

*Administrative
Leadership*



DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

Volume III November, 1966 Number 1

Introduction

The Department of Educational Administration is happy to present Administrative Leadership in this new format. In addition to a change in form, we have added a new dimension in substance that will be of interest to school administrators. Administrative Leadership is designed to fill the gap between the concerns of the school administrator and the theoretical basis of much of contemporary journal literature. The lead article by Professor Van Mueller on collective bargaining in this issue is a case in point. Professor Mueller's review of a recent conference should provide stimulation for creative thought regarding the relationships between teachers and the governors of the schools and should set some guidelines for the administrator of school personnel programs.

Those of us concerned with editorial policy invite your comments on our purpose and method. Your advice and criticism will be of help to us as we attempt to mold Administrative Leadership into a useful journal for the Minnesota practitioner.

William Ammentorp, Editor

TEACHER/ADMINISTRATIVE/SCHOOL BOARD RELATIONSHIPS

Van D. Mueller, Executive Secretary, E.R.D.C.

Recent developments across the U. S. clearly indicate that some form of collective negotiations will be widely used in future years to determine the salaries and conditions of employment of public school teachers. Accelerated efforts by teacher organizations to persuade school boards to negotiate with their designated representatives have been a matter of recognizable concern to administrators and school boards. To provide administrators and school board members with the opportunity to analyze the existing situation and clarify issues and changes that lie ahead in the field of employer-employee relationship in public education, the Educational Research and Development Council of the Twin Cities Metropolitan Area, Inc., in cooperation with the Departments of Educational Administration and Industrial Relations, University of Minnesota, sponsored a 30-hour conference, October 12-15, 1966, dealing with topics directly related to better understanding the process of collective bargaining. This article represents a summary of a few of the significant presentations made during the work sessions.

Background and the Process of Collective Bargaining

In response to the question, "What is Collective Bargaining?" Dr. Cyrus Smythe, University of Minnesota Industrial Relations Center stated: "The basic reason for getting together for collective bargaining is economic. However, collective bargaining is not limited to those persons covered by the National Labor Relations Board. The strongest existing union in the United States is the American Medical Association which limits the supply of doctors, polices its own ranks, and bargains collectively with the public."

Smythe developed a framework for analyzing the effectiveness of the economic bargaining power of any group. The five components are:

1. The members of the group must be irreplaceable.
2. The employees must be critical to the operation of the organization.
3. The cost of disagreement for the employer must exceed the cost of agreement.
4. The employees must realize the existence of the three preceding factors.
5. The employees must possess the militancy and cohesiveness to strike.

Applying these five conditions to public school teachers caused the following conclusions to be drawn:

1. Teachers are irreplaceable.
2. Teachers are critical to the operation of the school system.
3. The disagreement vs. agreement factor must be assessed in light of public opinion, economic situation and needs, educational loss, fixed costs, and state aid loss.
4. Do teachers realize that they have economic bargaining power? (The most common responses seemed to be affirmative.)
5. Are the teachers militant and cohesive enough? (Yes, again!)

Significant points of discussion also suggested the uniqueness of each collective bargaining situation; the political nature of employee and employer groups; and the basic irrationality which brings about work stoppages.

Mr. Arvid Anderson, Member of the Wisconsin Employment Relations Board and Professor Thomas P. Lewis, University of Minnesota Law School, reviewed "The Law Pertinent to Collective Bargaining in Minnesota and the United States." Mr. Anderson listed five principles involved in collective bargaining: (1) the right of employees to organize and be represented; (2) the duty of the employer to bargain; (3) the establishment and definition of unfair labor practices; (4) the development of dispute settlement procedures; and (5) the establishment of administrative machinery to elect employee representatives. Collective bargaining, according to Anderson, is a process supported by four primary areas of need: (1) economic benefits for employees; (2) tenure or seniority rights; (3) grievance and arbitration procedures to settle employer-employee disputes; and (4) provision for union security. It was strongly suggested that statutes on collective bargaining should, where possible, "balance the process of negotiation with respect for the public interest." Professor Lewis discussed in detail the 1965 Minnesota Labor Relations Act which excludes teachers and is currently under appeal to the State Supreme Court. Dr. Lewis emphasized that the 1965 Act does not describe the enforcement mechanism in sufficient detail, does not spell out the role of the supervisor, and has insufficient definition of what constitutes a bargaining unit.

The process of deciding employee representatives, holding elections, and certification of bargaining units was discussed by Mr. Peter Obermeyer, Labor Conciliator, State of Minnesota. Mr. Obermeyer

stated that collective negotiations indeed have an effect on superintendents and school boards, primarily, by limiting the unilateral action area of the school board and causing decision making to be a joint process. The character of the bargaining group is determined by excluding or including various divisions such as elementary and secondary teachers and excluding principals and supervisors. In defining an appropriate bargaining unit, Obermeyer indicated that consideration is given to the following: (1) efficient administration of the unit; (2) history of the organization; (3) occupational skills involved; (4) supervisory and administrative levels of authority; (5) geographic location factors; and (6) recommendations of interested parties. The labor conciliation service of the State of Minnesota is required to act whenever the contesting parties are deadlocked, one of the parties refuses to meet, or one of the parties petitions for conciliation assistance.

Preparation for Negotiations/Collective Bargaining

The shift from "background" to "operational" concepts of collective action came with Dr. Smythe's presentation on "The Role of Management in Negotiations--Principles and Preparation." The role of management was discussed in a two-fold manner; first, to represent the interest they are responsible for; and secondly, to consider employee groups as a part of reaching their goal, using an analytical rather than emotional approach. Problems faced by any management group tend to be caused by fear of the shift from an individual to a group process in dealing with issues. Management reactions after employee groups form often border on the illegal; i.e. prevent the functioning of the group, or favor one group over another. The means of overcoming problems of management in working with employee groups are within the capability of all school administrators and school boards. Smythe emphasized the following basic needs for management action:

- (1) Know the goal of the employee group.
- (2) Analyze areas of management that need to be improved.
- (3) Develop, on own behalf, the bargaining units to be established but beware of competing groups. A conflict between competing groups means trouble for management.
- (4) Bargain in good faith.
- (5) Develop strategy for the bargaining table based on:
 - (a) thorough knowledge of the employee organization.
 - (b) the psychological factors involved in the issues.
 - (c) personalities and quality of employee leaders.
 - (d) carefully developed management positions.

Smythe cautioned school boards on negotiating directly with teacher organizations as a board. A more appropriate alternative would have school boards hire a trained negotiator, establish his operating limits, and provide him with help from the school district staff. The ideal number of persons on the negotiation team is considered to be three with a chief negotiator determining strategy.

Continuing the discussion of "Management in Negotiations," Mr. Gary Morse, Chief of the Industrial Relations Department at Honeywell defined collective bargaining as "an inner-group power relationship that is collective and bargaining." Mr. Morse indicated that bargaining bothers the professional: one, because he looks at facts from the objective point of view; secondly, bargaining is a horse-trading method and presents serious problems to the professional who tends to evaluate and weigh data; and finally, collective bargaining is a power exercise not an intellectual exercise. Morse pointed out that collective bargaining can be a good process if understood and if natural restraints keep it reasonable. It was mentioned that collective bargaining with teachers in Minnesota cannot be avoided, that teachers know what is going on around the United States. The superintendent and school board must think bargaining positions through coldly and objectively, and make decisions. Mr. Morse maintained that bargaining is emotional and irrational. Collective bargaining is truly a power concern. The superintendent and school board should assess realistically and dispassionately. According to Morse, "You play your hand to win. It's trial by combat." However, he hinted that when you deal, you deal vigorously and harshly. Management must be careful, however, not to be so successful that the employee leadership loses effect. Boards were cautioned to leave some cohesiveness so that bargaining can be resumed at a future date, otherwise the leaders have no group following and disagreement and antagonism will trouble management until new employee leadership emerges.

The Emergent Role of Teachers

Both the American Federation of Teachers and the National Education Association have developed their own concepts of negotiations and are engaged nationally in a spirited competition for the right to represent teachers in their efforts to bargain collectively with school boards. Mr. Arnold Walpert of the N.E.A. Division of Urban Services, and Mr. David Selden, Assistant to the President, American Federation of Teachers were in substantial agreement concerning the need for increased teacher participation in the governance of education. In fact, no significant differences were expressed in the area of scope of negotiations. Both teacher organizations see collective bargaining encompassing salaries, working conditions, fringe benefits, and educational policy-making. Agreement was also evident as both speakers

place the superintendent clearly and necessarily on the management side of the bargaining table. From indications given by both Mr. Walpert and Mr. Selden it appears that teachers are finally realizing that it is essential for them to form effective organizations at the local level. It seems probable that the teacher organization of tomorrow will be quite different from either the AFT or the NEA. As the teachers begin to function effectively in collective negotiations and obtain higher salaries, the concern will shift toward professional issues on which teachers can act effectively. Such problems as management of dropouts, the adequate preparation of college-bound students, and improved guidance systems might be illustrations.

Scope and Strategies of Negotiations/Bargaining

A matter of considerable concern to administrators and school board members is the "Scope of Negotiations." Speaking on this topic, Dr. James Kuhn, Professor of Industrial Relations, Columbia University, stated that the first reaction of management is to limit, but realistically, there are no bounds that can be placed on negotiations. Management rights (perogatives) clauses are sometimes included in contracts but in Professor Kuhn's opinion are ineffective because each new contract opens all areas to negotiation. Kuhn also pointed out that any claim to absolute unilateral action is foolish since policy and working conditions cannot be separated easily. Any poor management on either side serves to open the scope of negotiations. Management's areas can be preserved by being adept in negotiations. However, Kuhn stated that the right to manage may mean sharing of all areas of authority in the present contexts. "We have just as much right to manage as we can hold." Professor Kuhn advised not to argue with the principle of the thing, just determine the scope and limits of the negotiations at hand and never negotiate without knowing the restraints and weaknesses of the opposition.

Professor John J. Flagler, Head of Labor Education, Industrial Relations Center, University of Minnesota, stated that the higher the pride and identification with the work, the more chance there will be of unionization of the employees. Discussing "Negotiations--Strategies and Tactics," Flagler said that people intuitively move into functional economic organizations.

The following list summarizes the significant techniques (ritual of negotiations) explained by Professor Flagler:

- (1) The first thing to do is determine the view and scope of negotiations.
- (2) Examine the tactics used previously by the employee group.

- (3) Determine the management negotiating team.
- (4) Get the facts--school districts should have a defined research unit to do a specific job of research for negotiation programs.
- (5) Develop a posture or philosophy for bargaining.

Dr. Flagler feels that honesty and candor are effective devices in collective bargaining. The theory of accommodation where both sides are willing to explore the needs and problems of the other is preferable. According to Flagler, "this is the question of what's wrong rather than who's wrong." The need was expressed to start negotiations from areas of common agreement to stimulate the habit of agreeing. The maintenance of a rigid agenda and a problem-oriented posture were stressed.

The topic of "Impasse and Alternatives" was introduced with a two-hour presentation by six members of the staff of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, Minneapolis. A mock negotiations session involving school board, superintendent, and teacher representatives was held. Professors Kuhn and Smythe joined in presenting preparatory material on "Contract Administration." Both speakers agreed that contract administration is the real heart of collective bargaining; that the relationships developed through day-by-day administration of the grievance process will have a great deal of effect on collective bargaining. The grievance process was thought to result in an inevitable checking of the authority of administrators with the sharing of the decision-making with teachers. The grievance procedure may be viewed as a communications device, with the size of a school system increasing the need for a sophisticated grievance process. Kuhn feels that the time devoted to bargaining and administration of the grievance system will be affected by three factors: first, union leadership; second, the authoritarian nature of the superintendent; and third, the militancy of the teacher organization. Professor Kuhn also added that grievance procedures can be used to pressure the administration and probably will require much time on the part of the superintendent until both parties develop a degree of sophistication in its proper use.

The Impact of Collective Bargaining on School Administrators and School Boards

Mr. George Coombe, Jr., President of the Birmingham, Michigan Board of Education spoke with considerable bitterness of the Michigan experience in collective bargaining. He stressed that school boards need to re-examine all personnel policies and be sure of uniform administration of policy. Coombe stated that preparation by teachers' organizations, administrators, and school boards is essential if the collective bargaining process is to be an effective instrument for improving

education. The Michigan legislation, having immediate effect, did not permit an adequate period for learning a new process and its attendant new skills. School boards and superintendents were advised to be politically active in working for adequate state legislation for collective bargaining.

Dr. L. V. Rasmussen, Superintendent, Duluth Public Schools, began his remarks by recognizing a sharp and rapid decline of school board power with the rise of teacher organization strength. In looking at the emergence of teachers, Dr. Rasmussen pointed out that teachers are forcing a move to general federal aid to education through their local collective bargaining procedures. The school board of the future will be divested of much of its power and possibly become extinct because it is easier for teacher organizations to manipulate public opinion than organized professional opinion. Teachers prefer to carry out negotiations with the public than school administrators and have done so successfully. Dr. Rasmussen further suggested that there will be a decline in interest to serve on school boards because of less job satisfaction. It was predicted that teachers will emerge as a dominate force and bypass the superintendent in their collective actions. The role of the superintendent according to Superintendent Rasmussen will be that of the significant third voice in negotiations, the student's voice, and he will assume the role of head of the instructional area. "The superintendent of the future will become an educator in residence, an educational politician and statesman. He will be deprived of most decision-making power and will be limited to assisting teachers in formulating policy, in setting goals, and hopefully the development of a more effective product."

Summary

Significant areas of agreement were evident in the remarks of the various speakers as they analyzed the future path of collective bargaining for teachers in Minnesota. First of all, such bargaining rights either under a new interpretation of present statute or through new legislation is inevitable and desirable. Secondly, school boards and administrators in other areas of the United States have made mistakes in not adapting positive accommodating attitudes toward collective bargaining.

The emergence of strong, organized teacher organizations can increase the total power of the school system in relation to the larger society and enable it to achieve its purposes more effectively. The challenge to administrators posed by new patterns of collective action by teachers lies in the organizational knowledge and leadership required to make the changes in the school system power structure that will make the optimum use of the potential increase in the total power of the educational system.

NOTE: An announcement will be forthcoming soon from the E.R.D.C. concerning tapes of the "Workshop on Teacher/Administrator/School Board Relationships: as well as a publication containing all major presentations.

DISTRICT REORGANIZATION IS SCHOOLMEN'S DAY TOPIC

Clifford P. Hooker, Professor and Chairman

District reorganization, the topic for Schoolmen's Day is not new to school administrators in Minnesota. For decades we have discussed the problems associated with an excessive number of school districts. With each advance toward fewer and larger districts, new problems have emerged and the search for an optimum number of districts continued. Improvements in transportation and communication; expansion of the educational program to include vocational and special education; extension of school services embracing libraries, reading specialists, and speech therapists; improved technology in education; and a host of other factors have caused educators to continue their examination of the size and strength of local school districts. Also, the shortage of qualified teachers and the administration of federal programs in education contribute to our concern.

The program for Schoolmen's Day will feature a combination of experts from around the nation and professors and superintendents from Minnesota. Professor E. O. Smith from the University of Illinois will open the conference at 9:00 a.m. with an address pertaining to the essential of quality education for the last one-third of the twentieth century. Following a break for coffee, Professor R. L. Johns of the University of Florida will review current developments in school district reorganization throughout the nation. As the director of numerous state surveys, Professor Johns will let us know what is happening nationally and give his recommendations for legislation to establish a sound pattern of district organization. Dr. Charles Sederberg, Curriculum and Research Coordinator of the Roseville Schools and Ray Stensvad, Superintendent of Lake County Schools, Two Harbors, will react to the addresses by Professors Smith and Johns.

The program at Schoolmen's Day will add at least one new element in our discussion of school district reorganization. Professor Luvern L. Cunningham, Director of the Midwest Center, University of Chicago, will address the luncheon session on emerging school district patterns in metropolitan areas. His remarks will raise questions about the district organization in the seven-county metropolitan area surrounding the Twin Cities. Dr. Donald Dunnan, Superintendent of St. Paul Public Schools and Nathaniel Ober, Assistant Superintendent in Charge of Secondary Schools in Minneapolis, will react to Dr. Cunningham's remarks.

The entire afternoon session will focus on the status of school district organization in Minnesota. Professor Otto E. Domian will address the conference on this topic. Armed with current data which he has gathered in a state-wide survey, Professor Domian will give his impressions of where we are and the road ahead. Arthur Nymann, Superintendent of St. Francis Public Schools, and Dr. Thomas Stark, Superintendent of Grand Rapids Schools, will react to Professor Domian's address.

The Genius of American Education by Lawrence A. Cremin. (New York: Vintage Books, V-311, 1966, paperback \$1.65).

Douglas R. Pierce, Assistant Professor

With clarity and directness, Lawrence Cremin has posed the simple question, "Why all this education? To what purpose?" The question warrants raising, insistently and well. Schoolmen and laymen alike will find the concise paperback, The Genius of American Education, excellent help in confronting the fundamental question.

A central problem of contemporary society, complex and highly differentiated, is commonality. Cremin identifies educational agencies, whether schools or television stations, as a primary mechanism for the integration of society: "I myself am led to the conclusion that the nurture of a common culture remains a central task of American popular education, and that the common school continues to stand as a prime agency for undertaking this task. But I am led also to observe that there are other agencies that can--and do--contribute significantly to the common education of the public, and that it is a serious error to discuss the problem without paying heed to the new opportunities they afford." (p. 75)

A commitment to popular education rests upon the proposition "that culture can be democratized without being vulgarized." (p. 73) Such is a matter of faith. To test it requires the sponsoring of intellectual and aesthetic experiences, within the schools and without, that are excellent.

Given that many agencies educate, what the school is uniquely qualified to do is "to make youngsters aware of the constant bombardment of facts, opinions, and values to which they are subjected; to help them question what they see and hear; and, ultimately, to give them the intellectual resources they need to make judgments and assess significance." (p. 22)

The politics of popular education entail a constant tension. Even as the commitment to popular education implies public control, the conviction that popular education will not be vulgarized education implies that the teaching profession has license to teach "truth as he sees it and to follow truth wherever it leads." (p. 95)

The developing national system of education poses the problem of how control is to be kept responsive to the public. The problem applies equally to educative media outside the school, as to the popular school.

The Genius of American Education brings into sharp perspective what is necessary to provide that popular education upon which democracy is predicted.

The Necessary Revolution in American Education by Francis Keppel.
(New York: Harper and Row, 1966).

William Ammentorp, Assistant Professor

We often experience the need for a book that summarizes basic problems facing all of American education. Too often such writings are parochial and do not provide the background of fact needed if the reader is to be encouraged to think of his own solutions to educational problems. I think that Francis Keppel has filled an important need by treating critical issues in the philosophic roots of the American school in the context of current practice. In addition, The Necessary Revolution in American Education is a very readable book and should find wide acceptance by boards of education and by interested laymen.

Keppel's point of attack in The Necessary Revolution is to examine the educational assumptions that American society has been implementing in its laws and practices and to ask how these assumptions might be used to build changes in the schools for the betterment of their practice. He argues that the American school is founded on beliefs about the need for (a) quantity of education--a "revolution" now completed by provision of free education for all through the secondary school, (b) equality of opportunity--a second "revolution" now in progress and, in Keppel's view, a revolution won through acceptance of the principle in law, and (c) high quality of education--this is the "needed revolution" and one which must proceed along with the winning of equality of opportunity.

Arguments supporting Keppel's view of revolution in education are derived from studies of past educational practice, statistics on inequities in opportunity and evaluation of education as a human resource. Keppel makes it clear that future efforts to improve the schools must, by virtue of the need for commitments of large quantities of scarce resources, be political in nature. He believes that three requirements must be met to enable political bodies to plan for education, (1) "information on the condition of education within the states," (2) "need for stronger leadership and planning by state departments of education in relation to local districts," (3) "need for innovation based upon sound research." In recognizing local controls, Keppel is quick to point out the emergent "creative Federalism" in education and to make his point, documents its importance.

Keppel believes that quality in education can come about only through attack on several different aspects of the schools. Teachers, research and curriculum all must have serious attention if the "needed revolution" is to be successful. The persons most likely to insure

that needed changes take place in the school are those charged with its leadership; school administrators and members of school boards must begin to see their efforts in larger perspective and to adapt their schools to the needs of the times.

I would recommend this book to administrators, teachers, and local school board members as a provocative writing. A careful reading of The Necessary Revolution by those interested in growth and change in the schools can provide a common background of understanding and will be sure to promote discussion and thought about the part that the readers' school will play in change.

Note: The Necessary Revolution is an excellent companion book to Cremin's work as recommended reading for school board members.

FACULTY ACTIVITIES

Dr. Vernon Hendrix is continuing his consultation work with the College Entrance Examination Board in a project which studies the articulation of students between high school and college and the transfer process between junior colleges and degree-granting institutions. In addition, he is engaged in preparing a chapter for Educational Administration Abstracts dealing with the administration of higher education.

A book completed by Dr. Samuel Popper, entitled, The American Middle School: An Organizational Analysis, will be available early in 1967 from Blaisdell Publishing Company (a division of Ginn and Company, Waltham, Massachusetts). This work should receive wide interest among persons concerned with the structure and function of the middle school in public school systems. We hope to review this book in a forthcoming issue of Administrative Leadership.

Dr. Donald Davis remains on three-quarter leave as Title V Program Director for the State Department of Education in St. Paul.

Dr. Ronald Lambert has been appointed Chairman of the Department of Elementary Education replacing Dr. James Curtin, who has been named Assistant Chairman of the Department.

HIGH SCHOOLS HOST TEN ADMINISTRATIVE INTERNS

Ten Minnesota secondary school principals are assisting in the preparation of the school administrators of the future. They are supervising young men in the University's Educational Administration Internship program, now in its third year of operation. The internship is a full-time one-year learning experience for graduate students in educational administration who are close to completing their degree programs. Under the guidance of experienced principals they have an opportunity to apply classroom theory to actual practice--to learn by doing.

<u>Intern</u>	<u>School</u>	<u>Supervising Principal</u>
Dan Barnett	Osseo H.S.	Myron Johnson
Neil Christenson	Kellogg H.S., Roseville	John Torgelson
James Harders	Kennedy H.S., Bloomington	Robert Vinitieri
Waldo Larson	Lakeville H.S.	Robert Greenslit
Dwight Lindbloom	University H.S., Mpls.	Richard Hill
Richard Moore	Phillips Jr.H.S., Mpls.	O. E. Bakke
Nicholas Olsen	Mechanic Arts H.S., St. Paul	George Kirkeby
Harvey Rucker	Lincoln Jr.H.S., Mpls.	George Christenson
John Strauss	Central H.S., Mpls.	James Treglawny
David Wettergren	Mayo H.S., Rochester	Ralph Wright

The N.A.S.S.P. joins the University in affiliation with the interns at Kellogg, Kennedy, Lincoln Jr., and Mayo. This includes monetary assistance to the hosting school, and participation by the interns in N.A.S.S.P. activities, including educational innovations.

Principals and superintendents interested in hosting interns in the future should contact Dr. Neal C. Nickerson, Jr., of the University's Department of Educational Administration.

Neal C. Nickerson, Jr.
Assistant Professor

BUREAU CONDUCTS STATEWIDE STUDY OF SCHOOLS

A statewide study of elementary and secondary education in Minnesota is the major 1966-67 project of the Bureau of Field Studies and Surveys. This year-long study, financed under Title V of Public Law 89-10, is scheduled for completion by June 30, 1967.

The purposes of this comprehensive study are:

- (1) to determine the current status of public education in Minnesota;
- (2) to assess the areas of strength and weakness; and
- (3) to formulate recommendations for immediate and long-range improvements.

The study will concentrate on four major areas: the educational program, the organizational structure, the professional personnel, and the methods of financing.

Five out-state specialists have been employed to assist Dr. Otto E. Domian, who serves as director of the project. Dr. W. R. Flesher, President of Cooperative Educational Enterprises, Inc., is the general consultant for the entire project. His organization has directed several state studies plus many smaller projects throughout the United States. He formerly served as Professor Of Education and Director of Surveys at Ohio State University. Dr. Marion McGhehey, who is Executive Secretary of the Kansas School Board Association, is the consultant in organizational structure. He and his Association have played a major role in the extensive school district reorganization in Kansas. Dr. Herbert L. Coon of Ohio State University is the consultant in educational program. As Professor of Education and Principal of University Laboratory School he has a broad knowledge and extensive experience in all phases of the curriculum. Dr. W. Monfort Barr, the consultant in finance, is Professor of Education and Director of the Bureau of School Surveys at Indiana University. He is the author of a major textbook in school finance and has a national reputation in this field. The consultant in professional personnel is Dr. Stanley Niehaus, who is Superintendent of Schools at East Peoria, Illinois. These five out-state specialists bring to the project a wealth of knowledge and experience in the areas of their specialty.

The survey staff is already well along in gathering basic data. In addition to the facts secured from official records and reports, ideas and attitudes were solicited by staff members at each of the 24 regional meetings held by the Minnesota State School Board Association. Inquiries have been mailed to each superintendent of schools and to each school board chairman in Minnesota to secure their reactions and ideas. Participation by elementary and secondary principals, other professional personnel, lay citizens, and various groups and organizations will also be solicited. The extent and nature of this cooperative effort will largely determine the effectiveness of this project in improving public education in Minnesota.

In addition to the Minnesota state-wide project, the Bureau is also conducting a variety of school district surveys. Wisconsin projects include a school district reorganization study of Rusk County and a school building survey at Hayward. The seven current projects in Minnesota include Austin, Bloomington, Fairmont, Grand Rapids, Olmsted County, Red Wing, and Wheaton. Several other projects are pending but contract negotiations have not been completed.

The numerous school district requests for survey services have made it necessary for the Bureau staff to be expanded. Director, Otto E. Domian, and four other staff members, Gayle H. Anderson, Kenneth E. Garland, Harris E. Miller and Manley E. Olson, carry over from last year. Seven new men have joined the staff this year. Two new members came from over-seas schools in Germany: Burton H. Cooper as Principal of Berlin American High School and Donald J. Weiss as counselor at Frankfurt American High School. J. Gregory Hellie and Harold L. Sorkness came from high school principalships at Westbrook and Marietta respectively. Three former superintendents have joined the staff, Vernon S. Bennett from Bruce, Wisconsin, Lloyd W. Telschow from Nashwauk-Keewatin, and Herman C. Rustad from Wabasso by way of the State Department of Education.

Otto E. Domian, Director
Bureau of Field Studies & Surveys

RESEARCH TRAINING PROGRAM BEGINS

The Department of Educational Administration has been authorized by the U. S. Office of Education to conduct a research training program for research workers in school districts and junior colleges. Currently, six graduate students are on stipend, with dependency allowances, as they work toward a Ph. D. in this program. The proposal for this program was developed jointly by Professors Hocker, Hendrix, and Pierce. Professor William Ammentorp, formerly of Carleton College, has joined the Department of Educational Administration staff with primary responsibilities for this program. Doctor Ammentorp will also be active in areas dealing with the Administration of Higher Education.

Two "models" provided some guidance for the development of this program. One is that of the institutional research worker in institutions of higher education. In many such institutions this person or office is relied upon to assist with decision making by other members of the administration. Secondly, operations research positions that have become quite essential in many areas of business, industry, government, military, etc., were examined. The role of such specialists in defining goals and objectives, and in general decision making, seems quite relevant to educational institutions.

Students in this program, who will largely be recent recipients of the Bachelor's degree, will undertake a three-year program leading toward the Ph. D. degree. While in this program, they will take course work in four areas: (1) general course work in administration, theory, finance, personnel, law, etc., (2) specialized course work dealing with the type of institution with which they are concerned, such as elementary schools, secondary schools, general district administration, junior colleges, etc., (3) course work in statistics, experimental design, multi-variate analysis, research techniques, and computer utilization, (4) course work in quantitative analysis in the College of Business Administration. A research internship and a dissertation will help focus the course mark on specific problems about which districts and colleges must make decisions.

These specialists in decision making and research should be quite valuable assets to school districts and junior colleges. Based on information concerning available positions, all six of this year's entering group could have been placed if they had completed the programs. The department is looking toward expansion of this program during the next academic year.

William Ammentorp
Assistant Professor

DO SCHOOLS MAKE A DIFFERENCE?

The first meeting of the Educational Administration Forum featured Professor Charles Benson, University of California, Berkeley, in a discussion of "Cost-Effectiveness Studies in Public Education." Professor Benson reported that in a study conducted under his supervision, socio-economic background and/or environment was the single most significant influence on student achievement. However, within socio-economic groups, teaching and schools do "make a difference." This study compared output measures (data) from the 1962/63 California State Testing Program and tried to ascertain those variables that might account for the differences in performance. As independent variables, the study used: district variables, (size, economic factors, social strata, family units) and policy variables (class size, teacher salaries, teacher ratios, administrative staffing). The district variables were found most significant in explaining differences in achievement.

The results of this study were compared by Professor Benson to another study conducted by James Coleman for the U. S. Office of Education and the Civil Rights Act of 1964 where similar "no difference" findings predominated. Coleman suggested, on the basis of this study's findings, that ghetto children should be evenly distributed amongst other schools. Educational achievement of dispersed students would then become similar to that of the other students.

Professor Benson cited a third study which contradicted the conclusions drawn by Dr. Coleman. The findings of this study conducted by Robert Stout, University of California, Berkeley, for the U. S. Civil Rights Commission stress the importance of socio-economic variables to a greater extent than the previously cited study by concluding: transferring a child from a ghetto school into a suburban school does not work in seven out of eight cases unless you can move the total family into a different socio-economic area. Dr. Stout believes that the differences in the two studies may be explained by the fact that Coleman's study used students who did not live in ghetto areas but in borderline mixed areas.

Benson's study did not show any rise in pupils output based upon educational variables. Does this mean schools make no difference or that there is not enough variation amongst schools to measure input? Professor Benson suggested further research to measure nonconventional educational variables, for example, a teacher ratio of 1:4 or other similar innovative features. As far as improving schools in low economic areas, Professor Benson suggested the creation of "professional schools" to be staffed and equipped with the best available teachers and materials. These schools would serve the area and act as teacher training and retraining institutions. They would provide excellent settings for educational research and good bases for seminars, inservice education workshops, etc., for the teachers in surrounding schools.

Education's function is not to solve society's ills but education can make a major effort to shorten the long process of societal changes for many a child, Professor Benson concluded.

Werner D. Tismer
Teaching Assistant

WARD LECTURES ON MULTIPLE LINEAR REGRESSION

Early in October interested faculty and students at the University had an opportunity to hear Dr. Joe H. Ward, Jr. lecture on multiple linear regression. Dr. Ward is Chief of the Computer Analysis Branch, Air Force Personnel Research Laboratory, Aerospace Medical Division, Lackland Air Force Base, Texas. He has published books and articles and lectured on this topic at numerous institutions in the U.S. and Canada.

Since the inception of statistical analysis as a tool for evaluating the relative merits of fertilizers, statistical procedures and methods have remained relatively unchanged, even though their use is no longer restricted to the fertilized and well-tested plots of ground. Statistical analysis has been employed by educators, psychologists and sociologists for the study of the complex human being and his activities. In the process of this rather broad generalization of methods from agriculture to humans, it became necessary to impose many restrictions as to the type of data that could be looked at. The mathematical models were available, all one had to do was find a problem to fit the model. In essence - fit the foot to the shoe, a painful process! Dr. Ward presents us with an alternative, multiple linear regression, a method more adapted to the study of complex organisms, and one which allows us to fit the shoe to the foot - a less painful and more productive process.

Ward's whole approach is structured on two basic concepts. Statistical models should be fitted to existing problems and secondly, the model should be fitted in natural language to a problem defined in natural language. This is quite opposite to the traditional approach which provides models and methods of analysis and anyone interested in meaningful results must design his research in accordance with a model or find a problem appropriate to the model. Ward's approach also shifts the emphasis from manipulation of data to critical and precise definitions of problems and design of appropriate research tools. The ramifications of this approach are threefold. One is the result of the proper problem-statistical model relationship, while the other two stem more from the natural language concept.

The fact that since the restricting and limiting nature of traditional statistics no longer impinges on the definition of problems or collection of data, many problems which heretofore could not be considered can now be fully and fruitfully investigated. With natural language replacing statistical symbols, the nonstatistically-oriented individual is now in a position to do meaningful research in an area of his interest. Ward expressed sympathy and understanding for the nonstatistically-oriented individual who has sought counsel from a statistician but then had to walk away, dazed and confused, no closer to researching his problem. Ward feels very strongly that the individual with the problem is closer to that problem and therefore, in a better position to determine which are the important questions to be answered.

Lastly, since inaccuracies of problem definition and "fuzzy" concepts cannot be covered up with technical and complex statistical jargon, it becomes imperative that clearer and more precise definitions of questions and problems evolve. This approach should lead to more powerful and useful research.

t e a c h i n g a s s i s t a n t s

LAVERNE C. ARNS, senior high school principal at North St. Paul, has joined the department as teaching assistant for Dr. Nickerson. Mr. Arns, on sabbatical leave from his district for one year, is working on a Specialist degree. He lists reading as his main hobby and states "this is the first time in ten years that there is enough time to explore the hobby to any degree."

GARY A. MOHRENWEISER, B.S. from the University of Minnesota, 1964 has been appointed teaching assistant to Dr. Davis. After teaching senior high school and junior college, physics and chemistry, at Nazareth Hall in St. Paul, Mr. Mohrenweiser has returned to the University on a Research Training Fellowship. He hopes to explore application of mathematical simulation to education.

JOSEFINA RESURRECCION, B.A. from Manila University, M.A. from National College of Education, Evanston, Illinois, has been reappointed departmental teaching associate. Miss Resurreccion has various educational experiences as: elementary school teacher in Manila, instructor for the Peace Corps in California, and as teacher for the Minneapolis Public Schools summer program. Miss Resurreccion is enrolled in a Ph. D. program.

HARRY L. SUMMERFIELD, B.A. and B.S. from the University of Minnesota, M.A. in political science, Washington University, St. Louis has been appointed teaching assistant to Dr. Popper. Mr. Summerfield taught senior high school social studies in West Allis, Wisconsin and worked for one year as vocational counselor for the Cook County Department of Public Aid, Chicago, before returning to the University.

WERNER D. TISMER, elementary principal at White Bear Lake, has been reappointed teaching assistant to Dr. Hooker. Mr. Tismer holds a Master's degree from Minnesota and has also attended the University of Maine and the Free University of Berlin. On a one-year sabbatical leave, Mr. Tismer is enrolled in a Ph. D. program.

JACK ZIMMER, M.A. from South Dakota State, has been appointed teaching assistant to Dr. Pierce. Mr. Zimmer taught chemistry and biology, 1957 to 1963 in South Dakota; worked as secondary principal at Storden, Minnesota from 1963 to 1965; and was assistant principal, University High School, University of Minnesota, 1966. Mr. Zimmer is enrolled in a Ph.D. program with his major interest being in research.

r e s e a r c h f e l l o w s w i t h E . R . D . C .

JEREMY M. HUGHES obtained his B.A. in philosophy from the University of Dayton (Ohio) in 1962. After four years of graduate study in theology at Assumption Seminary and College at Chaska, he received his M.A. in religious sciences. He was ordained as a Roman Catholic priest in March of 1966. After attending summer sessions at the University of Notre Dame in 1962 and 1963, he transferred to the University of Minnesota where he received his M.A. in educational administration in 1965. He is now working toward his Ph. D. in educational administration.

DALE A. JOHNSON has had six years' teaching and administrative experience. Before joining the Council staff in 1965, he served as assistant principal at Willmar Junior High School. He holds a B.S. from Mankato State College; and is working toward a Ph.D. in educational administration.

GERALD G. MANSERGH received his B.A. in history and English from Hamline University, St. Paul, in 1956. He received his M.A. in educational administration from the University of Minnesota in 1963 and is now working toward a Ph.D. in education. He has taught English at Forest Lake Junior High School, and social studies and English in the core program at Highland Park Junior High School in St. Paul. He has also served two years as a counselor at Capitol View Junior High School and two years as counselor at Frank B. Kellogg High School in Roseville. In this most recent appointment, he was also department chairman.

JOHN M. MAAS received his B.A. from St. John's University, Collegeville, in 1958. He taught English and social studies for six and a half years in both public and private schools in Minnesota. He has just completed a year and a half as intern-principal of the Lincoln Training Center, a curriculum development project of the Minneapolis Public Schools and the Hennepin County Office of Economic Opportunity, under Title III, P. L. 89-10. He is currently working on a M.A. in educational administration and intends to carry on to a Ph. D. program.

DONALD A. PORTER took his B.A. in physics at the University of Saskatchewan and then taught for a year, serving as administrative assistant to the principal. In 1958 he joined the faculty of the College of Medicine at the University of North Dakota, where he received his M.S. in physiology. After serving on the faculties of the University of Alberta and Alberta College with a year's military service interspersed, he returned to the public schools as a teacher in Winnepeg. For the last two years he has been principal of a combined elementary and high school in rural Manitoba. He is now pursuing a Ph.D. program in educational administration under Dr. Donald E. Davis.

*Administrative
Leadership*



DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

Volume III

February, 1967

Number 2

STRUCTURES FOR PUBLIC SCHOOL GOVERNMENT

Since this issue of Administrative Leadership contains the abstracts of papers given at Schoolmen's Day, 1966 and commentaries on these papers, it is tempting to use the theme of that conference, "School District Reorganization," as our title. However, a close examination of some of the assumptions underlying the present school district structure, such as that made by Professor Hooker, indicates that educators need to give broad attention to the problems of finance and governance of the schools. This attention should not be limited to tinkering with the present system; a climate of increasing urbanization and the demands of mass society require more than simple modifications to existing structures. The statement made by Professor Johns: "Despite the assumed improvement in school district organization during the past 35 years, the school district organization that existed in 1900 was probably more functional for that time as the district organization that exists in 1966." Neither school districts nor the concept of education as "forever reserved to the states" should be immune to serious question. If education is to adapt to contemporary society, it must question some of the organizational assumptions that have gone too long unchallenged.

William Ammentorp, Editor

AN EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM FOR THE LAST
ONE-THIRD OF THE TWENTIETH CENTURY
(Abstract)

B. Othanel Smith, University of Illinois

As one considers what the educational system should be for the remainder of this century, he must take into account the fact that what he thinks it ought to be will probably have little resemblance to the system as it actually develops. Furthermore, he must consider the further fact that prognostications about education have usually proved to be off the beam. Educational developments seem to have a logic of their own that defies those of us who would wish to know its inner workings or to guess its outcomes. I remember very well discussing with a group of schoolmen in 1946 the question of what would be the big developments in education during the next twenty years. It is interesting as well as distressing to note that no one mentioned the expansion of the activities of the U. S. Office of Education into almost every aspect of educational work; no one mentioned the extensive involvement of the federal government in curriculum revision through the National Science Foundation; no one mentioned the development of projects in the education of the gifted or for that matter the research in this area; no one mentioned the development of computer based instruction or the extensive developments in programmed instruction; and no one even thought about the possibilities of an expansion of the training of teachers and of the interest of the federal government in the education of the disadvantaged. Yet, these are the very features of the educational scene that have come to be most visible in the 20-year period that we were considering. If my prognostication for the next 20 years turns out to be no better than that of this particular group of schoolmen of which I was a member, there would seem to be very little to be gained from my trying to out-guess the course of educational history.

There are some new educational ventures, however, which are already on the scene and which promise to advance still further during the next 20 to 25 years. It seems clear that the schools have become identified with the national interest in ways that were not thought possible 20 years ago. The officials of government as well as scholars and research workers are beginning to recognize that growth in the national income is associated with the extension and enrichment of schooling for all the people. Indeed, this insight into the relation between schooling and national prosperity is now in the minds of people throughout the world. This is why there is so much emphasis today on education in underdeveloped countries. There is good reason, therefore, to believe that the interest of the federal government in education will continue with little if any abatement.

It is becoming clear, also, that youth is the nation's greatest resource. From one standpoint this means that the great resources that underlie the wealth of the nation are such because of the schooling the youth receive. The natural resources of soil, coal, oil, minerals, are resources precisely because of the ability of an educated people to exploit them. Furthermore, our notion of resources has been tremendously expanded by the development of science and technology that has come through education. Today most of the products and materials which were once thought useless have come to be important in industry and agriculture.

To say youth is a great resource is to say that the education of youth is the chief task of the community, the state, and the nation. At the present time the youth of this generation are troubled and in a state of turmoil. This is due in large measure to the fact that they have been alienated by their families and their communities. No other generation of young people has been thrown back upon itself as has the current one. This means, among other things, that their notions of right and wrong are engendered by youth groups themselves rather than by emulation of their elders. This alienation has in it the makings of severe discontent and violence. The threat of these social consequences will force communities as well as state and federal governments to develop programs on a broad front for the involvement of youth in the significant activities of society. There is no way of escaping this responsibility if social stability is to be achieved and maintained. Put in its broadest terms it is as much the responsibility of industry, agriculture, and labor to participate in the development of an integrated and comprehensive program for youth as it is the responsibility of the school. The time has come for a bold attack on the problems of youth by creating and operating an adequate social mechanism through which youth can participate in the life of the community, the state, and the nation.

Technical and vocational education will become more and more theoretical and most of the work in vocational education will be carried on in the post high school years through junior colleges and other forms of continuing education and through industry itself. This means that high schools will tend to concentrate their efforts on the teaching of basic concepts and theories essential to the technical occupations. In other words, basic studies such as science and mathematics as well as language and the social sciences will be emphasized more and more in the high schools and will be organized and taught in such a way that all children regardless of their social status will be able to acquire them. Only by becoming familiar with such basic knowledge can individuals who are now living in culturally disadvantaged areas come to have the opportunity of participating in a broader and more meaningful social existence.

It is becoming quite clear also that the schools of the future will provide for all sorts of specialized services. This extension of school services means that teachers will be more highly specialized and that more specialized and highly trained personnel in counseling and guidance, in psychological and social work, in recreation, and all sorts of adult and community services will be provided.

The time is close upon us when the police and the courts, the church, the schools, and countless other agencies and organizations will be working as a team to provide a consistent environment within which our youth can identify itself with significant social activities and goals. To take its proper place on such a team the school must be staffed with personnel that is able to grasp the total picture of community life as well as serve the various specialized functions that the school must necessarily provide in this period of extreme urbanization.

To carry on an adequate educational program along the lines just suggested will require a reorganization of the school system at the local and state levels. With an increasing participation of the federal government in the financing of education as well as in curriculum development and instruction, it will become necessary for the local units to increase their size and power. If this is not done, it is only natural that the influence of local school officials in decision and policy making will be reduced almost to the point of extinction as federal influence increases.

A NATIONAL VIEW OF SCHOOL DISTRICT PATTERNS

R. L. Johns, University of Florida

The number of basic school administrative units or school districts has been reduced from 127,000 in 1931 to 25,000 in 1966. Despite this great reduction in the number of school districts during the past 35 years we still have as wide a range in organizational absurdities today as existed at the beginning of this century. For example, we have school districts which enroll no pupils and we have other districts that enroll more than one million pupils. We have one-teacher school districts, elementary school districts, high school districts, junior college districts, unified elementary-high school districts, union districts, intermediate districts, consolidated rural districts, township districts, town districts, suburban districts, city districts, and some territory not assigned to any school district. In fact, we have one state, Hawaii, with no local school districts. Insofar as school districts are concerned, you name it and we have it!

Despite the assumed improvement in school district organization during the past 35 years, the school district organization that existed in 1900 was probably more functional or at least as functional for that time as the district organization that exists in 1966. Certainly the one-teacher school district was far more functional in 1900 than in 1966 but we still have thousands of one-teacher school districts. The problem of school district organization in metropolitan areas hardly existed in 1900, but today that problem probably affects a greater number of pupils than any other problem in school district organization.

As a background to a national view of school district organization, let us consider the following basic questions:

1. What is the legal basis for school organization?
2. Are school districts really necessary or desirable?
3. If school districts are retained in our organizational scheme, what type of school district will probably be most functional in the years ahead?
4. What is the most effective method of reorganizing school districts?

Let us first examine the legal basis for school organization. The Tenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States provides: "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively or to the people." Since education was not mentioned in the Constitution, it has generally been assumed that the basic responsibility for public education lies with the states. However, Clause I of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution provides that: "The

Congress shall have the power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States....." Although this clause of the Constitution deals with many other important matters, it is commonly known as the "general welfare clause."

Numerous court decisions on many matters through the years have given Congress the power to take action on practically any matter when Congress decides that it affects the public welfare provided it does not act arbitrarily. Education, especially in recent years, has been deemed by Congress to be an important factor affecting not only the general welfare but also the common defense. Proof of this fact is seen in the federal budget for fiscal 1967 which provides approximately \$8,400,000,000 in appropriations for education, training, and related programs. Most of these funds are allocated to the states or local educational institutions and agencies. However, a substantial part of this appropriation is expended directly by the federal government for schools, colleges, and educational programs operated by the federal government. These educational activities of the federal government have not been successfully challenged in the courts nor are they likely to be so challenged. The Supreme Court in an opinion dealing with the Social Security Act declared: "nor is the concept of general welfare static. Needs that were narrow or parochial a century ago may be interwoven in our day with the well-being of the Nation. What is critical or urgent changes with the times."¹

It has long been recognized that the States did not have the power to pass any law or to adopt any constitutional provision which denies any citizen the rights guaranteed to him in the United States Constitution. It has not been generally recognized, however, that the federal government has the power, if it deemed it essential for the general welfare, to establish a complete federal system of elementary, secondary, and higher education. If the states abolished their systems of public education, which was threatened by some of the Southern states following the 1954 decision of the Court abolishing school segregation by race, the federal government would no doubt establish a federal system of public education. This point is emphasized because it is sometimes assumed that the states have the exclusive right to operate public schools. Legally, the states have the responsibility and the authority to establish and operate schools and colleges. The federal government also has the legal authority to operate schools and colleges. The extent to which the federal government exercises that power depends to a large degree upon the extent to which the states discharge their responsibilities for providing educational opportunities.

¹Helvering v. Davis, 301 Cr. S619, 57 SUP. CT. 904.

Let us now consider the basic legal powers and responsibilities of local school districts. A local school district has no legal powers and responsibilities except those given to it by the state. School districts are created by the state, therefore, there is no inherent power of local school government. If a state creates school districts it has the responsibility of creating local school district organization that is functional. There has been considerable improvement in local school district organization in recent years. However, most school districts in the United States are still too small to be efficient. Despite recent progress, 85 to 90 percent of the school districts in the United States should be reorganized. The most urgently needed educational change in many states is for the state to accept its responsibility for creating a functional local school organization. This is not likely to be accomplished by wishful thinking. It will require strong educational leadership and courageous action on the part of the legislature and the governor of a state.

Are school districts really necessary or desirable?

There are some authorities who believe that local school districts have outlived their usefulness. The most outspoken of these critics of local school districts is Myron Lieberman. He would not only do away with local school districts but he would also abolish state control of public education and establish a national system of education. In his book, The Future of Public Education, Lieberman made the following statement:²

One of the most important educational trends in the next few decades is likely to be the decline of local control of education. Such a development is long over due. Local control of education has clearly outlived its usefulness on the American scene. Practically, it must give way to a system of educational controls in which local communities play ceremonial rather than policy-making roles. Intellectually, it is already a corpse. At least, I propose to treat it as such in this book. The proper way to treat a corpse is to conduct an autopsy upon it and then bury it promptly. Having done this, we can better understand the rationale for the school system which will emerge from the present chaos in education.

An autopsy of local control reveals several reasons for its demise. In the first place, mobility and interdependence have completely undermined the notion that local communities ought to have a free hand in educating their children. Second, national survival now requires educational policies

²Myron Lieberman, The Future of Public Education, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1960, p. 34.

and programs which are not subject to local veto. Third, it is becoming increasingly clear that local control cannot in practice be reconciled with the ideals of a democratic society. Finally, local control is a major cause of the dull parochialism and attenuated totalitarianism that characterizes public education in operation.

Professor Campbell, Dean of the College of Education of the University of Chicago, while not advocating the discontinuance of all school districts, has questioned the value of the folklore of localism. In a paper on "Processes of Policy Making Within Structures of Educational Government" presented in a seminar at the University of Illinois in 1959, Campbell made the following statement:³

But the myth has outlived the fact. Free land is gone, the rural predominance has vanished, industrialization has taken over, cities have spawned, mass media bring immediately every world altercation to all eyes and ears, man circles the globe in hours, and competitors have planted a rocket on the moon. These technological changes have their social, economic, and political repercussions. Complete local government in today's world is an anachronism.

Campbell stated that this folklore of localism causes state and federal policy to take strange forms. "Usually, at the state level, policy tends to be formulated in terms of minimums and the state agency's role in implementation becomes one of regulation or enforcement of these minimums.....At the federal level, conditions are even more deplorable. Seemingly in order to perpetuate the myth of localism, policy is fragmentary and diffused." He glumly concluded: "The national government pretends not to make policy, the state governments cannot make adequate policy."

Professor Benson, an economist at the University of California at Berkeley in a book entitled, The Cheerful Prospect, published in 1965, argues that the minimum size of school district should be set at a total population of 250,000 except in the most sparsely settled areas. This policy if adopted would reduce the number of school districts in the United States from 25,000 to approximately 600. Professor Benson commented as follows:⁴

³William B. McLure and Van Miller, eds., Government of Public Education for Adequate Policy Making, Urbana, Ill: Bureau of Educational Research, College of Education, University of Illinois, 1960, p. 67.

⁴Charles S. Benson, The Cheerful Prospect. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1965, pp. 44-45.

There is good reason to be concerned about the continued existence of thousands of fantastically small school districts, namely, that many of them represent islands of privilege; they are districts whose boundaries have been drawn to produce high property values for each resident pupil. The local share of the education bill is paid primarily from taxation of the real property located in the district. Hence, the power of some districts to include estates or large industrial holdings within their boundaries but to exclude high-density residential areas allows those districts to provide expensive educational programs at extremely low tax rates. The other result, of course, is that the poorer districts (in terms of local real property base) must levy taxes at high rates in order to finance even a minimum program. The gerrymandering of the real property base excludes a substantial portion of local wealth from the support of schools. Where extremely small districts exist, the state governments, moreover, have been unable to compensate effectively for the variations in property tax base per pupil by the use of such devices as grants-in-aid.

As has already been pointed out, the State of Hawaii, has not created any local school districts. No country in Europe, with the exception of England, has established local school districts. But a number of European countries have good school systems. Therefore, there is no necessity for having local school districts and there are some people who believe that local school districts are not even desirable.

Are local school districts really desirable? In my opinion properly organized local school districts are desirable. However, it is not as easy as it might seem, to establish the validity of my position. When I was a graduate student at Columbia University I heard an internationally known churchman, Rabbi Wise, lecture on the subject, "Has religion been more beneficial than harmful to humanity." After analyzing the evidence in a two-hour lecture, he concluded that religion had been slightly more beneficial than harmful to humanity. I am not quite as skeptical of the value of school districts as Rabbi Wise was of the value of religion.

In taking the position that properly organized school districts are desirable, I make the following assumptions:

1. That there is no inherent right to local self-government in schools.
2. That school districts are established to provide educational opportunities for students and not for the purpose of providing experiences in government for adults or jobs for school administrators.

3. That school districts should not be used to make educational opportunities unequal and at the same time make tax burdens onerous in some districts and negligible in other districts.
4. That school districts should not be used to strengthen the barriers between caste and class.
5. That school districts should be large enough to provide for reasonable economies of scale in operation but not so large as to result in an unwieldy and unadaptive bureaucracy.
6. That school districts should facilitate and not hinder the activities of state governments and the federal government in providing educational opportunities.

I have already pointed out that education is a state responsibility. Therefore, there is no inherent right for local self-government in schools. It follows then that the state and not the people of different areas of the state should take the responsibility of creating and setting the boundaries of school districts.

It has been argued that we should retain large numbers of local school districts in order to provide more opportunities for citizens to participate in democratic government. Just as frequently however these small districts have provided the opportunity for little, narrow-minded dictators to impose their will on the schools to the detriment of the education of the children. It has also been argued that the greater the number of districts, the greater the number of opportunities for local educational leadership and hence, the faster the rate of educational progress. If that argument is sound, South Dakota should have the most advanced school system in the nation because it has the greatest number of districts in proportion to its population. That school districts have been used to create islands of poverty and islands of wealth is a fact so well known that we need not dwell on it at length. Differences in per capita wealth of school districts in states with large numbers of school districts are very great. This results in tax havens for some rich individuals and corporations and onerous tax burdens for others. Small districts of this type sometimes segregate caste and class and further strengthen the barriers to social mobility. For example, in one mid-western state there is a suburban school district in which only people of the Negro race live. Within the same county are other districts inhabited almost entirely by whites which have a per capita valuation as much as nine times the valuation of the district in which Negroes are segregated.

It has long been recognized that a school district should be sufficient in size to provide for economies of scale in operation. That principle is universally accepted in business and industry. Economy of scale means that a district should be large enough to provide a broad program of high quality educational services with high quality

educational leadership at a per pupil cost which is comparable with districts of larger size. For example, data provided in National Education Association Estimates for 1965-66 show that Iowa had 693 operating school districts or an average of only 859 pupils in average daily attendance per school district. For that same year Iowa had a pupil-teacher ratio of 22 to 1, paid its classroom teachers an average salary of \$6003 and expended \$503 per pupil in ADA for current expenses. During that same year Florida had only 67 operating school districts with an average of 17,215 pupils in average daily attendance per school district. Florida had a pupil-teacher ratio of 23-1 but it paid its classroom teachers an average salary of \$6,435 and expended only \$458 per pupil in ADA current expenses.

Authorities on educational administration generally recognize that school districts can be made too large for the most efficient operation. Behavioral scientists have pointed out that the larger the organization the greater the number of echelons of control and the more complex the bureaucracy. These scientists have pointed out that increasing the number of echelons of control and the complexity of a bureaucracy increases the difficulty of communication within the organization and reduces the probability of an organization receiving the feedback required from the environment to provide needed change.

I have stated in my assumption that school districts should facilitate and not hinder the activities of state governments and the federal government in providing educational opportunities. What kinds of educational organizations do we need at the local level, at the state level and at the federal level?

Assuming that school districts are reorganized into districts of sufficient size to have the potentiality of being efficient and capable operating units, then what should be the respective roles of local school districts, the state central education agencies and the federal government? Will we continue to wrangle over the relative merits of local, state and federal control? Will the folklore of localism and states' rights prevent us from establishing educational organizations at the local, state, and federal levels adequate to meet the requirements of the times?

Considerable attention has been given recently to the concept known as "creative federalism." Opposition to the increase of state or federal control over education has been based on the traditional assumption that there is a fixed quantity of power and that if the power of one level of government is increased, automatically the power of other levels of government is decreased. It is similar to the assumption of the classical economists that there is a fixed volume of goods and

services and that if more goods and services are allocated to one sector of the economy such as education, that automatically the amount of goods and services consumed by other sectors of the economy, especially the private sector, would be reduced. This concept of the classical economists ignored the fact that in a dynamic economy, that the total volume of goods and services is never fixed but constantly growing. Therefore, the increase in the allocation of resources to investment sectors of the economy, such as education, will not reduce but actually increase the resources available to other sectors of the economy.

The concept of creative federalism is based on the assumption that the power to deal with educational problems is not a fixed quantity but that it is expanding very rapidly. The increase in the power of one level of government to deal with a particular educational problem does not reduce the power of another level of government to deal with that problem. For example, educators have known for many years that education was one of the important means by which economic and social deprivation can be reduced. But the power of the states and local school districts could not be effectively harnessed to deal with this problem until the federal government was given the power to assist in dealing with this problem. Therefore, the increase in the educational power of the federal government to deal with social and economic deprivation actually increased the power of the state and local school districts to deal with this same problem. This is what is meant by the concept creative federalism. It is a concept of partnership in which the federal, state, and local school districts operate as equals each assuming the responsibility to perform the educational functions that can be most appropriately dealt with at that level. The model for educational organization that I suggest is not a monocratic, pyramidal, bureaucratic model with the federal government at the top of the hierarchy, the states in the middle, and local school districts at the bottom of the pyramid. I am suggesting that what is needed is a strong, well-staffed, capable federal education agency interacting with strong, well-staffed, capable state education agencies in interaction with strong, well-staffed, capable local education agencies. Furthermore, each of these organizations, the federal education agency, the state educational agencies, and the local education agencies will be in continuous interaction with the decision making political power systems in their environments.

The total organizational model that I suggest cannot possibly operate with 25,000 local school districts. That number would have to be reduced to approximately 2,500 in order for local school districts to interact as peers with state education agencies and the federal education agency. This would probably require school districts with a minimum population of 50,000.

I will conclude this paper by dealing briefly with the problem of reorganizing school districts. What is the most effective method of reorganizing school districts? Experience has shown that progress in school district reorganization is very slow and frequently results in poorly conceived reorganized districts if it is accomplished by a vote of the people in the area involved. This procedure has resulted in such reorganizations as consolidating three one-teacher schools into one three-teacher school district, and thus probably preventing a desirable reorganization for another generation. I have already pointed out that education is a state responsibility and that the state has the responsibility of establishing the boundaries of local school districts. It is not good government for the state in the name of democracy to establish the laissez faire policy of saying to the people, establish your own school districts the best way you can. Some states have reorganized school districts by direct legislative act. That method has been commonly used in the southern states. For example, prior to 1947, Florida had 700 local school districts within 67 county districts. In 1947, pressure was being brought on the Legislature to double state appropriations. The Governor and certain legislative leaders raised the question of why we should try to equalize educational opportunity at the state level and then permit education to be de-equalized at the local level through the operation of hundreds of unnecessary local districts. The 1947 Florida Legislature then with only one dissenting vote passed an act consolidating all of the school districts within each county into one district thus establishing a county unit system. I am not advocating a county unit system of school organization for all states. I cite Florida only as an example of how school districts might be reorganized.

The Legislatures of Mississippi and Nevada followed the procedure of passing acts which abolished all school districts within each state for a limited period of time and then districts were reorganized in accordance with certain desirable mandatory criteria. This procedure takes courage but it has much in its favor.

District reorganization has been hindered in many states by a preponderance of legislators being elected from rural areas. Legislatures are now being reapportioned in accordance with a ruling of the United States Supreme Court requiring representation in state legislatures on the basis of one man, one vote. The implementation of this ruling should greatly increase the political feasibility of district reorganization in a number of states.

In conclusion, it is probable that the same method of reorganizing school districts may not be equally effective in all states. However, I do not believe that any method of district reorganization is likely to be effective in reorganizing school districts unless the state assumes the responsibility. This can be done by direct action on the

part of the Legislature such as was done in Florida and also in West Virginia, or the Legislature may establish a state commission with an authority to reorganize school districts in accordance with each criteria as I have described in this paper or similar criteria. It might be argued that the people themselves should first be given the opportunity to reorganize school districts in accordance with the criteria. Such a procedure has sometimes resulted in a kind of partial reorganization that made it impossible for a state commission to reorganize properly the remaining unorganized territory. Therefore, if school districts are to be reorganized properly, the state must assume the primary responsibility.

EMERGING SCHOOL DISTRICT PATTERNS IN METROPOLITAN AREAS

Luvern L. Cunningham, University of Chicago

To quote from a forthcoming volume on Metropolitanism and Education:

Some 70 percent of our people live in metropolitan areas today and the percentage is inexorably increasing year by year. The tensions, dislocations and melting pot functions of our metropolitan areas are such that the need for educational services is increasing. The rapidly increasing ghettoization and de facto segregation in metropolitan areas has, within the last two decades, become an explosive educational and civic problem. The exodus of the white population to the suburbs has accelerated the erosion of the older central cities' tax base. Local school systems and local governments must operate under archaic and shackling state constitutional systems. Finally, our urban places are in danger of losing their traditional role of civilizing the lives of our citizens, placing an additional responsibility on educators to restore that function to the city.¹

These observations provide an appropriate prelude to my remarks on metropolitan government for education. We have at the present time something like two hundred and eighteen standard metropolitan areas in the nation. We have witnessed not only the move from the hinterland to urban areas in recent decades, but we have observed as well the redistribution of populations within urban areas, including the spilling over from city boundaries into the vast peripheries of the core cities and into the surrounding countryside. Our concerns as educators must be for the apprehension of the implications of this kind of growth and population distribution for education.

There appears to be emerging a "metropolitan area consciousness." More and more of our social problems are being viewed from metropolitan perspectives rather than from the central city perspective and the suburban perspective. There appears to be a new understanding that the problems of metropolitan environments cannot be attacked singularly beginning with either the core city or its suburban fringes. It must be the metropolitan area as an entity that serves as the location for educational problem definition, attack, and solution.

¹Norman Beckman, "Metropolitan Education in Relation to State and Federal Government," in Robert Havighurst, ed., Metropolitanism and Education, (Yearbook, National Society for the Study of Education, 1968).

The new metropolitan area consciousness manifests itself in many ways. We see within the private sector growing references to the metropolitan area. For example, our public service companies such as telephone, electric and gas service systems, water, and in some cases sewage disposal systems, bus transportation systems, and the red feather or crusade of mercy programs are organized on metropolitan bases. Likewise, library systems are developing on a metropolitan basis, as are professional associations, unions, banking institutions, and parochial school organizations. Of course newspaper, radio, and television services have for decades recognized metropolitan areas or regions as their service territories.

Local school government, too, must be considered in metropolitan terms. An enumeration of just a few of many reasons would include: (1) the inability of the state to perfect systems of school finance capable of taking care of inequalities in the ability to support education; (2) the vast variations in ability to finance schooling that exist within our metropolitan areas; (3) flight of the middle class populations to the suburbs in search of improved public services and especially improved education; (4) the emotional factors which surround race and minority group problems in the core cities; (5) the lack of political access for individuals and groups in large cities; (6) the disfunctional aspects of large size which seem to mark large city school systems; (7) the fragmented and diffuse nature of suburban fringes which appear to be inefficient and ineffective in educational problem solving; (8) the absence in most metropolitan areas of an educational needs identification structure, which permits many metropolitan area educational needs to remain unidentified.

There are probably four or five broad categories into which we could fit most types of school government in metropolitan areas. These are: (1) core city-suburban district fringe--weak county unit (St. Louis, Chicago, Milwaukee, Cleveland, Omaha, Portland, Seattle, Philadelphia, Boston, Joliet, Peoria, Dayton, Columbus), (2) core city--county (Lexington--Fayette Co., Louisville--Jefferson Co., Kentucky, Washington D. C.--Montgomery Co. Md., Baltimore - Baltimore Co., Md.), (3) Metropolitan area districts (Dade Co., Florida; Nashville-Davidson Co., Tennessee), (4) Multiple Core - suburban (Twin Cities, New York City-Newark, Quad Cities - Moline, Rock Island, etc., Akron-Canton, Ohio, St. Joseph - Benton Harbor, Michigan), (5) Large City - no suburbs (Memphis, Tennessee), (6) City - county overlay (San Diego - San Diego Co., Detroit - Wayne Co., Los Angeles - Los Angeles Co.).

This brief description suggests that our metropolitan areas represent considerable variation in how they are organized governmentally to meet educational needs. It suggests too that we need to examine more thoroughly the implications of structure of educational government as far as the effective operation of schools is concerned. In developing

adequate school government, initial attention needs to be given to the elaboration of a set of values that we hope to achieve through education itself. In thinking about metropolitan area school government, there appear to be three types of values that need to be considered.²

The first set of values has to do with the school program, the heart of the school. The first program value is the achievement of program diversity in response to variation in educational need. The second program value is the achieving of structural flexibility for realizing any program advantages in economies of scale, which derive from organizational bigness or organizational smallness. A third program value relates to the ability of the school system continuously to alter and improve its program. The fourth program value is the lodging of program decision-making as near as possible to the effected constituency, in the belief that education is served best when local interests are effectively expressed and when there is a free release of local energy in support of the schools.

A second set of values has to do with the financing of education. The first financial value is the efficient aggregation of resources. The best educational government for a metropolitan area is one that can achieve efficiency in the gathering together of monies to run the schools, and that can be creative in the location of available resources not being currently applied to the support of schools. A second financial value is the equalization of the revenue burden. The problem in school system design is identifying the governmental unit or a system of units through which equality of burden can be achieved, and which at the same time does not do violence to an efficient and effective system of using resources. A third financial value is related to the perfection of mechanisms for the differential distribution of resources. A fourth financial value is the development of mechanisms for decentralizing the responsibility for defining educational programs and effectively extending the responsibility for budget construction. And a fifth financial value is to ensure the best return on each dollar invested.

The final set of values has to do with the consumer of public education. The American people have tried strenuously to keep the public schools close to the citizens of the local communities. These efforts have grown out of a conviction that local citizens are in the best position to understand local conditions, needs, aspirations and abilities to carry on public education. The growth of metropolitanism in contemporary life has made realization of this desire more difficult. The problems are those of bigness, impersonality, inability to respond to many problems, and too little time.

² Luvern L. Cunningham, Archie Dykes, James Kincheloe, and Vincent Ostrom, The Merger Issue (Louisville, Kentucky: Louisville and Jefferson County, Kentucky Public School Systems, August, 1966).

The first consumer value is the value of extending citizen participation or consumer opportunity for effecting educational policy making. We would say then that an adequate school government is one that develops and continues to refine an extended structure for citizen participation. The second consumer value involves acknowledging and responding to the variation in consumer demand for education. The need is for school government for metropolitan areas that will be sensitive to differences and demands to the point that citizens can agree to support schools differentially if they choose to do so, and possess the machinery of government which will administer variation in demand.

The design of a school system for a large metropolitan area needs to deal with both the big and the small and needs to recognize the commonality of interests of the metropolitan community, and the diversity of interests among neighborhood communities. A metropolitan school government then must provide the structural flexibility to encourage and permit imaginative people to exercise creative entrepreneurship in the provision of quality educational services necessary to meet the growing demands of a technologically advanced society.

An Example of Metropolitan School Government

In August of this year a team of university-based scholars made recommendations to the Louisville and Jefferson County, Kentucky boards of education in regard to a new pattern of educational government for that metropolitan area.³ In keeping with the program, financial, and consumer values above, a team of university people recommended a mixed pattern of educational government for that metropolitan area. Briefly, the new design calls for the creation of a metropolitan education district covering the entire metropolitan area, as well as the establishment of a number of local community, semi-independent districts with their own boards of education. The Metropolitan Education District would be governed by a nine-member metropolitan education commission to be elected from the metropolitan area. The commission would have strong fiscal powers, whereas the local school district boards would be responsible for operating the schools of the region.

The establishment of a number of semi-independent local school districts is designed to bring schools closer to the people and to offer citizens increased opportunity to participate in educational policy making. Interviews which were conducted with many community leaders in the metropolitan area indicated an intense desire on their part to be involved in school affairs, especially in ways that would permit them genuine opportunities to effect the direction in which schools were moving in the metropolitan region.

³Ibid.

The recommendations, the study team argued, combine the advantages to be achieved through consolidation of the districts of Louisville and Jefferson County with the advantages that are present in small school districts. The new pattern of metropolitan educational government separates fiscal control from everyday management of schools, permitting the metropolitan education commission to focus on problems of school finance while the local community districts give their attention to the development of the strongest educational programs possible.

The study recommends further that a top level charter committee be appointed to develop legislation, which could be introduced into the next session of the Kentucky legislature, to establish the Metropolitan Education District and the machinery for creating the local community districts. A fifteen member committee to serve as the charter committee would be selected from the Louisville and Jefferson County areas.

The Metropolitan Education District would have responsibility for providing basic school support necessary to finance the educational programs of the local districts, plus special needs funds to assist local districts with educational problems that demand extra money. The Metropolitan District would also assume responsibility for all school construction, some special educational programs, a school construction division, a research and planning division, and centralized services such as data processing, purchasing, warehousing and the like.

It was emphasized in the report that school costs in metropolitan areas will grow in the future. New educational needs are being defined continuously, the populations in most metropolitan areas are continuing to grow, the costs of school housing and instructional materials are mounting, and the need for substantially increased salaries for personnel in the metropolitan areas were cited as reasons for expanding educational costs.

The Louisville and Jefferson County boards voted unanimously in August to implement this pattern of school government. It is precedent-setting in the sense that it separates, to a considerable degree, fiscal problems for operational problems. It is also precedent-setting in the sense that it calls for the breaking up of the Louisville Public Schools and the Jefferson County Public Schools into several semi-independent local community school districts. The problems of defining these local district boundaries are staggering, to say the least. The questions of racial composition of the new districts, ethnicity, economic homogeneity, and natural and man-made barriers are also difficult to solve. The boards of education and the citizens are now wrestling with these issues, and the school boards have committed themselves, at this point, to the implementation of this governmental design.

The issues which prompted the recommendations for Louisville seem to be similar to the questions regarding school government in other metropolitan areas; they are growing in importance throughout the nation. The problems, although always somewhat unique in each case, have certain common bases. There is interest in rethinking educational government in many metropolitan areas throughout the country. Schoolmen's Day, 1966, is one kind of evidence. A similar meeting in Denver two weeks from now is another kind of evidence. A meeting in Chicago a month ago, sponsored by Harvard University, is still another kind of evidence. It would be inappropriate to recommend that the Louisville-Jefferson County pattern of government be adopted in wholesale fashion throughout the nation. But I do believe that some of the thinking which went into that set of recommendations is applicable to other parts of the country and to urban area problems in many places.

In summary, I would urge professional educators and interested laymen to look seriously at the questions involved in governing metropolitan areas for educational purposes. I would also urge that we not examine educational government for metropolitan areas without incorporating the needs of the rest of the state. I would further observe that Minnesota is ahead of many areas, since it has moved forward in the development of regional educational research and development councils. These councils are linking together population centers of some consequence and incorporating within them some of the needs of smaller communities at the same time. They could be the forerunners of regional educational districts throughout the state and could meet some of the values of criteria for sound educational government which I suggested earlier in this presentation. Finally, I believe that each state should develop special study commissions to think through metropolitan area educational problems relevant to that state. Because of the uniqueness of each standard metropolitan area, there needs to be individual attention directed to each set of circumstances. A national study commission would not do the job, except at a very general and superficial level. We have a long way to go to create structures of educational government sufficient to meet disparate needs. Somehow we must meet the challenge.

STATUS OF SCHOOL DISTRICT REORGANIZATION IN MINNESOTA

Otto E. Domian, University of Minnesota

In order to place the current status of school district organization in proper perspective it is useful to examine its historical development. School district organization has been of concern to the citizens of Minnesota since territorial days.

As early as 1849 the first territorial legislative assembly established a school district in each township as soon as it had at least five families. In 1861, after Minnesota became a state, the Legislature set up a revised form of township school district organization. The township, however, proved to be too large for the travel conditions of pioneer days. As a result, the Legislature delegated authority to the county commissioners to establish such school districts as might be needed, provided that no district could be smaller than four sections. Lowry Nelson, in his book, The Minnesota Community, makes this comment regarding the size of early school districts: "The unit of measurement of the school district was the day's journey of a child six years of age." Thus it may well be said that the length of the legs of a six-year old child became a prime criterion in establishing Minnesota School districts.

With the growth of villages and cities, the common school district with its eight grades of school proved to be inadequate. As a result, the Legislature created independent school districts and permitted the establishment of high schools. Thus a dual system developed, with thousands of common school districts giving a limited program through the eighth grade and a much smaller number of districts providing elementary and secondary education. By the 1940's, a record number of almost 8,000 districts had been established.

The proliferation of small districts has been a matter of concern for more than fifty years. The school district consolidation law of 1911 was an early attempt to create more adequate districts. Some consolidated districts were created but progress was relatively slow. It was not until the school reorganization law was passed in 1947 that district reorganization received its major impetus. The law permitted counties to establish survey committees to study district organization and propose plans for reorganization. Based on this legislation, 63 counties established county survey committees. Under the leadership of these committees the number of school districts was substantially reduced. Unfortunately, the reduction was limited to apportioning the common school districts among the districts operating high schools.

The major emphasis was on reducing the number of districts; practically no consideration was given to the necessity of creating sound districts. The same legislation also created a State Advisory Committee on School District Reorganization. This committee of 9 members, appointed by the State Board of Education for six-year terms, has been a continuing factor in working toward more effective school district organization. As early as 1947, it described the desirable school district as having "a school population sufficiently large to provide an adequate and economical educational program to meet the needs and abilities of all children through the secondary school years."

The most recent legislative impetus to school district reorganization was the 1963 law requiring districts which have not been operating schools to be attached to districts maintaining schools. On July 1, 1966, some 500 such districts, in which the citizens had failed to act, were legislated out of existence.

As a result of this historical development, Minnesota now has a variety of district organizations, with the number of districts constantly changing. By July 1, 1966, the number of districts had declined to 1,371. As of November 10, an additional 51 districts had disappeared.

Diversity is the prime characteristic of Minnesota school districts. There are extreme variations in the amount of area, the wealth per pupil, the number of pupils enrolled, and the scope of the educational program. The districts can readily be divided into two groups, based on the nature of their educational program. In 1965-66, 454* districts provided elementary and secondary school programs and 921 limited their program to the elementary grades. These 921 districts were primarily common school districts; 737 of them operated a one-teacher school. In 143 of these schools, fewer than ten pupils were enrolled. Although these districts constitute 80 per cent of all Minnesota districts, less than six per cent of all public school pupils live within their boundaries.

The districts with elementary schools only are concentrated in relatively few areas. In 17 counties there are no such districts; 48 counties have five or less such districts. Three counties, Stearns with 97 districts operating elementary schools only, Ottertail with 85 and Todd with 53, have made little progress in district reorganization. Strong support exists for legislation at the 1967 session to abolish all districts operating elementary schools only.

*In two of these districts the secondary school does not extend through the twelfth grade.

The districts with elementary and secondary schools differ greatly in the number of pupils enrolled. Based on 1965-66 secondary enrollments, they range in size from fewer than 100 students to more than 31,000. The 452 districts which operated schools through the twelfth grade are distributed by secondary school enrollment as follows:

<u>Secondary School Enrollment</u>	<u>Number of Districts</u>
Under 150	49
150-199	56
200-249	48
250-299	44
300-399	61
400-499	46
500-699	41
700-999	38
1,000-1,499	21
1,500-2,499	21
2,500 & over	27

There is no magic secondary school enrollment figure which determines whether a district is of adequate size. Many educational leaders hold that no district should have fewer than 300 secondary students; others state a comprehensive program is not economically feasible with fewer than 600 secondary students; and some place the minimum enrollment substantially higher. Applying the standard of at least 300 students, almost one-half (197) of Minnesota districts with high schools would not be acceptable. Regardless of the standard that is accepted, it is evident that Minnesota has many districts which are much too small to provide an effective program in an economical manner.

Many communities are recognizing this need for larger school districts. In various sections of the state, citizens in districts operating high schools have been studying the educational, financial, and community effects of consolidation. Some mergers have already been completed and others are pending. Every precaution needs to be taken to insure consolidations that are large enough to achieve the desired goals.

Districts with elementary schools only or those with small secondary school enrollments are not the only districts facing serious problems. The metropolitan and suburban districts may not be afflicted with the restrictions of small enrollments, but their problems are no less serious. The exodus to suburbia has left the metropolitan centers with some critical unsolved problems and has resulted in a haphazard array of suburban districts. New approaches are needed in both types of districts.

Minnesota also has a limited number of special districts. Such districts as Minneapolis, Rochester, Duluth, Winona, and South St. Paul operate under special charters which specify the conditions under which each school system must function. Often these charters have hindered school district reorganization in the area and placed other restrictions on the district. The need for any special district designation may well be questioned.

Another phase of school organization in Minnesota relates to the intermediate district. The county superintendent served some of these functions in earlier years when Minnesota had thousands of districts operating elementary schools. In general, each county had a superintendent who provided various services to the districts. Lake County and Cook County were exceptions; each county comprises one school district and the superintendent is the administrator of the entire school system. In a few counties, such as Cass and St. Louis, a mixed organization existed. Certain areas of the county, not desired by any established school district, were combined into an "unorganized territory," which functioned as an operating school district. The county superintendent in each of these counties had a dual role; he served as the administrator of the school system in the "unorganized territory" and performed the usual functions of the county superintendency for the other districts in the county.

The county superintendent in Minnesota is fast disappearing. In 42 counties a county administrator has replaced the county superintendent. In ten of these counties, the Commissioner of Education serves as the county administrator; in the other 32 the superintendent of one of the operating districts performs that function. Excluding Lake and Cook counties, which are operating school districts, this leaves only 43 counties with county superintendents. In eight or nine of these, there were no candidates for the office at the November election. Thus by January, 1967, there will be only 35 county superintendents. If the 1967 legislature abolishes the districts operating only elementary schools, the county superintendency may disappear completely.

With the demise of the county superintendency, the question may well be raised whether some other organizational unit is needed. Wisconsin has divided the state into 19 intermediate units, each directed by an administrator serving under a separate board. Each unit is financed by a combination of state appropriation and service charges collected from the participating districts. In Minnesota some of these same services have been provided by school study councils. The Educational Research and Development Council in the Minneapolis-St. Paul metropolitan area has been functioning for several years. Other councils, such as those centered at Duluth, St. Cloud, and Morris, have been established recently with major assistance from federal funds. These

councils, as voluntary organizations of school systems, have no assurance of permanence. Districts may fail to renew their memberships. Many districts do not belong to any council; other districts may be located in an area served by two or more councils. Regional offices of the State Department of Education may be another method of providing the specialized services often associated with intermediate units. Minnesota has already established regional offices to process applications for federal programs and for some other purposes. With all these variations existing now, there is no certainty regarding the future of the intermediate unit in Minnesota.

It is evident from this resumé that the present organization of public education poses major problems to the citizens of Minnesota. The large number of districts operating elementary schools, the many small high schools, and the metropolitan, suburban, and special districts are areas of concern. The role of the intermediate district must be determined. Whether an intermediate unit is developed, or whatever form it may take, is secondary to establishing a sound system of school district organization. It is hoped that the criterion of "a school population sufficiently large to provide an adequate and economical educational program to meet the needs and abilities of all children through the secondary school years," as voiced by the State Advisory Committee on School District Reorganization, will be applied rather than the criterion of "the length of the legs of a six-year old," used in early statehood days.

SCHOOL DISTRICT ORGANIZATION: NUMBER ONE
EDUCATIONAL PROBLEM IN MINNESOTA

Duane J. Mattheis, Commissioner of Education

School district organization in Minnesota looms as one of the greatest deterrents to educational progress in the state. At the latest count only two states, Nebraska and South Dakota, had a larger number of school districts than Minnesota. Of the 1,324 school districts in the state 870 maintain only elementary educational programs and 685 maintain a single one-room elementary school. The difficulties in developing an educational program that has the desired depth and breadth when a single teacher has the responsibility for students in four, six or eight grades are obvious. The best teacher in the best school district feels it challenges her every talent and effort to provide a satisfactory quality of instruction to students in one grade. In almost every instance it is impossible for the common school district to provide curricular offerings in science, mathematics, physical education and special education that meet the needs of today's young people. In many instances the textbooks and equipment meet only minimum standards and other resources such as library books and reference books are non-existent. The consolidation of all area in Minnesota into a school district offering an instructional program for grades 1 - 12 is of the highest priority. Every effort must be made for the enactment of legislation by the 1967 session of the Minnesota State Legislature to achieve this goal by July 1, 1969.

Important as the consolidation of all area in the state into a high school district is, it is only the first step toward the ultimate goal of consolidation of many of the small high school districts in the state into larger administrative units that will provide the necessary opportunities for a better quality of instructional program at the high school level. In 1966-67 over 200 junior-senior high schools, grades 7-12, are operating in the state with total enrollments of less than 300 pupils. The inability of the small high school to provide the necessary quality of instruction in advanced science, mathematics, foreign language, music, art, vocational education and special education is well documented. It is becoming increasingly difficult for the small high schools to secure administrative and teaching personnel (the 1966-67 school year was started with seven school districts having a vacancy in the position of superintendent of schools). Scheduling and administrative procedures dictate that many teachers in small high schools must teach in subject matter areas for which they have only a minimal, and in many instances, complete lack of professional preparation. These conditions, prevalent in too many of the three hundred smallest high schools in the state, must be corrected if the young people attending these schools now and in the future are to be provided with educational opportunities suitable to help them meet the challenges of the world in which they will live.

In order to initiate specific and concrete school district organization planning, the Department of Education has contracted with the Bureau of Field Studies of the University of Minnesota to do the most comprehensive statewide study of elementary and secondary education in the history of the state. The study will (1) identify the educational program that should be available to every child attending the public schools, (2) determine what type of school district organization will be necessary in order to provide the educational program, and (3) examine and recommend revision for the state aid formula. The study should provide direction to the development of legislative proposals for the 1969 session of the Minnesota Legislature that would challenge the entire state to new heights of educational accomplishment. Such far-reaching educational legislation will demand the interest, involvement and support of substantial segments of the state's citizenry. The problems of the one-room school are not only the problems of the people sending their children to such a school. In a very real sense the problems of these schools, which are providing an inadequate education to young people of Minnesota, are the problems of every citizen in the state. A poor educational investment in any child is bad investment for every child. Mobility of our people indicates that in increasing numbers the young people educated in the rural one-room schools and the small high schools will not live as adults in those areas but instead will live in larger centers of population. It is the responsibility of every Minnesota citizen to demand that more nearly equal educational opportunities be available to every child attending the public elementary and secondary schools of the state. School consolidation legislation in the 1967 legislative session to eliminate school districts maintaining only elementary schools and legislation in 1969 to provide for orderly mandatory consolidation of small high schools will do a great deal to help insure equal educational opportunity to all of Minnesota's young people in the years ahead.

ASSUMPTIONS WHICH LIMIT CHOICES IN SCHOOL GOVERNMENT

Clifford P. Hooker, University of Minnesota

Most of our public statements about local school government include two basic assumptions which are seldom subjected to inspection or debate. First, it is assumed that the process of education can move forward only when there is a daily confrontation between learners and teachers, both on a full-time basis. Groups of 25 to 30 pupils per teacher in classrooms which are put in a container called a school, with schools grouped together into a school system; these are the essential elements of a structure for public education as viewed by both advocates and opponents of school district enlargement. The major issues are limited to the size of the school and the number of schools which should be grouped together as a school system. While the number of districts has been reduced drastically in recent years, the controversy seems to be far from ended. Professor Johns, elsewhere in this journal, states that the organization for education in 1900 was probably more functional for that time than the district organization that exists today.

Secondly, the assumption that genuine education is the exclusive role of government, especially state government, is also common to most of the literature on school district reorganization. Evidences of this assumption can be found in the often repeated legal cliché "education is a function of the state". Also, much of the concern in state capitols about federally administered Title III projects which bypass state departments of education and Title II grants which provide for a sharing of instructional supplies with private schools can be traced to the premise that the states have the exclusive right to operate public schools.

The assumption that a school is a daily meeting place for teachers and students imposes two serious restrictions on the structure for public education. First, it virtually demands that students attend school relatively close to home. The neighborhood school in the cities and small attendance units in rural areas have been developed in response to this demand. While this pattern of attendance has much in its favor, and it did serve the nation well during a previous era, its continuation is now subject to serious question. The problems associated with the low density of population in rural areas are extremely grave for persons who are interested in offering a full range of courses and services to students. The cities and suburbs have encountered quite a different problem with neighborhood schools. Homogeneous living patterns have produced economic and racial segregation in the schools.

A second problem associated with the traditional concept of a school pertains to the nature of the teaching staff which must be available daily. Since education under this concept is a full-time occupation for teachers as well as students, only persons who are able and willing to meet five or more classes daily can make maximum contributions to the instructional program. Moreover, teachers are limited to employment in a single school building or certainly, one school district. Highly skilled and educated adults who would be willing to work only a few days per month are discouraged from seeking employment in most schools. Since practically all teachers are expected to teach the same groups of students daily, in most cases for a full year, teachers are forced into becoming generalists. Few have the time to extend their knowledge of the subjects they teach far beyond the completion of the undergraduate college major. Nuclear physicists, geneticists, linguists, and other highly specialized persons are rarely found in an American high school.

Beginning with a different assumption about the nature of a school, alternate patterns of organization begin to emerge. For example, if one views a school as simply a place where people and ideas converge, the "schoolhouse" is not necessarily a building. Places to learn are where people are. As more educational services are distributed to more people with a greater range of abilities and interests, then there must be more distribution points. Through wide use of a new technology, including television, tele-lecture, radio, films, tapes, libraries, computers, programmed instruction and dozens of educational media and "filling stations" yet to be developed, teaching and learning can move ahead in a variety of settings with the teacher and the learner separated by thousands of miles in distance and possibly years of time.

Students can enroll in a multitude of schools or programs, and truly expert teachers can work for short periods of time in many cities and states. While the new technology and independent study would be used widely in this approach to learning, frequent personal contact between teachers and students would be possible through vastly improved systems of transportation. Regular commuting to points several hundred miles apart is entirely reasonable and practiced now by some persons in business and education. One professor at the University of Chicago has an academic appointment at the University of Kansas City. Another Chicago professor commutes weekly to London where he teaches a class. Of course, further development of telestar satellites will all but eliminate the necessity for the professor to leave his office on the Chicago campus or home in the Rocky Mountains as he chooses. People and ideas will converge as his students in London turn on the television sets in their homes.

Besides the confining box-place of education, the patterns of financial support and compulsory attendance have tended to perpetuate the traditional school concept. Students must attend daily if the local district is to receive the maximum amount of state support. Moreover, since a very large share of the support for the cost of education comes from local property taxes, only children whose parents reside in the district may attend school. Others are classified as tuition students and may be admitted or rejected at the option of the receiving district. This out-moded concept of educational finance stands squarely in the path of developing new and imaginative approaches to total education for persons of all ages.

Viewing the operation of public schools as the exclusive right of the several states was mentioned earlier as a deterrent to logical school organization. This problem becomes clear when one observes the relationship between the typical state department of education and the large city schools. Few, if any, state education agencies are organized or staffed to be on any real assistance to metropolitan school systems. Yet chief state school officers view with alarm the inclination of city school officials and their boards of education to seek direct assistance from the federal government. The concept of a creative federalism of local, state, and federal efforts to improve education is not accepted by those who view the operation of public schools as the exclusive right of state government. State rightists seem to ignore the political truism that when one level of government fails to satisfy the needs of citizens, such citizens will seek a remedy from the next higher level of government. Hence, those who would strengthen the role of the state in public education by stubborn defense of the fiction that the state government has a monopoly have accomplished precisely the reverse. City schools have sought and received aid from the federal government without much encouragement from the state. Thus the impact of the state on education in the large cities has been greatly diminished because of its failure to join with the city schools in presenting their unique needs to the federal government.

The end product of trends already established is somewhat clear. If state education agencies continue to concentrate on the needs of rural schools, the city schools can be expected to develop an increased reliance on the federal government. Unless this trend is reversed, state education agencies of the future will serve a function not unlike that formerly performed by the fast vanishing office of the county superintendent. Consequently, state education agencies are contributing to their own demise in their defense of an exclusive role in public education.

The best uses of present and prospective advances in educational technology cannot be realized within the limitations of many of our basic assumptions about the appropriate structure for public education. Moreover, large segments of our adult population who wish to continue their education on a part-time basis cannot be accommodated best in school districts which were established to serve a very narrow purpose. The function of local school systems and state education agencies along with our methods of financing will have to be modified to encourage the development of regional and national educational communications systems. These multipurpose electronic links for schools and colleges would foster institutional cooperation in the use of the technology. They would provide teachers with a large repertory of the highest quality presentations of ideas and specific curricular materials. The teacher would then take on a new role and achieve a new importance. Instead of delivering the same hastily prepared lecture to five classes per day, the teacher would be able to devote several days or even weeks to the development of one outstanding presentation to be filmed or taped and presented and revised as needed. Box-place education and the blind defense of the exclusive role of state government in public education must be rejected in favor of a new era of educational opportunity for all.

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA ACTIVITIES AT A.A.S.A. CONVENTION

Minnesota Luncheon

The Department of Educational Administration in cooperation with the Minnesota Association of School Administrators will again sponsor the Minnesota Luncheon to be held in the Ozone Room of the Hotel Dennis, 12:00 noon, Sunday, February 11, 1967, in Atlantic City, New Jersey.

Mr. John Prasch, Executive Director, Upper Midwest Regional Educational Laboratory, and former superintendent of schools, Racine, Wisconsin will address the luncheon. His topic will be "New Directions in Educational Research."

School administrators and board members attending this convention are encouraged to come to the luncheon. An invitation is also extended to all former Minnesota educators.

Reservations may be made with the Department of Educational Administration. The luncheon cost is \$5.00. Please make all checks payable to HOTEL DENNIS. Advance registrations are requested and should be mailed to 203 Burton Hall by February 9, 1967.

Headquarters Suite

The Department of Educational Administration will maintain a MINNESOTA HEADQUARTERS SUITE in the TRAYMORE HOTEL (please note change in hotels). Minnesota school administrators, board members, and alumni attending the convention are welcome to use this facility for consultation with staff members, meetings with colleagues, or simply for "coffee breaks." The headquarters suite will be open daily from 11:00 a.m. to 11:00 p.m. and will have space available for private conferences.

Dean Robert J. Keller and Professors Davis, Domian, Hooker and Mueller will be your hosts and will be assisted by seven graduate students in educational administration.

See you at the Traymore Hotel, February 11-15, 1967!

Van D. Mueller