assumes, however, that most state leadership groups would be in support of the proposal and would not actively work against it. If a campaign to pass the PEP Proposal were to stir up its opponents into substantial organized opposition, it seems to us that the chances of its passage would be greatly diminished. 24

Mr. O'Keefe reported on a survey made of O.E.A. members as to whether the PEP bill should be on the ballot or not. Considering that the survey was made during vacation time, a 31.09% response was considered exceptional. Of the 24,690 who responded, 61.05% were in favor of going on the ballot; 11.57% were opposed; 27.37% were in favor of letting the O.E.A. Executive Committee decide. 25 This gave the O.E.A. no alternative but to vote to place the bill on the ballot.

The Administrative Director, James O. Brennan, prepared the pros and cons of placing PEP on the ballot which were presented to the Council. Because of his comprehensive presentation, it is given here in its entirety:

25 O.E.A. Research Division Mimeograph, July 1965
Report on Alternatives of Going to the Ballot with PEP

As the Council meets today to consider the advisability of proceeding with the referendum campaign on the PEP proposal, there has been no school foundation bill passed by the General Assembly. House Bill 950 as it was passed by the House alleges to spend an additional $100 million for public schools in the next biennium, but included in this figure is from $31 to $35 million for normal growth. Furthermore, the House version of this bill contained many restrictive provisions which tended to close some of the incentive features of the present Foundation Program.

The Senate has added a minimum of $9 million to the House version of the bill despite the implied threat of the Governor that he will veto any such measure. The Senate version corrects some of the inequities in the salary allowances and minimum salary schedules, and also provides a little more leeway for incentive programs.

While the following report will touch upon the various possibilities that exist in the passage of a School Foundation bill, the Council will have to weigh its decision based only upon possibilities, and not the certainty of what will be contained in a School Foundation measure approved this year. Without House concurrence to Senate amendments, the final bill may well not pass until our petition filing time runs out. Furthermore, in a meeting with House majority members last night, the Governor made it very plain that he intends to veto any bill that exceeds the dollar amount passed by the House. Whether he holds to this position is a matter of conjecture only.

The following report will deal only with the pros and cons which are evident on the issue of taking the Plan for Educational Progress to the ballot in November. Certainly there will be factors to be considered by the Board of Trustees and the Council which will not be listed in this report. However, it is felt that these are the principal areas of consideration which will determine the ultimate decision that is made.
Reasons for Taking PEP to the Ballot

1. OCE member organizations have a large corps of potential volunteer workers:

The ten organizations represented on the Ohio Council for Education have a total membership of almost 900,000. This figure, of course, includes the PTA membership which represents almost three quarters of a million. If it is possible to secure the active support of members of the various organizations represented on the OCE to the extent that they would even be willing to ring door bells and distribute literature from house to house throughout the state during the campaign period, there can be no doubt that this is an extremely effective force in attacking the most crucial problem facing PEP which is that of dissemination of information.

2. The proposed Foundation Program Bill is inadequate for educational needs in Ohio:

The Foundation Program Bill which will be passed and may be signed by the Governor will produce an amount in the neighborhood of from $120 million to $160 million less than the PEP proposal for the biennium. Furthermore, the percentage of State support as compared with local support of public school education will not rise substantially. Thus, the argument that the State should bear a greater share of the cost of public school education will not be diminished, and the survey has shown that the public feels that a greater share should be borne by the State government.

3. The Plan for Educational Progress is a good educational bill:

The PEP bill embodies improvements in all phases of the public school program. Thus, it has wide and varied appeals for the voters regardless of what has been done under the Federal Aid bill or what will be done under the Foundation Program Bill passed by the General Assembly.

4. The public shows an interest in improving education through increased sales tax:
the public shows an interest in improving education through increased sales tax:

The survey reveals that 57% of the voters are in favor of or lean toward the PEP proposal as of today when it is briefly explained to them. While it is true that there have been no federal funds distributed yet and the public is not yet aware of what additional State funds will be made available to schools, there is evidence that when you tie the subject of schools to an increase in taxes, the latter becomes more digestible.

5. The public is against increasing property taxes:

The survey has revealed that there is great opposition to the increase of property taxes at the local level. On the other hand, while the taxing of business and industry is the most favorable to voters, an increase in the sales tax is looked upon far more favorably than a state income tax or higher property taxes. Even democratic voters, whose party has endorsed State income taxes show that they would favor an increased sales tax two and one-half times to one over a State income tax.

6. The Federal Aid to Education Bill provides earmarked money:

While there is possibly over $100 million coming into Ohio under the Federal Aid Bill in the next biennium, it is not designed for the enrichment of the total educational program in our public schools. In fact, the funds will generally be available for programs which would be related to the culturally deprived program in the PEP bill, and this was a very small amount of money under the total PEP program.

7. PEP has the endorsement of the Ohio Methodist Conference:

While the endorsement of the Ohio Methodist Conference may not appear to be of any great force, there was an indication from the
chairman of the Christian Social Concern Committee of the Conference that there existed the real possibility of Methodist ministers in the Conference actually speaking for the Plan for Educational Progress during the campaign period. Furthermore, I believe it should not be overlooked that many organizations in the State cannot or will not endorse the PEP program because of positions which their organizations have taken, but we have fairly definite commitments from a number of these organizations that they will not actually oppose the PEP program if it is placed on the ballot.

8. Even if PEP were defeated at the ballot, this may aid local districts in passing local levies:

If PEP were to go to the ballot and be defeated it is quite possible that local school districts would have a much better chance of passing levies and bond issues because of the need for school improvements which the State has not provided.

Reasons for Not Taking PEP to the Ballot

1. The support of certain members of the OCE participating organizations is doubtful:

Although we can conclude that the majority of the members of the OCE participating organizations will be in support of the PEP proposal, evidence exists that in the large voter population areas this support may not be forthcoming. Specifically, the PEP campaign will require the support of every major city school administrator and board of education. Because of its constitutional policy, the PTA will not be able to lend the assistance required to pass the issue unless encouraged to do so by school boards and school administrators. Of the eight large counties, we can only be sure of excellent support in Stark County and possibly good support in Montgomery and Lucas Counties. In Cuyahoga, Hamilton, and Franklin, we had better be prepared to find school boards and school administrators opposing the issue. Summit County and Mahoning County are questionable, but it
is likely that at best we could count on the help of only one of these two. Thus, unless there is a complete about-face on the part of the school boards and administrators in the larger voter areas, we will not have the organization required to pass the proposal.

2. The Governor will probably oppose the issue:

We have recently received information from the Secretary of State's office that without a doubt the Governor will have the Attorney General's office prepare the opponent statement which is issued by the Secretary of State to all voters on an issue of this type. This would indicate that the Governor does intend to oppose the issue and the question therefore only exists as to what effort he will make to defeat it at the polls. We all know that the Governor has the ability to not be vocal about an issue but to influence the issue through other sources than himself. It was demonstrated during the last election that approximately 85% of the press in the state supported the Governor's position and if he were to make his opposing position known, this factor could be insurmountable.

3. The Federal Aid Bill does provide Ohio with over one hundred million dollars per biennium:

While educators are aware that the Federal Aid to Education Bill does not enhance the total education program, we can predict that our opposition will stress the availability of Federal dollars. Whereas the attitude study showed that voters did not feel the Federal Aid Bill would help schools significantly, one-third of the voters expressed no opinion to the question and we can surmise from the results of the survey that very little is now known about the Federal Aid to Education Act. By the time the voters go to the polls, the significant amount of money received by local school districts will become a factor in the casting of their vote. It would certainly be necessary to say very little about the PEP culturally disadvantaged program and the program for better text books and libraries if this issue is taken to the polls because of
the monies which are made available in the Federal Bill for these programs and which will be widely publicized by our opposition.

4. The legislature will pass the largest dollar appropriation increase in the history of education in Ohio:

Although we recognize the proposed law to be inadequate as compared to what PEP would do, our opponents could still claim that between a hundred million and one hundred twenty million dollars of new state money will be spent for public school education in the next biennium. It is logical to assume that if this device were used, it would be a deterrent to passage of the issue.

5. A tax revision study will possibly be conducted during the current biennium:

It is likely that the General Assembly will do a two year tax revision study to arrive at new sources of income for public education. It will be said by the Retail Merchants that the PEP proposal of increasing the sales tax will only add to the "patchwork" tax program in the state at a time when responsible studies are being made of the problem. While the survey shows that the increase in sales tax is favored over a state income tax, a far greater percentage of voters feel that the state must begin levying higher taxes on business and industry. Of further significance is the fact that the survey shows that only 18% of Ohio voters feel that the state government really needs new or additional taxes now.

6. Strong opposition forces could have an adverse effect:

The only announced militant opposition that the PEP bill has at the present time is that of the Ohio Council of Retail Merchants. However, we are aware that the Retail Merchants bear strong influence upon the newspapers and it is obvious to assume that the news media will remain in the enemy camp if the threat of the Retail Merchants to fight the PEP proposal at the polls develops. The
AFL-CIO was approached by the Retail Merchants to assist in coming up with a one-hundred thousand dollar "war chest" to fight the PEP proposal in November. While the labor organization has indicated they are not willing to participate financially in such a campaign there is no doubt that they will continue to do as they have been doing during the past several months in speaking against an increase in the sales tax at local union meetings. The effect of the union opposition, therefore, cannot be minimized despite its reluctance to fight PEP financially.

7. Comparison of factors in the first and second petition campaign:

While we were able to secure over 112,000 signatures in the second petition campaign, this amount must be contrasted with the 135,000 which were secured in the first go-around. This does not reflect less of an effort in the second campaign because quotas were actually set at a higher level, and additional follow-up correspondence and contacts exceeded those of the first petition campaign program. Rather, there was a definite lack of dedication upon the part of our own organizational members to circulate the petitions as was evidenced by the considerable number which were returned blank. Here again, we must look to the educational leadership as having failed to press the issue in their school districts.

8. PEP approach would have to be changed in line with public opinion:

One of the most significant parts of the voter attitude study had to do with public opinion toward possible school improvements. 44% of the public felt that the most important improvement needed was in the area of vocational training for students who are not going to college. The second most important need was that of better guidance and counselling; while the third was raising the quality of teachers, and the fourth was giving more attention to the physically handicapped children. While we can identify all of these
areas as being a part of the PEP package, the only one which has been built into the PEP bill substantially is that of guidance and counselling. The PEP program has stressed the need to raise teachers salaries and only 27% of the voters see this as the number one need. Thus, the job of educating the average citizen to thinking as educators do about school needs would be a very great one.

9. Voters will react unfavorably to non-earmarking of the one cent sales tax increase:

As has been pointed out, the survey reveals that Ohio voters do not believe that an increase in taxes is needed at this time. This position, however, is refuted somewhat when the words "taxes for public schools" are used. The danger here is that with the legislature having already appropriated a substantial amount of money for public school education, only a portion of the one cent sales tax increase will now go toward financing of the PEP proposal. All of us have hear the oft-repeated criticism that there is no guarantee the sales tax increase will go for education and this has caused reaction against the proposal even within our own organizational groups.

10. Defeat of the PEP proposal could result in prolonged damage to the image of education in Ohio:

This is a proposition which must be weighed carefully based upon the individuals who have continually been making the statement. We must recognize that certain interests would prefer that we not go to the polls and therefore they preach this doctrine. On the other hand, we must also recognize that if the PEP proposal were defeated at the polls, it could be said by the Administration and subsequent legislative assemblies that the people do not believe public school education requires any more aid than has been made available by the State government. Further than this, there is the danger that the image of the participating organizations could be damaged during an unsuccessful campaign in
which it would be necessary to "take off the gloves." Regardless of whether the Administration has any feeling about our going to the polls, legislators who have been and are friends of education have expressed themselves as greatly concerned about the possibility. To deny their counsel now might make the legislative future of education bleak.

11. Financing the PEP campaign will be a substantial problem:

The Council has previously discussed the need for a large "war chest" to successfully pursue the PEP campaign. The minimal figure which can be considered is a half million dollars, and advisors who have studied educational campaign needs estimate that the budget could run closer to a million dollars. We must assume that this budget would have to be raised almost entirely by the participating organizations since an overture was made to business and industrial leaders by a prominent member of the Ohio School Boards Association and the results were negative. It is unrealistic to assume that even a professional fund raising organization will be able to raise campaign funds from the public to wage a campaign that would raise the public's taxes.

Following this report it was decided to return to the parent organizations with a recommendation to go on the ballot. The next meeting was set for July 29, 1965.

**The Final Decision**

After roll call, a motion was passed to reverse the decision of the chair that it would require a unanimous vote of the Council to stop the act of placing the PEP bill on the ballot. Dr. Lucas had previously cited the June 23, 1964 minutes, "that the O.C.E. initiate a bill by petition", implies you go to the General Assembly
and then go to the people. This motion was passed. It aroused some discussion concerning the constitution. To make the discussion and action legal, the constitution Article III, Section 2 was amended to read:

> It shall be the policy of this organization to support legislation and programs which have the majority concurrence of all participating organizations by acting as a clearing house for reaching agreement on issues of common interest.

Reports from Mr. Griffith indicated that the second request for signatures on petitions did not go as well as the first. Senator Ocasek predicted that the PEP bill would be defeated in November. Mr. Hall's report of what the legislature was doing for education was negative.

Dr. Paul C. Hayes (OEA) moved that the Council place the issue of the initiative petition on the ballot; that it be filed on July 30, 1965. It was seconded by James King (ODESP). The vote was: Yes - 6; No - 4. The negative votes were cast by the School Administrators, County Superintendents, School Employees, and Ohio Congress of Parents and Teachers.

A fifteen minute recess was given and the roll was kept open. During this time groups caucused to consider their stand. In one intergroup discussion, some heated words were exchanged. When the groups reconvened, the roll call remained the same. During interviews
conducted by the writer a year later, it was mentioned that one of the persons voting "yes", voted against the wishes of the organization the person represented. Had the person voted as directed, the PEP bill would not have been placed on the ballot.

A motion calling for unanimous support of the action of placing PEP on the ballot was passed unanimously.

In the discussion of the finances, O.E.A. representative said they had a minimum of $300,000.00 available for the campaign. The trustees had earlier established the cost of the campaign at $392,000.00.

The Trustees met immediately after the Council had adjourned. They planned a news release at 9:00 A.M. the next day, and to have Director Brennan find a public relations firm to carry on the campaign. The next meeting was set for August 19, 1965.

The meeting of August 19th was optimistic. Friends of the Governor reported that Governor Rhodes and members of the Assembly would not oppose PEP.

Charles Baker of the Burr Communications Agency was in attendance to present the letter of intent and the campaign plans. This was accepted unanimously by the Council.

The O.S.B.A. was going to ask local boards to keep local issues off the ballot if at all possible this
November.

P.T.A. was planning a September meeting of Council and unit presidents with an expected 1,500 persons. This was being done to inform them and to seek contributions for the campaign. All of this was done at P.T.A. expense.

Ed Hoon was assigned full time to the promotion of PEP for the O.E.A. staff.

The Administrative Director suggested that they have telephone conferences in place of meetings to save time and be more convenient to all concerned. The next meeting was to be held in October.

The October 6th meeting of the Trustees was devoted to reports and plans of the Issue 1 campaign (PEP). The key persons at the local level were the elementary principals. This left the role of the superintendents in doubt as to what they were doing. The P.T.A. members were the working members at the grass roots level.

To support and supplement local efforts 88 "County chairman systems" had been established. Local boards had been asked by the O.A.S.B. to keep local operation and bond issues off the ballot if possible.

The Burr Agency was stressing Issue 1 as a moral issue, that the voters must vote for the children of Ohio. Their advertising campaign was being done on bill boards, radio and TV. Because of the expense of TV, Issue 1 had
limited exposure.

The law of Ohio requires that the Secretary of State when distributing the information concerning a state issue, must include statements of not more than 300 words both pro and con about the issue. The Council felt that the one prepared by the legislative service as requested by the Secretary of State Brown was erroneous and misleading. The persons preparing the statement had their names removed from the published release. The efforts by the Administrative Director to change the statements were fruitless because the law would not allow them to force a change.

**Defeat of Issue I**

On Tuesday, November 2, 1965 the voters of the State of Ohio defeated Issue I in all of the 88 counties. The vote was 1,707,581 to 803,857.

Analyses were made by both Charles Baker of the Burr Communications Agency and James O. Brennan, Administrative Director of O.C.E. While Mr. Baker was explaining "What Happened", by presenting the situation as he saw it, he was giving the O.C.E. a pep talk to "keep up the good work, you have made gains, don't give up now, to give up would be to lose the war." 26

A summary of Mr. Baker's remarks shows the

---

26 Charles Baker "What Happened" November 26, 1965
following areas influenced the voters:

I. Attitudes:
   A. The public is generally satisfied with the schools. The Princeton survey showed only 17\% felt the schools were not being well run.
   B. The idea of no new taxes that had been implanted in the minds of voters was difficult to overcome.
   C. The sales tax was not "ear marked" for education and the people were not sure the money would be spent for education.
   D. The reluctance of the voters to assume more taxes "that would nibble into their income."

II. Legislative action made it hard to establish need:
   A. Passage of House Bill 950 did provide for a substantial increase for education.
   B. The "across the board" increases of HB 950 were more attractive to wealthy urban centers.

III. Limitation of the initiative process:
   A. No adjustments by O.C.E. could be made in the PEP bill once it was introduced in the assembly.
   B. The wording on the voting machines "To amend the school foundation program to increase taxes" was not a fair representation of the bill.
IV. Factors that had been favorable for the passage of Issue I.

A. The "self-interest" votes of the parents, school boards, and school personnel.

B. Holding down the "no" vote:
   1. The appeal was directed on a "moral" issue
   2. The undecided vote was not decided until the day of election (the undecided vote was affected by the "no increase of taxes" idea).

V. The endorsement and support of large associations to help persuade the "yes" vote was not obtained.

Support was not obtained from:

A. Any top political figure

B. Any political party

C. Any labor organization

D. Any community leaders in the urban areas

E. The news media

In the area of encouragement, he cited the working force that was now trained in speaking and campaigning; the influence of the political pressure for the improvement of HB 950; that the legislators could not ignore the over 800,000 voters who supported PEP; that questions had been raised in the minds of voters concerning the quality of education in Ohio; that Issue I could not have been an end in itself, that it would have been necessary to go back to the assembly again in the future for more
support.

Mr. Brennan made the following points in analyzing the voting:

I. There were no political, geographic or religious factors that were apparent.

II. The O.C.E. had a potential vote of 900,000 in its membership alone. The Council had failed to convince its own membership to understand, support, and promote the PEP bill.

III. The Foundation Program Bill was hard to criticize because the people thought that education was given great benefits in HB 950.

IV. The Princeton survey showed 68% of Ohio voters felt that the public schools were being well run.

V. The funds not being earmarked for schools was very damaging to the cause.

VI. Confusion over part of the foundation program relating to "culturally disadvantaged" and the principle of equalization.27

The other comments were similar to those of Mr. Baker.

Reassessment

The Trustees meeting of November 26th was devoted to financial reports of Issue I that had to be submitted

27James O. Brennan, O.C.E. Council Minutes, November 26, 1965
to the Secretary of State, Mr. Brennan's analysis, and discussion of the future of the O.C.E.

The Administrative Director had written recommendations for the future of O.C.E. While the entire recommendation is in the appendix a brief summary is necessary at this point. His recommendations were:

I. To continue the O.C.E. . . . "for the basic problem of how best to pay for good schools for all children remains with us as a result of the defeat of Issue I. No one organization or group can solve that problem . . . ."

II. That the Board of Trustees be increased to ten, one representative from each organization.

III. That the basic aim be restated to be one of research and information.

IV. That it be stated in the O.C.E. by-laws that this organization is not and will not be an action group.

V. That O.C.E. return to the policy of requiring a unanimous vote in support of programs and legislation.

VI. That a member of the State Department of Education be asked to serve as an ex-officio member of the Trustees.

VII. That organizations with interests other than education be asked to participate in O.C.E. discussions.
VIII. That the member organizations report semi-annually on their legislative goals so the Council can be a clearing house.

IX. That a special committee work with the representatives of higher education to seek their vast fund of untapped knowledge and information for the solution to public school problems.

X. That O.C.E. broaden its scope to areas of research and development of programs in education and not confine its activities to school finance.  

The other changes the Administrative Director recommended for the operation of the Council were to eliminate his position, hire a part-time General Counselor who could have his office for his other work. Services such as duplicating and mailing would be contracted out.

Fiscal policy suggestions included the equal sharing of the financial burden, if possible, seeking funds from federal or private endowments, research cost being assumed by participating organizations by loan of personnel and facilities. The Trustees decided to take the suggestions made to their parent organizations and discuss with them the future direction that the Council would take.

---
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should take.

The Council did pass a resolution:

. . . . to recommend a change in the By-laws of the Ohio Council for Education so that the member organizations will not lose their tax exempt status by participating in the Ohio Council for Education's activities and financially supporting the Council.

Other items of business were:

An election of officers with Mrs. Herbert Kinney chosen President; Dr. Robert Lucas, Vice President; Mr. Thomas O'Keefe, Secretary-Treasurer. The office at 86 E. Broad St. was changed to a room at the Ohio Congress of Parents and Teachers on a trial basis.

The P.T.A. donated $1,700.00 for the continuation of the work of the Council.

The financial report covering January 1 through December 23, 1965 reveals the amount of financial support given during the year by the member organizations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O.E.A.</td>
<td>$280,321.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O.S.B.A.</td>
<td>2,495.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O.A.P.S.E.</td>
<td>6,309.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O.A.S.B.O.</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O.C.P.T.A.</td>
<td>1,776.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O.A.S.A.</td>
<td>5,665.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

29 O.E.A. is the Ohio Education Association; O.S.B.A. is Ohio School Boards Association; O.A.P.S.E., Ohio Association of Public School Employees; O.A.S.B.O., Ohio Association School Business Officers; O.C.P.T.A., Ohio Congress of Parents and Teachers Association; O.A.S.A., Ohio Association of School Administrators.
O.D.E.S.P. $ 6,208.00
O.A.S.S.P.30 3,000.00
Miscellaneous 11,206.60 - 3.5% 
$317,982.07

Miscellaneous represents contributions that were made by members and groups affiliated with O.C.E. for supplies or campaign support. Three other organizations who made large contributions were Ohio Association for Higher Education - $1,323.12; South-Western Ohio Education Association - $2,500.00; and North-West Ohio Education Association - $500.00.

The expenditures were divided into two categories, "normal operating disbursements" totaling $62,773.21 and "Issue I campaign disbursements" totaling $257,305.62. This total cannot reflect the contribution of time given by personnel of the member organizations, such as Ed Hoon (OEA), Robert Baker (OSBA), or office assistance by OCP.

The breakdown of items relating to Issue I. was:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Amount Expended</th>
<th>Percent of Total Campaign Expenditures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>$ 1,356.50</td>
<td>.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel and Miscellaneous Expenditures</td>
<td>9,315.69</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Classification of Amount Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Amount Expended</th>
<th>Percent of Total Campaign Expenditures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>$1,813.64</td>
<td>.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent and Utilities</td>
<td>1,998.22</td>
<td>.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing, Publications and Mailing</td>
<td>53,376.79</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies and Equipment</td>
<td>2,342.13</td>
<td>.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service (P.R. Adver.)</td>
<td>187,102.65</td>
<td>73.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Organizational Changes**

In the January 20, 1966 meeting, a change was made in the representation on the Board of Trustees. All ten organizations would now sit on the Board. This matter was always a source of irritation to those not represented.

Since most of the members had not discussed constitutional changes with their executive group, other suggested changes were tabled for future consideration.

The services of James O. Brennan, Administrative Director, were terminated as of January 21, 1966, at his request. Secretarial help was to be continued.

During this period after the defeat of Issue I, the question of "if" the O.C.E. should continue to operate, had been settled in the affirmative. The question of how it could effectively function with limited financial support and still accomplish what it desired to do,

31 James O. Brennan, Administrative Director, Financial Summary - Jan. 1 - Dec. 23, 1965 to O.C.E.
was unanswered. The by-laws were re-evaluated so that the purpose was now changed:

The Council will recommend legislative proposals for sponsorship and initiation by a member of the General Assembly. 32

It shall be the policy of this organization to support legislation and programs which have the majority concurrence of participating organizations. Only those programs approved unanimously by all participating organizations shall commit each organization to a position of active support. 33

An annual budget for the year was set at $6,080.00. The budget amount considered in the December meeting $15,000.00. The difference was the omission of the General Counselor ($3,400.00), travel and expenses ($1,200), printing and publication ($1,300.00), supplies and equipment ($750.00), research expenses $2,400.00), and special services ($50.00).

The omissions in the budget give clues to the thinking of the Council. The items of research, travel, reduction of printing, publication, and mailing from $18,000.00 to $500.00 makes one wonder as to how much they thought they could do. The member organizations' contributions for the December proposal was $1,500.00 per year; and reduced to $608.00 in the February 11, 1966 budget. This reduced their financial obligation more

32 O.C.E. Council Minutes of December 23, '65, Sec. 2 of Article III of Policy Statements
33 Ibid, Sec.2, Article II
than 50%.

At the April 29, 1966 meeting, the O.S.B.A. contributed $500.00. All other members reported that their contributions were forthcoming.

The legislative programs of the members were still being developed so no program for the O.C.E. could be started.

Robert Regula (OASSP) moved that committees be formed to interview leaders in industry, labor and political power structures of the state to find what they considered to be the critical issues in education. The motion was passed.

Dr. Lucas was elected temporary treasurer during the September 29th meeting. Mr. O'Keefe was no longer a representative for O.E.A. Kermit Daugherty represented O.E.A., but had not been appointed by the O.E.A. Executive Committee.

Reports were submitted by the different committees on their conferences with the Ohio Manufacturers' Association; the Ohio Chamber of Commerce; Dr. Fawcett, President of the Ohio College Association; Mrs. Cromwell of the League of Women Voters of Ohio. Other organizations to be contacted were: The Ohio Junior Chamber of Commerce, the Ohio Catholic Welfare Conference, the Farm Bureau Federation, and Mr. King of the Ohio A.F.L.-C.I.O. These reports identified three critical areas: finance,
technical schools, and communications with organizations outside the Council as well as within.

The financial concerns was expressed in the need for improved long range planning for the financing of Ohio Schools; that major changes are needed so Ohio could keep pace economically and educationally; that some organizational leaders felt the state should carry 50% of the financial burden. Other concerns expressed were: the need for vocational and technical education should be studied for expanding these areas; the demands of the economy for capable, reliable, and trained people was making this a critical issue. There was a need to de-emphasize the "college for all" philosophy.

Other areas brought out in the general discussion were reorganization of school districts; that few people know or understood the Foundation program; that all people really care about is a good education rather than understanding the mechanics behind its financing; that the benefits of the PEP program were good.

Discussion of The Fact Book on State Issue I lead to the passing of the motion that a committee be appointed to look into the possibility of up-dating The Fact Book and report back to the Trustees at the next meeting.

---

34Report of Contact Committee in regard to meetings with various leadership organizations, December 1, 1966, O.C.E. Mimeograph
The Fact Book on State Issue I was a pamphlet that graphically presented the picture of education in the State of Ohio in relation to other states.

Subsequent action by the Council resulted in the publication of a Fact Book with $2,500.00 spent for the first printing.

An office for O.C.E. was established at the Ohio Congress of Parents and Teachers at a rental of $20.00 per month as of January 1, 1967.

The election of officers at the January 12, 1967 meeting of Trustees resulted in the election of Jean Kinney (PTA) President; Robert Bowman (OSBA) Vice President; Francis Rudy (OAPSE) Secretary-Treasurer. In the Council meeting that followed immediately after; the rough copy of the Fact Book was examined and some changes made. Final approval was to be given by the Trustees. Approval was given on January 19, 1967 of the Fact Book, now entitled "What About Our Future?"

A Policy and Procedure Statement was adopted at the meeting of February 8th, 1967. Since this had a bearing on the operational procedures, it is presented as adopted:

**Policy and Procedure Statement**

The Ohio Council for Education, Inc. has a very compelling reason and a unique capacity to provide leadership in education during a legislative year. It will provide this leadership most effectively when it functions within
the concept of its constitution and applies its beliefs in the following special ways:

1. The Council should carefully review proposed school legislation to determine the application of the legislation to participating organizations of the Council. Approval of the legislation would be based on unanimous consent by participating organizations.

2. The Council should publicize its approval of those legislative proposals which it unanimously supports. This approval should be clearly indicated to all membership organizations through their representation on the Council, and to legislators and others with an interest in the Council's thinking. Even though the Council does not give unanimous approval to certain legislation, the sharing of agreements and disagreements should have a wholesome effect on the effort of the Council to give breadth and depth to the thinking of all who are interested in the progress of education in Ohio.

3. Special effort should be made by the Council membership to convey to the members of their own professional organizations the thinking of OCE. Only in this way can the Council utilize the machinery for coordinating the efforts of organizations and individuals interested in education.

In order to implement the above policy the following procedure is necessary:

1. A screening committee of four people representing the four constituent bodies of OCE - the Non-Certificated Employees, the Ohio School Boards Assn., The Ohio Education Association, and The Ohio Congress of Parents and Teachers, Inc.

2. The screening committee should meet at approximately two-week intervals to review legislative proposals and decide upon those which are important to improving the quality of the educational program and which pertain in general to all participating organizations.
3. The screening committee should report to the full Council at least once a month and, when necessary, supply interpretation of new legislation, possibly by arranging for "experts" to appear before the Council.

4. The screening committee should be given the authority to re-define its procedures as it sees fit and so arrange its operation as to serve most effectively the goals of the Council in regard to school legislation. 35

Because of anticipated income from the sale of the Fact Book, "What About Our Future?" the budget for 1967 was increased to $10,470.48. Of this amount $3,470.48 was the cash balance on December 31, 1966. The large sums in the budget were for a secretary, $3,600.00, printing $2,500.00, and contingency fund, $2,181.48. The contribution expected from each member-organization was $280.00.

The first discussion of legislation pending before the Ohio General Assembly was held by the Council on March 8, 1967. This was two months after the General Assembly was called into session.

The only bill that received unanimous agreement was SB No. 7 - Weeks - Indefinite continuation of School Levies. The other six bills were tabled for further discussion at the next meeting. The bills tabled were:

HB No. 39 - Motti - Required simple majority to pass levies and bond issues at all

35 O.C.E. Trustees Minutes, February 8, 1967
HB No. 240 - Galbraith - Reduces needed vote requirements for local bond issues to majority in all elections.

SB No. 123 - Shaw - Tax sheltered annuity to meet Internal Revenue Service regulations.

HR No. 279 - Bechtold - To permit school boards to pay for operation of and buy equipment for student activity programs.

HB No. 206 - OAPSE - On employee negotiations

SB No. 30 - OEA - On employee negotiations

At the April 5, 1967 meeting of the Trustees, the sale of the fact books, "What About Our Future?" showed a profit of $1,106.36. Of 100,000 ordered, 22,630 copies had been sold, 1,239 copies given out to newspapers, department of education, legislators, etc., leaving over 75% to be sold. The questioning of the purpose of O.C.E., its future and program, brought out these considerations:

1. A rewarding asset is its service as a means of communication among its members.

2. Promoting the awareness of legislative bills presented and listening to the views of all members for greater understanding.

3. Act as a "buffer" organization as we strive to work together in good faith for our central purpose - that of improving educational opportunities for our children.

4. Serving a purpose in representing and expressing diverse views for the benefit of better understanding as we work together
in harmony for the betterment of the children of Ohio.

5. Serves as a communication function at the state level.

Suggestions made to further the program:

1. Interpretation of key legislative measures, followed by discussion.

2. Invite leading men who have talked on a particular bill to come and express their views to O.C.E. 37

Dr. Martin Essex, Superintendent of Public Instruction, was to be invited to attend all of the O.C.E. meetings.

In the Council meeting that followed, emphasis was placed on the discussion of the legislative proposals. Those that gained approval by the O.C.E. were:

SB No. 216) - Collin et. al. - Would hike minimum salaries of teachers (Contingent upon adequate state support).

Endorsement of the Ohio Bond Commission Constitutional Amendment.

Unanimous agreement to oppose HR No. 422 was reached.

HR No. 422 - Jones - Relative to a uniform contract form for photographing school children, and to provide penalty.

36 O.C.E. Trustees' Minutes of April 5, 1967
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A motion for approval was lost for:

HB No. 358 - Sherrer - To enter the State of Ohio into the compact for education.

SB No. 229 - Collins - To adopt and implement the inter-state compact for education.

Request for time and further information on both of these was asked for by the Council.

Other bills were discussed but due to apparent disagreement by one or more organizations, no vote was taken. These were:

HB No. 279 - Bechtold - Permissive legislation for boards to use tax money to support student activity programs.

HB No. 453 - Creasy, et. al. - Relative to the creation of a state educational practices board.

SB No. 123 - Tax-sheltered annuity to meet Internal Revenue Services.

At the June 15, 1967 meeting, Dr. Martin Essex spoke on his views on state support of elementary and secondary education in relation to legislation before the Ohio General Assembly. The Foundation Program would be modified, the $200.00 per teacher salary raise would remain; and that a compensatory or A.D.C. basis remain. He urged the adoption of a state salary schedule. Legislators were saying that there would be $160,000.00 new money plus $41,000,000.00 for growth.
Prior to his statements related to legislation, Dr. Essex urged that participating members of O.C.E. continue with their discussion of educational problems and legislation. The exchange of views was needed to promote better understanding and eventually a better educational program for Ohio.

On June 29, 1967, the Trustees did not have enough member-organizations present to conduct business. The evening meeting had only six member-organization representatives present and they did carry on with their regular agenda. This was the lowest attendance recorded to this date.

John Hall (OEA) discussed SB 350 relative to the financing and distribution of state support for elementary and secondary public education and establishing a minimum salary schedule. The Council passed a resolution urging all their member organizations to let Governor Rhodes and their representative know of their support for SB 350.

The July 20, 1967 meeting was devoted to a summary report of SB 350 and looking at possible action for the future. The motions passed for future action were to update the fact book after evaluating the legislation put into effect and to plan a legislative program for O.C.E. for the next session of the Ohio General Assembly.

A motion endorsing opposition to the principle
of utilizing public funds in support of private school education was defeated. A motion to refer the defeated motion to the Trustees was defeated. This would indicate that the Council would not oppose that part of SB 350 that gave aid in a limited way to private schools.

The Trustees' meeting of December 12, 1967 was devoted to a discussion of the request to withdraw from the Council by the Ohio Association of Classroom Teachers. The reasons given by Raymond O'Dell were the duplication of representation since O.E.A. really represented them, presenting a duplication of thinking or position on the Council. The other reason given was that the OACT's budget had been reduced $11,000.00 and it had to curtail some of its commitments. Other members reviewed with him the purposes of the Council and urged that OACT stay with the organization.

At the Council meeting, the financial resources were reported at a low ebb and it was asked that members bring their contributions up to date. The O.C.S.A. stated a check would be sent soon. While this would leave a deficit at the end of the year, the membership decided to take this into consideration.

Some changes in the by-laws were submitted for the Council members to discuss with their organizations. These changes would be considered at the next Council meeting.
The new officers elected at the January 10, 1968 meeting for O.C.E. were Dr. Robert Bowman, (OSBA), President; Francis Rudy (OASBO), Vice-President; and Mrs. Hubert Kinney (OCPT) as Secretary-Treasurer. The January 22, 1968 meeting of the Trustees records the O.A.C.T. representative stated that they had voted to participate, but the amount of contribution would not exceed $500.00. The amount of contribution expected from the other organizations was $680.00. The Ohio County Superintendents' Association had to limit their contribution to $200.00 because of their limited membership previously, so this was not a new situation to the Council.

The O.C.E. unanimously agreed upon the principle of compulsory negotiations for all school board employees and published a resolution on January 22, 1968. This supported the principle of compulsory negotiation without getting involved in the mechanics of how the legislative bill would be written.

The budget for 1968 was set at $8,041.08. The 1967 expenditures were $8,866.35. Since 1967 was the year for the General Assembly to meet, it was higher. The sale of the pamphlet, "What About Our Future" reduced the need of contributions from member organizations so that the contributions totaled $2,418.00. 38

38O.C.E. Trustees' Meeting Minutes, April 24, 1968
The year of 1968 had five other meetings of the Trustees and four of the council besides the two in January. The meetings were devoted to the outside speakers who presented information which would give them additional background. Topics discussed were Local Government, Tax Revision in Ohio, Little Hoover Commission Report, Vocational Education, District Organization, Foundation Formula, Special Education, and Problems and Prospects for Financing Education in Ohio.

At the November meeting of the Council, a decision was reached to have a budget for a total contribution of $560.00. This closed the office and dispensed with the secretarial services of Mrs. Trudy Leach as of the end of 1968.

This action taken just prior to the start of the 1969 General Assembly year has the implication of reduction of activities and a loss of interest of the members in the value of the O.C.E.

The writer being unable to obtain the minutes after the November meeting, closes this chapter with grave questions as to the future of the organization. There has been nothing tangible about which the Council could say to themselves or anyone "look what we have done." Being a clearing house or a discussion group may not have sufficient holding power to make the members
feel that the O.C.E. is contributing enough to warrant their support with their time, money and efforts.
Chapter IV

OHIO COUNCIL FOR EDUCATION

COMPARSED WITH OTHER COUNCILS

In comparing the O.C.E. with the other thirteen councils in this study, the information was gathered from Chapters II and III. In most areas, there was very little contrast. The areas of comparison will be the organizations which were involved in starting the councils, the main purpose, membership requirements, the financial obligations, influence within the councils, efforts with legislators and governors, effectiveness of educators as lobbyists, and the accomplishments of the councils.

The comparison was made to find the outstanding differences which might be considered for the improvement of the O.C.E.

1. Originating Organizations of the Councils:

The very fact of joining in coalition by the organizations expressed their acknowledgement of the need for united action to improve public education. The various organizations that participated showed that there was a wide spread interest in education. The comparison was made to find if a trend exists that might help the O.C.E.
evaluate its membership.

The state education associations were directly involved in calling all 13 of the original meetings to start new councils. Other organizations, such as the school board association and the P.T.A., joined with the education associations to sponsor the meetings. In North Carolina the Master of Grange was given credit for calling the first meeting. In two other states, the college association was in the coordinating group. The names of other organizations interested in public education frequently mentioned as having representatives present at the first meeting, are the American Association of University Women, University or college associations, and both elementary and secondary school principals associations.

All the representatives of originating organizations who answered questionnaires reported that they were favorable to the meeting except two. No reason was given for this response in one case; in the other a board member feared the professionals would dominate the organization. On the whole, the need for this type of organization must have been widely recognized by the groups.

In Ohio, the four organizations that worked together for the first meeting were the Congress of Parents and Teachers, the Ohio School Board Association, Ohio
Education Association and the Ohio Association of School Administrators. The others quickly responded to the need for establishing the O.C.E. There was no hesitation on the part of the members in joining to work together for the improvement of public education.

2. Purpose of Councils:

The O.C.E. changed its purpose twice. The constitutions, by-laws and minutes (where available) of other councils were studied to find if they changed purpose, and if so, why.

It was found the main purpose of the councils was to plan agreed-upon legislation so that a united front was presented to the legislative representatives. This was done by recommendation of legislation and by participation in lobbying for the legislation, or, in some cases, by simply restricting the procedures to the recommendation stage.

Once established, the other councils have stayed by the purpose for which they were established. There was one board member who indicated the purpose of the council was changed, but did not indicate how or why it was changed.

One point in which the O.C.E. was different from the other councils was the changing of purpose. When first organized, the O.C.E. was to be a clearing house.
After seven meetings spent in getting organized, the O.C.E. elected new officers, changed the purpose of the Council to that of an action group, changed the financial obligations of the member organizations and altered the operational procedures by establishing an executive committee with the power to hire an executive director. This was all done in one meeting.

The preliminary work for this change of direction was started by individuals who withdrew from active participation as soon as the O.C.E. had assumed the responsibility. Many of these persons were superintendents from large cities who later opposed the P.E.P. bill. The report that the superintendents on the Blue Ribbon Committee had defected was made at the Trustees' meeting on April 15, 1965. The reason for their change of interest was reported to be the pressure put on by the retail merchants because of the adoption of a sales tax increase as the basis of added school revenue.

The men who worked so hard to formulate a new foundation program must have realized that whatever tax source was used, there would be repercussions on the local level. Thatchers' report\(^1\) indicated the best sources of revenue would be a state income tax or an increase

\(^1\) Thatcher, George W., Tax Revision Alternatives for the Tax System of Ohio, Ohio Tax Study Committee, Columbus, Ohio, 1962.
of the sales tax. Whether the bill would include a tax proposal or not, they knew that some source of tax money would have to be tapped to supply the needed money.

Assuming they were aware of this, did the city superintendents plan the bill then purposely abandon the Council to avoid any political effect that might reflect on them?

One Trustee of O.C.E. reported that he knew some of the superintendents had been to see Governor Rhodes on different occasions. He felt that some political threats or promises had been made. However, there were no indications that any of the Trustees or Council members were involved in this situation.

While O.C.E. did change its purpose twice (from the original clearing house to an action group, then back again) there was only one Trustee who expressed concern about its return to the role of a clearing house. This person thought that the provision for being an action group should remain. The expressed opinion was that the Council could be an action group without getting into another initiative procedure. Without some kind of active program undertaken by the Council, it was felt, the group would not exist very long.

3. Membership of Councils:

Membership regulations of the various councils were compared to see if the restricted membership, as in
O.C.E., was found satisfactory or if an open membership was preferable.

Membership on the councils was classified as open or closed. In either case, the councils had to vote on the acceptance of new member organizations.

Most of the representative members were satisfied with the membership policy (Question VII, p. 24), but four persons wanted changes. There were two reasons given for this: (1) to admit more lay organizations to balance the voting with the professional organizations; and (2) to increase the number of organizations so as to reduce the financial obligations of each.

The Trustees of O.C.E. when interviewed were satisfied with its membership. While there were other organizations who could qualify for membership, the Council did not actively encourage additional members to join. The Council did refuse membership to other departments of O.E.A.

4. Financial Support of Councils:

The resources to support the operation of a council is one problem that faces all citizen groups. A study of this matter in other councils was made to find other possible ways in which the O.C.E. budget could be supported.

The constitutions of the councils studied indicated that seven out of thirteen councils provided for
membership fees. The response to the questionnaires (Question VIII, p. 24-25) shows however that two coun­
cils were dependent on other sources. Only five of the seven councils whose constitutions authorized membership fees reported having such fees. In the ten states which had two or three responses to the questionnaire, only four were in agreement as to their sources of revenue. Massachusetts depended on donations and services. New York had four incomes: membership fees, donations, ser­vices and sale of publications. Maryland, with its large membership of 76 organizations, depended on fees. Maine was supported by donations from its members. Maryland and North Dakota reported that all organizations shared equally in the cost of operation. In councils with open membership, membership fees usually covered the expense of the council.

There were nine states where two or three different responses were given to the question on the con­tributions of funds and services of member organizations to the council; six in which the responses were in agree­ment. Four states indicated 25% to 29% support from or­ganizations other than the education associations. Two states reported equal support by the school board and education associations of 33% each. Six state education associations were contributing from 33% to 60% or more to the support of the council.
The O.C.E. was supported by donations, with the organizations of the educators assuming the major proportion of the budget. At first this was due to the expense of the referendum campaign, 88% of which was paid by O.E.A. Later, even when all organizations were sharing equally, the educators' contributions as represented by their five organizations' part of the budget, would exceed that of any other group. As separate members (superintendents, teachers, etc.) the donations were the same and in two cases less where the teachers and county superintendents limited their contributions.

5. Influence within the Council:

Comparison was made with other councils to find out whether one organization dominated the council or whether all organizations were equal.

The percentage of support on Question IX (p. 25), shows clearly that the educators are carrying most of the financial burden. While most persons believe the old statement that "those who control the purse, control the decisions," this was not true according to the twenty-seven persons who responded (Question X, p. 25-26) to the question relating contribution vs. influence. Only eight felt that the money influenced the decisions. Only two of the thirteen states had affirmative agreement from all persons answering this question. They were South Dakota and Tennessee. Three states, Louisiana,
Maine and Minnesota had all negative responses. In four states one person of the three answering felt the amount of contribution made a difference. However, the majority of persons felt that it did not influence their thinking, especially the lay persons.

In the two states reporting that the amount of contribution tended to give the member more influence, the education association was cited as the most influential and indicated the educators' financial contribution was 40% or more of the budget.

Educators responded to the questionnaire that they had the most influence (Question XI, p. 26). At least six board members agreed with them. But four board members felt that they were as influential as the teachers' association. One board member felt his organization was the power structure within its council. Of the lay persons answering, only one said that the education association was influential. Four persons said all were equal in their influence.

In the O.C.E., during the P.E.P. campaign, O.E.A. was contributing most of the money. Three of the Trustees felt that O.E.A. was making many of the decisions. For example: the suggestion of compromise with the legislators on a bill to improve public education in Ohio was brought up at three meetings, but was repeatedly turned down. The O.A.S.A. and the O.S.B.A. would
have settled for a compromise. The O.E.A. was strongly opposed because of a survey of its members, and Tom O'Keefe could not settle for less than the proposed P.E.P. bill.

The Trustees of the O.C.E. liked the financial situation when all members were contributing the same amount to the budget, and believed that all members of the Council were equals when they were on an equal financial basis. Three of the Trustees felt that O.E.A. was making final decisions during the P.E.P. campaign because of the need to refer to O.E.A. to learn if there would be sufficient money to carry out the proposal.

6. Influence with Legislators, Governor and Public:

The efforts of the councils were directed toward influencing legislators and governors for the benefit of public education. A comparison was made to see if other councils were more effective than the O.C.E. in this regard.

The level of influence outside the council, according to the frequency of mention in the questionnaire responses, (Question XIII, p. 26-27) was given as the legislators, the general public and governors, in that order. The legislators have become accustomed to pressure groups trying to influence their voting, but have been more sensitive to receiving large numbers of individual letters from their constituents, and to the
position of the governor. If the governor has been of the same party as the legislator, the governor's opinion has been more important.

Very few of the councils have mentioned that the governor or his representative or a representative of the state department of education have been members or ex-officio members of the councils. While department heads could have been a communication source, a direct representation would be a better way of gaining the support of the governor and of letting him know that the council supported his program.

Of the nine board members answering the questionnaire, eight rated the effectiveness of the council with the governor "fair" to "little." The lay persons were in agreement with the board members, marking "fair" and "little." Educators had marked the council's effectiveness "very strong" 3 times; "strong" 2 times; "fair" 4, and "little" 1 time.

The educators were also inclined to rate the effectiveness of the council with legislators higher than the board members and lay persons. They had six ratings of "strong" and "very strong" (3 each), while five members rated the Council's effectiveness as "fair."

Five of nine board members rated their effectiveness as "strong" while the lay persons were evenly split between "fair" and "strong," with one "very strong."
There were no states where all three persons responded the same. There were nine states where two persons were in agreement. They were:

- Very strong
- Strong
- Strong
- Strong
- Strong
- Fair
- Fair
- Fair
- Fair
- Fair

In the other four of the thirteen states, only two council members felt that the council's effectiveness with the legislators was "strong" or better.

Dr. E. E. Holt, Superintendent of Public Instruction, or his representative did attend the first meetings of the O.C.E. After the initiative process was under consideration, he ceased to attend the meetings. One of the Trustees discussed with him the problems relating to O.C.E. almost weekly either by telephone or in conference meetings. While Dr. Holt did not attend the meetings, his advice was there by way of the Trustee. All the Trustees felt that Dr. Holt was restricted in his participation for two reasons: the State Department's own program was being considered in the Assembly and Dr. Holt did not want to cause any ill-will with
Governor Rhodes' office. After Dr. Holt's retirement, Dr. Essex became Superintendent of Public Instruction. He continued to work with the O.C.E. He attended the meetings or had a representative there.

The O.C.E. had no influence on Governor Rhodes. But his influence on what happened to the P.E.P. bill was tremendous. When the bill was being considered in the Ohio General Assembly, some of the legislators were switching their support in favor of P.E.P. It was reported in the Trustees' meeting that Governor Rhodes called the Republicans in his office and told them if they wanted his endorsement for re-election, to withdraw their support of P.E.P. This was a very effective threat, for P.E.P. never seemed to have had a chance to be enacted by the Assembly after that meeting.

During the campaign in the fall for the November election, Governor Rhodes' influence was still apparent. While he did not come out against the bill, his silence and ingrained "no new taxes" was effective. His influence with prominent superintendents was still strong, for they refused to support any P.E.P. activities. Many local superintendents, being conscious of political pressure, followed the example of the other superintendents.

The influence with legislators was growing until Governor Rhodes put an end to it. The planned appearances
before the committees were well done due to the efforts of James Brennan, John Hall (O.E.A.), Tom O'Keefe, and Lewis Harris. On several occasions legislators came to the O.C.E. offices seeking information. This was unusual for a new organization.

7. Effectiveness of Educators:

This comparison was made to determine if there are common areas in which the educators need to improve, to work more effectively with the other member organizations.

In determining the importance of the role that educators played in the councils, most of the board members and lay persons thought that all organizations were mutually dependent. Only 4 out of 12 educators agreed with them. Most of the educators said that the councils were "very dependent" to "dependent" on them. Evidently the educators felt they were more important to the councils than the others did.

Question XVI (p. 27-28) where educators, board members and lay people rated the contribution of educators compared to others in the operation of the councils, again the educators felt they were more important to the councils than the others did. In 16 responses in the "more" for organization work, 8 were educators. The board members and lay people were nearly even in marking "more" and "same."
In all operational areas, the educators perceived themselves as more effective in their abilities than their fellow members perceived them, except in the area of "fund raising." Since all categories given were directly related to the educator's training, experiences and daily occupational expectations, it would be expected that their fellow workers would rate them higher in these job expectations. The responses indicated that the board members and lay persons were equally divided in their opinion of the abilities of educators compared to others; half thinking they contributed "more" and half the "same."

In the 12 behaviors listed, only in 2 behaviors did the majority of educators rate themselves below average. This was in their performance related to the political area. Since they had a tendency to rate themselves "average" to "strong" in most areas, this indicated a need to be more knowledgeable in the political arena.

The Trustees of O.C.E. were very reluctant to evaluate educators in any way. One person did report disappointment in the way many superintendents withdrew their support when pressure was brought to bear on a few big city superintendents. It was felt that many were too quick to respond to possible political pressure. Four of the Trustees were very well satisfied with the
leadership of the educators at the state level.

The O.C.E. Trustees commented that politics was an area where the entire Council needed to improve. The superintendents have had experience and seminars on working at the grass-roots level, but there has been very little on working at the state level. A suggestion was made by one person that the state organizations and the universities need to give some thoughts to seminars on practical politics at the state level.

8. Accomplishments of the Councils:

The O.C.E. had difficulty saying what they had achieved. The comparison was made to find if the other councils could definitely state accomplishments they had carried out.

After examining the answers on the questionnaires as to how effective the members considered the councils to be, it was evident they were not succeeding sufficiently to cause the members to indicate general success. This was supported by the comments related to evidence of achievement.

No concrete evidence was provided in answer to the question "What evidence is there that the organization has been effective in carrying out its purpose? (For example: a definite change in the financial structure or contribution beneficial to school districts.)" The replies were stated in general phrases and in very
broad terms. In comparing the responses within each state, only one state (New York) had three responses that were similar in that they were all related to increasing state aid. Idaho had three different answers given. One person listed the council's successes as:

"Made public more aware of school needs and problems

Deserved considerable credit for enactment of state sales tax base for school funding

Enactment of teachers' retirement system

Credited for increasing the level of state support"

The second person wrote "Legislation proposed - increased per cent of state support."

The third person reported "Fair legislative success."

Of the 28 answers, 19 were related to finances; 2 to retirement; 1 to certification; 1 to school district reorganization; 2 states' goals were felt to be successful; and 3 said success could not be determined.

School finances directly related to increasing state aid were the most frequently mentioned accomplishments. This would be a ground of common need and concern to all member organizations. Teachers' retirement might be a point of dissension if it were to increase the local boards' contribution. Legislation making negotiations mandatory would perhaps cause a division of
opinion within the council. While it might be a subject for discussion, it would not be a likely program for action for the group.

The accomplishments of the O.C.E. were intangible things that one can only assume were true. The Trustees felt that the P.E.P. campaign did make many citizens aware of the need to increase the state's contribution to local schools. This campaign made it easier for Governor Rhodes to propose SB 350 which included the 1/2 increase of the sales tax.

The comparison of the O.C.E. with the other councils indicated two important facts. The O.C.E. was the only council that had changed its purpose; and the O.C.E. was the only council to use the initiative procedure to promote legislation.

The O.C.E. compares favorably with many of the other 13 councils. The others offered no concrete evidence of success. The O.C.E. cannot claim anything as its own achievement. In structure, financial support, membership and purpose, O.C.E. was the equivalent of the other councils.
Chapter V
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

For more than a century in the United States there have been demands made on state legislatures for more money to help pay the expenses of the local schools. To an increasing extent real estate has been heavily and disproportionately taxed, so the people have been looking for more help from the state legislature with money secured from other tax sources.

Educators have been able to cope reasonably well with the problems related to the passing of local bond issues and operating levies, but even these are becoming increasingly difficult. When it comes to competing for the tax dollar at the state level, educators have put their trust in the state education association.

Being the target of other interested groups such as the Congress of Parents and Teachers, the school boards association, and the school employees, legislators used the different and somewhat conflicting demands made by these groups as counter arguments against each organization. They suggested, "you ought to get together so we can know what you want."
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This study reports on what happened when various organizations in one state did get together to promote legislation. The problem to be studied may be stated as follows:

When professional educators join with lay people and organizations at the state level to present a united front to bring about an improved educational condition in Ohio through legislation, what evidence is there that this is an effective procedure?

The first method used in the study was to survey what was happening in all fifty states. Letters were sent to the chief state school officers and the executive secretaries of the educational associations. They were asked for information of any organized group in their state composed of professional educators and lay persons working together to promote legislation to improve public education.

From the replies from all fifty states, letters were sent to the organizations referred to by the chief school officers and the executive secretaries. Thirteen councils were found that had formally organized under a constitution or by-laws by both educators and lay persons. Constitutions were obtained from these thirteen groups. Questionnaires were sent to three representatives in each group: an educator, a board member, and
a lay person. The questionnaire sought to find out who called the first meeting, whether the organization was serving its purpose, how it was operating, how financed, who provided the leadership, whom it was trying to influence, how much influence did it have, and how it perceived the professional educator as he participated in this organization.

There were 32 persons (13 educators, 10 board members and 8 lay persons) out of a possible 39, who completed and returned the questionnaire. The results of the questionnaire indicated the following:

There were generally three groups involved in the organization of the councils: the school boards association, the Congress of Parents and Teachers, and various education associations. Others involved, but not as frequently, were the universities, state departments of education and school principals.

As to the purposes of the councils, seven of the councils were organized to participate actively in the promotion of legislation. The remaining six were organized to study, recommend legislation, and publish their research. Once the purposes of the councils were established, the councils did not change them.

The operational procedures of the councils were:

That there be three officers serving one-year
terms of office

That membership was restricted in nine of the thirteen councils; the others had open membership.

That one vote was given per organization in six councils; two votes in two councils; three in three councils; one to four in two councils.

That eight councils would proceed to act on a motion receiving a simple majority; three required a unanimous vote; two required a two-thirds vote.

For financial support, seven councils relied on donations from their members; six councils had established membership fees. The education associations donated 30% or more of the budgets in every state. In two states the cost of operation was shared equally by the educators, board members and lay persons.

Most of the persons responding felt that the amount of contribution did not prevent each group of the membership from having an equal voice in the decisions reached.

The professional educators were influential in the councils. This was credited to their leadership ability, and because resources (such as research personnel) were easily available to them.

While the councils expended their efforts on trying to influence legislators, governors, and the general public, they were not as effective as they hoped. They
rated themselves from "strong" to "fair" with legislators; "fair" with governors; "fair" with the public.

When considering the dependency of the councils on professional educators, most persons (15 out of 28) replied that they were "very dependent" to "dependent," but 13 said they were mutually dependent.

The educators were inclined to rate their contribution higher than others in the areas of organizational work, campaign planning, execution of campaign and influencing others; but in "fund raising" and "decision making" they marked themselves the "same." Board members and lay persons agreed with them in "fund raising" and "decision making." In the others they marked the educators about the "same." Board members tended to rate professional educators higher than the lay persons did.

The trend in the rating of behavior was the same, with the educators rating themselves higher than the others did. The two items that rated the lowest (fair) were "knowledge of politics" and "effectiveness in politics." The "strong" items were "exchange of ideas," "firmness of ideals," "preparation of legislation," and "sources of good ideas." The last two were due partly to the large number of educators. In characteristics such as "decisiveness," "flexibility," "soundness of opinions," "willingness to compromise," "ability under pressure," and "ability to get job done," the educators
were rated as "average."

In the study of the O.C.E., three methods were used: a review of all the minutes, observation of the meetings of the Trustees and the Council, and interviews with the Trustees. From these sources a brief history of the O.C.E. was written which showed that:

Ten organizations joined together to provide a coordinating group for proposed legislation. This was to present a united front to members of the Ohio General Assembly and the Governor. The organizations which formed the Council were the Ohio Congress of Parents and Teachers, Ohio School Boards Association, Ohio Association of Public School Employees, Ohio Association of School Business Officers, Ohio Education Association, Ohio Association of Classroom Teachers, Ohio Department of Elementary School Principals, Ohio Association of School Administrators, Ohio Association of Secondary School Principals, and Ohio County Superintendents Association.

The original purpose of the Council was that of a clearing house. After seven meetings, the by-laws were changed to make it an action group. The sudden change was brought about by
planning started by a Blue Ribbon Committee. This was a committee working in the O.A.S.A. With a change of purpose, there were operational changes as well as financial ones. The first included establishing an executive committee and an executive director. The financial changes that were necessitated by the expanded purpose were met by donations by the member organizations with the understanding the O.E.A. would contribute most of the cost of the initiative campaign. It had been decided to use the initiative procedure to introduce the new foundation bill to the Ohio General Assembly prior to the changes made in O.C.E.

This foundation bill was called the Program for Educational Progress or P.E.P. On the ballot it was known as Issue I. Its cost was to be met by a 1¢ increase in the sales tax.

The O.C.E. assumed one of the most ambitious state-wide educational program in Ohio's history. This demand for the Ohio General Assembly to pass the P.E.P. bill was a challenge that put the legislators and Governor Rhodes on the defensive.
The political opposition and the defection of the writers of P.E.P., caused by the local pressure of retail merchants, led to a lack of leadership in key places and to eventual defeat.

Since O.C.E. would not compromise, the General Assembly did not pass the P.E.P. bill. After much debate and a change in the organization's constitution, the bill was placed on the November, 1965 ballot. During the campaign that followed, O.E.A. paid 88% of the cost of the campaign. Because of this financial commitment from O.E.A., many decisions were reached only with their approval.

The bill was defeated. The "yes" votes were 803,857. The total membership in the member groups of O.C.E. was 900,000. Assuming that each member had influence enough for one other vote, this would indicate that their own members were not firmly committed to Issue I.

Following the defeat of Issue I, the O.C.E. reverted to its original purpose of being a clearing house. The requirement of a unanimous vote to support any legislative measure made it hard to find proposed bills upon
which there was complete agreement.

The member organizations had held their annual delegate assemblies, which established their legislative programs, before the O.C.E. meeting. There was no opportunity to compromise or re-write a bill so that it could be approved by all ten organizations.

Subsequently, failure to find a strong issue to support and because the Council had become a discussion group which met after the member organizations had decided what they were going to do, it has now become a real problem for the leaders to hold the group together.

**General Conclusions**

The response to the question as to what evidence there is to show this is an effective organization, has to be qualified in this way:

1. The P.E.P. bill did not pass, so in its main objective the O.C.E. proved ineffective.

2. The member organizations did work together effectively at the state level in the operations and planning connected with P.E.P.

3. The rapid development of the O.C.E. prevented its building a respectable reputation
as a reliable and effective organization.

To raise another question, given a different set of circumstances, could this organization be effective? From the experiences of O.C.E. and other councils, the writer would answer "yes."

The effectiveness of serving as a clearing house was never really tested by O.C.E. before changing its purpose. Given time and experience, the members could have made adjustments as necessary to make the Council function.

In joining such a council, the members must be willing to make some concessions to the council. It would be like joining a federation government. The members keep most of their power, but they need to concede some power to the federation if the federation is going to succeed.

On the positive side, the representatives did work together in a cooperative way and had mutual trust and respect for each other. Their exchange of opinions was given freely without any resentment on the part of the individuals. This was especially true with the Trustees.

The Trustees were dedicated to the idea of a united front and to the concept that the Council was the best means to provide this front.

Cooperation with the Ohio Department of Education
was excellent. Communication was maintained even during the P.E.P. campaign. After returning to being a clearing house, the Superintendent of Public Instruction, Dr. Essex, urged the continuation of the O.C.E. to provide a forum for discussions between organizations.

The negative aspects of the effectiveness of the O.C.E. were more concrete.

The defeat of Issue I without obtaining enough votes to equal their membership was a very negative factor. It indicated that their own members were not made aware of, or convinced of, the value of P.E.P. and that the public relation program was not effective enough to convince persons with vested interests to vote for the bill.

The defection of the persons preparing the P.E.P. bill was a damaging factor in the providing of leadership. These persons were highly respected leaders in their own organizations; when they withdrew their support, many fellow members followed their example. This destroyed the leadership at the local level that the board members and P.T.A. members needed.

The sudden challenge which was made to the members of the Ohio General Assembly and Governor Rhodes' office was unfortunate. This put the legislators and Governor Rhodes on the defensive. The Council did not have an opportunity to establish itself as a reliable
group or to open channels of communication with either governmental representative.

Bailey reported the history of the Massachusetts Association for State Aid to Education. In a period of time between September, 1947 and June, 1948, it was very active in a successful attempt to increase state aid. After the passage of the bill, M.A.S.A.E. became inactive.

The history of O.C.E. seems to be following the pattern of the Massachusetts M.A.S.A.E. A short time after being organized, the O.C.E. assumed the promotion of the largest change in state aid ever attempted by an independent agency. Upon the defeat of this P.E.P. bill, it became a discussion group that has become increasingly ineffective on the state political scene.

In reviewing the events as they happened with the O.C.E., the question arises whether the O.C.E. was used by others as a one-time promotion agency. The events that lead to this question were:

1. The development of the P.E.P. bill by a group outside of the O.C.E.
2. The proposal of this group to use the O.C.E. as the sponsoring agency.
3. The decision of the O.C.E. to sponsor P.E.P.

with the proponents of the bill in positions of leadership.

4. The withdrawal of many of the leaders and developers of the P.E.P. bill.

5. The change of purpose immediately after the defeat of P.E.P. with its subsequent loss of value to the members.

To obtain the viewpoint of another person concerning the future of the O.C.E., Dr. Robert Bowman, President of the O.C.E., was contacted and asked to write his opinion of the possible future of the Council. He answered:

The Ohio Council for Education has slowly lost impact in the last 18 months. This is due to several reasons.

1. There has been nothing substantial for us to get behind in the way of a project or a state movement such as Issue I.

2. As teacher militancy and negotiations have increased, there has been more of a friction and wariness among the O.C.E. members. Our viewpoints have been more divergent and at times it has taken a great deal of work to keep the organization together.

3. There has been poor attendance even though we have tried full day meetings, different hours and diversified programs. Partly it has been due to the loss of some of the older dedicated members in OCE.

It has been the desire of Dr. Essex and the

---

2Dr. Robert Bowman's letter of June 27, 1969
State Department of Education that the OCE be continued. He believes that there needs to be a clearing house and a place for discussion of viewpoints in the Educational Community and that this should be its purpose. If it had not been for the cooperation of Dr. Essex and Dr. Paul Spade, I would not have been able to keep the organization together.

As to the future of the OCE, that is most difficult. There is increasing friction at the present time with the split of the OASA away from the OEA. I guess by necessity this involves the OSBA also. I would honestly say that at present I do not see a bright future for the OCE. However, with the less than enthusiastic approach of the state legislators to any changes or improvements in financing of education, the chaos which may well result might well be the impetus toward action which is needed.

The question remains, if given a different set of circumstances, could this type of organization be effective?

Difficulties involved in the study:

The limitations of the questionnaire technique leave much to be desired. It does not necessarily reflect the attitudes of the persons completing the form. The failure to get concrete statements or evidence as to achievements of the councils leaves a question in the writer's mind as to whether or not there was concrete evidence that the councils are effective or that it can be obtained by questionnaire. The promotion of the legislation that was passed may have been supported by so many other power groups that the members of no one organization could say "we did it."
Some persons refused to rate the professional educators in any way. This weakened the validity of the general conclusions concerning educators.

The limited amount of material obtainable on the history of the other councils was a handicap to finding what they were doing and how they were doing it.

The observations of the writer were handicapped inasmuch as at the meetings of the O.C.E. once or twice a month, the Trustees never completely accepted having an observer's presence. On a few occasions the observer was not mailed all the materials that the Trustees received. The observer had made it clear that all information received would be confidential until it was made public. This agreement was not violated by him. The materials that were not received, that the observer noted being used, were asked for and received after the meeting.

The fact that the observer knew most of the professional educators personally helped him to adjust to the meetings quickly. This may have been a disadvantage during the observer's interviews, for with the Trustees, they were reluctant to evaluate the contributions of the professional educators. They were told by the writer that the information would be used without any names. The educators were at times very conscious of the observer being present. The others occasionally seemed to
forget that an observer was there.

The minutes were always made available to the writer. Dr. Bowman made all the records in the files available at any time they were needed during the research.

Recommendations

The writer has divided the recommendations into these categories:

1. For educators
2. For O.C.E.
3. For future councils
4. For further research

1. Recommendations for Educators

The professional educator must become involved in political activities in a leadership role for the promotion of legislation for public schools.

Board members, school employees and lay persons look to the educators for leadership. This is true in political activities for the betterment of education as well as in the educational field. To assume this recommended political leadership and be prepared to participate in the political activities, the following items need to be accomplished.

a. Preparation and presentation on a continuing basis of seminars on political procedures and activities at the state
level.

b. Plan and establish an effective two-ways communication that will operate among the council state member organizations and the affiliated local organizations.

c. Sustain interest and assure continued leadership by developing a program of preparation of young educators as they show signs of leadership. This will give a source of leadership when a person withdraws due to retirement or because it is politically expedient.

2. Recommendations for O.C.E.

The need for the continuation of the O.C.E. is still present. The splintering off from the O.E.A. by the superintendents, and the possible separation of other groups, creates a need for a coordinating agency even greater than before.

After the study of the O.C.E., N.Y.C.B. and other councils, the writer feels the following recommendations would improve the O.C.E. if followed out:

Changes in the By-laws which would include:

a. Change of purpose
b. Long range goals
c. Voting requirement of unanimous approval to a simple majority.
d. Establishing the Council as a coordinating
group for agreed legislation

e. Communication

f. Change in representation of members

g. Time to establish a reputation

a. **Change of purpose**

The constitution needs to be changed to allow O.C.E. to be an action group. An action group would mean allowing it to sponsor legislation introduced by a friend in the Assembly. This would allow its representatives to appear at committee hearings and to engage in other activities related to promotion of the bill(s). This does not mean it would be necessary to use the initiative process.

While publishing a fact book giving the State of Ohio's education progress as compared to the rest of the nation is fine and informative activity, it is not enough to keep the Council together as a group.

b. **Long range goals**

The financial improvement of state subsidy to schools presented by Issue I was a short range goal. The establishment of one or more goals that the Council could achieve would give direction to the membership. For example, the Council could set as a goal having the State of Ohio as the tax base for the support of all public schools. This would release the real estate tax
for other political divisions of the government.

As one long range goal is accomplished, it must be replaced with another.

c. Voting requirement change

One factor that was different from the majority of councils was the requirement in the O.C.E. for a unanimous vote. Enforcing the rule of a unanimous vote for action could stop the Council from giving support to legislation entirely. With ten organizations, it would be difficult to find unanimity on any proposal other than financial changes that increased the state's contribution to public schools.

Since any decision reached by O.C.E. commits the member organizations to support that issue, it is recommended the O.C.E. change its requirement to that of a simple majority or two-thirds of the members voting. Those organizations not in agreement should not be forced to support the issue.

d. Establishing the Council as a coordinating group

In analyzing the minutes of the O.C.E., the element of timing appeared to be too late for effective agreement and action. The member organizations with their delegate assemblies, meet in the fall prior to the meeting of the Ohio General Assembly, to determine what legislative proposals meet with their approval. After
the delegate assemblies had approved a legislative pro-
gram, it was then presented to the O.C.E. To present a
united front, the Council would have had to approve or
reject the proposals as presented. There was little op-
portunity to change them.

It is recommended that the members of the Council
decide what common concerns are pertinent to all mem-
bers; that having reached common agreement on one or
more needs, the Council would have the proposed legis-
lation written and have this presented to regular dele-
gate assemblies of the member organizations.

This would not prohibit the O.E.A. or any organi-
zation from presenting other bills that it wished to
propose before the General Assembly or to work indepen-
dently to support or oppose other bills. The Council
might not be as deeply concerned about a bill presented
by a member organization, but might be willing to support
the issue.

e. Communication

An effective two-ways communication system needs
to be established within each member organization. The
system must be fast (when necessary) and effective so
the complete messages are told. The Council must urge
each organization to establish such a system or each
organization must furnish the mailing lists and suffi-
cient money to support a communication system operated
by the Council.

Work sessions with the member organizations should be established to orient them on the political procedures and expectations of the members of participation, both at the state and local grass-root levels. This would be an abbreviated program similar to that established for educators.

f. Change in representation of members

The recent militancy and impatience of the teachers in their negotiations with superintendents and board members has caused doubt as to what to expect from the teachers.

The recent separation of the superintendents from the Ohio Education Association was further evidence of unrest among educators. This was noted in an editorial by Dr. Harris. He commented that the withdrawal of O.A.S.A. from O.E.A. was inevitable. "O.A.S.A. is now in a position to perform an active role as a member of the administrative team." An alignment of O.S.B.A., O.A.S.A. and all full-time principals was called for by Dr. Harris.3 Because of this separation, the O.C.E. is needed more than ever to serve as a coordinating agency among the groups now in O.C.E.

Because of the withdrawal of O.A.S.A. from O.E.A. the

---

3Lewis Harris, "An End and a Beginning," OSBA Journal, June, 1969, p. 5
and the possibility of both elementary and secondary principal groups doing the same, the O.E.A. can represent the O.A.C.T. in the Council, reducing the number of member organizations to nine.

g. Time to establish a reputation

The history of O.C.E. clearly indicates that Issue I developed faster than the organization. While superintendents and teachers could tell the writer what Issue I was, they had not heard of the O.C.E.

If the previous recommendations were followed, the Council could establish the confidence of its own membership in its activities. At the same time, O.C.E. could be working with the legislators and the Governor in the promotion of the interests of public schools. The establishment of a good working relationship with state officials would help the Council's legislative program by having their support. The support of the Governor is essential to the success of any legislative program. A special effort should be made to cultivate a good relationship between the Governor and the Council.

3. Recommendations for future councils

With the increasing militancy among teachers and division among professional educators across the United States, the need for councils similar to the O.C.E. will develop in other states. This type of council can serve as a coordinating agency.
Educators not being politically orientated, need to work together as a group and with other interested groups to gain support and influence upon the governor and legislators.

The one unifying need is the demand for increased financial support from the state government. Having one common concern in finance, they may find other areas where they can work together. For the uniqueness of the Council is that the representatives seat as equals to discuss legislation for the schools.

The following recommendations for establishing councils are made in general statements:

a. The primary purpose for existence of a council should be the promotion of legislation to improve public education.

b. The council should have under consideration enough proposals to make it an action group if the need arises.

c. Membership should be limited to organizations whose primary reason for existence is related to the educational field.

d. The cost of operation should be shared equally by the member organizations without undue burden on the ones with very limited membership.

e. The council should take time to develop a
good reputation for its research and recommendations. This must be done with its own membership as well as with legislators and the governor of the state.

f. Effective leadership should be selected and/or developed which will be knowledgeable in the area of political activities. This would call for knowledge at both the state and local levels. (See the recommendations to educators and the O.C.E.)

g. Effective communication should be established among the councils, state organizations, and the local affiliates of the state organizations.

h. Legislation to be proposed and promoted by the council should be the result of mutual research, planning and writing of the legislation under the coordination of the council.

i. Member organizations should be encouraged to present their legislative programs to the council for discussion. Any action taken by the council in support should be by a simple majority vote.

j. A recommended constitution based on the O.C.E. experiences appears in the Appendix.
The writer has made changes he would recommend based on the studies of the O.C.E. and other councils. This could serve as a guide for other councils.

4. Recommendations for Further Research

The effectiveness of this type of council has not been established. It is the opinion of the writer that the number of years that some councils have been operating indicates they must have value. Some of the years of organization for the councils in this study were 1936 (Iowa), 1937 (New York), 1949 (Maryland and Louisiana) and 1944 (North Carolina). It is recommended that further study be made as to how effective other councils are in promoting legislation, and if there are any areas where common agreement, such as the increasing of state aid, would make it easier for the organizations to cooperate in the council.

The involvement of the councils in the state political competition for the tax dollar makes it important that the council members be prepared to meet this situation. It is recommended that research be conducted as to the needed techniques involved in the preparation, presentation, and promotion of support for proposed legislation. This should be organized in such a way that it can be used in universities, colleges, and/or councils.
Because the professional educators should be the leaders in the fight for the tax dollar for public education, it is recommended that the universities and colleges require in their master's program in school administration a course in the political aspects of promoting public school legislation as part of the recommended courses.

Due to the sensitive positions of most of the persons involved in the development of O.C.E., the writer feels that some of the persons interviewed were reluctant to talk freely. It is recommended that a follow-up study be made at a later time involving the political implications in the forming of the O.C.E. and the support of Issue I.

The Future of the Ohio Council for Education:

The basic reason for the joining together of the ten organizations still remains today. The legislators should listen to any organization that has the support of a membership of 900,000.

The O.C.E. representatives did work together when they had a common cause in which they were actively participating. The problem of finances and the overpowering influence of one organization can be solved in part by limiting the action planned to that which will require no more than a reasonable financial contribution from all members. The publication of the fact book with
the graphic pictures and charts of where Ohio stands educationally in the nation has been a good research publication that should be continued. This also provided a good source of revenue for the budget.

Two purposes have been tried by the O.C.E. When an action group, interest was high and participation was good. All the organizations believed in the O.C.E. and what it could do for education in Ohio. As a clearing house, the interest and participation has gradually declined until it is questionable whether the Council will continue. The withdrawal to a clearing house purpose has taken away the strong voice of one speaking for many; it has become many voices making announcements that O.C.E. also approves of this bill.

The future role of councils similar to O.C.E. may be questionable also. There have been recent developments in the relationship among teachers, administrators, and board members that have strained any association among these organizations. The militancy of the teachers in pressing their demands for higher salaries has placed administrators and board members on the defensive. The superintendents, as in Ohio, have withdrawn their membership from education associations. This separation of administrators from the teachers' organization can be compared to the division in industry between labor and management. The superintendents, in
joining with school board members, represent management and the board of directors. The teachers, utilizing the professional day of study, compare to the union members with their strike power.

The strained relationships among the different organizations make it harder for them to sit down to discuss legislation for public schools. The need for cooperative action is still there.

The Ohio situation at the time of this writing was that mentioned earlier. The Ohio Association of School Administrators had withdrawn their membership from the Ohio Education Association. The reasons given were:

The teacher strikes and increasing teacher militancy have caused the superintendents to seek an organization separate from that of the teachers. 4

This separation which started as a friendly separation of ways, soon ended in court action initiated by the O.E.A. 5 Two reasons given for the O.E.A. action by Willard Fox, President of O.A.S.A., were (1) fear of losing other departments and (2) the desire to provide an organizational home for superintendents who do not care to join with the organization withdrawing from

4"Court Orders Unit to Drop O.A.S.A. Name," The Blade, Toledo, Ohio, June 21, 1969
5Willard Fox, Letter to O.A.S.A. Membership, June 19, 1969
the Ohio Educational Association.

The secondary school principals have discussed the possibility of withdrawing from O.E.A. in meetings attended by the writer. No action has been taken since those meetings.

The division within the ranks of the professional educators, with the possibility of more in the future, will prevent O.E.A. being the one organization in Ohio that can speak for all educators. Where there was unity at one time, only distrust and tension now remain among the departments of O.E.A. and O.A.S.A.

The need now is for a unifying agency that can coordinate the activities of the professional groups for the betterment of public education, and still leave them independent of each other. This is part of the unique opportunity of the Council. By following the suggestions given previously, the writer believes the organization can become an effective and vital Council for the proposing of unified action in the promotion of legislation for public schools.

At the present time and under present conditions, the future prospects of the Ohio Council for Education certainly indicate the gradual decline and eventual demise of this group. With a change of purpose and procedure, the Ohio Council for Education can become a strong, active and needed organization in the future.
APPENDIX A

Questionnaire sent to three members of each of the councils found to be similar to the Ohio Council for Education, and related letters obtaining information about these councils.
April 22, 1965

Mr. Elmer S. Crowley, Executive Secretary
Idaho Education Association
Box 2630
Boise, Idaho

Dear Sir:

In seeking information on how educational legislation is promoted in all the states, I am turning to the executive secretaries of education associations for help.

While I am particularly interested in any formal organization, the informal or ad hoc groups play an important role in the political scene. If you can answer these questions, it would be greatly appreciated.

What organizations promote and support educational legislation in your state?

How do they support it? (money, pamphlets, etc.)

Are there any attempts to coordinate or combine the efforts of the different groups?

I need this information for a dissertation that I hope to complete at Ohio State University. If you wish further information, I will be happy to explain in detail. Tom O'Keefe can tell you of my interests, too.

Would you be willing to fill out a questionnaire on this topic at a later date?

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely yours,

(Signed) William F. Rogers
February 10, 1965

The Honorable A. John Holden, Jr.
Commissioner of Education
State Department of Education
Montpelier, Vermont 05602

Dear Sir:

In seeking information for a dissertation, Dr. Edgar Fuller suggested I address the chief state school officers directly as the best source for the information needed.

The Ohio Council for Education has been incorporated to promote legislation for the improvement of education. Its program is called "Plan for Educational Progress" (PEP). The Council is a combination of professional education associations and lay organizations such as P.T.A. and school board members who are interested in education.

To develop background and establish some comparisons, I need to find similar organizations in the other forty-nine states. If you have such an organization, would you please send me the name of the group and the executive officer so I may contact them.

Any references to studies relating to this that have been made at state universities or colleges would be gratefully received.

Your consideration, time, and effort in assisting in this matter is appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

/s/
William F. Rogers

WFR/jmh
March 23, 1965

Mrs. Charles Mage, Chairman
Allied School Council
105 South Adams
Vancouver, Washington

Dear Mrs. Mage:

In seeking information of state organizations composed of professional educators and lay people promoting educational legislature, I have given your name as Chairman of the Allied School Council.

I am gathering data for a dissertation on the Ohio Council for Education. For a comprehensive study, it is necessary to have information on all the similar organizations in the other 49 states.

Would you please send me a copy of your organization's constitution and any reference you have to information on the historical development of the Allied School Council.

Your time and effort to help me will be greatly appreciated. My sincere thanks for your assistance in advance.

Sincerely yours,

William F. Rogers

WFR: gr
August 2, 1967

Darld Long, Exec. Sec.
Utah School Boards Association
574 East Second, South
Salt Lake City, Utah 84114

Dear Mr. Long:

Enclosed is a questionnaire concerning organizations of professional and lay persons interested in education. If you would answer the questions in relation to your Cooperating Agencies for Public Education, I would greatly appreciate it.

The information is for a dissertation I am writing. As there are only 16 states that have similar organizations, each one is very important to this study. All answers will be kept confidential, so please be frank.

If you desire a summary of this dissertation, please indicate this on the questionnaire.

Thank you very much for your assistance.

Sincerely yours,

William F. Rogers
This questionnaire is designed to gather data for a doctoral study concerned with the Ohio Council for Education consisting of educators and others interested in promoting legislation for the benefit of public education. Your assistance in completing this questionnaire about your state organization is greatly appreciated.

Please fill in the appropriate remarks and return in the enclosed envelope to:

William F. Rogers
10944 Heltman Avenue N.E.
Alliance, Ohio 44601

For identification purposes only:

Name __________________________ Position __________________
Organization ______________________ Total Membership ________

How long had your organization been associated with this state organization? ________________

How long have you been representing your organization? ________________

Organization:

Did you participate in the first meeting? ________________
Who called the meeting? ______________________
Was there any reluctance on the part of your organization to join?
Yes__ No__. If yes, why? ______________________

Which of the following organizations participated in organizing this joining of educators and lay persons?

____ Teachers Educational Assoc.
____ Department of Education
____ Assoc. of School Boards
____ Congress of Parents & Teachers
____ American Legion
____ Other: ______________________

Constitution:

Has the organization been operating in accordance with its stated purpose? Yes__ No__. If no, explain ______________________

______________________________
Is membership to the organization restricted? Yes____ No____

Are you in agreement with the membership policy? Yes____ No____

If No, how would you change it?__________________________________________

Finances:

Many state organizations find financing of their projects one of their major problems. Check below the sources of revenue for this organization by estimating the percent of income from the different sources:

____ 1. Membership fee
____ 2. Donations from members
____ 3. Contribution of services from members
____ 4. Donations from other sources
____ 5. Sale of research reports
____ 6. Subscription to a magazine, or publication of some kind
____ 7. Other__________________________________________

Do you find one member contributing more than the others? Listed below are organizations. Please estimate the percent of the total budget their contribution makes:

All share equally. Yes____ No____

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>25-29%</th>
<th>30-39%</th>
<th>40-49%</th>
<th>50-59%</th>
<th>60+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers Association</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congress of Parent &amp; Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Board Association</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Areas of influence:

Has the amount of contribution of any one organization tended to give that member more influence in the decision making? Yes____ No____

Which organization has the most influence? ____________________________

Is this due to the financial contribution______, leadership______, both______, or other____________________________________________________?
At what levels has the organization tried to be the most influential? Please rank in numerical order as to where they placed their efforts.

_____ State legislators  _____ Chamber of Commerce
_____ State Dept. of Educ.  _____ General Public
_____ Governor  _____ Others

Over the years how would you rate their influence upon the following groups:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of Influence</th>
<th>Very Strong</th>
<th>Strong</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Little</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State legislators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Dept. of Educ.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Public</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What evidence is there that the organization has been effective in the carrying out of its purpose? (For example: a definite change in the financial structure or contribution beneficial to school districts.)

Rating of educators:
To what extent has the organization been dependent upon educators for leadership to be an effective group?

___ 1. All members are mutually dependent
___ 2. Very dependent on educators
___ 3. Dependent
___ 4. Could operate without them

In your opinion how would you rate the contribution of educators in the following areas as compared with other members:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>More</th>
<th>Same</th>
<th>Less</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organization work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campaign planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund raising</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision making</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Execution of campaign plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influencing others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In your association with educators, how would you rate their behavior in the following characteristics:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Strong</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decisiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchange of ideas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soundness of opinions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to compromise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firmness to ideals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of politics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness to politics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability under pressure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation of legislation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sources of good ideas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to get the job done</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
July 12, 1968

Hon. John R. Williams
Governor of Arizona
Phoenix, Arizona

Dear Sir:

This is probably the worst time to ask you for a few minutes of your time, just prior to the national conventions, but I know of no time that is best, due to the many pressures of your office.

Your answers to the two questions below will help me in writing my Ph.D. dissertation:

1. When you need reliable information concerning the public schools, to what organization or organizations do you turn?

2. Is there one person you turn to for reliable information concerning public schools? If there is one person, what is his position?

There are only sixteen states involved in this study, so your response is very important. Neither you nor your state will be identified in the study, so please be frank.

Your cooperation in answering these questions will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

William F. Rogers
August 11, 1968

Mr. Robert Day
Education Committee
House of Representatives
Carey, Idaho

Dear Mr. Day:

Although this is probably a very busy time for you, prior to elections, I am hoping you will find time in your busy schedule to answer the two questions below. This information is necessary for my Ph. D. dissertation.

1. When you need reliable information concerning the public schools, to what organization or organizations do you turn?

2. Is there one person you turn to for reliable information concerning public schools? If there is one person, what is his position?

There are only sixteen states involved in this study, so your response is very important. Neither you nor your state will be identified in the study, so please be frank.

Your cooperation in answering these questions will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

William F. Rogers
APPENDIX B

Selected Minutes and Financial Report of the Ohio Council for Education
Minutes of Meeting of Education Groups
Deshler-Hilton Hotel
Columbus, Ohio
Thursday, September 13, 1962

Pursuant to the date set by this representative group at its August 13th meeting, the September 13th meeting was called to order by acting Chairman Mrs. Smith H. Witter, at 1:00 p.m. in the Deshler-Hilton Hotel.

Present:

Mrs. Smith H. Witter, President, Ohio Congress of Parents and Teachers
Mr. C. L. Dumaree, 2nd Vice President, Ohio PTA
Mrs. Herbert Kinney, Chairman, Legislative Committee, Ohio PTA

Mr. Thomas G. O'Keefe, Executive Secretary, Ohio Education Association
Mr. William Henry, Manager, News Service, Ohio Education Association

Dr. Lewis E. Harris, Executive Secretary, Ohio School Boards Association
Miss Carolyn Copen, Editor, Ohio School Boards Journal, OSBA
Miss Joyce Howell, Administrative Assistant, OSBA

Mr. Charles B. Harris, President, Ohio Department of Elementary Principals
Mr. Robert Dowling, President, Ohio Department of Classroom Teachers

Miss Howell was asked to serve as secretary for this second meeting.

Mr. O'Keefe presented the report of the subcommittee which had been named to draft a set of basic principles for this proposed group. The organization representatives present agreed that if such a group were approved by the various governing bodies, it would be entitled "The Ohio Council for Education". The Proposed Policy Statement as submitted by the subcommittee was discussed item by item and is appended hereto in amended form. Mr. O'Keefe moved, seconded by Dr. Harris, that the representatives adopt the Policy Statement, as modified, for the Ohio Council for Education, subject to approval of the participating organizations. Motion unanimously carried.

Dr. Harris moved, seconded by Mr. O'Keefe, that Mrs. Witter continue to act as Chairman until the Annual December Meeting.

The representatives agreed that the next meeting should be held at 10:00 AM on Friday, December 7th, at the Deshler-Hilton Hotel in Columbus. (The arrangements were left to the staff of OSBA. Room #307 has been reserved for the meeting, which will continue through luncheon and until approximately 3:00 PM.)
The Ohio Council for Education held its first reorganization meeting of the year at the Athletic Club on April 16, 1964 at 7:00 p.m. with Mrs. Smith H. Witter presiding.

The first item on the agenda was the election of officers for the current year. Robert Lucas, Superintendent, Princeton City Schools and a representative of the Ohio Association of School Administrators was elected Chairman for 1964 by a motion made by Herschel Wilson and seconded by Paul Stearns. Vance Bell, Ohio School Boards Association was elected Vice-Chairman in a motion made by Jean Kinney and seconded by Tom O'Keefe.

Immediately following election of officers Mrs. Witter turned the meeting over to the new Chairman, Robert Lucas. Mr. Lucas reported on the previous meetings held by the major educational organizations during the past several months.

Mr. Lucas explained how the educational organizations had been working together in taking steps to initiate a school finance bill in the 1965 session of the General Assembly. He reported to the Council that these organizations were interested in reorganizing the Ohio Council for Education so that it could become an action group which would have the right to initiate legislation. Mr. Lucas further explained that five members had been appointed, one each from the five major educational organizations to act as an Executive Committee to set up recommendations to present to the full Council. The five Executive Committee members are as follows: Robert Lucas, Chairman, OASA; Jean Kinney, PTA; Tom O'Keefe, OEA; Herschel Wilson, OAPSE and Vance Bell, OSBA.
Mr. Lucas presented to the Council a proposed plan of organization for state support of schools, wherein the ten educational organizations would appoint four members each as representatives to the Ohio Council for Education. It was agreed that each of the ten organizations participating are as follows: Ohio Congress of Parents and Teachers, Inc.; Ohio Association of School Administrators; Ohio Education Association; Ohio School Boards Association; Ohio Association of Public School Employees; Department of Classroom Teachers; Ohio Association of Secondary School Principals; Ohio Department of Elementary School Principals; Ohio County Superintendents Association and the Ohio Association of School Business Officials.

A draft of the new Policy Statement was presented to the Council, which was adopted in a motion made by Paul Stearns and seconded by Tom O'Keefe. The Policy Statement as amended is attached.

The first action taken by the newly reorganized Council was the approval of a ten member Finance Committee, headed by Cincinnati Superintendent Wendell Pierce. This Committee was set up to seek funds necessary to promote an initiate petition to increase sales tax in Ohio from 3¢ to 4¢ on the dollar. The Finance Committee, as listed below, was approved in a motion made by Paul Stearns and seconded by Walter Nichols: Members are Wendell Pierce, Chairman, Cincinnati Superintendent; Richard Donaldson, Rocky River school board member; Howard Kuhnle, Columbus clerk-treasurer; Harold Howard, clerk-treasurer, Dayton; Harold Nelson, Columbus classroom teacher; Robert Dowling, Alliance teacher; Akron Superintendent Martin Essex; and Mrs. William Shapiro, PTA. (The tenth member named to the Committee was Mrs. Milton J. Schloss, PTA. This member was secured after the April 16th meeting.)

The Executive Committee recommended to the Council the official appointment of a "reporter" to report meetings and actions of the Council in order to insure unity of all organizations in press releases. Don Schaub, OEA, was appointed by Chairman Lucas as the reporter for the Council.

It was the hope of the Council, through Executive Committee recommendat that the following deadlines could be met: May 1st, all major committees establi including Budget Committee; June 1st, possible securement of an Executive Directo July 1st, complete agreement on program; and November 15th, petitions completed.

Tom O'Keefe was elected Treasurer of the Council in a motion made by Paul Stearns and seconded by Gordon Humbert.
The Executive Committee of the Ohio Council for Education met on Friday, May 29th at the Athletic Club with all members present. The meeting was called to order by the chairman, Robert Lucas. Minutes of the May 15th meeting were approved as presented.

Mr. Lucas explained to the committee that the City Superintendents met on May 28th at Stouffers and agreed to set up a meeting for Wednesday, June 10th at 11:30 a.m. at the Olentangy Inn. This meeting is a Blue Ribbon Committee of the Ohio Association of School Administrators. It was agreed that two or three representatives, who thoroughly understand the foundation program, be present to represent the position of the five educational organizations represented on the Ohio Council for Education's Executive Committee.

Mr. Lucas further explained that this meeting was being called in order that final agreement on the contents of the bill could be reached. Each organization was asked to be prepared to state their position and have present items they want the bill to contain.

After considerable discussion of the foundation program it was agreed that Mr. Lucas would ask Wendell Pierce, superintendent of Cincinnati City School to figure certain changes in the foundation program suggested by the committee. These figures to be used at the June 10th meeting.

Mr. Lucas reported that the city superintendents met on May 28th along with members of the Executive Committee to discuss selection of a state citizens committee. The committee agreed that Tom O'Keefe, OEA and Lewis Harris, OSBA be appointed to help the superintendents in their selection of a state citizens committee.

The Executive Committee further agreed that Tom O'Keefe, OEA and Lewis Harris, OSBA be appointed to help locate and hire an Executive Director for the Council.

The committee suggested that Tom O'Keefe, John Hall, Lewis Harris and Robert Olds meet together and determine if possible the amount of money needed to finance the campaign.

The Finance Committee meeting tentatively scheduled for May 28th was not held. Another date for the meeting will be set as soon as possible.

The Executive Committee will meet on June 10th at 11:30 a.m. in conjunction with the OASA Blue Ribbon Committee and on Monday, June 15th at 12:00 noon at the Athletic Club.
The Ohio Council for Education's Finance Committee met on September 4, 1964 at the Christopher Inn, Columbus, at 12:00 Noon, with the following members present: Richard Donaldson, Lewis Moore and Lewis Harris, OSBA; Mrs. Maude Shapiro, PTA; T. G. O'Keefe, OEA; Harold Howard and Howard Kuhnle, OAPSE; Wendell Pierce, Chairman, OASA; and Donna Gaynor, OSBA, Recording Secretary.

The purpose of the meeting was to establish a tentative budget for expenditures of the Council and also a budget of anticipated revenues to be raised by each organization.

Anticipated Operational Expenses

Byer and Bowman, for Press and Legislative Meetings. ................ $ 8,500.00
Initiative Petition Campaign .......................................  9,100.00
Director and Staff, budget for six months .......................... 35,000.00

Total Anticipated Operational Expenses ............................. 52,600.00

Anticipated Revenues from Contributions

OAPSE - - - $2.00 assessment from each member. .............. $ 30,000.00
OSBA - - - Contributions ............................................ 100,000.00
OEA - - - Contributions .............................................. 200,000.00
OASA - - - $8.00 assessment from each superintendent .......  $8,000.00
                               338,000.00
PTA - - - 750,000 members to help with campaign. ... No dollar commitment

Several recommendations were made by the Committee for referral to the Executive Committee:

1) To convert the Ohio Council program into a long range plan for promoting education in Ohio. This plan to be in operation for at least the next ten years, thereby helping the chances for hiring an executive director, with the understanding that the Finance Committee would find ways to support the long range program.

2) That the Council have two major objectives - (a) of first importance, the long range plan of the Council - secondly (b) the Initiative petition campaign, which will only be one part of the overall plan.
3) The Committee suggests that the whole concept of the Ohio Council for Education be promoted from now until after election, with all emphasis taken off of the Initiated bill.

4) Suggest that a one page sheet be developed for the Council listing the whole concept of the Council. The long range plan to stimulate education in Ohio over the next ten years, stating all major objectives of the Council. This would be a promotion piece designed to be used by each organization in securing contributions. Lewis Harris agreed to develop this piece in time for the PTA Convention October 5th.

5) The Committee agreed that the raising of contributions in each school district should be a coordinated effort of all organizations, and suggested that a deadline of 90 days after the 1st of November be set for raising contributions. A goal of $500,000.00 has been set by the Committee.

6) It was agreed by the Committee that it is necessary to find other affiliated groups to join the Council, such as Women's Clubs, Ohio Chamber of Commerce, etc.

7) It was suggested by members of the Committee that a tear-off sheet could be used in the publications of each organization, which would be a self-addressed envelop, carrying the Council's address, for sending in individual contributions.

The next meeting of the Committee is to be held in October, to develop techniques for implementing the tentative budget.
MINUTES: OHIO COUNCIL FOR EDUCATION

The Ohio Council for Education met at the Athletic Club on Tuesday, July 27, 1965 at 7:00 p.m.

The roll call was requested by Chairman Robert Lucas.

Following this Dr. Lucas advised the Council that this was a closed meeting and that everything said is to be held strictly confidential.

Mr. Harry O'Neill, Opinion Research representative from Princeton, New Jersey was called upon to present his analysis and report on the opinion survey taken in the state on how the voters felt about the present status of education in Ohio. The sampling was taken on only those people who were fairly certain they were going to vote in November.

In the opinion survey taken, the five most needed school improvements are:

1. Provide more vocational training for students who are not going to college.
2. Provide all children with better guidance and counselling.
3. Raise the quality of teachers.
4. Reduce the dropout rate.
5. Give more attention to children who are physically handicapped.

He bought out that we should stress and talk in terms of benefits that people will most likely recognize.

Dr. Lucas called upon Mr. B. I. Griffith, Petition Coordinator, to give a report on the Petition Program. Mr. Griffith did so.

The Council commended Mr. Griffith for the fine job he has done for the Ohio Council for Education during this second petition campaign.

John Hall was called upon and gave his report on the legislative picture in the last week and how it now stands.

Mr. Brennan gave his report on "Alternatives."

Mr. O'Keefe gave a short talk on the feeling of some of the members of the OEA in regard to taking PEP to the ballot which reflected the majority in favor of going to the polls.

Mr. Wilson brought up the question of financing going to the ballot. This was discussed at length by representatives of all organizations.

Dr. Lucas: "Do you want to vote on the recommendation?"

It was moved by Mr. O'Keefe that we place PEP on the ballot. Mr. Pace seconded the motion. It carried.

It was moved the meeting be adjourned and carried unanimously.
MINUTES: OHIO COUNCIL FOR EDUCATION
Athletic Club, Columbus, Ohio.
July 29, 1965 - 7:45 p.m.

The meeting of the Ohio Council for Education was called to order at
7:45 p.m. at the Athletic Club in Columbus on July 29, 1965.

The meeting was opened and the reading of the roll call followed.

Dr. Lucas called for a discussion in regard to a decision basis.

Mr. Thomas Quick said, "I move that the decision of the chair made last
Wednesday to the effect that it required a unanimous vote of the Council to
change the decision to go to the ballot be reversed, and that a majority
vote rule."

The motion was seconded by Herschel Wilson. Motion was carried.

Mr. Jackson: "I would like to make the motion to change the majority
to 2/3 vote of all the participating organizations in the OCE."

Motion was seconded by Mr. Pace. Motion was defeated.

A motion was made by Mr. Thomas Quick: "The majority of the members of
the Ohio Council for Education will make the decision whether or not PEP
would go on the November ballot, and that Article III - Section 2 be changed
to "majority" instead of "unanimous."

The motion was seconded by Mr. Wilson. Motion carried unanimously.

Thus, Article III - Section 2 now reads as follows:

"It shall be the policy of this organization to support
legislation and programs which have the majority concurrence
of all participating organizations by acting as a clearing house
for reaching agreement on issues of common interest."

A motion was made in three parts: The adequacy of the current legisla-
tion; a secret poll by organization of all groups present regarding their
feelings in regard to going to the ballot; and third, an open unanimous ballot
to support the secret ballot. Motion was seconded by Mr. Sebold. The motion
was defeated.

A motion was made by Mr. Hayes: "I make a motion that this Council place
the issue of the initiative petition that was given to the legislators in
January on the November ballot. That the Ohio Council for Education shall file
on July 30, 1965 and all participating organizations of the OCE reaffirm their
interest in the plan. Mr. King seconded the motion. The motion failed.

Mr. Siebold: "I move that the Council pledge unanimous support of the
motion of placing PEP on the ballot. Mr. Regula seconded the motion. The
motion carried unanimously.

A motion was made to adjourn at 10:00 p.m. and was accepted unanimously.
MEMORANDUM

To: Board of Trustees, Ohio Council for Education

From: J. O., Brennan, Administrative Director, OCE

Subject: Financial Summary - Jan. 1 - Dec. 23, 1965

While there will be an annual financial report prepared for the Council (Jan. 1, 1965 to Dec. 31, 1965) in accordance with Article V, Section 2 of the Bylaws, this report is intended to be substantially the same as the annual one except that it will not include receipts or expenditures between December 23 and December 31. Nevertheless, you will note that Attachment "A" does carry a figure for estimated obligations to the end of the year.

It might be well to point out that the Secretary-Treasurer has agreed the Council's fiscal year should be the same as the calendar year in view of the transition which will shortly be taking place.

Attachment "B" of this report summarizes the annual fiscal activity of the Ohio Council for Education. It is divided into 3 sections as contrasted with the normal receipts and expenditures type of report. The reasoning behind this is to illustrate expenditures incurred during the Issue 1 campaign and those resulting from all other activities sponsored by the Council.

In the "Receipts" section of the report, it will be noted that $280,321.76 or 88% of the total contribution was made by the Ohio Education Association. Of this amount, approximately $239,000.00 was contributed toward the Issue 1 campaign and over $41,000.00 was contributed toward other Council activities. Another significant figure in the "Receipts" section is the $11,206.60 or 3.5% as "Miscellaneous," all of which came as a direct result of the Issue 1 campaign.

Some explanation must be made of the normal operating expenditures insasmuch as the figure of $62,773.21 cannot be considered as the norm for OCE operations. The figure for Personnel is a fairly valid one. It is based on an annual salary of $11,000.00 for the Administrative Director and $4,500.00 for the secretary. It also includes part-time help during the second petition program and employer's contributions for Social Security, Workmen's Compensation, etc.

Travel and Miscellaneous Expenditures cover not only the Director's travel but also that of legislative witnesses and training team personnel. The figure also reflects Board and Council meeting expenses; press briefings; petty cash ($225.00); and other incidentals not chargeable to another classification.

Communications is primarily for telephone service although approximately $210.00 was paid to Western Union. During normal periods, telephone service amounted to approximately $75.00 per month.

The figure of $2,787.60 for Rents and Utilities reflects $2,663.64 for rental at 88 E. Broad St. plus rentals we paid for meeting rooms where a particular organization was holding a conference called by or directly related to the OCE program.
Printing, Publications and Mailing accounted for over 20% of the normal operating expenses for the fiscal year. On the other hand, it is significant that only $830,69 was spent under this classification subsequent to June 1. Two major factors are responsible for this apparent imbalance. The first has to do with the activities which were undertaken during the first 5 months of the year, (grass-roots meetings, stocking of PEP Booklets, and the second petition campaign) which accounted for over $11,000.00 of the total. The second is the fact that during the Issue 1 campaign itself, most printing, publication and mailing was done by and charged to the campaign headquarters. Thus, it can be reasoned that a normal operating budget for this classification will fall within the range of $1,500 to $2,000 annually unless the Council undertakes a major information program.

Attachment "C" to this report will explain in some detail the reason for the amount shown under the classification "Supplies and Equipment". Over $1,700 of the total was spent for non-expendable equipment which the Council can list under "assets". Again depending upon Council activity, it would appear that a $500 per annum budgetary figure would be ample for supplies and equipment considering the present availability and condition of office equipment and furniture.

The final figure under the classification "Services" is possibly the least valid when considering future expenditures. This classification covers advertising agency fees, public relations fees, accountant fees and special project fees. Of the $22,493.86, over $10,000 was expended prior to June 1 on film strips and advertising agency fees for the development of materials to initiate the PEP program. An additional $12,000 was expended for the opinion survey the Council authorized. On the other hand, all PR and advertising during the Issue 1 campaign is charged to campaign expenditures and is not reflected under these normal operating expenses.

The final item on the financial report deals with the expenditures directly related to the Issue 1 campaign. Using the same definitions as above, a percentage breakdown of disbursements for the campaign is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Amount Expended</th>
<th>Per cent of Total Campaign Expenditures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>$ 1,356.50</td>
<td>.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel &amp; Misc. Expenditures</td>
<td>9,315.69</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>1,813.64</td>
<td>.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rents and Utilities</td>
<td>1,998.22</td>
<td>.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing, Publications &amp; Mailing</td>
<td>53,376.79</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies and Equipment</td>
<td>2,342.13</td>
<td>.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services (PR, Adv.)</td>
<td>187,102.65</td>
<td>73.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(more)
The Public Relations and Advertising expenditures can be broken down as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Amount Expended</th>
<th>Per cent of Total Expenditure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Relations</td>
<td>$19,181.82</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio and TV</td>
<td>$72,860.00</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper</td>
<td>$67,859.00</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Billboard</td>
<td>$10,500.00</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other advertising</td>
<td>$7,612.00</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation charges</td>
<td>$9,089.83</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The foregoing report is only intended to be a factual analysis of the fiscal activity of the Ohio Council for Education during the year 1965. It may serve, however, to lend some guidance to the Board of Trustees and the Council in its future planning. Detailed reports of each contribution and expenditure are available in the permanent OCE files.
Ohio Council for Education

Financial Report
December 23, 1965

November 22, 1965 - Cash Balance

Receipts:

OEA

Miscellaneous

$ 9,321.76

FEP Campaign Disbursements:
511 - Ohio Education Assn. $ 8,825.11

Normal Operating Disbursements:

512 - Evelyn Rucker - salary 13.26
513 - Gertrude Leach - salary 152.83
514 - J. O. Brennan - salary 390.75
515 - Western Union 55.83
516 - Tempco, Inc. 15.75
517 - Federal Reserve Bank 222.42
518 - Typewriter Exchange 15.45
519 - 88 E. Broad Corp. - rent 221.97
520 - Ohio Bell Telephone Co. 87.75
521 - Bonnie Speed Delivery 4.00
522 - Edward Roberts - expenses 150.00
523 - Richard Steinfirst - art 25.00
524 - H. Cole Co. 3.09
525 - Replaced Check #504-lost -- --
526 - Gertrude Leach - salary 152.83
527 - Void -- --
528 - J. O. Brennan - salary 390.75
529 - Western Union 34.84
530 - Ohio Bell Telephone Co. 8.49
531 - Ohio Education Assn. 496.65

$ 2,041.66

$11,266.77

December 23, 1965 - Cash Balance

Estimated obligations through December 31, 1965:

Gertrude Leach - salary $ 152.83
J. O. Brennan - salary 390.75
Evelyn Rucker - salary 80.00
S.S. and I.R.S. Withholding 600.00
Workman's Compensation 20.00
BUC 100.00
City Treasurer 80.00
Telephone 60.00
Accountant fee (quarter) 200.00
Unforeseen 50.00

$ 1,733.58

Estimated unobligated balance 12-31-65 - $ 61.45
OHIO COUNCIL FOR EDUCATION

Attachment "B"

Financial Report

(Jan. 1 - Dec. 23, 1965)

January 1, 1965 - Cash balance - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - $ 3,891.79

Receipts:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OEA</td>
<td>$280,321.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSBA</td>
<td>2,495.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OAPSE</td>
<td>6,309.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OASBO</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCPTA</td>
<td>1,776.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OASA</td>
<td>5,665.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OADESP</td>
<td>6,208.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OASSP</td>
<td>3,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous *</td>
<td>11,206.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** - - $317,982.07

Normal Operating Disbursements:

**Classifications**

Personnel: 18,605.03
Travel & Misc. Expenditures: 2,007.62
Communications: 1,351.53
Rents & Utilities: 2,787.60
Printing, Publication & Mailing: 13,354.98
Supplies and Equipment: 2,172.59
Services (PR, Adv., Legal, etc.): 22,493.86

**Total** - - $62,773.21

Issue 1 Campaign Disbursements:

**Classifications**

Personnel: 1,356.50
Travel & Misc. Expenditures: 9,315.69
Communications: 1,813.64
Rents and Utilities: 1,998.22
Printing, Publication and Mailing: 53,376.79
Supplies and Equipment: 2,342.13
Services (PR, Adv., Legal, etc.): 187,102.65

**Total** - - $257,305.62

December 23, 1965 - Cash balance - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - $ 1,785.03

* These contributions were mainly from members and groups affiliated with OCE participating organizations for supplies or campaign support. Three significant contributions in this account were: Ohio Association for Higher Education - $1,323.12; SWOEA - $2,500.00; and NWOE - $500.00.
APPENDIX C

Minutes of the Sub-Committee on the Initiated Bill.
The legislative working committee of the five major educational organizations met on Wednesday, March 4, 1964 at the PTA office in Columbus to take steps to set a plan of action into motion for the initiation of a petition to increase the financial support of public schools. The organizations represented were: The Ohio Association of School Administrators, The Ohio Education Association and departments groups, The Ohio Association of School Business Officials, The Ohio School Boards Association and the Ohio Association of Public School Employees.

The purpose of this meeting was not to make motions or take definite action on matters, but rather to find as many points of agreement as possible which all organizations are willing to support.

I - INITIATION OF BILL

Who initiates?

It was agreed by all members of the committee that an independent citizens group, headed by key leaders throughout the state, be organized to initiate the bill. It was the feeling of the committee that this major committee should not contain any members directly affiliated with schools, boards of education, or any educational organization. However, all educational organizations will work directly with the independent citizens group.

How initiated?

B. I. Griffith, Ohio Educational Association, was suggested as the key coordinator to set up steps for the plan of action to secure signatures for a petition to initiate the bill, and to help with coordination of the program.

How to label the bill

It was agreed that no specific title or label could be attached to the bill until a public relations firm had been hired. Their advice should be considered when naming the bill, in order that the title of the bill would carry as much public appeal as possible at the polls.

Legal steps for initiation and referendum

(1) Who drafts the bill and who takes the legal steps?

The committee agreed that the major independent citizens group should have an active part in drafting the bill, but should work directly with the educational organizations. It was also agreed that the description of the bill on the ballot should be worded very carefully, in order to carry the most appeal for the voter.
How will the referendum be carried out?

The referendum will be carried out by Initiative petition. Any further details on carrying out the referendum will be determined by the full committee.

2 - CONTENTS OF THE BILL

Sources of revenue

It was agreed by all members of the committee that a 1% increase on sales tax was the best and most practical source of revenue for the needed support of public schools in Ohio.

There was considerable discussion on whether exemption of sales tax under 31c should be eliminated. According to Thatcher’s revised tax estimate the 1% increase would return $100 million per year, and if the tax were dropped to 11c it would bring in an additional $15 million per year. Because of previous Board action on the part of several organizations represented no agreement could be reached on the lowering of the sales tax from 31c to 11c.

Earmarking the sales tax

Two points of view were presented in regard to this matter:

1) That some members of the committee were in agreement in regard to supporting a 1% earmarked increase in the general sales tax in Ohio. Funds derived from this source would be utilized for the improvement of the public school foundation program K through 12.

2) While a portion of the committee was in favor of a general increase from 3½ to 4% in sales tax for the state of Ohio for educational purposes (K-12), it was also suggested that no attempt be made to delimit the source other than to make a general recommendation that a 1% increase be made in the sales tax and this should be noted in the drafting of the bill and in publicity materials distributed to the citizenry of Ohio.

How to distribute the money

1) Foundation program revisions

A proposed statement of apportionment of state funds for the foundation program was presented to the committee by the Ohio Educational Association. The committee made the following recommendations relative to the OEA proposal: (Copy attached)

Items 1, 2 and 3 - with reference to approved teacher units - the committee could not fully agree to changing the divisor from 30 to 27.

Items 4 and 7 - should be incorporated into one item. (Special Education Units *DBEC and Student Service and Research.)

Item 5 - Vocational Education Units - remain the same

Items 8, 9 and 10 - discuss with full committee

Approved Unit. Operating Allowances, Items 11 through 17 were not fully agreed upon by the committee.
Minutes - Sub committee on Initiated bill

Item 18 - 65% of 17 - no agreement until Items 11 through 17 are agreed upon.

Item 22 - 12.5 mills on tax valuation of dollar amount - the committee was in accord that this Item could not be changed.

Item 20 - Transportation - It was agreed that this Item could not be changed.

Items 24 and 26 were changed by the OEA from $2,100 to $2,600.

It was the feeling of the members present that this proposal should be studied very carefully by the organizations present and discussed further at the March 12th meeting of the full committee since the amount set is related to the total appropriation.

3 - STATEWIDE PUBLIC RELATIONS CAMPAIGN

Names of those responsible for campaign

It was agreed by the committee that Gordon Humbert, President of OASA and superintendent of Canton City Schools, should be named as Chairman of a committee made up of the superintendents from the 9 big city schools, which will work together in securing the members of the Independent citizens group. These 9 members are: Gordon Humbert, Canton; Wendell Pierce, Cincinnati; William Levenson, Cleveland; Martin Essex, Akron; Harold Ebling, Columbus; Paul Briggs, Parma; Harry Wanamaker, Youngstown; Philo Dunsmore, Toledo and Robert French, Dayton.

The members of the various educational organizations will still be responsible for helping this committee in any way possible in obtaining members. These members should be from various segments of society and economy, and should fill in a pattern over the state, in order to reach all levels of voters.

Public Relations Firm

The committee was in agreement that a public relations firm must be hired to handle the petition. Several public relations firms were discussed but no definite firm was considered. It was agreed that John Hall of the Ohio Education Association and Robert Olds of the Ohio School Boards Association act as consultants and advisors to the state committee on strategy and also in securing a public relations firm. It was also felt that there should be one key person to work with the public relations firm on a day to day basis.

In addition to the larger Independent citizens group, the committee felt that an executive committee, an editorial committee and several smaller committees would be necessary to meet and work with the public relations firm. The smaller committees would work on an interim basis to make daily decisions.

Sources of money for promotion

John Hall and Robert Dowling, Ohio Education Association, stated that their association expected to contribute heavily to the funds which were necessary to support the campaign. They also stated that OEA would not expect to sponsor the campaign or receive open recognition for supporting the campaign. However, they would expect that a reasonable amount of their ideas in planning the campaign
Hall and Dowling also stated that it was their hope that the resolution adopted by OEA at their March 21st meeting would provide for flexibility to allow the OEA Executive Committee to arrive at compromises necessary to secure agreement by all interested organizations on the proposal to be submitted on the initiative petition.

Meeting Date of the full committee

The full committee will meet at 7:00 p.m. at the Deshler Hilton Hotel on Thursday, March 12, 1964 in room 216. Your attendance is vital to the success of this campaign.
The Executive Committee passed a resolution to meet with the Ohio Council for Education. A meeting was set for April 16, 1964, 7:00 p.m., at the Athletic Club. It was agreed by the committee that Robert Lucas should serve as Chairman at the April 16th meeting.

The Executive Committee agreed to meet at 5:00 p.m., April 16th at the Athletic Club, prior to the meeting of the Ohio Council for Education.

The Executive Committee agreed on the official appointment of a "reporter" who will report meetings and actions of the Council and shall be answerable to the Executive Director and the Executive Committee. This would assure unity of all organization in press releases.

Attendance at the Ohio Council for Education meetings would be limited to official members of the Council, the Executive Committee, the Executive Director, the official reporter and a recording secretary.

It was recommended by the Executive Committee that the Ohio Council for Education and the five major organizations which have been working on the initiative petition be one and the same if agreed upon by the Ohio Council for Education.

Officials representing the Ohio Council for Education to be four representatives from each of the organizations, as selected by their respective organizations. Term of office for each representative to be staggered with overlapping terms. One representative to be appointed for 1 year, one representative to be appointed for 2 years, one representative to be appointed for 3 years and one representative to be appointed for 4 years. The terms of office to be from January 1st through December 31st.

It was agreed that the Executive Committee would make recommendations to the Ohio Council for Education, with the full committee retaining the right to appeal or change any decisions of the Executive Committee.

It was agreed that the minutes of the Executive Committee meetings would be sent to all 10 member groups of the Ohio Council for Education.

The Executive Committee prepared a proposed draft of the Policy Statement of the Ohio Council for Education in order that the Council could become an active organization which would be able to initiate legislation. A draft of the proposed Policy Statement is enclosed. It will be presented to the Ohio Council for
Education for their consideration and possible adoption at the April 16th meeting.

A proposed plan of organization for the committee was drawn up and is enclosed as agreed upon by the Executive Committee.

The following is a time schedule of deadlines which the Executive Committee was like to meet:

1) April 16th, organization meeting with the Ohio Council for Education.

2) April 16th, or before, set up Finance Committee - to consist of two representatives from each of the five organizations represented on the Executive Committee. This committee can be expanded as necessary. Names of proposed committee members to be submitted to the Chairman.

3) May 1st, major committees to be established, including Budget Committee. The Executive Committee to be responsible for setting up the job description of each committee.

4) June 1st, secure an Executive Director

5) July 1st, complete agreement on program (what is in petition).

6) November 15th, petitions completed.

It was agreed that the Executive Committee shall be composed of 5 members, one from each of the executive body of each of the following organizations: The Ohio Education Association, The Ohio Congress of Parents and Teachers, Inc., The Ohio School Boards Association, The Ohio Association of Public School Employees and The Ohio Association of School Administrators.

The Executive Committee members will serve for a term of one year. Such members will be eligible for reappointment.

The duties of the Executive Committee will be to plan, coordinate and direct the duties of the organization.
The Ohio Council for Education held its first reorganization meeting of the year at the Athletic Club on April 16, 1964 at 7:00 p.m. with Mrs. Smith H. Witter presiding.

The first item on the agenda was the election of officers for the current year. Robert Lucas, Superintendent, Princeton City Schools and a representative of the Ohio Association of School Administrators was elected Chairman for 1964 on a motion made by Herschel Wilson and seconded by Paul Stearns. Vance Bell, Ohio School Boards Association was elected Vice-Chairman in a motion made by Jean Kinney and seconded by Tom O'Keefe.

Immediately following election of officers Mrs. Witter turned the meeting over to the new Chairman, Robert Lucas. Mr. Lucas reported on the previous meeting held by the major educational organizations during the past several months.

Mr. Lucas explained how the educational organizations had been working together in taking steps to initiate a school finance bill in the 1965 session of the General Assembly. He reported to the Council that these organizations were interested in reorganizing the Ohio Council for Education so that it could become an action group which would have the right to initiate legislation. Mr. Lucas further explained that five members had been appointed, one each from the five major educational organizations to act as an Executive Committee to set up recommendations to present to the full Council. The five Executive Committee members are as follows: Robert Lucas, Chairman, OASA; Jean Kinney, PTA; Tom O'Keefe, OEA; Herschel Wilson, OAPSE and Vance Bell, OSBA.
Mr. Lucas presented to the Council a proposed plan of organization for state support of schools, wherein the ten educational organizations would appoint four members each as representatives to the Ohio Council for Education. It was agreed that each of the ten organizations participating are as follows: Ohio Congress of Parents and Teachers, Inc.; Ohio Association of School Administrators; Ohio Education Association; Ohio School Boards Association; Ohio Association of Public School Employees; Department of Classroom Teachers; Ohio Association of Secondary School Principals; Ohio Department of Elementary School Principals; Ohio County Superintendents Association and the Ohio Association of School Business Officials.

A draft of the new Policy Statement was presented to the Council, which was adopted in a motion made by Paul Stearns and seconded by Tom O'Keefe. The Policy Statement as amended is attached.

The first action taken by the newly reorganized Council was the approval of a ten member Finance Committee, headed by Cincinnati Superintendent Wendell Pierce. This Committee was set up to seek funds necessary to promote an initiative petition to increase sales tax in Ohio from 3¢ to 4¢ on the dollar. The Finance Committee, as listed below, was approved in a motion made by Paul Stearns and seconded by Walter Nichols: Members are -- Wendell Pierce, Chairman, Cincinnati Superintendent; Richard Donaldson, Rocky River school board member; Howard Kuhnle, Columbus clerk-treasurer; Harold Howard, clerk-treasurer, Dayton; Harold Nelson, Columbus classroom teacher; Robert Dwelling, Alliance teacher; Akron Superintendent Martin Essex; and Mrs. William Shapiro, PTA. (The tenth member named to the Committee was Mrs. Milton J. Schloss, PTA. This member was secured after the April 16th meeting.)

The Executive Committee recommended to the Council the official appointment of a "reporter" to report meetings and actions of the Council in order to insure unity of all organizations in press releases. Don Schaub, OEA, was appointed by Chairman Lucas as the reporter for the Council.

It was the hope of the Council, through Executive Committee recommendation, that the following deadlines could be met: May 1st, all major committees established including Budget Committee; June 1st, possible securement of an Executive Director; July 1st, complete agreement on program; and November 15th, petitions completed.

Tom O'Keefe was elected Treasurer of the Council in a motion made by Paul Stearns and seconded by Gordon Humbert.
The OASA Blue Ribbon Committee met in conjunction with the representatives of the OSBA, OEA, PTA and OAPSE. This meeting was held Wednesday, June 10, 1964 at the Olentangy Inn.

The following were present:

**OASA**
- Walter Nichols
- Virgil Blanke
- Wendell Pierce
- Frank Dick
- Martin Essex
- Kenneth Crim
- Thomas Quick
- W. A. Smith
- John W. Shreve
- Paul Briggs
- John R. Telchert
- Art Williamson
- Gordon Humbert
- Robert Lucas

**OEA**
- Tom O'Keefe
- John Hall
- Kermit Daugherty
- Don Schaub

**PTA**
- Maude Shapiro
- Jean Kinney
- Lewis Burkhart
- Lewis Harris
- Robert Olds
- Robert T. Baker
- Donna Gaynor

**OAPSE**
- Steve Lewis
- Herschel Wilson

Mr. Lucas served as chairman of the group which was called together to discuss possible changes in the foundation program. Mr. Lucas brought the group up to date on activities of the Ohio Council for Education and asked that each organization present recommendations which they had prepared on the foundation program changes.

Crim, Williamson and Shreve presented proposals for the OASA and John Hall presented a proposal which had been prepared by the Ohio Education Association and previously adopted by their representative assembly. Following discussion on various factors of the foundation program, each organization present met in separate groups. The group meetings were held in order to reach recommendations which could be presented to the entire group on behalf of the respective organizations. Following is a synopsis of the group reports:

1. **OASA**
   1) That a calculation be made of the proposed OEA program to determine a total dollar amount.
   2) The present 12½ mill charge off would remain the same. It was the consensus of this group that it would not be politically expedient to recommend a change in the charge off rate to the next session of the legislature.
   3) This group recommended that a divisor of 30 be retained as presently used in the Foundation Program.
   4) That the OEA salary allocations be accepted.
   5) That a 30% minimum guarantee be adopted.
   6) Retain the $2200.00 operating allowance as stated in Proposal #1.
It was stated by Mr. Lucas that this proposed program would produce a yield of approximately $200 million more for the public school systems of Ohio. While this would not be a quality program, it was the consensus of this group that it would be practical in so far as the present economic picture in Ohio is concerned.

II - PTA

No specific conclusions were reported out by the PTA. However, concern was expressed for the future of the Vocational program in Ohio's public schools. Question was also raised as to whether or not the matter of transportation had been given proper consideration in the OASA Proposal #1.

III - OAPSE

1) This group requested that paragraph #6 of the OEA proposal (that the allowance for general operating cost be $2200.00) be clarified so as to show the per cent of this amount that would be used for non-certificated personnel.

2) The group was also concerned as to whether a factor would be included under line 9 of the OASA Proposal #1 which could be used for the position of/or Business Manager, Clerk-Treasurer, Director of Buildings and Ground and that credit would be received from the Foundation Program for this position even if the person was not certificated.

IV - OEA

Members of the OEA group stated that since their position had already been made quite clear in the proposal which had been presented earlier they would not take the time to present it again. However, it was the consensus of the OEA group that they would be willing to compromise in regard to salary allocations in order that a united front could be presented.

The OEA group also stated that they desired a provision for minimum salary increase in the Foundation Program and expressed the opinion that the charge off in effect under the present Foundation Program should remain the same.

V - OSBA

1) The OSBA stated they would accept the OASA Proposal # 1 with the OEA Salary allocations substituted as their first plan.

2) Requested that the Operating Allowance of $2200.00 in the OASA Proposal #1 be reduced to $2100.00.

3) Requested that the classroom unit be raised from 28 to a divisor of 29 for high school and elementary grades.

4) As a last resource, the divisor be raised from 29 to 30. It was the feeling of the OSBA that a lower classroom unit would hold more voter appeal, and would make a stronger selling point for the initiative petition when taken to the people.
5) Retain the present 12½ mill charge off.

Chairman Lucas asked Williamson, Shreve and Crim to prepare the new calculations and present them to the Executive Committee of the Ohio Council for Education at their meeting on Monday, June 15th.

The suggestions coming from each of the groups reported above were to be considered as tentative pending new calculations. It was agreed that the group making the calculations would possibly introduce other variations in order to come as close as possible to the estimated income.

###
APPENDIX D

Selected Policy Statements of O.C.E.
A meeting of representatives from groups interested in education in Ohio met at the Deshler Hilton Hotel, Columbus, Ohio, August 13, 1962, 1:00 to 3:00 p.m. The invitation was extended by Mrs. Smith H. Witter, President of the Ohio Congress of Parents and Teachers.

Mrs. Witter called the meeting to order and explained the origin of the idea and the purpose of such a group. At a meeting in July, 1962, the chairman of legislation, Mrs. Herbert Kinney, her committee and the executive board of the Ohio Congress discussed ways and means of presenting information that might come up in the coming legislature, to the parent-teacher membership. At this time this group also discussed the overlapping of programs and the efforts of educational groups and suggested the possibility of working together to study the needs of education and ways of meeting these needs. This might be effective in any one of these suggestions: a clearing house and a place of pooling ideas, agreeing on a program and ways of promoting it as well as an exchange of ideas.

Mr. Tom O'Keefe reported on the success of a similar group known as the Educational Conference Board of New York State of which Mr. Clyde B. Moore is chairman. A copy of a publication from the New York Board entitled "A New Approach to School Finance" was given to each group represented at the meeting.

Each person attending was asked to give his opinion of these groups united in such an effort. It was the unanimous expression of all that coordination of effort is greatly needed.

Mr. Lewis Harris suggested that a group such as this might be more effective as a "round table discussion group" rather than a formal organization, since it is not to be an action group. He proposed that a plan covering (a) basic principles to which our organization be committed (b) policies for establishing agreements and (c) a timetable for dealing with immediate issues before 1963, be set up.

Mr. O'Keefe moved that a committee be named to draft the basic principles for this group and present them for approval at the next meeting. Carried.

The group named Mr. O'Keefe, representing O.E.A., Mr. Harris, O.S.B.A. and Mrs. Witter, the P.T.A. to draft these principles.

The meeting adjourned at 3:00 p.m. The next meeting scheduled for Thursday, September 13, 1962, 1:00 p.m. in Room 216, Deshler Hilton Hotel, Columbus, Ohio.

Attending:

Mrs. Smith H. Witter, President Ohio Congress of Parents and Teachers
C. L. Dumaree, 2nd Vice Pres. Ohio P.T.A.
Mrs. Herbert Kinney, Chairman Legislation - Ohio P.T.A.
Tom O'Keefe, Executive Secretary O.E.A.
Dickinson Guiler, President-elect, Chairman Legislation O.E.A.
Edward Schumacher, President O.S.B.A.
Lewis Harris, Executive Secretary O.S.B.A.
Philip C. Drake, Chairman O.S.B.A. Legislation Committee
Carl Baden, President, Ohio Association School Administrators
E. H. Fornier, President Ohio High School Principals Association
Charles B. Harris, President, Ohio Department Elementary Principals
Jeanette Riddle, Vice Pres. Department Elementary Principals
Fred H. West, Treasurer, Department of Elementary Principals

E. E. Holt, Superintendent of Public Instruction - unable to attend on this date.
Robert Dowling, President, Classroom Teachers - could not be reached for this date.

Mrs. Herbert Kinney, Secretary
POLICY STATEMENT
FOR THE
OHIO COUNCIL FOR EDUCATION

I. PURPOSES OF THE COUNCIL.

1. To promote the interests of public education in Ohio.

2. To provide the machinery for coordinating the efforts of organizations interested in education.

3. To supply information to the legislators and state administrative officials relative to legislative proposals which are acceptable to and will be supported by the Council's member organizations.

II. BASIC OPERATING PRINCIPLES FOR THE COUNCIL.

1. The Council will serve as a clearing house for reaching agreements on legislation of common interest.

2. The Council will not initiate direct action.

3. The support of agreed legislation will be taken through action by the constituent organizations in their own names, but reference should be made by each group to the agreed program of the Council.

4. Agreement to a program by member organizations of the Council will commit each organization to a policy of active support for all items in the agreed program.

5. Concurrence by member organizations on a Council agreed program will not preclude independent action by the constituent organizations on their own or other programs.

6. Agreed program or program items should, wherever possible, be related but not limited to the recommendations of the State Board of Education.

III. BASIS FOR ESTABLISHING AGREEMENTS.

1. Each member organization will submit in writing for Council consideration, well-defined statements of proposals.

2. To enable the Council to determine those areas of agreement or support of the legislative program of the State Board of Education, the Superintendent of Public Instruction, or his representative, shall be invited to submit an outline of such program.

3. The announced agreed program of the Council must have the unanimous support of all member organizations. Failure to reach unanimous agreement on a particular item or items will not preclude member organizations from supporting such item or items in their own behalf.

4. The Council may assign responsibility for collecting research data to one of the member organizations or to any other institution or agency of its choosing.
IV. BASIS FOR REPRESENTATION.

1. Membership in the Council will be restricted to those organizations or institutions committed to the development and improvement of public education in Ohio. Any educational organization, or its departments, who have an independently elected set of officers or board of directors will be eligible for membership in the Council. New members may be admitted by a three-fourths vote of those eligible to vote on the Council.

2. Charter membership on the Council will be the Ohio Congress of Parents and Teachers, the Ohio Education Association, the Ohio School Boards Association, the Ohio Association of School Administrators, the Ohio Association of Secondary School Principals, the Ohio Department of Elementary Principals, the Department of Classroom Teachers.

3. The State Department of Education and a representative of the Inter-University Council shall be eligible for either active participation or consultant representation, as they may determine.

4. Those eligible to vote at Council meetings will be the president, elected head or president-elect of the member organization, the legislative chairman and the executive secretary or an elected official in lieu of the executive secretary of each member organization, provided that department of a parent organization shall be represented by the president or president-elect and legislative chairman only; and provided further that each representative of a member organization shall designate an alternate who shall serve in his absence. These representatives will serve until their successors are elected and qualified.

5. The Council may, in its discretion, invite individuals or organizations to participate as observers or consultants in its deliberations.

V. ORGANIZATION OF THE COUNCIL.

1. OFFICERS: The Council shall elect a state chairman and vice chairman, both of whom shall be an active member of one of the participating organizations. No paid staff member of a participating organization will be eligible to hold these offices.

There shall be no elected treasurer, but any disbursements will be made from a special fund to be created for specific purposes through a member organization acting in behalf of the Council.

The secretary of the Council may be a salaried employee of any participating organization and shall be designated by the Chairman from meeting to meeting.

2. TERM OF OFFICE: Officers shall be elected by a majority of the voting members of the Council for a term of one year. Officers may be re-elected, so long as they retain their affiliation with member organizations, either as officers or members.

3. MEETINGS: The Council shall hold an annual organization meeting and may meet at any other time deemed advisable at the call of the chairman, or at the written request of a majority of the members.

4. FINANCIAL SUPPORT: The Council shall operate without a budget. Expenses of participants in Council deliberations shall be borne by the constituent organizations.

The Council may accept gifts for specific purposes, such as research projects.
Organization of the Council

Officers are elected by a majority of the voting members of the Council for a term of one year. Officers may be re-elected so long as they retain their affiliation with member organizations, either as officers or members.

The Council holds an annual organization meeting and meets at any other time deemed advisable at the call of the Chairman, or at the written request of a majority of the members.

The Council operates without a budget. Expenses of participants in Council deliberations are borne by the constituent organizations. The Council may accept gifts for specific purposes, such as research projects.

The Council’s officers are an elected chairman and a vice chairman. Only active members of participating organizations are eligible to hold these offices. Salaried staff officers of participating organizations are not eligible to hold these offices.

There is no Council treasurer. Any disbursements are made from a special fund created for specific purpose through a member organization acting in behalf of the Council.

The secretary of the Council is designated by the Chairman from meeting to meeting, a salaried employee of a participating organization authorized to perform this duty.

Membership of the Council

OHIO ASSOCIATION OF PUBLIC SCHOOL EMPLOYEES
40 S. Third St., Columbus 15, Ohio

OHIO CONGRESS OF PARENTS AND TEACHERS
Room 2240 50 W. Broad St., Columbus 15, Ohio

OHIO EDUCATION ASSOCIATION
Department of Classroom Teachers
Department of Elementary School Principals
Ohio Association of School Administrators
Ohio Association of Secondary School Principals
Ohio County Superintendents Association
225 E. Broad St., Columbus 15, Ohio

OHIO SCHOOL BOARDS ASSOCIATION
3752 N. High St., Columbus 14, Ohio

—Council Members, March 1963

Ohio Council for EDUCATION

- To promote the interest in public education in Ohio
- To provide the machine coordinating the efforts of organizations interested in education
- To supply information to legislators and other state of about legislative proposals which are acceptable and will be supported by the
Basic Operating Principles

The Council serves as a clearing house to reach agreements on legislation of common interest.

It does not initiate direct action.

Support of mutually agreed upon legislation is arrived at through action by the individual constituent organizations, with reference made by each group to the agreed program of the Council.

When there is agreement to a program by member organizations of the Council, each organization is committed to a policy of active support for all items in the agreed program.

The support by member organizations of a program agreed upon by the Council will not, however, preclude independent action by the constituent organizations on their own or other programs.

Whenever possible, the agreed program or program items are related to but may not be limited to the recommendations of the State Board of Education.

How Council Agreements Are Established

Each member organization submits in writing well-defined statements of proposals for Council consideration.

The Council may assign responsibility for collecting research data to one of the member organizations or to any other institution or agency of its choosing.

To enable the Council to determine those areas of agreement or support of the legislative program of the State Board of Education, the Superintendent of Public Instruction, or his representative invited to submit an outline of the program.

The announced agreed program of the Council must have the unanimous support of all member organizations. Failure to reach unanimous agreement on a particular item or items will not preclude member organizations from supporting such items as individual organizations.

How Membership Is Determined

Membership in the Council is restricted to those organizations or institutions which are committed to the development and improvement of public education in Ohio. Any educational organization, or its departments, which has an independently elected set of officers or board of directors is eligible for membership in the Council. New members may be admitted by a three-fourths favorable vote of those eligible to vote on the Council.

Charter members of the Council, which was established in January, 1963 were the Ohio Congress of Parents and Teachers, the Ohio Education Association, the Ohio School Boards Association, the Ohio Association of School Administrators, the Ohio County Superintendents Association, the Ohio Association of Secondary School Principals, the OEA Department of Elementary Principals, and the OEA Department of Classroom Teachers.

The State Department of Education and the Inter-University Council are eligible to have representation on the Council on the basis of participation or consultant representation as be determined by each of these groups.

Those eligible to vote at Council meetings are the (1) president, elected head or president-elect of each member organization, (2) the legislative chairman of each member organization and (3) the executive secretary, executive director, or an official serving in this capacity for each member organization. In the case of departments of a profession, voting representation is by the president or president-elect and legislative chair only. Each voting representative of a member organization designates an alternate who serves in absence. These voting representatives serve their successors are elected and qualified.

The Council on occasion, invites individual organization representatives to participate as observers or consultants in its deliberations.
APPENDIX E

Charles Baker's Report to the Ohio Council for Education on "What Happened" after the defeat of Issue I (PEP).
MEMO: OCE Decision makers

SUBJECT: WHAT HAPPENED

FROM: BURR COMMUNICATIONS AGENCY

November 3rd, 1965

On November 1st, Mr. Charles P. Taft of the law firm of Taft, Lavercombe & Fox sent a letter to Dr. J. William Burley declining an invitation to join Ohio Citizens for Action Now. He said, "The issue is a very difficult one, and while I have certainly not decided to vote NO, I am not sure yet about voting YES.

On October 28th, Mr. George Hammond, executive secretary of the Ohio State Council of Retail Merchants, was in a forum on "taxation" at the Jewish Community Center in Columbus in which, apparently to his great surprise, the audience began picking up the logic of the Issue 1 cause and firing pointed questions at Mr. Hammond. The latter turned red and finally defended the OSCRM position by asserting gruffly "BUT OHIO IS A LOW TAX STATE."

The two incidents, I feel, illustrate our central difficulty which was selling a "difficult" issue involving a tax increase to the voters conditioned by the "righteousness" of being in a "low tax state."

To figure out what happened, it seems to me you almost have to take a look at what we were trying to achieve.

Our chief job was to convince Ohio voters of the need to increase the level of state support for education, and do so in such depth that they were willing to increase their taxes to meet this need.

Here are some of the attitude obstacles we had to overcome in order to establish this feeling of "need."

A.) The "attitude of general satisfaction with public education found throughout all areas of the state and among all subgroups of the voter population" discovered by the Princeton opinion survey.

The Princeton survey showed, for example, that only 17% of voters felt local public schools were not being well run.

B.) A general feeling that the "state government really does not need any new or additional taxes now" also uncovered by the Princeton survey. Only 18% of Ohioans opposed this view while another 20% had "no opinion."
MEMO: OCE Decision makers

C.) An apparent distrust of the Administration on money matters. Time and time again we encountered the fear that "The Governor will get his hands on any unspent money," and this appeared to be voiced most often by Democrats who want to pull the fiscal rug out from under Rhodes.

D.) Ohioans, in keeping with their counterparts all over America, tend to be living to the limits of their incomes. In the mad drive for status purchasing, mortgage and chattel mortgage debt in Ohio has continued to soar, and little consumers, putting their shiny chrome status faces to the world, tend to reject anything which nibbles into their incomes. School hospital and welfare levies have been having ever more difficult sledding.

This is pure speculation, but I have the feeling that the Cuba and Viet Nam situations had an impact on all this for there does seem to be a bit of the "let's live for today and to hell with tomorrow" attitude associated with all efforts.

By passing House Bill 950, the Legislature multiplied our difficulty in getting the "need" established.

A.) It was difficult to convince the typical Ohioan that we had an "emergency" when the Legislature did, in truth, come up with an increase in state support which was quite "substantial by Ohio standards.

B.) Issue I would have generated about $30 million a year more that was required to finance the portions of the PEP program not contained in HB 950 and this gave the voters a magnificent escape hatch to our conscience appeal.

Obviously there is no "moral compunction" to provide annually $30 million which is not earmarked.

C.) The "across the board" increase in benefits contained in HB 95 made Issue I substantially less attractive to wealthy urban centers.

The initiative process is so cumbersome that we wound up with technical difficulties which cost many votes: among them:

A.) We had no way to adjust the PEP bill to new conditions flowing from passage of HB 950.

B.) On most voting machines, Issue I was at eye level and the vote was struck by the "TO INCREASE TAXES" phrase without a comparison appeal in the qualifying top line. "TO AMEND THE SCHOOL FOUNDATION PROGRAM" has to be a fairly meaningless phrase to the majority of voters since a majority probably do not know what the "school foundation program" is.

(more)
To the very substantial number of voters who walked into the booth unaware of what Issue 1 was about, the phrasing in the top lines gave reason to vote against the measure but none to vote for it. Most likely did not read beyond that.

Despite these obstacles, we felt victory was obtainable, and that it would take this combination of factors:

A.) Turning out our "self-interest" vote of parents and school personnel.

In this, we actually turned out a larger total vote than Governor Rhodes managed for his Issue No. 2 "goodies for everybody" bond issue this spring. You may recall, many self-interest groups (including universities) became active because of promised building programs, airports, etc.

Issue 2 got exactly 15,642 votes last May. It won by only 167,085 votes despite the vigorous campaign on its behalf, despite the promise of "no increase in taxes" and - also - despite the lack of any opposition.

B.) Holding down the "no" vote.

We hoped for bad weather such as hit Ohio at factory quitting time on election day, 1960. Never has Ohio had more beautiful weather for a turn out.

The media appeals and much of the publicity was directed to the effort to make this a "moral" issue, the kind it is difficult to oppose.

I think there was an enormous "undecided" factor right up to the last moment, and this was substantiated by a straw poll taken the final week which showed 50.5 per cent of the voters who told our pollsters they planned to vote...had not made up their mind on the issue.

Some of these likely did not want to own up to opposing an education issue, but there is no question in my mind that THE DECISION LITERALLY WAS NOT MADE UNTIL ELECTION DAY.

Undecided voters nearly always vote "No" especially on a tax issue. Had we been able to produce a last-minute development around which this uncommitted opinion could polarize, we might have squeaked through. We jarrad loose a lot of potential votes which wound up plunkering "against any tax increase."

C.) Getting enough "Good Association" support that the uncommitted voter would be subconsciously persuaded to vote YES.

(more)
In this regard, OCAN worked out reasonably well, and we did get a fair amount of status endorsement, but WHAT WE DID NOT GET WAS ENORMOUS. WE DID NOT GET:

1 - The endorsement of any top political figure
2 - The support of either political party
3 - The support of the Ohio AFL-CIO and labor generally
4 - Open support of community leaders in urban areas
5 - An even break in media support

D.) Convincing Ohio that schools "need" more money; an area in which we were largely unsuccessful.

E.) Convincing property owners that school costs were going to increase and that their "chief hope" was higher state support; an area in which I think we made a substantial impression, but success in establishing this equation hinged upon establishing the "need" in greater depth than we were able to do.

F.) Establishing an "enemy" our forces could rally against since America appears to be negatively motivated during this era.

Here the opposition was extremely clever. The line, "We're not against helping kids, BUT" tended to deprive our forces of the rallying point they needed.

Lacking heated opposition, we couldn't create the heat needed to shed more light on the subject.

G.) Relying on media selling to create the necessary voter attitude. This had the twin goal of motivating our many heroic field forces and of selling voters.

We actually spent about a third of the media total devoted by the Lawson Milk Company to "selling" its Sunday amendment in 1962. The most expensive New York talent was used in developing and producing this media effort. The amendment was defeated by some 425,000 votes.

While a larger expenditure on our part probably could have influenced the outcome by a couple of percentage points, obviously the net result would have been the same.

ARE THERE ANY BENEFITS FROM THE VAST EXPENDITURE OF RESOURCES ON ISSUE 1?

It seems to me that there are many plus factors, but they are of such fragile nature that, unless handled with some understanding, they too, may be lost. Among the "pluses":

A - At least 803,857 Ohioans are convinced there must be an increase in the level of state support for public schools. Probably a million additional Ohioans at least have some question in their minds about whether school support is adequ
YOU HAVE LAID A BASE FOR A CHANGE IN VOTER ATTITUDE ABOUT THE STATE RESPONSIBILITY TO EDUCATION

B - You did make HB 950 far better than it would have been without the pressure of Issue 1 and, for what its worth, "at no increase in taxes."

C - At least 2,000 allies know more about giving speeches, placing newspaper advertisements, placing press releases, etc.

While there will be some fall off, by and large this same field force will, after licking its bruises, respond to similar appeal.

A great deal of magnificent effort went into this campaign at the grass roots level.

JUST AS THE CREATION OF GRASS ROOTS KNOW HOW IN THE 1958 RIGHT-TO-WORK CAMPAIGN literally produced the defeat of the apportionment amendment this past May, you will be getting the benefit of this grass roots effort for many years.

If we had come close, you would have an automatic tiger "out there." Obviously, the "tiger" is battered at the moment, but scarcely permanently incapacitated.

D - Your potential for vigorous action has been more deeply established among legislators and other decision makers.

The "pros" all will take due note of the fact that acting without allies, you produced almost a million votes for a "tax increase."

While you have not established the ability to force a policy decision on the state, you have clearly demonstrated the kind of vote-getting potential that has to make you a factor in a contested situation.

It seems to me the fundamental test of an individual, or an organization, is whether it holds beliefs strongly enough to press for them at the risk of adverse consequence. It further seems to me that the need to increase the level of state support for public schools is so great that this become the kind of moral issue which affords the opportunity for such greatness.

In my view you have taken three steps toward that objective.

These are:

1. Forcing additional money for schools out of the legislature.
2. Raising a serious doubt in the public mind about the adequacy of Ohio's educational system.
3. Forcing the power structure to concede the need to "do something about schools."

(more)
By collecting the opposition editorials and policy pronouncements and extracting the many references to the "need", it seems to me you will be creating a powerful educational tool which can help build the kind of educational system which is your essential objective.

ISSUE 1 CANNOT BE VIEWED AS AN END UNTO ITSELF.

Issue 1 was a focal point for two battles in the war, one the successful effort to get more out of the Legislature and the other the unsuccessful effort to secure its adoption. In losing the battle, you lost no ground unless you choose to retreat.

Issue 1 would not have solved your problem for all time. Indeed, with it or without it, you would still be coming back to the Legislature in 1967 for "more".

Education's fundamental problems in Ohio include the need to educate the electorate to the needs of schools and to the responsibility of the State to serve as the vehicle whereby school districts can achieve cooperatively the levels of education that are unattainable through local action.

The same attitudes which defeated Issue 1 this time around are responsible for the low level of welfare benefits, the incredible state of mental health, the morally indefensible status of correctional institutions and the inadequate provisions for higher education. One of the ironies of the campaign is that neither the trade union movement, chief champion of many of these causes, nor the Democratic Party, which has the classic function of forcing the "ins" to provide better for commonweal, grasped the overall significance of Issue 1.

It seems to me that in making the good fight, the individuals and organizations who have participated should have pride in the endeavor.

Thousands of speeches were given. Thousands of placards were put in store windows and by polling places. Thousands of bumper stickers were indeed on cars. Thousands of Ohio residents experienced the heady feeling of actually believing in a cause.

In the face of difficult odds, a great deal of time, money and effort went into a campaign for the common good.

The campaigners did wage the good fight.

The need OCE sought to fill cannot be filled without action at the state level.

If the fight to fill the need does not continue, it is less likely to be achieved.

The techniques and the timing are always open to criticism but I believe keenly that democracy cannot function more efficiently than responsible elements within it require.

(more)
Democracy cannot produce results extending far beyond the willingness of responsible groups to do battle for their beliefs.

Campaigns are crucibles out of which startling truths emerge.

One such truth is that Ohio had a dangerous complacency about the state of its educational plant.

It seems to me that one of the fated functions of the educational associations in this state is to step up to that challenge.

That you did.
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Related information on the separation of O.A.S.A. from O.E.A.
May 21, 1969

Yesterday, May 20, the OASA Executive Committee established OASA as an independent professional organization. Members of the OASA will soon be contacted regarding a vote of confidence for this action.

WHEREAS, the general membership met on April 28, 1969 to review the current professional organizational status and to instruct the executive committee relative to the future status of OASA and

WHEREAS, the representatives of the executive committees of OASA and OEA met to discuss the organizational needs of OASA and

WHEREAS, the representatives of the OEA executive committee and subsequently the whole OEA executive committee rejected the conditions presented by the OASA executive committee and approved by the membership April 28, 1969

BE IT THEREBY RESOLVED, that the executive committee establish the Ohio Association of School Administrators as an independent professional organization in accord with our present constitution.

BE IT RESOLVED, that the officers be authorized to take such steps as they may deem necessary in the interim period of reorganization, and

BE IT RESOLVED, that the action be communicated to the membership with each member urged to communicate with the executive committee supporting the action of the executive committee and officers. Such response to be sent to the executive director prior to the annual meeting at Cedar Point. Responses should be received by the executive director by June 20, 1969.

Without our knowledge and at the same time, the OEA President and Executive Secretary sent a ballot to our members regarding "the sentiments and desires of school superintendents and central office personnel regarding OEA relationships."

While we feel that OEA should not have taken this action without our knowledge and consent we do see it as an additional opportunity for our members to express themselves on this vital issue.

More complete information will be forthcoming.

Willard Fox, President
Ohio Association of School Administrators
June 19, 1969

TO: OASA MEMBERS

FROM: WILLARD FOX, PRESIDENT

SUBJECT: RECENT DEVELOPMENTS CONCERNING THE OASA-OEA RELATIONSHIP

The issues become clearer as the situation develops!

It now appears that the OEA feels that OASA should remain a part of OEA. Doubt has been cast on the fact of our incorporation. Challenges have been made to OASA ownership of our name, our office furniture, and our funds.

My analysis of the reasons for such OEA behavior is just one man's opinion; however, I feel that the fear of losing other departments and the desire to provide an organizational home for superintendents who do not care to join with us in a separate organization head the list. In this light then, the name "OASA" is the focal point of discussion and the funds and furniture become satellite issues. Our position is that our incorporation does indeed allow us to operate as a separate nonprofit educational organization with title to our name, our funds, and our furniture.

Incidently, it is probable that only the courts can determine which organization may continue to use the name; however, the prior name registration certainly looms large as a factor. It is my belief that neither organization wishes to go the legal mat. It is probably up to OEA to initiate legal action, if it so desires.

Should OEA take legal action, this would develop an ever higher degree of polarization and make it doubly difficult for the organizations to work together.

Note: I think we all recognize that there will be, in the future, times, issues, and situations that will make cooperative and collective action more effective than continued opposition.

Let me now put in chronological order a few significant events that occurred since the last State of the Association Message.

Recently several incidents detrimental to good relationships occurred in the OEA Building.

Harold Sebold and Stayner Brighton had agreed to an orderly and graceful separation over a period of several weeks. As a result of some unpleasantness, the OASA staff decided to move earlier (June 4). At this point the rationale of separation was changed by the OEA. In essence, the OEA now said that all property of OASA was to be held until further discussions were held by the OEA Executive Committee.

At this point in the swiftly moving events, Stayner Brighton and Harold Sebold met and drew up a working paper related to separation and to be used in a conference between Brighton, Koening, Murphy, and Griffith of OEA and Fox, Hauck, Sebold, and Daniel of OASA.
The result of this meeting was that the Executive Secretary and the President of OEA agreed to recommend to a hastily called meeting of the OEA Executive Committee "That the registered name of the Ohio Association of School Administrators shall be assigned to the new organization and that such furniture and properties that have been purchased by OASA members... be donated to the new organization."

Note: We instructed the movers to postpone the move until they heard from us.

The OEA Executive Committee met Tuesday evening for nearly five hours, and did not approve the recommendations of Dr. Brighton and Mr. Koening. They did pass the following resolution:

That we extend an invitation to the Executive Committee of OASA and their legal representatives to meet with this executive committee to discuss this dilemma that we are in, and suggest that the president appoint a smaller committee from all this committee to draw up some items to negotiate and that we meet with them at the time of the next executive committee meeting June 19 and that we give the executive secretary and staff the authority to use any necessary steps to keep every thing in this building that we feel is ours at this moment.

Our Executive Committee has met to consider the above actions and will probably meet again in the near future.

In conclusion, if all this leaves you slightly confused, you have probably read it correctly. Let there, however, be no mistake; we intend to operate as a separate organization. We intend to make every effort to hold on to our funds, furniture and our name. We intend to do those things which made the creation of our own organization imperative.

This brief statement cannot possibly answer all your questions or detail every incident, but Mr. Sebold or I will be pleased to respond when we can. The Cedar Point Meeting will provide time for further discussion. See you there!

P.S. Address all mail to our new address:

657 N. High Street
Worthington, Ohio 43085

Phone (614) 888-0391

P.S. #2: The mailing of the above information has been delayed for reasons which can be explained at another time. This document is now going out on June 19 from our new office. Please remember we are now in the new office.
MEMO TO: Fellow School Administrators
FROM: Willard Fox
DATE: June 21, 1969
SUBJECT: MOST RECENT DEVELOPMENT - WE HAVE BEEN SUED!!

Harold Sebold, Executive Director, was served a court summons on Friday the 20th at 2 p.m. by Stayner Brighton, OEA Executive Secretary and the OEA Legal Counsel, Ed Lindley. Also named as defendants in the suit were Willard Fox and Gilbert Johnson, Superintendent of Whitehall. The three above named defendants were listed as trustees of the Ohio Association of School Administrators when the OASA was incorporated on April 2.

The Franklin County Court of Common Pleas granted a temporary restraining order that our organization be refrained and enjoined from:

1. Using the name "Ohio Association of School Administrators";

2. Removing any business records, furnishings or furniture from the OEA office; and

3. Spending or appropriating any of our savings account of approximately $30,000, which we had accumulated during the past two decades.

A business session will be held on Thursday morning at the Sandusky Senior High School. Cancel all other plans! Make every effort to attend!

All checks now need to made payable to "Superintendents' Summer Conference Fund."

A sad footnote to all this is that about 20 superintendents met with OEA Executive Committee Thursday night less than 12 hours before the suit was filed. Don't forget fellows, we are doing business at 657 North High Street, Worthington, Ohio 43085. Phone 888-0391.

Come to the conference for the next exciting chapter!!!
Dear Fellow Administrator:

I'M UPSET !!!

The recent action of the OEA Executive Committee and Executive Secretary, Stayner Brighton, has unnecessarily placed the school administrators of Ohio in a most awkward position. The very fact that we are temporarily prohibited by the courts from using our name, our equipment, our files, our five-year old letters, and the money we had in our savings account is certainly a distressing position.

As a member of the American Association of School Administrators Executive Committee, and as a past president of the Ohio Association of School Administrators, I want to inform each school administrator that we must have a concerted, united effort in behalf of the school administrators in order to meet the momentary crisis.

I urge you to support President Willard Fox and his Executive Committee in their efforts. A valiant attempt was made to negotiate and "smooth out" the break between the OEA and our association, but the Executive Committee of the Ohio Education Association flatly rejected a "midnight common sense" approach.

It becomes obvious that we are going to need to go to the courts to fight for the things which are rightfully ours. These include:

1. Our past business records and correspondence of the last five years.
2. Furniture and equipment selected and purchased by our association and paid for from the direct monies paid by members of our association.
3. Approximately $30,000 in savings that have accumulated in the past 15-20 years.
4. A name which has been ours for nearly 20 years.

Cooperation is a two-way street. I urge all school administrators to support our officers in their valiant efforts.

Sincerely,

Frank Dick

FD:csp
APPENDIX G

Suggested Constitution for councils similar to The Ohio Council for Education.
BY-LAWS

Article I
Name

The name of this organization shall be the Ohio Council for Education, Inc.

Article II
Purpose

The purpose of this organization shall be to:

Section 1. Promote interest in and provide leadership in legislative action for public education in Ohio;

Section 2. Provide the machinery for coordinating the efforts of organizations and individuals interested in promoting legislation for public education;

Section 3. Furnish to elective and appointive officials, and to the general public, information relative to legislative proposals that have been approved by and recommended by the Council.

Section 4. Provide a medium for representatives of member organizations to discuss educational matters and coordinate their efforts on agreed legislation, including provisions for the financial support of public education in Ohio.

Article III
Policy and Aims of the Council

Section 1. Participating members will keep the Trustees advised of planned legislation. When a mutual concern is expressed, the Trustees will act as the coordinating
group to develop the legislative proposal.

Section 2. Participating organizations may submit proposals and programs for consideration by the Council. These proposals and programs should be well-defined and must be submitted in writing.

Section 3. The Council may recommend legislative proposals for sponsorship by and initiation by a member of the General Assembly.

Section 4. It shall be the policy of this organization to actively support legislation and programs which had the concurrence of a majority of the participating organizations.

Section 5. Agreement to a program by all participating organizations of the Council shall commit each organization to a policy of active support for all items in the agreed program, but such concurrence shall not preclude independent action by the constituent organizations on their own or other programs.

Section 6. The Council shall be the governing body and its major function shall be to set the policy of the Ohio Council for Education, Inc.

Article IV
Membership

Section 1. Membership in the Council will be restricted to those organizations or institutions committed to the development or improvement of public education in Ohio. New members may be admitted by a unanimous vote of those eligible to vote on the Council.

Section 2. Charter membership on the Ohio Council for Education, Inc
shall be the Ohio Association of Classroom Teachers, Ohio Association of Public School Employees, Ohio Association of School Administrators, Ohio Association of Secondary School Principals, Ohio Congress of Parents and Teachers, Inc., Ohio County Superintendents' Association, Ohio Department of Elementary School Principals, Ohio Education Association and the Ohio School Boards Association.

(OEA shall represent OACT after July 1, 1969)

Section 3. No later than July 15 of each year, each participating organization shall submit in writing the names of its four active Council members, who shall be appointed for terms of office beginning August 1 of each year, and one of whom the participating organization shall designate as a member of the Board of Trustees. Whenever practicable, participating organizations shall re-name some of their members to the Council, so that experienced membership on the Council may be assured.

Section 4. All members of the Council shall be entitled to the privilege of the floor to make motions and to speak on any issue. Each participating organization, following a caucus if needed, shall be entitled to one vote.

Article V
Meetings

Section 1. There shall be held an annual meeting in August of
each year. Other meetings may be called as deemed necessary by the president, or upon the written request of a majority of the participating organizations. Such requests shall be submitted to the president. Meetings requested by a majority of the participating organizations shall be called within 30 days of the receipt of such written request.

Section 2. At the annual meeting, there shall be rendered to the Council by the Board of Trustees a complete report of all Council activities, including financial activities, for the preceding year.

Section 3. A majority of the participating organizations must be represented to constitute a quorum.

Section 4. The Council may invite individuals or organizations to participate as observers or consultants in its deliberations.

Article VI

Board of Trustees

Section 1. The Board of Trustees shall plan, coordinate, and carry out the Council's objectives and shall consist of one member representative designated by each of the participating organizations of the Ohio Council for Education, Inc.

Section 2. Members of the Board of Trustees shall serve for a term of one year beginning at the annual meeting. Such members shall be eligible for reappointment.

Section 3. Meetings of the Board of Trustees may be called by the president, or upon the written request of a majority of its members.
Section 4. Except for executive sessions of the Board, a member of the Board of Trustees may invite an individual as an observer at meetings of the Board of Trustees.

Section 5. A member of the Board of Trustees may designate another member of his organization as his replacement at a Board of Trustees' meeting, and such replacement shall be eligible to exercise the vote of the regular member.

Section 6. A majority of the membership of the Board of Trustees shall constitute a quorum.

Section 7. The Superintendent of Public Instruction of the State of Ohio, or his representative, may serve as a consultant to the Board of Trustees.

Section 8. The Board of Trustees shall be empowered to create committees as necessary.

**Article VII**

**Officers**

Section 1. Prior to the annual meeting of the Council, the Board of Trustees shall elect a president, a vice president, and a secretary-treasurer from the membership of the Board of Trustees.

Section 2. Procedure for the election of the officers named in Section 1, (Article VII) shall be as follows: The president shall appoint a Nominating Committee composed of three members of the Board of Trustees. At a meeting of the Board of Trustees held prior to the annual meeting of the Council, this committee shall submit to the Board of Trustees nominations
to the offices named. In addition to these nominations, opportunity for nominations from the floor shall be given at said meeting of the Board of Trustees.

Section 3. Officers shall serve for a term of one year beginning at the close of the annual meeting. Officers may be re-elected provided they retain membership on the Board of Trustees.

Article VIII
Staff

Section 1. The Board of Trustees shall be empowered to employ an executive director and such staff as may be required to carry out the objectives of the organization.

Section 2. The Board of Trustees may accept additional staff support from participating organizations when required and offered.

Article IX
Financial Support

The Ohio Council for Education, Inc. is a non-profit corporation. There shall be no dues, as such, required to retain affiliation in the organization. The defraying of expenses shall be borne equally, insofar as possible, by all participating organizations or through gifts from interested individuals or groups.

Article X
Amendments

These by-laws may be amended at any meeting of the Council by a two-thirds majority of the participating organizations, provided 30 days written notice has been given to Council members.

Article XI

Parliamentary Authority

The rules contained in Robert's Rules of Order Revised shall govern this association in all cases in which they are applicable and in which they are not in conflict with these by-laws.
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