

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 093 533

RC 007 993

AUTHOR Isenberg, Robert M., Ed.
TITLE The Community School and the Intermediate Unit.
Yearbook 1954 (Department of Rural Education).
INSTITUTION National Education Association, Washington, D.C.
Dept. of Rural Education.
PUB DATE 54
NOTE 256p.; Out of print
EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.75 HC-\$12.60 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS *Community Schools; *Educational Improvement;
Educational Opportunities; *Educational Programs;
Futures (of Society); Individual Needs; Interaction;
*Intermediate Administrative Units; *Rural Areas;
Rural Education; School District Autonomy; Student
Needs

ABSTRACT

The spirit of sharing and neighborliness has helped improve educational opportunities for rural communities through school district reorganization. As educational programs related to individual community needs are developed, the need for services beyond the reach of most local school districts is discovered. Community schools face the problem of how to get these educational services at a reasonable cost, while at the same time preserving local autonomy. The future development of educational opportunities for most schools and communities depends on: (1) the interrelationships between intermediate units and the constituent community schools, and (2) the organization and operation of the intermediate unit itself as an agency for providing educational services. This 1954 Yearbook discusses the interrelationships of community schools and intermediate units. Examples of present practices, both well established and just beginning, are given. A 17 item annotated bibliography; a brief account of the Department of Rural Education and a roster, arranged by State, of its members; and the goals for the Centennial Action Program of the United Teaching Profession are also included. (MQ)

ED 093533

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

The Community School and the Intermediate Unit

DEPARTMENT OF RURAL EDUCATION

YEARBOOK 1954

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPY-
RIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Rural Education
Association

TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING
UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL IN-
STITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRO-
DUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM RE-
QUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT
OWNER.

RC007993

ED 093533



The Community School and the Intermediate Unit

Edited by

ROBERT M. ISENBERG

YEARBOOK 1974

DEPARTMENT OF RURAL EDUCATION

NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION OF THE UNITED STATES

1201 SIXTEENTH STREET, NORTHWEST

WASHINGTON 8, D. C.

COPYRIGHT 1954

NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION OF THE UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF RURAL EDUCATION

Published by the Department of Rural Education of the National Education Association of the United States and sent free of charge to all 1954 members of the Department. Executive and editorial offices, 1201 Sixteenth Street, Northwest, Washington 8, D. C. Sale price per copy: Cloth \$5.00; Paper \$2.50. Discounts: 2-9 copies, 10%; 10-49 copies, 20%; 50 or more, 33 1/3%.

Out of Print

FOREWORD

WHEREVER rural people have been confronted with tasks which could not be accomplished by individuals acting independently, they have devised ways of uniting their efforts. This spirit of sharing and neighborliness contributed to the establishment of our early schools. More recently it has helped to bring about improved educational opportunities for rural communities through the reorganization of school districts.

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

The future development of educational opportunities for most schools and communities depends upon two basic considerations: (a) the interrelationships between intermediate units and the constituent community schools, and (b) the organization and operation of the intermediate unit itself as an agency for providing educational services. Sharing and neighborliness continue to be necessary.

There is yet much to be learned concerning community school-intermediate unit cooperation. Examples of present practices have been included to illustrate developing interrelationships. The examples reported represent programs which are well established and some which are just beginning, in both sparsely and densely populated areas. No best way has been recommended. Since communities and areas differ in their traditions, needs, and resources, these descriptions are suggestive of what can be done. They are a challenge to educational leadership.

Exploration, discussion, and experimentation are needed. From such activities can come for each community a more specific definition of community school-intermediate unit cooperation; from such activities can come better educational opportunities. Community school administrators, intermediate superintendents, specialized personnel as members of the inter-

mediate unit staff, members of state education departments, college and university professors of educational administration, and boards of education and other community groups must share responsibility. This yearbook contains many ideas and illustrations to guide action.

The officers and members of the Department of Rural Education are grateful to the Committee on Publications and Constructive Studies for their efforts in planning and preparing this yearbook and to the many others who have contributed to its development. Special recognition and thanks are due to Robert M. Isenberg for his guidance in developing the outline, for a sizeable proportion of the writing, and for all of the editorial work. His contribution has indeed been an exceptional one.

HOWARD A. DAWSON
Executive Secretary

CONTENTS

Foreword	iii
1. The Good Educational Program	1
2. The Administrative Framework for the Good Educational Program	25
3. Services Focused on the Needs of Pupils	57
4. Services To Help Teachers Meet the Needs of Pupils	87
5. Services To Facilitate the Educational Program	111
6. The Search for Direction—A Review of Current Studies	135
7. Adapting Intermediate Units To Meet Community School Needs	179
Selected Bibliography	220
The Department of Rural Education	224
Roster of Members	231
Index	255

ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF PHOTOGRAPHS

- CHAPTER 1—Department of Audio-Visual Service, San Diego County Schools, San Diego, California
- CHAPTER 2—Department of Audio-Visual Service, San Diego County Schools, San Diego, California
- CHAPTER 3—Department of Audio-Visual Service, San Diego County Schools, San Diego, California
- CHAPTER 4—Department of Audio-Visual Education, Fulton County Schools, Atlanta, Georgia
- CHAPTER 5—Photographic Service, Auburn Polytechnic Institute, Auburn, Alabama
- CHAPTER 6—Summer Workshop, Teachers College, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebraska
- CHAPTER 7—Department of Audio-Visual Service, San Diego County Schools, San Diego, California

DEVELOPMENT OF THE 1954 YEARBOOK

THE 1954 Yearbook of the Department of Rural Education, like its predecessors, is a result of the knowledge, experience, and cooperative efforts of many people. Its development has differed from most previous yearbooks, however, in at least one respect. Instead of appointing a special committee to plan and prepare this yearbook, direct responsibility was accepted by the Department's Committee on Publication and Constructive Studies:

ROBERT S. FOX, *Chairman*, Principal, University Elementary School, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor

EFFIE BATHURST, *Research in Elementary Education*, U. S. Office of Education, Washington, D. C.

BURTON W. KASITLOW, *Assistant Professor of Rural Education*, University of Wisconsin, Madison

AGLAND MCCANNON, *Manager*, Illinois Pupils Reading Circle, Lincoln

JOHN WILCOX, *Supervising Principal*, Candor Central School, Candor, New York

ROBERT M. DENBERG, *Staff Advisor*, Assistant Director of Rural Service, National Education Association, Washington, D. C.

The committee wishes to acknowledge and express its appreciation to the following persons, each of whom assumed major responsibility for the preparation of original manuscript for particular sections of this yearbook and in many other ways contributed to its development:

WINSTON BROWN, *Superintendent*, Waukesha County Schools, Waukesha, Wisconsin

FRANCIS C. DAABY, *Assistant Superintendent*, Business Services, San Diego County Schools, San Diego, California

HOWARD A. DAWSON, *Director*, Rural Service, National Education Association, Washington, D. C.

WILLIAM J. EMERSON, *Superintendent*, Oakland County Schools, Pontiac, Michigan

CECIL D. HARDENY, *Superintendent*, San Diego County Schools, San Diego, California

WILLIAM MANN, *Editorial Coordinator*, San Diego County Schools, San Diego, California

HOWARD E. WAKEFIELD, *Project Coordinator*, School-Community Development Study—CPEA, Ohio State University, Columbus

The outline for this discussion of the interrelationships of community schools and intermediate units was developed cooperatively by the committee working as a team. Manuscript for each chapter has been reviewed, critiqued, revised, and again criticized and revised into its final form. The

committee accepts responsibility for the content of each chapter and for the entire yearbook.

The committee wishes to express its appreciation to the many school administrators, teachers, and others who submitted descriptive reports of programs in which the schools in their area cooperatively share educational services. Although it has been impossible to include all of these contributions, those not included directly have served as valuable background material in the development of the several chapters.

The committee is also indebted to the members of the National Commission on the Intermediate Administrative Unit for assistance in clarifying certain aspects of the intermediate unit concept, to Daniel R. Davies, Frank W. Cyr, and the Cooperative Program in Educational Administration—Middle Atlantic Region and the cooperation of each of the other centers for assistance in providing some of the material used in the development of Chapter 5, and to Shirley Cooper, Assistant Secretary, American Association of School Administrators, Kenneth E. McIntyre, Associate Professor of Educational Administration, University of Texas, Howard G. Sackett, District Superintendent, Lewis County, New York, J. Roland Ingraham, Assistant Superintendent, Inglewood City Schools, Inglewood, California, and Lois M. Clark, Assistant Director of Rural Service, National Education Association for their valuable suggestions for revising the manuscript. The committee is also indebted to the NEA Division of Publications for assistance and guidance in production and publication.

CHAPTER 1

The Good Educational Program

THIS is a book about people and their schools. It is about education—good education—the best kind of education obtainable. It is concerned with the educational programs which communities provide and about the educational programs which they do not provide. It is primarily about small communities and their school problems. Problems that involve people and personalities—children and adults:

"What are you going to do with Harvey?"

That question pestered the school principal all day long. Mrs. Savage had called that morning because the neighbor's boy, Harvey, had been threatening her little girl.

Harvey is a mentally retarded boy. He is now 10 years old, but mentally he is about 4. He is large physically and a threat to smaller children in the neighborhood.

Many thoughts passed through the principal's mind:

Harvey is not profiting from our school program. . . . Harvey should be in a special class. . . . Mentally retarded children can be helped . . . but we can't provide a class just for Harvey.

The neighboring city school has a special class . . . but Superintendent Ford said that they have more than enough eligible children of their own . . . and, then, even if they would take Harvey, how would we get him there? . . . The cost of transportation and tuition would be tremendous.

We could exempt Harvey from school as uneducable . . . leave him for his parents to worry about. But that wouldn't solve either Harvey's or Mrs. Savage's problem.

We could start children's court action to have Harvey committed to an institution. . . . Golly, how would I feel if someone did that to a child of mine?

I guess the only thing to do is let things ride along until something really bad happens and then let the law enforcement agencies handle it. . . . We'll do what we can in school.

The morning mail was placed neatly on the superintendent's desk. Included among the correspondence, invoices, inquiries, and advertisements was a medical exemption certificate for Betty Lou.

Poor kid—another case of rheumatic fever. An excellent student, too.

The doctor's personal note read: "Severe case—may take a couple of years before Betty Lou can participate normally with groups of children. Recommend home teaching only."

The question had been raised. Can home teaching be arranged?

Let's see, we could ask one of the teachers to volunteer to do some work after school and on Saturdays. Quite a lot to ask though—two years is a long time.

We could hire Mrs. Reed who retired last year to go out there two or three times a week. We could—if we had any money to hire her with! Maybe we can provide a little in our budget next year.

Bruce wants to go to college. He has been out of high school for two years and just returned from service in Korea. He wants to study architecture. That's all fine, but where can Bruce go? His high-school record is so poor that it's doubtful that any college would accept him.

Oh, it's not that Bruce hasn't the ability to do good work. He could have had the best record in his class. But maybe that was just the trouble. Things came so easy for him that he just never did apply himself.

We can try to get him in somewhere, though. If he can't get in architecture we might get him into some other course and then he can transfer later.

We have several boys in school right now who are going to have the same problem as Bruce in a couple of years. I know their parents plan for them to go on to college, but they're just wasting their time in school.

There must be some way we could get these young people to understand that it's important to have a good high-school record. They just never seem to be concerned until they're about ready to graduate. And then it's much too late.

I wish we could provide a guidance program. I'm sure our kids are just as good as those in Maple City. But the city certainly has a corner on all the college scholarships in this county. We haven't had a scholarship student in the past seven years. And some of our young folks really need the help.

But—what was it—oh, yes, Bruce. Let's see, maybe I should get him to write for some college catalogs.

Mrs. Leftwitch called again about sending the bus up Ring Road for George and Andy. Really don't blame her for complaining. It is nearly two miles up to their place. And the boys are pretty small to walk that far every day—especially when the weather is bad.

But that bridge is just not safe enough to take the chance.

Mrs. Parker complained about Bus 17 speeding again, too. Will have to do something about that or she will have the whole PTA up in arms. And with the new building project . . . we just can't afford to . . .

Must talk to the driver again. Have been going to anyway—too many complaints about the conduct on that bus.

And better see Larry, too. He's been complaining about the clutch on No. 9 for a long time. Hope it will hold out.

I wonder if other schools have these problems? Have any of them tried having their own bus mechanic? How do they get bus drivers to understand how important their job really is? Has anyone ever tried setting up a training program for drivers? Seems like a good enough idea. . . . Wonder if the bus drivers would come.

Looks as if a lot more time needs to be spent on this thing before I make any recommendations to the board. What could I recommend anyway? Where are the facts to back up a recommendation?

We need to be thinking about bus drivers' salaries, too. . . . They've got good reason for being dissatisfied. The teachers want the board to meet with their salary committee, too.

It had been an interesting day. People from a number of states were attending the community school conference. They

spent most of the day visiting Moffitt School and talking with community leaders.

They liked what they were able to see . . . our canning center where the people come to "put up" the produce from their orchards and gardens . . . the repair shop where Vo-Ag boys and farmers bring their machinery . . . the playground and recreation program . . . the classes for adults.

They saw many of the ways our school has been serving the community . . . commented enthusiastically in fact.

But they asked questions. Some were difficult to answer. . . . Some of the visitors were not completely satisfied. What are the elementary teachers doing, one asked, to relate the curriculum to the needs and experiences of our rural children? Well . . . come to think of it . . . maybe we're not doing very much.

And what about the academic work in the high school? They wanted to know how we gear our program, so what *these children* especially need. Why, we do a lot of things. In home-making the girls have been . . . but the academic subjects. . . . I'm not so sure.

But what else can we do? We're all working day and night. There are just so many hours. How can we help teachers to know how to relate their work to the children's needs . . . to the experiences which grow out of our community life? It will take someone who has a lot more special knowledge. . . . If . . .

An instructional supervisor who really knows curriculum could help, but we can't . . . and the county hasn't any special staff, either.

Yes, it had been an interesting day. But a disturbing day. Maybe being disturbed is a good thing. The things the visitors pointed out are important. Something must be done. We must find a way.

The illustrations presented above reflect problems which exist or could exist in any and every community. How well the school is equipped to handle these and the many other kinds of problems concerns everyone.

People are interested in the school program. In every com-

munity they are anxious to help in making the best possible educational opportunities available. The children attending school are the community's children and their future is the community's concern. The community and its future are also the people's concern. The school can help in realizing their dreams and hopes and plans. The school, too, is concerned, or should be, in both the children and the community.

Is their school adequate? Is it a good school? Is it doing the kinds of things a school should do, providing the services it should provide? How can they tell? How can they help? What functions and services should the school perform? The answers to these questions depend primarily upon two factors: (a) the accepted concept of what constitutes a comprehensive educational program, and (b) the allocation of responsibility for providing the educational services needed.

SPECIFICATIONS OF A COMPREHENSIVE PROGRAM OF EDUCATION

The specifications of an educational program originate and become meaningful in relation to the educational needs of the pupils and the community served. The specifics in a program are likely to and should vary to some extent from community to community. They should be as similar or as different as the problems and resources of communities are similar or different.

For purposes of discussion the general specifications of a comprehensive program of educational opportunities and services are presented here under the following headings: (a) the elementary school, (b) the secondary school, (c) a school-community program, (d) special services focused on the needs of pupils, (e) special services which help teachers to meet the needs of pupils, and (f) administrative services. The details of each area indicated will depend upon the problems, resources, and nature of each individual community.

The Elementary School

A comprehensive program of elementary education is designed for children from kindergarten age through the sixth

grade. The program includes *as a minimum* instructional offerings in the following areas:

1. *The Fundamental Skills.* Skill in understanding and using the tool subjects (the Three R's) should be acquired by continuous and purposeful use. Direct and specific teaching for this purpose is necessary; skill in ideas and processes already understood in order to increase proficiency and assure retention is a necessary and inherent part of the curriculum.

2. *Communicating.* Provision should be made for acquiring proficiency in the language arts, especially oral and written English, reading, and an appreciation and understanding of literature. Beginnings should also be made in developing an appreciation for other modern languages.

3. *Living Together.* The school itself should be an experience in desirable social living. The sharing of experiences in group activities is important and should be looked upon and treated as an essential aspect of the curriculum. The social studies—especially history, geography, and civics (probably in a unified program of social studies rather than as separate subjects)—constitute the basic subject matter of this field.

4. *The Material and Natural Environment.* Developing an understanding of the physical world, including the physical qualities and needs of people, should be a major sector of the elementary-school curriculum. Necessary to such an understanding are subject matter and instructional activities in arithmetic, health, physical education (with emphasis on play, games, and other recreational activities of a physical nature), safety knowledge and practices, and the physical and natural sciences. Special attention should be given to the conservation of natural and human resources.

5. *Enriching and Beautifying Life.* Instruction and other activities that lead to understanding, appreciation, enjoyment, and some skill in the use of music, literature, dramatics, painting, drawing, modeling, and designing should be amply provided in the elementary-school curriculum.

6. *Manual Skills.* Appropriate instruction and other activities in the manual arts should be provided. Skill in the use of the hands should be provided through the use of tools. Activities should include simple and elementary experiences in the industrial arts—including woodworking, metal working, handicrafts, painting, electrical work, mechanical repair work, and ordinary home repairs.

7. *Citizenship.* An understanding and appreciation of United States citizenship should be developed through both instruction and experience. This should be begun in the early years of the elementary-school program and continued throughout in a manner appropriate to the developmental level of the children. It should include the traditions and ideals which undergird our form of government, the individual and group responsibilities which citizenship involve, and the attitudes and values necessary for democratic process.

Essential to the development of an adequate elementary-school program are the following:

1. Organizing and implementing the educational program through provisions for: early childhood education (especially the kindergarten); supervision that is characterized by leadership and cooperative, democratic work with teachers; a wide variety and sufficient quantity of instructional materials and supplies, textbooks and libraries; adaptations to individual differences and needs; provisions for handicapped children; and the creation of a classroom atmosphere characterized by aesthetic appearance, flexibility of arrangement, democratic relationships, purposeful activities, and responsibility and recognition for everybody.
2. Guiding pupil growth through home, school, and community relations, including parent education, desirable parent and teacher relations, parents' organizations and parent-teacher associations, and activities related to community life.
3. Guiding pupil growth through recording, evaluating, and reporting to pupils and parents.

The Secondary School

A comprehensive program of secondary education will include as a minimum the program for Grades 7 through 12. The time is rapidly approaching when the scope of secondary education may also include Grades 13 and 14. The particular plan of division of these grades for organizational purposes is not of special significance to this discussion. Organization may be 6, or 3-3, or, 3-3-2, or 2-4, or 4-4. The program through Grade 12 should certainly provide the following opportunities as a minimum:

1. *A General Program.* The attitudes, knowledges, skills, habits, and ideals developed in the elementary school should be continued in the secondary school to the end that the various abilities needed for dealing wisely with the problems of daily living will be acquired. In addition, the program should offer special opportunities to learn about the practice skills in safety, conservation of human and natural resources, family and community living, international understanding, and self-government.
2. *A College-Entrance Curriculum.* Adequate opportunities should be provided for those who expect to attend higher institutions of learning in order to extend their general education or for preparation to enter the study of law, medicine, architecture, engineering, teaching, agriculture, business administration, or other professions.
3. *Vocational Education.* Opportunities should be provided for those who expect to take additional training for semi-professional and skilled

occupations, for those who do not expect to go beyond the secondary school in their formal education, and for those who drop out before completing the twelfth grade. Such education should provide, in addition to the general program described above, the basic skills and knowledge necessary to enable those students to enter directly into employment sufficiently remunerative to provide a living and also enable them to make adjustments and acquire the new knowledge and skill necessary for advancement in their chosen occupations. The vocational curriculum should be related to any unique vocational opportunities in the area or region as well as the more usual vocational fields. For example, it might at least include:

- a. *Agriculture*: to prepare for farming, for becoming established in farming, and for farm management. Programs should be based primarily on the types of farming found in the area or region where the school is located. They should include the basic scientific information and skills in agriculture, production, management, marketing, buying, and the use and upkeep of farm equipment. For the students entering service occupations for rural people, instruction in such occupations as food and farm machinery salesmanship, dairy management, greenhouse and nursery management, and food processing is needed.
- b. *Business*: to develop economic literacy on the part of everyone in such matters as savings, investments, insurance, and the management of the family budget. Programs should be sensitive to the special needs and opportunities of the area in business employment. Instruction for the preparation of clerks, typists, bookkeepers, and stenographers should be provided as needed. Instruction related to the business problems of farm management should be included, as well as opportunities in special business problems as may be needed and desirable.
- c. *Homemaking*: (for boys as well as girls) to prepare for making and managing a superior home, including sewing, cooking, child care, nutrition, home decoration, and personal and family relationships. Special preparation for employment as cooks, chefs, seamstresses, housekeepers, practical nurses, and related occupations may well be needed.
- d. *Industry*: to prepare for a variety of semi-skilled and skilled occupations. As a minimum the program should provide occupational orientation in construction, manufacturing, and transportation, and for local service occupations such as those in the telephone system, the distribution and use of electricity, refrigeration, central heating and air conditioning, and radio and television. Small communities really need good mechanics, carpenters, and "jacks-of-all-trades."

A School-Community Program

Every school system serving rural people should conduct its program to the end that the school actually contributes to

general community improvement. Among the services that should be provided are the following:

1. *Adult Education.* Appropriate programs should be available for all adults who wish to extend their preparation in vocational fields, desire to improve their general informational or cultural knowledge and skills, or wish to develop avocations or hobbies.

2. *Library Services.* If no library is available in the community, the school may appropriately develop a service for adults as well as for the pupils in school. Where library services are available (private, county, city, or state) the school should cooperate in a manner which makes the existing services of maximum possible value to the community.

3. *Recreational Activities.* Recreational programs should be provided for all groups not otherwise provided for, through use of the school gymnasium, auditorium, playgrounds, and other facilities.

4. *Summer Activities.* Included in the school's summer program may be a play and athletics program, classes in hobbies, music, art, drama, industrial arts, handicrafts, a summer music festival, a summer dramatics festival, and (if not adequately provided for commercially) motion pictures.

Services Focused on the Needs of Pupils

Every comprehensive school program should have available from some convenient and economical sources certain well recognized and highly specialized services which are necessary to insure the effectiveness of the elementary, secondary, and school-community programs. Among these specialized services are the following which serve pupils directly:

1. *Supervision of Attendance.* Adequate records and accurate pupil accounting, adherence to state and local school-attendance laws and regulations, and social and educational case work are necessary. Such work should be performed by well prepared and experienced persons, preferably those trained and experienced as teachers and social case workers.

2. *Guidance and Counseling.* Services to pupils regarding personal, educational, and vocational needs and problems should be provided. Important adjuncts to this type of opportunity are psychological and psychiatric services by specialists in those fields.

3. *Health Services.* Specialized supervision of health instruction, medical and dental inspection, immunization, prevention and control of infections and contagious diseases, and physio-therapy, as well as a program including safety education, accident prevention, and school lunches should be available as necessary and desirable. Such services require the availability of professional personnel such as doctors, dentists, dental hygienists, school health nurses, physio-therapists, dieticians, and physical education specialists.

4. *Library Services and Materials Bureau.* Books for pupils and teachers, other printed matter, pictorial collections, models, objects, and museum exhibits are essential to an adequate educational program. In the absence of other adequate public library services for the community, the school system should provide such services. The materials indicated here are usually too numerous, too varied, and often too rare and expensive for a single school, especially a small one, to collect, store, and pay for. Competent supervision is needed for such services. Mobile units, such as the bookmobile, are usually necessary adjuncts to this service in rural areas.

Modern teaching requires a wealth of audio-visual equipment and materials. Such equipment and materials can be supplied through a central administrative or service unit under the supervision of one or more professional persons who are experienced as teachers, are expert in the operation and use of such equipment and materials, and can effectively assist teachers.

5. *Special Teachers.* Instruction and activities in such areas as art, music, physical education, manual arts, and crafts require teachers with special professional training. The special abilities of these teachers should be used to assist the regular classroom teachers both with their instruction in the particular specialized area as well as in supplementing and relating these special activities to other aspects of the curriculum. These special teachers should also provide direct instruction in the advanced courses in their respective areas. School systems having two or more relatively small schools (or two or more small school systems) may need to provide circuit or itinerant teachers who serve more than one school.

6. *Special Services and Instruction for Exceptional Children.* The number of exceptional children in many schools and communities is likely to be so small that the districts concerned cannot afford the financial cost of giving these pupils the educational opportunities that they need and that society needs them to have. Neither can their special needs be ignored. An estimate of the extent of handicaps is reflected in the following Table 1.

Excluding the hard of hearing, many of whom with some special assistance may fully participate with normal children, it is certain that at least 12.5 percent of the school population may be expected to have definite handicaps. In many instances the services needed will have to be provided by some administrative or service unit larger than the local school.

Services Which Help Teachers Meet the Needs of Pupils

A clear delineation with respect to the benefits of any particular specialized service is difficult since in most instances a

TABLE 1.—ESTIMATED PERCENT AND NUMBER OF EXCEPTIONAL CHILDREN FOUND IN THE SCHOOL POPULATION¹

Percent	Type of exception	Number of exceptional children in each 1000 school population
0.2	Blind and partially sighted	2
1.5	Deaf	15
1.1	Hard of hearing	11
1.0	Crippled	10
1.7	Deaf-blind	17
1.8	Speech defective	18
2.0	Mentally retarded	20
0.2	Epileptic	2
2.1	Behavior problems—socially unadjusted	21
2.0	Mentally gifted	20
18.0	Are exceptional	180

given service or program is more comprehensive in its influence. For the sake of discussion, however, certain services may be identified as primarily intended for the aid of teachers. Some of these services which have contributed to improved instruction are as follows:

1. *Supervision of Instruction.* Teachers need the assistance and stimulation of expert, democratic, professional supervision. Perhaps the best term to describe such service is "helping teacher" or "consultant." Supervision should be regarded as a process involving many people and in this sense is of the general rather than the subject-matter type, although, as has been previously indicated, there is need also for specialized supervisory assistance. Experience and best practice seem to indicate that there should be at least one supervisor or helping teacher for each 50 classroom teachers, at both elementary- and secondary-school levels. It is the opinion of many authorities in educational administration that a ratio of one such supervisor for each 25 or 30 teachers would be much more in keeping with the job to be done, especially in instances where the specialist serves several independent school districts involving travel, differing educational philosophies, etc.

2. *Inservice Education for Teachers.* Improving professional competence is a continuous and universal need. Opportunities and facilities should be made available through supervisory assistance and also through cooperative enterprises of teachers organized under and stimulated by professional leadership possessing the requisite resources.

¹ Estimates made by the U.S. Office of Education for the Mid-Century White House Conference on Children and Youth, 1950. See also *Hearings Before a Subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, United States Senate, Eighty-First Congress (Second Session) on S. 3102*, May 1950, p. 19-20.

3. *Professional Library Services.* Teachers, if they are to keep abreast of modern developments and trends in education, need access to professional materials. Supervision and inservice education are highly dependent upon the availability of standard and current professional literature. Such literature and materials should be available and readily accessible.

4. *Curricular Services.* Curriculum development is a continuous process that affects all the activities of a school or school system. It is a process by which state requirements regarding the curriculum are made effective at the local level, while at the same time adjustments and additions are made to fit the needs of the pupils and community where teaching takes place. Curriculum coordination among the schools of an area is needed. Such coordination is essentially a function of a unit of school administration larger than most school systems. Essential to curriculum services are a curriculum laboratory equipped with sufficient and appropriate materials and consultants in specialized aspects of the curriculum. The function of curriculum development and adjustment also involves a number of facilities and services previously identified—supervision of instruction, guidance and counseling, attendance supervision, health and physical education and recreational services, library and materials bureau services, audio-visual materials services, special education for handicapped children, special teaching and supervisory services in such fields as art, music, manual arts, and crafts, and trade, vocational, industrial, homemaking, and business education.

5. *Instructional and Audio-Visual Materials.* As previously indicated, the use of many types of special materials and equipment is essential to good teaching. The wealth of such materials needed for a comprehensive educational program is usually greatly underestimated. If teachers are to meet the needs of pupils, the materials and equipment necessary must be available.

Services Related to Administration

It is well recognized that the efficient and economical operation of a comprehensive program of instruction and related services requires certain administrative and business services. The sole purpose of such services is to make possible and to facilitate the educative activities of teachers and pupils. Without them it is hardly possible for educational objectives to be attained. Among these essential services are the following:

1. *Personnel Services.* A great deal of care in the selection, retention, promotion, and remuneration of teachers and other essential personnel is necessary to facilitate the operation of a comprehensive program of education.

2. *Business Services.* Budget making, accounting, purchasing, contract making and execution, and legal procedures are essential activities, often extremely complex. Frequently they are beyond the scope and facilities of a single school or school district.

3. *School-Plant Services.* The planning of school buildings, the alteration and adjustment of physical facilities to meet changing educational needs, the maintenance of school property, adequate sanitary upkeep, and the continuous maintenance of physical conditions necessary to the health and safety of pupils and teachers are services which should be available to all schools at all times.

4. *Pupil Transportation Services.* The transportation of pupils is usually a necessity in community school systems. Such services include: the purchase of equipment; maintenance essential to conservation of property and the health and safety of pupils; the selection, training, and supervision of bus drivers; the planning of bus routes for the most economical use of facilities consistent with the health, safety, and reasonable convenience of pupils; and the administration of transportation facilities for purposes other than merely getting pupils to and from school, that is, for essential educational and school-related community activities.

5. *Research Services.* Research is increasingly essential to the adequate functioning of a school system. The kind of research needed is that related to the pupils, teachers, community needs, and the business and administrative affairs of the school system concerned. Personnel and facilities for research activities should be continuously provided.

6. *Reorganization of Schools and of School Districts.* Reorganization is a function of educational administration found in every state and part of the nation. Within the relatively large school districts, changes in population and the distribution of population necessitate the addition and relocation of school buildings and changes in the boundaries of attendance areas. New communities and neighborhoods arise; some communities and neighborhoods disappear. Wherever school districts are organized as community units, some flexibility of district boundary lines is desirable. The board of education, as the legally responsible representatives of the people in the area involved, should have the responsibility for making studies and recommendations and for stimulating efforts to bring about the needed adjustments and reorganizations. (In some instances more than one board of education will be involved.) Such functions involve research, leadership, and administrative action.

7. *Evaluation of the Educational Program.* Every aspect of the educational program must be examined continuously in an effort to determine in what respects it can be improved. Results must be appraised and the effectiveness of the manner in which educational services are provided should be studied. Specific needs change from time to time and the educational organization must be alert to these shifts so that the program can be adapted appropriately. Evaluation should be directed almost exclusively to the job of improving the operating program.

8. *Coordination of Educational Programs among Communities.* Some degree of coordination is a continuous need. It involves curriculum adjustments and unification of objectives, the elimination of wasteful competition

and overlapping services among community school districts (as in the provision and administration of pupil transportation), and mutual assistance and cooperative efforts in all programs where large-scale efforts will best serve the needs of pupils, teachers, and community patrons.

ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSIBILITY FOR PROVIDING A COMPREHENSIVE EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

It must be assumed that the particular functions and services outlined in the foregoing general specifications of a comprehensive educational program are the responsibility of some educational administrative unit or a combination of units. Responsibility for each function and the performance of service must rest somewhere. Administrative responsibility for education must be accepted.

Since the details of these specifications actually grow out of the particular needs of pupils and the community, the educational opportunities which should be provided are not determined by the type or size of administrative organization. The extent to which the desired program is actually provided, however, does depend upon the ability of the administrative organization to provide it. The fact that a given school or school district lacks sufficient resources to provide a comprehensive program does not alter the need. The real problem is one of finding ways and means to meet deficiencies.

Determining the administrative unit which should properly assume responsibility for providing each of the specific educational services is necessary. Otherwise many needs are likely to be unmet. However, the problems involved in determining the administrative unit most appropriate to assume responsibility for each of the particular services are extremely complex. Communities differ in their resources and specific needs. Patterns of association are established. People are accustomed to and have certain expectations regarding the manner in which the functions of local government are carried out. These must be taken into account in the determination and allocation of responsibility. One approach to determining the type of administrative unit which should have responsibility is based upon (a) the size of units which can most economically and efficiently perform the necessary services, and (b) the actual and

probable situation as to the size of administrative units available or that are likely to be made available for performing the indicated services.

Size of Administrative Unit Necessary

Many problems are involved in organizing a program which can meet the variety of educational needs found even in small communities and rural areas. What is to be done when there is but one homebound child, for example? Recognizing that the basic educational needs of homebound children have no relation to where they live, how can the services be provided? What kinds of special personnel are needed? How large an administrative unit must be developed to justify a specialist for home teaching? For guidance services? For curriculum coordination? For the many other services?

The size of the administrative unit best suited to provide all the educational services which would be included in a comprehensive program has not yet been determined. Many factors are related to and affect appropriate administration. Distance, topography, climate, density of population, patterns of communication, occupational diversity, social responsiveness and social unity—these and many other factors influence the operation of an educational program. It is quite possible, therefore, that a truly ideal or optimum size cannot be determined. The establishment of a range of sizes which, under varying conditions, might approach the optimum in terms of effective and economical operation seems much more realistic. At this writing, however, the research and experimentation necessary to establish clear-cut standards have not been carried on.

Some guidance can be obtained from the experience of certain school systems which have been operating programs including each of the various types of educational service needed in a comprehensive program. Schools and school districts have had a great deal of experience with many of the services included in the outline of general specifications. While experience with programs for certain of the other types of service is much more limited, it is increasing rapidly. More and more school systems are establishing programs for particular

types of exceptional children, for providing instructional and curricular materials, and for the maintenance of school buses, for example. The experience of these operating programs should be most helpful in establishing tentative guides. A careful and accurate survey of the experiences of school systems providing each of the specific types of educational service, however empirical, is needed.

In the absence of such guides, certain hypotheses regarding the provision of a comprehensive program of educational services appear to be reasonable. At least one of these is related to the size of the administrative unit needed to provide such a program, and it would be of some usefulness to examine it briefly.

HYPOTHESIS—Different educational services require different numbers of pupils for efficient and economical operation.

For our examination, let us assume that the size of the administrative unit is measured by the total number of children of school age. Lacking any conclusive evidence to support or disprove, let us assume some arbitrary but reasonable figures regarding the number which can be served by a single specialist in a few of the areas of special service.

An attendance supervisor, for example, with adequate clerical assistance can serve a total enrollment of about 6000 pupils; a health nurse can serve about 2000 pupils; a dental hygienist, about 2000 pupils; a school psychologist, about 3000 pupils; a guidance counselor, about 600 pupils.

The estimates regarding the incidence of specific types of handicaps or exceptions among children of school age show considerable variation. (See Table 1, page 11.) In addition, the nature of the special instruction needed for each type of exception also varies. Again establishing some arbitrary estimates as to the number of pupils necessary for the economical use of the time of special teachers for exceptional children, it can be assumed that an adequate program would provide:

One teacher for each 20 mentally handicapped children. There are about 20 such children expected per 1000 school age population.

One teacher for each 18 physically handicapped children. There are 18 such children expected for each 4500 school age population.

One teacher for each 20 partially sighted children expected for each 10,000 school age population.

One teacher for each 18 homebound children. There are 18 such children expected for each 22,500 school age population.

One teacher for each 200 pupils needing speech correction. There are 200 such pupils expected for each 4000 school age population.

Only a few types of specialized educational services have been indicated, but it is quite obvious, to the extent that the estimates are reasonable, that different educational services require different numbers of pupils for efficient and economical operation. For the services indicated, the number of pupils which could be served ranges from 600 to 22,500. For most of the services indicated, it might tentatively be concluded that a service unit having approximately 5000 to 6000 school age population would be adequate. For other services, economical operation would require either a much larger administrative unit or the joint or cooperative efforts of two or more administrative or service units of that size.

The number of the school age population is not in itself an adequate measure for determining the desirable size of the service area. Other factors which must be considered have previously been indicated—distance, topography, social cohesiveness, etc. In addition, the size of the area within which any of the particular educational services may function effectively will depend upon the availability of other services and other specialized personnel. The number of school age population that one school psychologist can serve, for example, depends upon the role he is expected to take—whether he works alone or whether his work is coordinated with that of social workers, school nurses, visiting teachers, a mental health clinic with psychiatric services, and with specialized personnel such as a speech correctionist, guidance counselor, or others whose special type of service may be directly related to the cause of an emotional problem needing psychological help. The number of pupils is but one of the bases for determining the optimum size

of the area for each of the specialized educational services. There are no clear definitions.

The absence of satisfactory standards of size for economical operation of educational services raises many questions. The services of a school psychologist indicated above is but one example. How many pupils can an audio-visual center and staff, or a school library center, effectively and economically serve? What size school administrative unit can most effectively use a central building maintenance staff and the necessary equipment, or a central staff and equipment for school bus maintenance? Similar questions can be raised respecting any of the other needed services. *Research is needed.*

Actual and Probable Size of Administrative Units

The existing administrative organization in each state has a direct effect upon the adequacy of present educational programs. It has already been indicated that the ideal size for an administrative unit to provide a comprehensive educational program has not been determined. The actual size of existing administrative units and an indication of what may reasonably be expected in the future is much more tangible. One of the available and more reliable measures of the size of administrative units is the number of teachers employed.

In 1953 there were in the United States a total of 66,472 school districts, each a separate administrative unit. Of these 11,137 or 16.7 percent did not operate a school. It must be assumed that these districts either had no children of school age or were providing education for their children through the facilities of a neighboring district, probably by some form of contractual agreement. Of the 55,335 districts which were actually operating a school or schools, only 3647 or 6.5 percent (including all city districts) employed 40 or more teachers. A total of 17,028 districts or 30.7 percent employed 9 or fewer teachers.²

²Data reported in this section are from a survey of the 48 state education departments made by the Department of Rural Education, NEA. Data are current as of July 1, 1953. See Dawson, Howard A., and Ellena, William J. *Status of Schools and School Districts, 1940-53*. Washington, D. C.: Department of Rural Education, National Education Association, 1954.

If it could be assumed that the ratio of pupils to teachers was 30 to 1, probably a high estimate, the data show that fewer than one out of each 10 school districts in the United States had as many as 40 teachers and 1200 pupils in 1953.

In the 36 states organized on the basis of common school districts, community school districts, or town or township districts, less than 5 percent of those districts operating schools employed 40 or more teachers in 1953; nearly 32 percent employed 9 or fewer teachers. All of the legally constituted administrative units which do not operate any school are found in these 36 states.

Efforts to remove many of the handicaps of small school districts have been made in nearly all of the states operating under the community school district plan of organization. An examination of the data from some of the states that have experienced the most extensive programs of school district reorganization in recent years should give some indication of the probable size of school districts in these states. Data for a few of the states in this group are shown in Table 2. It is immediately obvious that in no one of the highly reorganized states for

TABLE 2—NUMBER OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS, NUMBER OPERATING SCHOOLS, AND PERCENT OF DISTRICTS OPERATING SCHOOLS ACCORDING TO NUMBER OF TEACHERS EMPLOYED FOR SELECTED STATES, 1953^a

State	Number of school districts	Number of districts operating schools	Percent of Districts Actually Operating Schools		
			Employing 9 teachers or fewer	Employing 10 to 39 teachers	Employing 40 or more teachers
Arkansas	423	422	12.1	66.1	21.8
Idaho	216	179	33.5	36.9	29.6
New York	2862	1698	10.2	70.1	19.7
Ohio	1352	1338	29.8	56.9	13.3
Oregon	933	823	50.6	43.6	5.8

which data are shown is there as many as 3 out of 10 school districts with as many as 40 teachers or, at a pupil-teacher ratio of 30 to 1, 1200 pupils.

A reasonable idea of the probable size of school districts after a long and successful program of school district reorganization

^a *Ibid.*

may be obtained from New York State where school district reorganization has been under way since 1925. In 1925-26 the average number of pupils per reorganized community school (central) district was 335; in 1935-36 the number was 524; in 1945-46 it was 792; in 1950-51 it was 1279. During the past decade the leadership of the State Education Department has favored the development of community school units and the further reorganization of formerly organized districts. Even under that deliberate policy it is obvious that a large majority of the districts have fewer than 40 teachers.

In 12 states the administrative unit which has major responsibility for the educational program is the county or parish. The degree of responsibility for education which is exercised separately by the several communities within these larger administrative units varies a great deal among the states and also among the counties within certain of the states. For the most part, however, the pattern is one of providing educational services to community schools from the central administrative agency. Even with this pattern of organization, a considerable number of county school districts are too small, acting alone, to afford some of the services needed in a comprehensive program. In such instances cooperative arrangements of some type among counties might be adopted to make possible the offering of all the services needed.

Factors Other Than Size

The analysis of the type of administrative organization which has and might have responsibility for providing a comprehensive program of education has been limited to the size of the unit as measured by the school age population or the number of teachers employed. But many other factors are involved. If only the logic of the size of a school administrative unit were applicable to educational organization, the answer to the problem of how to obtain a comprehensive program would be that all school districts should be so organized as to make such a program feasible. In short, the answer would be that school districts should be reorganized on a super scale in such a way that each one of them be of the requisite size, have

a board of education, a superintendent of schools, a staff of employees sufficient in number to provide a comprehensive program, and all operations conducted according to the traditional chart of line-staff organization. But such Aristotelian logic is unrealistic.

While the school takes its purposes from the need for a comprehensive program of educational opportunity, it defines its objectives in terms of the community it serves. The school must depend upon the interest and support of the community. But the interrelationships of the school and the community are reciprocal. In many communities the school is a focus and meeting ground for the other institutions and groups who share the concern and responsibility for the educational program. This is especially true in smaller communities. These smaller communities have certain values which are important, which should be preserved, and which are possible largely because the communities are small. People live closer to nature and "closer" to each other. Every person has an important place and an opportunity to participate actively in community functions. Community participation in school affairs is a prime value for every school system. The school, as a community institution, can assist in the development of an awareness and appreciation of these values. The school can do much to help make communities strong and wholesome social entities.

Just the awareness that the school is a social system organically connected with its community has implications for the leadership required for providing a comprehensive program. The educational administrator, for example, is continually confronted by such things as: mediating community pressures and conflicts; arranging for communication within the school system; selecting, training, and motivating staff; and maintaining coordination and agreement among the diverse elements of the organization for which he is administrator. The greater his insight into the basic nature of social process, the greater the likelihood that he will make the necessary specific applications to his own situation. The kind and quality of leadership will in a large measure determine the adequacy of any given program.

CONCLUSION

The specifications for a comprehensive program of educational opportunity originate and take their scope from the needs of the pupils and communities served. That a given school or school district does not have the resources to provide a comprehensive program does not alter the need. Ways must be found to meet deficiencies.

Most of the states are committed to the organization of local school administrative units which correspond closely to sociological community boundaries. It is extremely doubtful that such basic units can alone even approach providing all the elements of a comprehensive educational program. It follows that some other type of administrative organization needs to be developed to supplement the ability of the smaller local units. Therein lies the future development of the intermediate unit.

CHAPTER 2

The Administrative Framework for the Good Educational Program

THE schools of today differ in many respects from those of several generations ago. They have continually made adaptations to meet needs arising from new social and economic conditions. Many differences have developed within and among the states, and nearly every generalization about schools has exceptions. In most respects, however, schools are similar.

There is variation in the extent to which individual schools provide a comprehensive program of educational opportunities, but the most pronounced differences are those which relate to the legally established administrative structure and organization. A brief and general review of the historical development of administrative organization gives meaning to the functions and relationships of the two aspects to which this yearbook is devoted—the community school and the intermediate unit.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE ORGANIZATION

From the beginning of our nation, each state has been a separate unit of school administration. Most of the early states were slow in assuming their responsibility, however. The matter of providing schools was at first entirely subject to local action or inaction. The earliest state laws regarding education were largely permissive measures granting to groups of people the right to meet and form school districts and to levy taxes on their property for the support of schools. This period of development has been colorfully described by Cubberley:

Wherever half a dozen families lived near enough together to make organization possible, they were permitted, by the early laws, to meet together and vote to form a school district and organize and maintain a school. Districts could be formed anywhere, of any size and shape, and only those

23, 24 25

p. 23 blank

p. 24 non-reproducible photo

families and communities desiring schools need be included in the district organization. The simplicity and democracy of the plan had a strong appeal.¹

From this beginning which amounted to little more than the "encouragement of schools," the states began to increase their acceptance of responsibility. This followed somewhat different patterns among the states, but each state made some provision for the schools which had already developed. In discussing this development, Engelhardt reported:

By the time that the states were ready to establish general policies for the administration of schools, many local traditions had grown to maturity and the boundaries of school districts had been practically determined.²

Frequently there was strong opposition by the local school districts to all efforts of the state to raise standards or to modify basic administrative units. Motivating this opposition in most instances was the belief that these state efforts would "take authority away from the people." In many cases this continues as a strong concern.

Because of the large number of school districts and the limited number of supervisory officers, it was virtually impossible for the state education departments to oversee the operation of the schools or even to determine whether or not the local school districts were complying with minimum requirements established by law. There was an almost universal need for some decentralization and delegation of authority. As a move in this direction, state legislatures established a system of regional school officers. These school officers, usually county superintendents of schools, were created to function between the state and the local districts within a specified area. In this sense they were *intermediate*. The manner of selecting intermediate school officers and the specific duties delegated to them varied considerably among the states, but each state had need for a

¹ Cubberley, Ellwood P. *Public School Administration*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1929, p. 5.

² Engelhardt, Fred. *Public School Organization and Administration*. Boston: Ginn and Co., 1931, p. 165.

representative sufficiently close to the local school districts to actually advise, guide, and supervise.

The experience of New York serves well as an illustration. In 1841 provision was made for a superintendent of schools in each county of the state "for the visitation and inspection of the schools" and to make possible "a much more thorough system of school supervision and much more effective central control."³ Opposition to this intermediate office led to its being abolished in 1847. But the need for decentralized supervision continued, and an intermediate office was re-established in 1856. Although the new office was different from that previously abolished and the duties, responsibilities, and the structure itself have since been modified, an intermediate unit of school administration has continued in New York from 1856 to the present time.

In each of the other states except those in which the county or similar political subdivision was established as the administrative unit for providing schools, an intermediate office similar to that of New York was created to assist the state in supervising schools. In many of the new states this office was established by constitutional provision.

Because of the traditions surrounding the way in which schools developed, the responsibility for education is not concentrated at the state level. The need for educational programs to be closely associated and identified with each locality has also helped to keep much of the responsibility for education with the individual communities. The administrative organizations which have been developed in each of the states recognize and provide for local autonomy and local responsibility. Although there are some exceptions from an organizational and structural standpoint (the county-unit type of organization which is discussed in a later section of this chapter is the most notable exception), three functional aspects of educational operation exist in every state—the state, the basic or community unit, and between them, an intermediate unit. The specific duties of these functional divisions vary from state to state.

³ Cubberley, Ellwood P., and Elliott, Edward C. *State and County School Administration*. New York: Macmillan Co., 1927. p. 146-47.

The remaining sections of this book will deal primarily with the local community and the intermediate units of administration and their interrelationships. The fact that both are a part of a state system of schools is of such importance, however, that the relationship of both community and intermediate units to the state will also be indicated.

THE COMMUNITY UNIT OF ORGANIZATION

One of the objectives in the establishment of the early schools was that they be within walking distance for every child. The ease by which any group could form a school district and establish a school resulted in the development of very many one-teacher schools. By 1917 it was reported that 195,400 one-teacher schools were operating. The sparse population in rural areas and the lack of all-weather roads made impractical any other kind of local school organization. Because universal public high-school education was yet to develop, people were generally satisfied with this type of school for their children.

The limitations of these schools were recognized by some educational leaders at an early date. In 1838 Horace Mann included the following statement in his first report to the Massachusetts Board of Education:

In attempting to accommodate all with a school-house near by, the accommodation itself is substantially destroyed. . . . A school-house is erected . . . but it is (often) at the expense of having a school in it. . . .⁴

Over the years educators continued to be concerned with the numerous deficiencies in the existing organization for providing schools in the several states. In one rather comprehensive description of the status of rural education many aspects of inadequacy were described. The following is illustrative:

. . . a considerable proportion of the children between the ages of six and fourteen is not in any school. If there is no school within easy reach of these children, the compulsory attendance law is not applied to them. Some of the children are not in school because there is no room for them.⁵

⁴ Mann, Horace. *First Annual Report of the Board of Education together with the First Annual Report of the Secretary of the Board*. Boston, Mass., 1838. p. 26.

⁵ National Society for the Study of Education. *The Status of Rural Education*. Thirtieth Yearbook, Part I. Bloomington, Ill.: Public School Publishing Co., 1931. p. 70. (Now available from University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Ill.)

More recently, as the shortcomings which had been recognized for many years by most educators continued to persist, Dawson identified certain administrative limitations:

These small schools present three problems that have not been met to a large extent: (a) they result in excessively high per pupil costs, (b) they usually offer very limited and restricted instructional opportunities, (c) the teachers usually are not adequately trained to deal with the complicated problems of teaching in small schools.⁶

Despite the many weaknesses these small schools had for providing adequate educational opportunities for rural children, they had one very significant advantage. They were close to and strongly identified with the people who supported them. The relationships of the people to their schools were personal and direct. The groups who created the original school districts and the generations which followed looked with pride upon the accomplishments of their "district school" and were active in its support and management. The local school was very often the center or meeting ground for all of the various interests in the area.

The strong feelings of association which rural people had toward their small schools have frequently been responsible for their resistance to efforts which they believed aimed at "closing the school." The close association of people to their school is a characteristic of strong school districts. The need for the participation and active involvement of parents and lay citizens in school activities and planning is receiving increasing attention by even the largest school systems today.

Rural isolation was markedly reduced, however, by the rapid improvement of means of transportation and communication. The village trading center became more important both from the standpoint of economic activity and that of social relationships. Patterns of association formed over larger areas, and many previously well established communities and neighborhoods were no longer recognizable as social entities. The close neighborhood associations have been and are being replaced continuously by larger community identification.

⁶Dawson, Howard A. "Trouble at the Crossroads." *The White House Conference on Rural Education*. Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, 1944. p. 10.

With the establishment of high schools in the village or town centers, farm people tended to send their children to these schools rather than establish a high school in their smaller districts. The high-school attendance areas usually followed the community boundaries established by other social and economic relations with the village. As a result, the relationships of rural areas and village centers were strengthened through their mutual interest in the schools.

The Reorganization of School Districts

In most states the small neighborhood districts continued to provide education only at the elementary level. The village schools were providing education at the elementary level for village children and at the secondary level for both village and rural children. But both small district schools and the village schools had problems. Schools were poorly financed, buildings and equipment were often inadequate, and curricular offerings were generally both meager and unrealistic in terms of the needs of children. The entire school system often failed to measure up to desirable standards of quality. The need for a reorganization of school administrative units became more and more apparent.

Attempts to consolidate schools and reorganize school districts can be traced back over many years. Beginning about the turn of the century and continuing until the general decline of farm income after World War I, consolidation efforts were made in most of the states in which the common school district was the basic unit of organization.⁷ The greatest movement to reorganize school districts, however, has been much more recent. Even at this writing, it is going on to an extent as great as that of any period in the past. Effective programs of reorganization began in New York in 1925 and in Arkansas in 1928. Washington began an extensive program in 1941, Illinois and Kansas in 1945, and Idaho, Minnesota, and Missouri

⁷ For descriptions of the early consolidation efforts in a number of the states, see Dawson, Howard A.; Reeves, Floyd W.; and others. *Your School District*. Report of the National Commission on School District Reorganization. Washington, D. C.: Department of Rural Education, National Education Association, 1948. Part II, "Development of School District Organization in Selected States," p. 143-217.

in 1947 or later. From 1947 to 1953 the total number of school districts in the United States has been reduced from 104,074 to 66,472.⁸ In many states the impetus for school district reorganization has come from strong and effective leadership on the part of state education departments.

In each state the program of reorganization has been developed within the educational structure already existing, and, as would be expected, the specific nature of reorganized school districts varies to some extent among the states. However, the experience with programs of reorganization has identified certain characteristics of successful reorganized districts. The following are examples: the initiative for reorganization coming from the people affected, approval of the proposal by the people in the area affected, final review and approval by the state education department, and a high ratio of majority to minority at the time of reorganization. Although consideration could be given to each, it is our purpose here to give particular attention to the characteristic considered by many competent persons as most important—whether or not the area included in the reorganized district conforms as closely as is practically possible to natural community boundaries.

The Community and the Reorganization of School Districts

Some sociologists in attempting to define "natural communities" have indicated that rural areas having high or relatively high group consciousness or feeling of belonging usually have trade centers with populations ranging from 1000 to 3500.⁹ The natural sociological community has also been described in terms of the provision of certain services essential to satisfy the needs of people. Thaden has described these services as *educational, economic, medical, recreational, religious, and social* in nature and has suggested six services which are prerequisites to a "good community"—a medical doctor, a dentist,

⁸Dawson, Howard A., and Ellenz, William J. *Status of Schools and School Districts, 1910-51*. Washington, D. C.: Department of Rural Education, National Education Association, 1954.

⁹Lindstrom, David E. "The Rural Community and School District Reorganization." A report to the annual meeting of the Rural Sociological Society for the Committee on Community School Districts and Community Schools. Estes Park, Colo., September 1950. (Reference is made to comparative community studies under the direction of Carl C. Taylor.)

a newspaper, a bank, a motion picture theater, and an accredited public high school. The many other aspects of community life—church, post office, retail establishments, etc.—would normally be present if the first six services were available.¹⁰

Even though the small neighborhood school districts had been formed by groups of people almost entirely with respect to their patterns of association, little recognition was given to these relationships in the earliest efforts to reorganize school districts into larger administrative units. Efforts were primarily based upon programs of reorganization which would result in an adequate number of pupils and sufficient financial resources to enable the provision of the quality of educational program desired. But the idea of the relationship of the natural sociological community and school district reorganization was soon brought into being. The first known expression of this concept was an outgrowth of the survey made in New York State by the Joint Committee on Rural Schools (probably better known in that state as the Committee of Twenty-One).¹¹ One of the most important outcomes of this survey was the involvement of both rural lay leaders and educational leaders in a consideration of rural school problems. When the study was completed, each of the groups and organizations involved were instrumental in securing the necessary support for the program recommended to the state legislature. Among these recommendations was that which called for the development of "community districts." This proposed school district was to include the area within which people work together on their social and economic problems.¹² This was truly a recommendation for the reorganization of school districts on the basis of the natural sociological community.

¹⁰ Thaden, J. E. "What Is a Good Community?" Paper presented at the Great Lakes Regional Conference on Rural Life and Education, Ann Arbor, Mich., November 1949.

¹¹ The Joint Committee on Rural Schools was made up of three representatives from each of seven state organizations. Four were farm and home organizations—the New York State Grange, the Dairymen's League, the New York State Farm Bureau Federation, and the New York State Home Bureau Federation; three were educational organizations—the New York State Department of Education, the Department of Rural Education of the New York State College of Agriculture, and the New York State Teachers Association.

¹² See Works, George A. "The Community Unit." *Rural School Survey of New York State: Administration and Supervision*. Ithaca, N. Y.: Joint Committee on Rural Schools, 1923. p. 543-54.

Experience indicates that when the boundaries of a newly reorganized school district coincide closely to the boundaries of the natural or sociological community—a village, town, or city together with the tributary trade and service area of smaller population centers and open-country—the district is almost always successful.¹³ Because patterns for association and lines of communication are already established, the school district established on the natural community basis has the advantage of benefits from all of the existing factors contributing to social cohesion.

The relationship of the natural community to school administration was emphasized by the National Commission on School District Reorganization as follows:

The administrative structure for the support and control of public schools should be adjusted to the natural processes of community living in order to have the spirit and vigor essential to providing a good educational program. . . . Basic administrative units should not be smaller than the area included within the boundaries of the natural sociological community.¹⁴

When the boundaries of school districts or school attendance centers are limited to straight lines or contained within county boundaries, the organization of natural community schools does not necessarily result. It is significant that many of the recently reorganized community districts have almost completely disregarded political boundary lines, taking advantage of the existing boundaries of social interaction.¹⁵

The impact of school district reorganization upon community life and community solidarity has not yet been determined. There are many who believe that nearly all reorganization proposals are likely to "destroy" the community. Others believe that the reorganization of school districts is more likely to contribute to a stronger community. There is little doubt that school district reorganization has some effect upon com-

¹³ It should be noted that reorganized districts are frequently successful even when boundaries are determined on other bases than the natural community. However, many efforts and proposals for school district reorganization have failed to gain approval.

¹⁴ Dawson, Howard A.; Reeves, Floyd W.; and others, *op. cit.*, p. 72.

¹⁵ See Fitzwater, C. O. *Selected Characteristics of Reorganized School Districts*. Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Bulletin 1953, No. 3. Washington, D. C.: Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, 1953. p. 15.

munity association. The programs of nonschool agencies are influenced, for example. What happens to 4-H Clubs, to Boy Scouts, to Girl Scouts, etc., after the school districts have been reorganized? Are their programs given new impetus or are barriers created? There is probably no single answer to any question regarding the impact of a reorganization program. A study now underway and involving both educators and sociologists is investigating through a number of community case reports the sociological relationship of school district reorganization to community life.¹⁶ The results of this study will be significant to an appraisal of present reorganization programs and as a guide for planning future district reorganization.

THE COMMUNITY SCHOOL

The community school has been defined as "a school that is intimately connected with the life of the community, serving as a center for many community activities, and utilizing community resources in improving the education program."¹⁷ Among the many other definitions is one which defines the community school as "a school that has two distinctive emphases (a) service to the entire community, not merely to the children of school age, and (b) discovery, development, and use of the resources of the community as part of the educational facilities of the school."¹⁸ A full chapter in the recent yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education has been devoted to definition.¹⁹ Our purpose here is not to elaborate upon or review these and other definitions but to call attention to three distinctly separate but closely related aspects of the community school concept.

¹⁶ This study is being carried on by a Joint Committee of the Department of Rural Education, NEA, with the Rural Sociological Society.

¹⁷ Good, Carter D., editor. *Dictionary of Education*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1945. p. 87.

¹⁸ Seay, Maurice F. "The Community—School Emphasis in Postwar Education." *American Education in the Postwar Period: Curriculum Reconstruction*. Forty-Fourth Yearbook, Part I. National Society for the Study of Education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1945. Chapter 10, p. 209.

¹⁹ Hanna, Paul R., and Naslund, Robert A. "The Community School Defined." *The Community School*. Fifty-Second Yearbook, Part II, National Society for the Study of Education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1953. Chapter 4, p. 49-63.

Providing a School in the Community

In view of the preceding discussion concerning the relationship of the natural sociological community to the development of organization for education, the first aspect of the community school concept is stated briefly. Primarily it is the concern that there be a school in the community. Although most communities can be identified, it is often difficult to define community boundaries clearly. The high degree of mobility of people and the ever broadening of interests, particularly in the fringe areas of a community, makes identification increasingly complex. A number of the factors which are frequently used for determining the natural or sociological community have already been indicated. It is recognized that the specific services made available through the community will vary from place to place and from time to time. But regardless of the particular services provided, the community is a basic unit for democratic processes and the achievement of social action. The school is an important agency for developing a more effective community life, and *every identifiable community should have a school*. This does not mean that there should be a separate school district for every community.

It is important that school organization be close enough to the people so that they can develop a strong personal interest in its welfare and actively participate in its program. Providing a school in every identifiable community means that there will be many small schools. These schools will often be too small to provide the variety of educational services and experiences necessary in a comprehensive program of education. Some suggestions as to how community programs can be supplemented and enriched are discussed in other sections of this yearbook.

The Community School Program

The second aspect of the community school concept has to do with the nature of the educational program. This concern demands that the school be an integral part of the community. Its program is built upon educational needs and it serves adults

as well as children and its buildings, facilities, and equipment are used by the entire community. Community problems become "classroom problems." All resources are made available and used when they have pertinence to learning. Efforts are made to bring the reciprocal influences of the school and the community into desirable balance.

Much has been written about this aspect of the community school concept. Descriptions, case studies, and lists of objectives, basic and guiding principles, characteristics, and criteria have been developed by educators and educational groups.²⁰ Each has been an attempt to convey the character and potentiality of an educative process which relates the school to the community. The purpose and limitations of this discussion exclude even a brief summary of the available literature, assuming such a summary were possible. Because of its straightforward simplicity, the following statement will illustrate what is here referred to tentatively as the "program aspect" of the community school:

Any school is a community school to the extent that it seeks to realize some such objectives as the following:

1. Educates youth by and for participation in the full range of basic life activities (human needs, areas of living, persistent problems, etc.).
2. Seeks increasingly to democratize life in school and outside.
3. Uses community resources in all aspects of its program.
4. Actively cooperates with other social agencies and groups in improving community life.
5. Functions as a service center for youth and adult groups.²¹

The School and Community Life

The third aspect of the community school is its concern with leadership toward a more desirable community life. Community development is impossible without coordination of the man social, educational, and economic organizations which

²⁰ Two of the most recent books are especially worthy of note:

National Society for the Study of Education. *The Community School*. Fifty-Second Yearbook, Part II. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1955. 292 p.

Olsen, Edward G., editor. *The Modern Community School*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1955. 246 p.

²¹ Cook, Lloyd Allen. "School and Community." *Encyclopedia of Educational Research*. (Edited by Walter S. Monroe.) New York: Macmillan Co., 1941. p. 1002.

are responsible. Although several concepts of the leadership role of the community school tend to place the school in the center of community development activities, a more realistic approach recognizes the school as but one of the many groups concerned. In this approach the school is associated with community change through a core of community leaders of which school people are but a part. Thus, the leadership the school exerts is not that of a public institution setting its own independent goals for community change. Rather it is that of an institution arriving at its community development goals with the understanding and support of other agencies. It also places the school in a much better position to cooperate for certain community development activities. It is only through this interrelationship among organizations and agencies that the community school can become an integral part of the community in both planning and process.²²

Interrelationships—The School and the Community

These three distinct aspects of the community school concept have some important relationships which should be indicated. The first or "organizational aspect" calls for a school in what has been termed the natural sociological community. It does not necessarily follow that the fulfillment of reorganization on this basis assures the development of the "program aspect" of a community school.

The community school cannot be built in just any community, no matter how skillful the board of education members and the professional educators may be. Only in those communities where there is full respect for human personality, where shared judgments are valued and sought, where the highest gains are those which bring better relations between all persons, will there be the kind of freedom that is necessary to develop the interrelationship of school and community. . . .²³

In contrast, it is pointed out that "a community school may exist in any kind of social, economic, or political setting."²⁴

²² For a more complete analysis of this concept, see Kreitlow, Burton W. *Rural Education: Community Backgrounds*. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1934. (Publication anticipated early in the year.)

²³ Olsen, Edward G., editor, *op. cit.*, p. 189.

²⁴ Hanna, Paul R., and Naslund, Robert A., *op. cit.*, p. 55.

It is very possible that a school district could be organized so that its boundaries are coterminous with those of the natural sociological community and still remain somewhat isolated from and have a program unrelated to this stream of interaction. Likewise a school could be organized without relationship to other patterns of community association but through its program so relate problems and resources that in certain respects it becomes a community school. Under most circumstances the school itself can contribute greatly in the development of the requisite social and economic conditions. This is most likely to result when the school is an integral part of the community's leadership core.

It is possible for any of the three aspects of the community school described above to be present in part without the others. However, the total development of the program can be realized to the extent that the first aspect of this concept is achieved and the third aspect accepted.

THE INTERMEDIATE UNIT OF ORGANIZATION

An intermediate unit of educational organization is "intermediate" in the sense that in the organizational framework it is between the local administrative unit and the state education department. An intermediate unit has been defined as:

an organization within the legally established structure of school administration which includes the territory of two or more basic administrative units. It serves as the intermediary between the state department of education and the quasi corporate units having immediate responsibility for maintaining schools. It may have a board or officer, or both, responsible for performing stipulated services for the basic administrative units and for exerting leadership in their fiscal, administrative, and educational functions. Through leadership and services the intermediate unit promotes and strengthens local control and responsibility. It assists local districts and the state education department in finding and meeting more effectively the educational needs of children and communities by performing functions which can best be administered by an intermediate type of organization.²⁵

Because of its position in the structure for administering the

²⁵ National Commission on the Intermediate Administrative Unit. "Tentative Statement of Purpose of the National Commission on the Intermediate Unit." Developed at the first meeting of the Commission, Washington, D. C., September 1953. (Mimeo.)

educational program, the intermediate unit has responsibility to both the local community and the state.

The concept of an intermediate unit of organization is not new in American education. As indicated in the first section of this chapter, most state legislatures became aware of the necessity for a representative of the state close enough to the many schools which had been established to supervise and give guidance to local officials. The experience of these states was carried into the extension of the frontier, and, as the new states were created, provision was made for an intermediate school officer. Some form of intermediate unit now exists in 34 states.

The county has been the area for which this intermediate officer has had responsibility in most states. In New York the intermediate area is called a supervisory district, each county having from one to several such districts. In the New England states these areas are usually designated as supervisory unions or supervisory districts. In New York and the New England states, however, where the intermediate area is not the county, the supervisory districts or supervisory unions do include the territory of two or more basic administrative units in the same way as in those states where the county is the intermediate area.

Beyond the fact that an intermediate type of organization exists in most states there are many differences among them. In some instances where the county is the intermediate unit, it is required or empowered to levy taxes. Some others have no such authority. In some states the intermediate officer is a field member of the staff of the state education department while in others he is a county official. In some states there is provision for a county board of education while others have no such provision. Some states require the highest type of administrative credentials for their intermediate officers while in other states not even a teaching certificate is required. In some states the intermediate officer is elected by popular vote in the regular political election, sometimes in a special nonpolitical election, while in other states he may be appointed by a county board, by the chief state school officer, or by a state board of education. In some instances his term is two years while in others it is continuous unless removed. In some states the

salaries paid the intermediate officer are comparable to those paid the superintendents of large urban school systems while in others they are less than that of a beginning teacher. In some states the intermediate officer works out of his home, having no office or clerical assistance of any kind, while in others he has a large staff of professional workers. Many of these differences exist within states as well as among them.

Although most intermediate units and intermediate superintendents are somewhere between the extremes of the differences indicated, the differences make generalizations concerning intermediate units somewhat difficult. In spite of this difficulty and with recognition of their limitations, a few generalizations can be indicated.

Original Purpose of the Intermediate Unit

The major purpose of the intermediate unit at the time it was first established was to assist the state education department by visiting the schools in the intermediate area and supervising both the educational program and local school authorities. The duties of the intermediate superintendent included recording changes in district boundary lines, apportioning state funds to the districts, ascertaining that teachers employed possessed certificates, collecting data on expenditures and attendance for each of the districts, and reporting this information to state officials. To a large degree the earliest intermediate school officer in most states was a clerk and statistical recorder, serving as a means of communication between the state and local district.

Challenge to the Purpose of the Intermediate Level

The purpose and functions of the intermediate level of organization have been continually challenged. Early opposition came from local school authorities who had previously had little or no state supervision. "Local trustees and town commissioners were not pleased to find their former independence interfered with. . . ." ²⁶

In a survey of the legal status of intermediate school officers,

²⁶ Cubberley, Ellwood P., and Elliott, Edward C., *op. cit.*, p. 147.

Newsom indicated that the "educational literature dealing with school administration reveals much criticism of the county superintendency and its personnel in many states."²⁷

Some attempts to abolish the intermediate organization have from time to time developed in several of the states. Most recently these efforts have been a partial outgrowth of the program for the reorganization of school districts. Although the intermediate unit has a continuing relationship to reorganized districts in most states, in some the reorganization procedure severs all relationships when the new district is formed. Under such circumstances the legal responsibility of the intermediate superintendent is largely removed as soon as the reorganization of all or a large portion of the intermediate area has been accomplished. It is somewhat ironical that in many of these particular instances the leadership stimulating reorganization has been provided by the intermediate officer.

On the grounds that the functions of the intermediate unit should be limited to the routine and clerical duties traditionally required, it has sometimes been argued that the intermediate organization should be abolished. This is not to say that, even in these instances, the intermediate unit has divested itself of educational usefulness. The answer as to whether an intermediate unit is needed is not so simply determined. The answer is to be found from the question as to what essential functions and services needed by reorganized administrative units can better be performed by the intermediate unit. That question will be dealt with in later sections of this yearbook.

Little Adaptation to Changing Conditions

Conditions in the rural areas of the country for which the intermediate units of organization have responsibility have changed greatly in a relatively short period of years. Electricity, farm machinery, scientific planting and breeding, and the many other technological advances have become an everyday part of rural living. Agricultural production and the size of

²⁷ Newsom, N. William. *The Legal Status of the County Superintendent*. U.S. Department of the Interior, Office of Education, Bulletin 1932. No. 7. Washington, D. C.: Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, 1932. p. 1.

individual farm operations have increased. A smaller number of people are engaged in farming, but the number of rural nonfarm people has increased. The general level of living has been raised greatly and differences between rural and urban have become less marked.

With improved transportation and communication, the broadening of interests of rural people, and the increasing desire for better educational opportunities for rural children, schools have been reorganized and curricular offerings expanded. Many states have accepted greater responsibility for the support of schools, and great strides have been made toward the apportionment of funds on an equalization basis.

The changes in the interests and needs of people and the consequent adaptations in educational organization and emphasis have not generally resulted in any change in the structural design of the intermediate unit. In many instances it continues to be geared to a system of schools which, except for a few sparsely populated areas, is largely obsolete or which already may have disappeared. Despite the many social and economic changes indicated, the structure of the intermediate unit of organization, its functions, and its personnel, have a striking similarity in a number of states to that first established more than 100 years ago.

In some states much progress in adaptation has been made. In almost every state there are instances where strong intermediate leadership has developed a means for making important contributions to the schools in the intermediate area. This was pointed out in a previous yearbook of the Department of Rural Education:

In states where conditions are favorable for strong dynamic county educational leadership, superintendents have been able to achieve a status fully comparable in every respect to that found in the most progressive and forward-looking urban systems.²⁸

Intermediate units as presently organized in a number of states have many limitations for meeting the demands for edu-

²⁸ Cooper, Shirley, editor. *The County Superintendent of Schools in the United States*. Yearbook 1950. Washington, D. C.: Department of Rural Education, National Education Association, 1950. p. 29.

educational services. In a few states, legislation has provided a means to overcome some of these limitations. In some other instances they have been partially overcome by the leadership of the intermediate superintendent.

Continuing Need for Strengthening the Intermediate Unit

The intermediate unit of organization has seldom approached its potential in serving educational needs. Limitations in the organizational structure, inadequate definition of duties and functions, or an absence of professional leadership with sufficient vigor and insight to develop new functions and provide new services have often impeded development.

Because of these frequent inadequacies, discussions of educational administration and studies of educational structure have repeatedly called attention to the need for strengthening the intermediate unit. Reports have emphasized the importance of some form of intermediate organization and have given suggestions for improving the quality of educational services offered. The following examples will illustrate.

In discussing the need for an intermediate unit better equipped to serve its constituent school districts, Cubberley wrote:

Everywhere our rural and small-town schools are calling for educational leadership and for professional leadership of a new type, but this cannot come, in most cases, until there is a marked change in the nature of the county educational office.²⁹

At about the same time a review of the status of rural education reported the following conclusion:

Except where the county or other area comparable to it in size and influence is the local district, an intermediate unit appears to be desirable. Such a unit may: (a) provide a better type of leadership than can ordinarily be secured in the constituent districts, (b) perform certain functions of control not practicable in the local unit that yet need not be referred to the state, (c) assist in equalizing the burdens and opportunities of education when adequate state financing is not in effect, (d) perform certain special forms of service not possible in the constituent districts. In very

²⁹ Cubberley, Ellwood P., *op. cit.*, p. 49.

few states is any one of these functions now exercised to the degree and in the manner to be desired.³⁰

The need for some type of intermediate level of organization was indicated in a more recent discussion of the status of rural education:

Where community units are adopted, there will sooner or later develop a need to superimpose intermediate districts upon all except the very large community units, in order to provide supervisory and specialized services which a single community unit cannot provide without excessive cost.³¹

However inadequate many of the intermediate organizations have been in assisting local communities to identify and meet their educational needs, there has been a continuing recognition of the need to strengthen the intermediate organization—its structure, its functions, and its leadership.

Increasing Concerns for Strengthening Intermediate Leadership

Within the past several years, efforts to improve the quality of leadership of intermediate units have yielded a number of significant results. Most of these efforts have been initiated by groups of intermediate superintendents. In some instances these administrators have sought the assistance of other groups and organizations while in others they have carried on projects for improvement completely by themselves. The results of these efforts and the professional enthusiasm which has developed are an encouraging challenge to existing inadequacies. A brief review of a few recent developments indicates to some extent the current efforts of intermediate superintendents to improve the quality of their educational service.

One of the developments which reflects the growing awareness by intermediate superintendents for the need to work together more closely has been the renewed interest in the

³⁰ Beim, Orville G. "Guiding Principles in Rural Education." *The Status of Rural Education*. Thirtieth Yearbook, Part I, National Society for the Study of Education. Bloomington, Ill.: Public School Publishing Co., 1931. Chapter 11, p. 272. (Now available from University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Ill.)

³¹ Chase, Francis S., and Baker, John E. "Rural Education Today." *Education in Rural Communities*. Fifty-First Yearbook, Part II, National Society for the Study of Education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1952. Chapter 4, p. 100-101.

Division of County and Rural Area Superintendents.³² Although this group had been organized since 1937, it was not until 1946 that it organized a national conference. Since then a national conference has been held annually with increasing attendance, participation, and quality of programs.³³ This series of conferences has been largely of the work conference type with much attention being given to a sharing of experiences and the seeking of solutions to common problems.

With the appropriation of funds by the W. K. Kellogg Foundation for the Cooperative Program in Educational Administration, the Division of County and Rural Area Superintendents established a Liaison Committee to work with each of the regional centers of that program. Motivated by the knowledge that nearly half the children of the country are under the administration of rural county or village superintendents of schools, this committee has attempted to be certain that each of the CPEA centers has been kept aware of the preparational needs of administrators for the county, intermediate, village, and small city superintendency. The work of this committee of superintendents has been responsible in part for the amount of attention given by these centers to the problems and concerns of intermediate superintendents and community school administrators.³⁴

Another development of the Division of County and Rural Area Superintendents was the establishment in 1953 of a National Commission on the Intermediate Administrative Unit.³⁵ This Commission, made up largely of county and intermediate superintendents, has at this writing just begun to function. The purposes of the Commission as outlined at its first meeting are:

to clarify the place of the intermediate unit in the American system of public education and to promote its further development through:

³² A division of the Department of Rural Education of the National Education Association.

³³ Approximately 1000 county superintendents from 42 states attended the Eighth National Conference of County and Rural Area Superintendents held at Omaha, Nebr., in October, 1953.

³⁴ A few studies carried on by several of the CPEA regional centers are reported in Chapter 6.

³⁵ Authorized by a resolution adopted by the Seventh National Conference of County and Rural Area Superintendents held at New York City in October 1952.

1. Formulating recommended policy and legislation to govern the structure, organization and functions of the intermediate unit and promoting understanding of the developing concepts underlying such recommendations
2. Proposing stimulating and synthesizing research dealing with this unit
3. Compiling and publishing descriptions of promising practices illustrative of recommended policies, application of research findings and typical services in the intermediate administrative unit
4. Promoting continued professionalization of the intermediate unit superintendency.²⁶

The work of this Commission and its reports, recommendations, and proposals will undoubtedly be of special significance to rural educators as they are developed.

Many of the county and intermediate superintendents' efforts to improve their status and adjust their functions to more adequately meet the changing concept of the educational needs of rural areas have been carried on through their state associations. One of the more significant developments has been a study of their jobs in an effort to determine adaptations and adjustments necessary to meet the conditions in their states. Several of these state studies have been a part of the CREA projects indicated above. In a number of states, often with the assistance of the state education department and colleges or universities, superintendents have attempted to improve their own abilities and understanding of their job through workshops and study groups. Recognition of the need to raise their own professional standards has resulted in proposals for higher certification requirements in a few states.

In some instances county superintendents groups have been working cooperatively with other administrative groups to clarify and define their functions, improve their working relationships, and increase their opportunities for services to pupils, schools, and communities.

Aside from these efforts of superintendents, and to some extent both cause and effect of their renewed professional concerns and enthusiasm, certain other actions and achievements have resulted in stronger intermediate leadership. The establishment of the County School Service Fund in 1947 has

²⁶ National Commission on the Intermediate Administrative Unit, *op. cit.*

made possible the provision of many new services to the schools in each of the California counties. Since 1948 the Boards of Cooperative Educational Services developed in New York have been extending many services to schools which otherwise would not be possible.

Even without special financial assistance, however, intermediate superintendents have in many instances developed insight into their possibilities for serving the schools in their area. A number of examples of the service programs which have been developed are included in Chapters 3, 4, and 5. The variety of services provided gives some indication of the possible range of services which might be developed by many intermediate units. In each of the intermediate areas where programs of service have been developed, the community schools are participating in their management and sharing in their benefits.

THE COUNTY-UNIT TYPE OF ORGANIZATION

In a number of states the county has always been the basic unit for local rural government. Although the early public schools in these states began as local neighborhood affairs just as in most other states, a more highly consolidated control on a county basis was developed. There are at present 12 states in which the county is the basic unit for school administration—Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, New Mexico, North Carolina, Tennessee, Utah, Virginia, and West Virginia.

In addition to these 12 states there are a few instances where the county-unit district exists in other states. Most of these county districts have resulted from recent programs of district reorganization. In Idaho, for example, there are 14 newly reorganized districts which include all the territory of an entire county. Thus 14 of the 44 counties in Idaho have become county districts. In Minnesota there are two reorganized districts which are county districts and, at this writing, a third is under consideration. A few others are found in Colorado, Illinois, Indiana, and Oregon.

The county-wide type of organization is an important aspect

of the general theme of this yearbook—the interrelationships of intermediate units and community schools. The primary basis for special consideration of this type of organization is the fact that it is an exception to a general discussion. In those states where the county is the basic unit for the administration of schools, there are no intermediate units.³⁷ But this fact does not necessarily preclude relationships to community schools and the provision of educational services similar in many respects to those of intermediate units. These relationships will be indicated.

Nature of County-Unit Organization

Just as for those states in which some type of intermediate unit exists, there are many variations among the county-unit organizations. An identification of these differences does not have particular significance to this discussion.³⁸ It may be sufficient to point out that, in general, there are two types of county-unit districts: (a) the entire county is a school district; or (b) the territory of the county outside independent districts, usually cities or other incorporated places of a specified size, constitutes a school district.

The general nature of the county-unit type of organization can best be seen in terms of those aspects which distinguish them from other types of districts.³⁹ Cooper and Fitzwater have recently outlined certain characteristics common to all county-unit districts:

1. The county-unit is centrally controlled by a single representative lay board. There are no subordinate boards within its limits that have general administrative power.

³⁷ In addition to the 12 county-unit states indicated above, there are two other states which do not have an intermediate type of organization. In these states, Delaware and Nevada, those administrative and supervisory functions which are not provided by local administrative units are furnished directly by the state education departments.

³⁸ For a concise and complete general description of the county-unit organization in each state as well as a discussion of the problems and advantages of this type of organization, see Cooper, Shirley, and Fitzwater, Charles O. *County School Administration*. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1954. p. 173-208.

³⁹ The major differences between county-unit and intermediate unit organization are compared in Butterworth, Julian I., and Dawson, Howard A. *The Modern Rural School*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1952. p. 310-52.

2. The board operates through a superintendent who is the chief educational officer in the county-unit district.

3. There is but one general school budget in the county unit.

4. Educational programs are maintained that extend through both elementary and secondary grades.

5. Administrative authorities of the county unit are directly responsible to the people in the local communities for the operation of the schools.

6. Lines of communication between the county-unit district and the state department of education are direct. There is no intermediate administrative organization.

7. There are a number of local attendance areas within each county-unit district.

8. The boundaries of the county-unit district coincide with or are approximately the same as the boundaries of the civil county.⁴⁰

As indicated in the characteristics above, under the county-unit system each county has a board of education and a superintendent of schools. It should be pointed out, however, that the administration of schools is not a function of the general county government. In most instances the county school systems are fiscally independent, i.e., not dependent on the county government for setting school tax rates or for the appropriation of funds. Usually, however, certain county officials are assigned duties in connection with the administration of the county schools. The county treasurer, for example, may be made the custodian of school funds and the county collector may be assigned the duty of collecting school taxes.

The county-unit district is most like the local school district of other states in the sense that it is the unit for operating schools. Because these county districts usually operate a number of both elementary schools and secondary schools, they are perhaps most comparable to an urban school system. In states where this type of organization has been established it has been quite successful. Since it is a relatively large unit for school administration, having a wide tax base and a relatively large number of pupils, the county-unit establishes conditions more favorable for equalizing educational opportunity in the area and for making effective use of educational resources. The experience of county units can generally be characterized in

⁴⁰ Cooper, Shirley, and Fitzwater, Charles O., *op. cit.*, p. 119.

terms of efficient administration and better schools than might otherwise have been provided.

But the county-unit type of organization cannot be regarded as a panacea for all educational problems. A few of the disadvantages should be recognized. Although certain of the disadvantages indicated are not entirely unique to county-unit districts, they are often likely to be greater in degree. County districts are large and are usually made up of a number of separate and identifiable communities. When administration and control is removed to the larger unit, certain real problems must be considered. The "distance" between the people and the administration of school is increased and their relations to administration less personal. Means must be found for providing the citizens in local communities opportunities for accepting responsibility and for participating in the development of school policies. Without such opportunities, the associations of people to their schools are apt to be lessened. Safeguards must be established against standardization and the inhibition of local creativity. Since the county is not a natural sociological unit, there are many instances under the county-unit system where the interests of a community area surrounding a village located near the county boundary are divided as regards schools. The selection of superintendents through political election, low salaries, low qualification requirements, and other problems characteristic of many intermediate superintendents also exist in a few county-unit states.

The few difficulties indicated and others which often develop can be overcome. Effective educational leadership has done so in many instances. But some county-units experience a difficulty of a different nature. The general philosophy which undergirds the county-unit district is that the basic unit of school administration should be sufficiently large to provide all the administrative and instructional services needed for a comprehensive program of education. In a number of instances the county is not large enough in terms of either population or resources to make this possible. Under such circumstances the need for combining two or more smaller counties into a single administrative unit for school purposes is indicated.

County-Unit Relationship to Community Schools

The very nature of the county-unit type district, by removing the control of schools outside of local communities to a larger administrative unit, lessens to some extent the individual community's relationship to the educational organization. But this does not prevent the development of community schools as they have been described in an earlier section of this chapter.

The purpose of every unit of educational organization is to make available, to the extent of its ability, a comprehensive program of educational opportunities. When the ability of any given unit is short of achieving this purpose, there is need for supplementing the program from some other source. The larger county district is often better able to provide the opportunities specified in the preceding chapter than many other types of districts.

The individuality of local communities should be protected, however. Individual differences often tend to receive less attention in a large scale operation. But this result can be avoided; it is not inevitable. Community individuality can be preserved and strengthened if the educational program developed relates the people in each of the communities to their own problems and concerns, if it contributes to community cohesion, and if through education it accomplishes a more satisfactory quality of community living.

Establishing a general blueprint for developing community schools within county-unit districts is not possible. The nature of communities with their cross-currents of interests and activities and their traditions and methods of working makes any such proposal inappropriate. Our plea is rather that this type of organization be sensitive to the importance of community individuality.

Certain procedures for carrying out this responsibility are obvious. For example, the elementary-school attendance units and the secondary-school attendance units should be organized around the natural sociological neighborhood and community areas. It may occasionally be both desirable and possible to include in such attendance units parts of adjacent districts

so that the natural community area is not artificially divided for school purposes.

The educational program itself should be sufficiently flexible to take advantage of specific community resources and concerns. Equalization should not result in standardization. Within the limits of the administrative organization, each community should be given a maximum of responsibility for the policies which determine the program of its own school. Individual community efforts above the level of the basic county program should be stimulated and encouraged.

The characteristics of local communities within a county-unit type of organization are no different from those of local communities where schools are organized on a community district basis. They have the same kinds of resources, the same kinds of problems, and the same kinds of educational needs. If the community is an important unit of social organization in a state organized on a community unit basis, it is important in a county-unit state. The school in the community should exercise a similar influence upon community life. The differences of the county-unit type of educational organization are real, however. The history of successful operation on the part of county-units is evidence that there is little probability that they either will or should be materially altered. Their responsibility to individual communities is the same as that of any type of school district; their difficulties are somewhat magnified.

Among the presently operating county-unit districts are some which have made genuine attempts to develop "community schools" with a great deal of success. The extent to which these efforts have been successful appears to depend upon (a) leadership which understands the importance of community, and (b) the method of operation, i.e., whether educational services are provided for communities or whether a program of educational services is developed by the community with the assistance of the county organization.

EMERGING PATTERNS AND RELATIONS

The preceding sections of this chapter have described the development of administrative organization for education.

A system of schools, as a type of social organization, is dynamic, ever changing in response to the desires and needs of people and communities and of the administrative organization itself. Even now, these changes continue.

It is somewhat difficult for educators to stand outside their situation in hope that they might get a fuller perspective of education on the national scene, identify the changes, observe the trends, and come away with a better understanding of the problems which confront them. To add confusion to such an attempt are the many differences among schools and among states—in their patterns of organization, in their directions and rates of change, in their stages of development, in their abilities to support education, and in their expectations from and understanding of the educational process.

From such a position apart from the immediate problems and pressures which are demanding attention, a number of emerging patterns and relations might be observed. Some are much more clearly identifiable than others. Some are just in the beginning stages.

A first observation is that the general quality of education is better than it has ever been. Teachers are better prepared. They know more about children and how children learn. They know more about teaching. How this quality will be further improved or even maintained in the face of increasing enrollments and a decreasing supply of teachers cannot yet be determined. Inservice improvement programs for all types of school personnel are increasing and may hold considerable promise.

The various groups of people who are actively involved in the educational program are working more closely together than ever before. The distance between "teachers" and "administrators" has been reduced; teachers participate more in the administrative process. Boards of education are becoming more concerned about good education and are looking farther beyond the "how" of administration to some of the "why." More use is being made of advisory groups and study committees. The role of such groups is becoming better defined and understood.

There is a continuous program of school district reorganiza-

tion which is changing the many small school districts existing in many states into community units able to provide a broader range of opportunities. They can be expected to continue for several years; programs are just beginning in some states. There is a growing recognition that most reorganized districts cannot become large enough to alone provide a comprehensive program of educational opportunity. The trend toward larger and larger reorganizations may soon be checked in part. More attention may be given to the relation of the reorganized district to the natural sociological community and less to the number of pupils which can be included. Community districts are likely to depend more upon the intermediate unit to assist them in providing on a cooperative basis special personnel and special programs which they can share.

County-unit districts are tending to provide greater opportunities for individual community variation. County administrators and boards are increasingly recognizing the need for community committees and citizen identification to the community schools. Educational programs are becoming more varied with the development of additional opportunities. The number of specialized services are increasing. Some of the smaller counties are beginning to have difficulty in providing the educational program demanded.

Intermediate units are beginning to experience their greatest change in the more than 100 years of their existence. The changes developing can be expected to make at least as great a contribution to the educational program of small communities and rural areas as the development of school district reorganization. Some aspects of this change are already evident. The professional level of intermediate administrators is being raised very rapidly. An enthusiasm for the potentialities of the intermediate unit has developed and is increasing its momentum. The emphasis upon clerical and inspecting duties is being replaced by a variety of efforts to provide a program of educational services. The intermediate unit is rapidly coming to be regarded as a "service center" for schools, a center which can coordinate specialized services which two or more schools can share, a center which can supplement the educational pro-

gram of community schools without encroaching upon their local autonomy. Although an understanding of this kind of relationship is not yet widespread, it is increasing rapidly. Many details are yet to be defined, but the possibilities are great.

The relationships of community schools and intermediate units are changing as a result of the development of more adequate community-unit districts and the changing concept of intermediate functions. Administrators of both types of units are working together more closely. Mutual understanding and confidence are on the increase. Also increasing are the evidence of cooperation—programs of educational services, administered by the intermediate unit to supplement the educational programs of community schools. Many examples of currently operating programs of this kind are included in Chapters 3, 4, and 5. Some are well established, some just beginning to develop, and others as yet largely experimental.

CHAPTER 3

Services Focused on the Needs of Pupils

WHEN the Spartans were ordered to give up 50 children as hostages, they replied that they would rather relinquish twice as many grown men—so much faith did they place in their children. Over the years a "conscience toward children" and faith in the future have been the high marks of our American civilization. It is this faith that has stimulated the development of our system of public schools. It is this faith that is responsible for our belief that a high level of education is necessary and desirable for everyone.

But many communities are small and their abilities and resources to provide a comprehensive program of educational opportunities are limited. Without supplemental assistance, these children and communities are deprived of many needed educational services. Where the desire to meet the existing needs for services has been sufficient to stimulate the industry, inventiveness, and leadership of the persons involved in the program of community education, they have cast about for means to supplement their own efforts. In many instances the intermediate unit has been willing and able to help. Programs of educational services have been developed through the cooperative efforts of the intermediate unit and the several communities and smaller schools in its area. These programs are making available many opportunities which were previously impossible.

In general, these programs of services have been developed to meet two types of needs. They have been established to meet needs which have existed in the several communities for a long time but which have been neglected largely because the local community schools have not been able to provide the service needed. In addition, they have been established to

56/57

x 50 non-reproducible
photos

meet new needs coming partially as out-growths of expanding community school curricular offerings. The educational aspirations of parents and school staff members have in some instances tended to outstrip the resources of the local community school districts. The development of intermediate unit services has come about in response to these needs and as a result of the growing awareness on the part of both intermediate units and community schools of the possibilities of this means of supplementing the educational efforts of the local community schools.

Because many different types of educational service programs have been developed, an arbitrary classification has been established to facilitate a description of a few of the presently operating programs. The purpose of this chapter is to identify and briefly describe programs of services which focus directly upon the needs of pupils. Other types of educational services—those directed primarily to helping teachers meet pupil needs and those related to administration—and descriptions of operating programs are included in succeeding chapters. Many of the programs included have much broader implications than the particular classification indicates or than the brief description included can convey.

One of the significant characteristics of the programs described is that they are all relatively new. Although many are already well established, others are in but their second and third year of operation. The realization that the programs of community schools can be greatly enhanced and their limitations overcome when they cooperatively share in the support and benefits of specialized educational services administered by the intermediate unit is growing rapidly. Because many of the programs described are new, they are being evaluated and adapted so that the assistance given to the various community schools in an intermediate area can be made even more effective. There is considerable variation among the programs developed. The extent to which the services of intermediate units focus directly upon the needs of pupils, the types of services provided, the methods by which they are financed, and the other details of administration necessarily vary in accord-

ance to the local conditions and circumstances within each intermediate unit and the needs and demands of the several community schools in its intermediate area.

Among the services included in this chapter as primarily directed to the needs of pupils are the provision of library and resource materials, instruction in specialized fields, health services, special educational programs for different types of exceptional children, and the range of what may be considered pupil personnel services—guidance, testing, psychological services, and attendance supervision and accounting. The programs of services described are almost exclusively those of intermediate unit-community school cooperation, but, in a few instances, the programs of county-unit school districts are also described. Although the administrative structure for these programs differs, the services are developed to serve the several communities in the administrative area in much the same way as those by intermediate units.

LIBRARY SERVICES

Library service is adaptable to many kinds of local conditions, is a type of service which can easily serve large populations, and requires the attention of persons specially trained in library management. It is one of the services which involves a relatively large capital investment. An adequate library to serve pupils and teachers (and the community in the absence of other facilities) is often beyond the ability of community schools to provide. Depending on the comprehensiveness of its materials, it can achieve excellence in either very large or very small situations. It is one of the services which many community schools share through the assistance of the intermediate unit.

There are a large number of small rural schools in Osborne County (Kansas) and, because of the small enrollments and limited funds, a cooperative central library was started several years ago, more as a traveling reading library project. This phase of the central library has grown until today there are approximately 10,000 books to supplement the individual school reading libraries. In order to enrich the reading program, much attention is given to the selection of the books.

Teachers using the library may find reading material on various levels and types. Under proper guidance every child in every participating school will read stories classified as literature, Bible stories, stories of atomic energy and jet planes, biographies, poetry, travel, science, stories of music by the masters, materials on art and artists, and books on many other subjects.

In addition to the reading materials, the central library also includes filmstrips and records which are chosen for the purpose of enriching the curriculum of the participating schools. In order to facilitate this phase of the program in the smaller schools, the projection equipment, screens, recorders, etc., are available from the library and are checked out to the teachers on a short time basis.

The program is administered and supervised by the county superintendent with the assistance of the office secretary. Each participating school is assessed a small amount each year for financing the program. County funds are used to purchase the necessary equipment. Since the library service has no additional staff, the method of checking materials "out and in" is a very simple number method with individual cards for each teacher. Teachers are encouraged to become familiar with the materials available through the library so that they can easily find those items which they may want to use.¹

When the program of library services was beginning in Wayne County (North Carolina), one teacher from each elementary school and each high school agreed to serve as teacher-librarian. This group met at regular intervals with the library supervisor and were given instruction in teaching their pupils how to use the library facilities. Each in turn instructed the other teachers in their schools, and in this way at least 10 lessons were taught to the pupils in all the schools the first year. Regular library periods were scheduled for each grade, beginning with the first.

To help the teachers with these periods, a committee composed of the classroom teachers, the county superintendent, the county library supervisor, and the library adviser from the state education department developed a check list of library activities. This proved especially helpful in determining

¹ Contributed by LaVerne B. Arnold, superintendent, Osborne County Schools, Osborne, Kansas.

whether or not a well-rounded library experience was being provided for the children in each school. It included items of specific instruction on the use of library materials, teachers' introduction of books, pupils' book reviews, free reading periods, and research for library materials on classroom topics, as well as exchange of books. The library supervisor checked these lists each time she visited a school and in this way kept in close touch with the kind of library periods being held. Where there was a sign of weakness in any group's library program, the teacher of that particular group was given special help and supervision in broadening the scope of her work.²

Since this beginning, the library program has in the five years of its operation made great strides, largely because of the enthusiasm and wholehearted support of all those involved. Central purchasing of books, materials, supplies, and equipment through the county library supervisor's office has effected great savings. All of the books are processed in the central office and are ready for immediate circulation when taken to the schools. A thorough cataloguing of each of the high-school libraries is now in process. A section on "Teaching the Use of the Library" has been developed and is included in the teacher's handbook. During the past three years "career" materials have been collected for all the high-school libraries and files set up for them, and a filmstrip library has been established in the county office. A catalog of these filmstrips has been placed in all of the schools.

The results of this program have given additional encouragement to the entire county staff. At the present time all of the high schools in Wayne County, both white and Negro, are accredited, the library service, of course, having contributed to the accreditation. Several libraries have been enlarged and others have been built to meet the growing needs. The average is about seven books per child for the entire county.³

Adequate and attractive school library quarters have been

² The check lists prepared by this committee have since been adopted by other counties in North Carolina and other states. Copies are available on receipt of a self-addressed envelope from Mrs. Mildred S. Council, 2009 Cumberland Ave., Charlotte, North Carolina.

³ Contributed by Alice G. Loftin, library supervisor, Wayne County Schools, Goldsboro, North Carolina and Mrs. Mildred S. Council, former supervisor.

developed in all of the permanent school centers in Fulton County (Georgia), 34 elementary schools and seven high schools. The elementary schools share the services of 21 librarians who have been successful teachers and have at least the library science training necessary for state certification of teacher-librarians. The high schools are served by nine full time professionally trained librarians. The service given in these libraries goes far beyond the acquisition, organization, and circulation of materials. It permeates the total school program and its influence is felt not only in the classroom but also reflects the individual interests of the children. Books and other materials are selected cooperatively by children, teachers, and librarians. These materials are ordered through the central library office in order to secure maximum discounts. Printed catalog cards are purchased through the state cataloguing service and from other sources to free the librarians from time consuming routines.

Working closely together, the librarians and the county coordinator have recognized their responsibility for "growth on the job" and have shared experiences and ideas. The librarians participate in all local school activities as members of the faculty. They stimulate broader and better "reading for fun" through story hours, book reviews, the use of films and recordings, and individual reading guidance; they work closely with teachers by suggesting and providing a variety of books and materials to extend and enrich the classroom work; they assist in remedial teaching of retarded readers; in many ways they help in interpreting the modern concept of library service to the local community; and they cooperate with the public library and encourage the use of the Fulton County Book-mobile service.

The success of this part of the school program cannot be measured by attendance and circulation statistics. The appreciation of the importance of this service in the total school program by children, teachers, administrators, and the communities, is evidence of its success. Its growth and development has come about through enthusiastic, sympathetic, and understanding teamwork. Efforts are now being directed

toward better financial support, more professionally trained librarians, and broader use of library facilities and services.⁴

The program of reorganization of school districts in McDonough County (Illinois) has reduced the total number of districts to seven. Prior to reorganization, a county elementary library project had been in operation with each of the common school districts participating. A large and useful library was built up and was used quite extensively by the many small schools since their resources were often quite limited. With reorganization, many districts were able to bring together the library materials and have a much better collection than had previously been possible. New books and library materials are purchased through the county superintendent's office which also maintains a supplementary and reference library and employs a full-time librarian.

An evaluation of special services in the county revealed that, while many audio-visual aids including maps, globes, pictures, and filmstrips were available in each of the community schools, there was a definite need for films. This service was not being provided by any of the local community schools, largely because of the high costs which films involve. As a result of the cooperation of the county superintendent and the administrators and boards of education of each of the school districts in the county, a Cooperative Film Library has been developed. Administered by the county superintendent's office, the library now has 156 films which are available for use as teaching aids in any classroom or for educational programs throughout the county at mothers' clubs, PTA's, or local community meetings. And the library is still growing.⁵

A similar program has been developed in Morgan County (Illinois). A county-wide film coordinator assists the teachers in each of the community school districts in the county in the selection and use of pictures, maps, tape recorders, filmstrips, and opaque projectors. At the present time 230 films are

⁴ Contributed by Virginia McJenkin, director, Fulton County School Libraries, Fulton County Board of Education, Atlanta, Georgia.

⁵ Contributed by Dorothy L. Dixon, assistant superintendent in charge of supervision, McDonough County Schools, Macomb, Illinois.

available and the purchase of 70 more films is contemplated.

A somewhat unique feature of this program is the possibility for teachers to improve their ability in the use of visual materials by enrolling in a visual-aids course which has been offered in the county for the past three years in cooperation with the Western Illinois State Teachers College.⁶

A library of over 5000 books has been developed in Russell County (Kansas) by the cooperative efforts of the schools in the county and the county superintendent's office. Among the materials available for the use of teachers and the pupils in the participating schools in the county are supplementary readers, preprimers, reference books, fiction, classics, and filmstrips. A simple method of checking out books and materials and a catalog of the books have been developed.⁷

Although services often begin very simply and progress seems at first to be very slow, they usually develop with remarkable rapidity. The program of library service in Kent County (Michigan) in 1935 was a WPA project and consisted of about 200 donated books on saw horses and planks and housed in a vacant room in the YMCA. Today the library is fully accredited, has a building of its own, and has 12 full-time and 15 part-time staff members, 61,000 volumes, two bookmobiles and a book truck, and 12 branch libraries.⁸

INSTRUCTION IN SPECIALIZED FIELDS

Many of the smaller schools are unable to provide full-time instruction in specialized fields—music, art, physical education, homemaking, agriculture, and industrial education. In many instances they are able to make instruction available to their pupils by sharing an itinerant or circuit teacher with other schools in their area. Schools which are able to provide full-time instruction often find advantage in sharing teacher-consultants for certain aspects of these curricular areas—a reading

⁶ Contributed by Wilfrid E. Rice, superintendent, Morgan County Schools, Jacksonville, Illinois.

⁷ Contributed by Mrs. Christina D. Graff, superintendent, Russell County Schools, Russell, Kansas.

⁸ Contributed by Lynn H. Clark, superintendent, Kent County Schools, Grand Rapids, Michigan.

consultant to coordinate and assist teachers, a remedial teacher, a music coordinator, or other specialist to work with individual children and teachers.

As a result of a survey in Milwaukee County (Wisconsin), 37 school boards agreed to contribute to a cooperative music program administered by the intermediate superintendent's office. Nine special music teachers are employed. At the request of many parents and some school board members and with the approval and support of most teachers and administrators, emphasis has been on vocal and rhythmic activities. This is rapidly growing to include singing, rhythmic activity, instrumental music, listening, and creative work. This year 41 of the 46 schools in the county are offering a program of formal music instruction. At the inception of the program, only one of the elementary schools had a well-developed instrumental program. This year 13 schools in the county are offering instrumental instruction to their pupils in addition to the vocal program—all through cooperative action.⁹

A cooperative program of music instruction has been developed in Waukesha County (Wisconsin). Any school in the county may join the music program. Music teachers are employed on a county-wide basis, and they, together with a special committee of classroom teachers, develop a general curriculum plan for music at the beginning of each year. Plans are adjusted throughout the year to the immediate and changing needs of each individual school and classroom. A special music teacher-supervisor visits a classroom once a week, teaches the class, and then discusses follow-up plans with the regular teacher. Music instruction is correlated with other classroom activities to a large degree. A tape recorder, a phonograph, records, visual devices, and other equipment all become a part of the music program. One of the major advantages of the music plan is that many schools, especially the smaller ones, could not obtain special music instruction in any other way. Other advantages come through joint planning and purchase of equipment.¹⁰

⁹ Contributed by Michael S. Kies, superintendent, Milwaukee County Schools, Milwaukee, Wisconsin.

¹⁰ Contributed by Winston Brown, superintendent, Waukesha County Schools, Waukesha, Wisconsin.

A comprehensive program of music instruction is provided in the schools of Tuscarawas County (Ohio) on a cooperative basis. A music teacher-supervisor and 13 additional music teachers are employed by the intermediate superintendent's office. Many of these teachers teach in a number of schools each week and as many as three different teachers go to a single school to teach pupils in their particular field of specialization—elementary vocal, chorus, and various types of instrumental instruction. Within two years after the music program was established, every school in the county was having music instruction. The funds supporting the program are paid by the cooperating school districts and the county board of education.

During the 16 years of its operation, this program of music services has tested a number of types of activities. For several years a county-wide band was organized. This group practiced throughout the summer months and played at various community gatherings in the county and at the county fair in the fall. Bands are now organized in each of the school districts and on a regional basis. Each year music festivals are held which, besides contributing to the cultural activity of the community, stimulate interest among parents and children in music instruction. Currently the program maintains 11 bands and a number of choral groups.

The county also employs an art supervisor and has added a number of additional art instructors. The program in art education is operated in much the same manner as that for music. Art workshops for elementary teachers are held under the direction of the art supervisor. During the past two years the supervisor has also been able to provide extension classes for the teachers in the county under the direction of a nearby college. Although art instruction was limited to the elementary grades in the early years of the program, an art elective is now provided in each of the secondary schools, and classes are growing in both enrollment and interest. The art work produced by students is the main part of the local community schools' exhibits at the county fair.¹¹

¹¹ Contributed by W. E. Laws, superintendent, Tuscarawas County Schools, New Philadelphia, Ohio.

An art supervisor and four other circuit art teachers work with the local community school units in Wayne County (Ohio). The program, stimulated by a similar program in Medina County (Ohio), includes art instruction in all of the elementary schools in the county as a part of the regular school curriculum and in the high schools as an elective course. Interest in art has increased rapidly, both on the part of pupils and teachers.¹²

In Wayne County (Michigan) assistance in physical education programs and recreation services provided by the local community schools is given from the intermediate office. The program consists of scheduling and assisting in the various interscholastic athletic contests, supervising recreation activities in the smaller schools, and in providing listings and descriptions of recreational activities. This program developed out of a need experienced during World War II for a physical fitness program. The regular program is financed entirely from county funds, although funds from the local school districts assist in financing a recreation program during the summer months.¹³

A program of reading improvement in Bucks County (Pennsylvania) is now in its third year of operation. The specific activities of the reading consultant have grown out of the needs of the intermediate area and are, for the most part, directed toward *the promotion of a balanced reading program and the prevention of disabilities*. Some of the activities are concerned with the *elimination of disabilities* which already exist. The consultant works in the classroom at the request of a teacher who needs help with such problems as grouping children for reading, using materials, and directing learning activities. Children not making desirable progress in reading despite normal mental ability are referred by the teachers to the consultant for testing. Recommendations are given to the teacher of each of these children regarding appropriate methods, materials, and levels of instruction necessary if improve-

¹² Contributed by Ralph Ely, superintendent, Wayne County Schools, Wooster, Ohio.

¹³ Contributed by Charles E. Brake, deputy superintendent, Wayne County Schools, Detroit, Michigan.

ment is to be made. The consultant serves as a resource person at teacher inservice meetings, for administrators, supervisors, guidance personnel, and reading teachers. He also teaches refresher courses and advanced courses in reading to interested teachers.

The program of reading improvement includes a reading clinic for the examination of very serious disabilities when more extensive diagnosis is necessary. Appropriate instruction during the summer and regular school year is provided for children who need special individualized help in reading due to extreme disabilities and personality complications. A systematic program of vision and hearing screening, an up-to-date library of professional materials for teachers, efforts to keep the public informed about the methods and progress of the program, instructional guides for teachers, and an abundance of remedial materials for teacher use are all a part of the program. In only two years of operation, 10 additional persons are spending full time in reading improvement work in the local community schools in the county at both elementary and secondary levels.¹⁴

Vocational and technical instruction is provided in Augusta County (Virginia) at the Woodrow Wilson Technical School which has been in operation since 1947. The school operates on a 12-month basis, and courses require from six months to two years to complete. The school is open to pupils from 16 to 60 years of age who can profit from the technical training offered. Classes are kept relatively small with each of the 24 instructors having a maximum of 25 pupils.

The offerings of the school have been expanded each year since its beginning and now include courses in secretarial and general office work, small business management, radio and electronics, television, cosmetology, horology, laundry operation, auto mechanics, body and fender repair, furniture repair and refinishing, upholstery, shoe repair, commercial sewing, barbering, cooking and baking, and vocational crafts.

This year the school has about 300 enrolled exclusive of some 50 high-school pupils who take some part of their advanced

¹⁴ Contributed by Charles H. Boehm, superintendent, Public Schools of Bucks County, Doylestown, Pennsylvania.

training here before completion of their regular high-school course. The program is operated and financed by the Augusta County School Board. Adults above the age of 20 years and six months are required to pay a reasonable tuition. High-school graduates who live in the county and who have not reached this age are admitted without tuition, and their tuition is provided from tax sources by the school district.¹⁵

SPECIAL EDUCATIONAL SERVICES FOR THE ATYPICAL

In most communities, the number of pupils who deviate sufficiently from normal to require special educational services is relatively small. The type of services required for an adequate educational program for those with limited vision, hearing disabilities, speech deficiencies, orthopedic handicaps, and other types of handicaps which require them to be homebound either for short periods or permanently is often highly specialized, both in terms of teaching methods and in the facilities and instructional materials necessary. In most communities these pupils are not receiving the educational services they desperately need. Increasingly, community schools are receiving assistance from the intermediate unit in providing an educational program for these atypical children on a larger area basis. The manner in which the program is provided and the scope of the services vary considerably among the states in accordance with the adequacy of state assistance in encouraging the provision of such services.

A program of special educational services has been in operation in a three-county area—O'Brien, Osceola, and Lyon Counties (Iowa)—since 1946. The program, supported largely by the state education department, includes the following types of services:

Hearing Difficulties. Each year Grades 3, 6, and 9 (plus referrals) are given a group hearing test. Where deficiencies are indicated, the children are given a pure-tone audiometric test. Four to six weeks later, this latter group is again tested individually and if a hearing loss is shown, the parents of the

¹⁵ Contributed by Hugh K. Casell, division superintendent, Augusta County Schools, Staunton, Virginia.

children are notified. Classroom seating adjustments are made where necessary. Suitable follow-up is carried on by the supervisor and in most cases beneficial medical care results as well as rehabilitation where necessary.

Speech Defects. At the time of the hearing survey, a speech survey is also made. All third-grade children (plus referrals) are tested and those with speech defects are referred to the supervisor and the speech correctionist. The work in each of the speech correction centers is carried on in four units of nine weeks each. At the end of each unit, the children are retested, their progress evaluated, and recommendations are made for dismissal (either "cured" or ready for classroom teacher help) or for continuation.

Vision Difficulties. Each of the schools in the three-county area tests the vision of each child for both distant and near vision and note certain eye symptoms. Results are sent to the supervisor and the parents of children who seem to have visual difficulties are notified. Where medical care and the purchase of glasses pose a financial problem, sources of assistance are sought. Clear type books and other sight-saving materials are made available to the schools for use by children whose doctor prescribes the need.

Physically Handicapped. Pupils who are able to continue school work but unable to attend school are provided wherever possible, and with their doctor's permission, with school-to-home telephone equipment. By this means the child can hear all that goes on in his classroom (or classrooms in the case of junior and senior high-school pupils) and can in turn recite and converse with the teacher and the class. Since the early 1940's, many children in Iowa have "attended classes" in this way, either for a short period from several months to a year or for their entire school life. Some have been presidents of their class and valedictorians at commencement. The Iowa program of school-to-home telephone teaching differs from those of many other states (and in this factor lies its success) in that *a child continues with his own teacher and his own class*. Excellent results are realized not only from the academic standpoint, but also from the psychological. Last year, eight such telephone "hook-ups" were established in this three-county area.

Other services for the physically handicapped are the visiting teacher (home or hospital) where the school-to-home equipment is not feasible and special transportation for those children able to attend school but not able to walk or take the bus.

Mental Retardation. The mentally slow child is tested to establish his rate of learning, his achievement level, his social maturity, and his behavior patterns. An educational program based on these results is outlined for the teacher, and methods and materials are recommended. Achievement is checked at the end of the school year.

Maladjustment. Pupils who appear to be socially and emotionally maladjusted are referred to a practicing physician and to a public-school psychologist for examination and recommendations as to an appropriate educational program. In serious cases, psychiatric services are obtained.

Many children have more than one handicap and therefore receive more than one of the special services. Last year more than 600 children received special services in this three-county program.¹⁶

A program of special services similar to that described above is operated cooperatively among Benton, Iowa, and Tama Counties (Iowa). One of the outstanding features of these programs is the cooperative efforts of the teachers, parents, doctor, county superintendent, psychologist, speech consultant, local community board of education, county nurse, supervisor of special education, and elementary supervisor for each individual case in need of the special service.¹⁷

The program of special educational services in Coos County (Oregon) is just in its second year of operation and only now beginning to develop. Community school districts in this county may request assistance from the intermediate unit. When requested, the responsibility for obtaining and supervising teachers for home instruction is assumed by the intermediate office for children physically unable to attend school and who are able to profit from instruction. Individual children who have speech or reading problems are also given assistance, although this phase of the program is as yet quite limited. Psychometric testing is provided, and this service is used occasionally by the Health and Juvenile Departments of the county. In general, the special education services provided are consultative and supervisory with respect to the special problems in the community schools. Coordination is another major emphasis, since cooperation with many different agencies is required to help the handicapped child profit as much as is possible from his educational experiences.¹⁸

The program for providing special educational services for exceptional children in Marathon County (Wisconsin) is somewhat unique from other operating programs in that it is sup-

¹⁶Contributed by Mrs. Ruth S. Amundson, special education supervisor for O'Brien, Osceola, and Lyon Counties, Sheldon, Iowa.

¹⁷Contributed by Sigurd B. Walden, supervisor of special education for Benton, Iowa, and Tama Counties, Morengo, Iowa.

¹⁸Contributed by Richard W. Woodcock, director of special education, Coos County Schools, Coquille, Oregon.

ported entirely through county funds and without subsidy from state or federal agencies. The program in operation since 1952 assists children with problems in speech, hearing, vision, mental retardation, and social and emotional maladjustments. One of the important ways in which the program functions is through the inservice improvement of teachers. The teachers from the various local community schools in the county meet regularly on released time in small groups. Parents are also invited into the groups. Together they plan and decide on the problems they wish to explore, and frequently these include how to help children with learning problems—problems of children with handicaps such as speech defects. The actual guidance of the groups comes from the two general supervisors under the direction of the county superintendent. The goal kept in mind throughout all the planning is to establish the teacher as a qualified consultant, able to help parents and pupils having problems. When teachers understand more about children's behavior than they did previous to the inservice emphasis, they are able to do a more competent job of talking things over with the parents of a child. In this way many anxieties are curbed and children aided in their adjustment problems. Those children and parents needing more help are counseled by the special supervisor, and the services of a psychiatrist are obtained for serious cases.

Many groups in the various communities and in the county assist with the program. The county library and bookmobile provide an extensive assortment of professional books and magazines which become a part of the parent education program. Parent groups and service clubs have purchased child-development films which circulate freely to homemakers, church, PTA, and mothers club groups. About 100 showings and discussions were held last year with the guidance of nurses and general supervisors.¹⁹

A survey in Lincoln County (Oregon) showed that many children in the county had, in varying degrees, sight, hearing, and speech impairments, and that a number were chronically

¹⁹ Contributed by Roger B. Maas, supervisor of exceptional children, Marathon County Schools, Wausau, Wisconsin.

ill and maladjusted. The program established last year in cooperation with the state education department provides the same services and educational opportunities to these children, wherever they are found in the county, as to all other children. Classroom teachers are provided with advice and guidance and special instructional materials to aid in the learning problems of physically handicapped children who are able to attend school, and part-time teachers are employed to give five hours of instruction each week to those who are homebound. Children who might benefit from psychiatric consultation are referred to a psychiatric clinic which is held in the county twice each year in cooperation with the public health department.²⁰

Homebound children in Clarion County (Pennsylvania) receive the attention of the special education services provided for the various schools in the county. Upon a physician's recommendation for home instruction and psychological examination, school-to-home telephone instruction is provided. This is supplemented with individual tutoring in the home under the supervision of the special education service. Community groups are encouraged to participate in assisting with the costs of this service. In one instance, for example, the Welfare Club of the Clarion Division of the glass company at which the father of the child worked assumed all the costs of the program. The combination of the school-to-home telephone instruction and private tutoring is considered to be most satisfactory and effective.²¹ A very similar program is operating in Allegheny County (Pennsylvania).²²

In Ingham County (Michigan) two speech correctionists are provided to assist the speech defective children in the 12 schools in the county. None of the schools served is large enough to provide the service. Each local community school district is assessed and this money supplemented by state funds to finance the program. An advisory committee of commu-

²⁰ Contributed by J. T. Longfellow, district superintendent, Lincoln County Schools, Toledo, Oregon.

²¹ Contributed by John E. Bower, Jr., supervisor of special education, Clarion County Schools, Clarion, Pennsylvania.

²² Contributed by Arthur G. Henry, supervisor of special education, Allegheny County Schools, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

nity school administrators and the intermediate superintendent meet together during the year to maintain liaison of the program with the cooperating schools.²¹

A school for the mentally handicapped is operated in Walworth County (Wisconsin) and serves all the rural and urban schools in the county. Referrals by teachers, nurses, and administrators are individually tested by the county psychologist and reviewed by the supervisor of the handicapped from the state education department. The IQ range of those admitted is usually about 50-75 and the chronological age range is 9-16. The service was initiated in 1949 at the request of teachers and community school administrators who recognized that the regular classroom instruction was not adapted to the needs of these slow learning children. The school is administered by a Special Service Committee: one city superintendent, one village principal, the county nurse, the superintendent of the State School for the Deaf (located within the county), the president of the county medical society, the president of the county PTA council, the county superintendent of schools, and one lay member. The special school is supervised by the county elementary supervisor and the teacher of the class is specially trained to teach mentally retarded children.

One of the aspects of this special school for mentally retarded children is that the curriculum is built around the "hot lunch" program. The children, guided by their teacher, plan their menus for the week and go shopping for food. All purchasing, planning, cooking, and serving is done by the group. The children learn by doing, not by being told. Language work deals with proper ways of meeting people, waiting on tables, or greeting visitors. Reading becomes a needed skill when recipes, newspaper ads, diet suggestions, and menus are involved. Arithmetic is needed in checking the amounts of proteins, carbohydrates, or starches present in each pupil's lunch. The weights of foods purchased are carefully checked, bills figured and paid. Health and safety come in for a large part of the program. One of the highlights for the boys and girls came

²¹ Contributed by Alton J. Stroud, superintendent, Ingham County Schools, Mason, Michigan.

last year when the school board members in the county (40 of them!) visited the school for dinner. The meal was completely prepared and served by the children with the guidance of their teacher.²⁴

A different type of special educational service to the handicapped is the Woodrow Wilson Rehabilitation Center operated in Augusta County (Virginia) by the state board of education in cooperation with the county schools. This center is not a hospital. Its function is to provide counseling, physical rehabilitation, and vocational training to persons with residual handicapping disabilities, in order that they may again resume suitable work. This service was begun in October 1947 and each year it has rendered a most valuable service to the state and also to other states in vocational diagnosis and counseling, physical therapy, occupational therapy, fitting of limbs and braces, and giving speech therapy to numerous handicapped persons of all ages. In giving these services, the center works closely with both the high school and the technical school.²⁵ Each unit renders a service which complements the program of the other.²⁶

GUIDANCE, COUNSELING, TESTING, AND ATTENDANCE SERVICES

There is need for educational, social or personal, and vocational guidance for all pupils from the kindergarten through college. The increased complexity of vocational opportunities and the extension of compulsory attendance laws have placed many added and varied responsibilities on the schools. The program of education must provide opportunities for those interested and able to continue their education through secondary schools and colleges and also for those who terminate their secondary or college courses before graduation. Although many community schools are able to provide guidance counselors, testing programs, and the administration of an attend-

²⁴ Contributed by Sheridan Ellsworth, superintendent, Walworth County Schools, Elkhorn, Wisconsin.

²⁵ A brief description of the Woodrow Wilson Technical School is included in this chapter on p. 68.

²⁶ Contributed by Hugh K. Cassell, division superintendent, Augusta County Schools, Staunton, Virginia.

ance accounting system, the services of specialized counselors, social workers, school psychologists, clinical psychologists, psychiatrists and other qualified technical and professional specialists sometimes necessary, are almost always beyond the scope of the community school's ability to provide. In many instances the intermediate unit is able to administer programs which assist the community schools when cases requiring such assistance occur.

An extensive study of the guidance needs in Westchester County (New York) has been made by a committee of community school administrators and the following conclusions reported:

We believe that every boy and girl of high-school age should be interested in getting the most out of his school experience. To do so, he should have at some time during his educational career in Grades 9 to 12 at least one thorough, objective, and as-complete-as-possible appraisal of his vocational aptitudes, interests, abilities, and personality—in some cases there may be a need for a second, or even a third, such appraisal. We believe, too, that many students, if left to their own resources will be unable to secure such services. For many, this is financially impossible. This type of service can be handled in most instances far more effectively and economically in a Guidance Center.²⁷

As a result of this survey and recommendation and with the cooperation of the intermediate superintendent, a guidance center was established in the county.

The staff of the guidance center consists of a director, a counselor, a psychologist, a psychometrist, a secretary, and a clerk. Ten school systems participate in the support and services of the center. Complete reports of the special testing and counseling are forwarded to the local school guidance counselors who discuss the outcomes further with the student and his parents. Following this, a copy of the report, along with the testing profile and other related material, is placed in the hands of the student and his parents by the local school counselor. The major purpose of the guidance center is to supplement the work of the local schools in providing guid-

²⁷ From the report of the Principal's Guidance Center Committee of the Northern Westchester County Schools, First Supervisory District, Westchester County, Chappaqua, New York.

ance services which they cannot provide for themselves.²⁸

Psychological services are provided for any school district in one intermediate area in Suffolk County (New York) on request. Children are referred by teachers, school nurses, principals, parents, probation officers, welfare workers, and physicians, for such matters as academic retardation, emotional instability, objectionable behavior problems, and physical symptoms coupled with psychologic disturbances. On referral, a background history is prepared for each child and the symptoms are noted and discussed with the person making the referral. A variety of psychological tests are administered as indicated by the disturbances manifested. The test results are interpreted to those professional persons who are in close contact with the child, and methods of overcoming the disturbance recommended. Frequently the psychologist, following up on recommendations, requires the assistance of local agencies in the county. Wherever possible the utilization of all available facilities is employed in helping the child to make a more satisfactory adjustment to his particular situation.

During the past year the intermediate district employed a team of psychologists, a social worker, and a psychiatrist to staff a child adjustment center as an added service to the children and the community schools in the area. The clinic functions primarily to assist the student in changing patterns of behavior so that he may better meet the demands of the school, whereas the psychologist working in the school, as described above, helps teachers and parents find the best means of conditioning the child.²⁹

A mental hygiene service is provided in Kenosha County (Wisconsin) primarily for the diagnosis and treatment of emotional disturbances of children and their parents in instances where such problems affect the school performance of the child. The total school population of the county is eligible for the service on request. However, only a small number of children and their parents require intensive service.

²⁸ Contributed by Robert E. Bell, superintendent, First Supervisory District, Westchester County, Chappaqua, New York.

²⁹ Contributed by Ruth S. Pasternack and Leonard J. Schwartz, psychologists, Second Supervisory District, Suffolk County, Patchogue, New York.

The program is administered by the county superintendent of schools and the services are provided by a psychiatric social worker and a psychologist. The program is financed entirely by the county.³⁰

The need for a variety of guidance services was emphasized in a survey of the interests and needs of high-school graduates and nongraduates in Milwaukee County (Wisconsin). It was found, for example, that the percentage of graduates attending college varies from 12 percent in the industrial areas to 92 percent in the highly residential areas. A comprehensive program of guidance services has been developed for all the schools in the city and the county. Teachers, guidance counselors, and administrators counsel with pupils, parents, and community groups. The teaching and giving of vocational information is a continuous process within the classroom as well as in the guidance office. Speakers, panel discussions, excursions, and career programs are scheduled throughout the year among the various schools.

Emphasis on the inservice education programs for teachers include the following observations and experiences:

1. A sensitivity on the part of the teacher to the immediate needs of the child in his relationship with pupils and teachers.
2. Sufficient understanding of, and familiarity with, modern guidance practices so that the teacher will be sensitive to the full guidance possibilities throughout a day's contact with pupils.
3. Some competency in the use and interpretation of tests and other evaluative materials.
4. Experiences and beginning skills in conducting individual conferences.
5. A recognition of the possibilities of guidance through school activities, clubs, and such other groups of children or adults as may be appropriate.
6. The experiences of participating in conferences which include pupils, parents, teachers, counselors, principal, and visiting teacher.
7. Experiences in actually developing curricula in terms of the needs of individual pupils.
8. A recognition of the distinction between such problems which may well be solved by the classroom and homeroom teacher, and those which should be referred to specialists.
9. A knowledge of school and community resources to which a classroom teacher may turn for assistance.

³⁰ Contributed by Margaret Diehl, superintendent, Kenosha County Schools, Kenosha, Wisconsin.

10. The recognition of symptoms of good physical and mental health in youth and a familiarity with the general principles of mental hygiene.
11. The sympathetic understanding of the problems of social adjustment and orientation of children and youth when entering a new school.
12. A recognition of the need and opportunities of teaching, either formally or incidentally, such vocational information and attitudes best suited to the various age levels.

This set of guidance experiences was developed to serve as a checklist for teachers and as a basis for group discussions.³¹

Guidance is the newest service provided cooperatively by the five reorganized school districts in one intermediate area in Lewis County (New York). This area is truly rural in that there is no village over 900 population and the K-12 enrollment ranges from 200 to 450 pupils in the schools. A program of guidance services designed to meet the vocational and educational needs of the young people in the schools has been developed. Prior to 1951 when this program went into effect each school had a part-time guidance person but in all but two cases these people were not trained in guidance. One of the most effective features of the program has been the inservice development of understanding of and skill in guidance services by the guidance people, teachers, and administrators. This inservice program is carried on by a number of means. Once each two weeks the guidance director meets with the intermediate superintendent, the community school administrators, and the elementary supervisor. At least once every two weeks he meets with each school faculty. The five school counselors and the guidance director meet together at least once each month. Out of this series of meetings has developed a number of study programs and specific projects and activities—all contributing to the inservice improvement of the school personnel involved. Programs of child study and other adult group activities are also a part of the program. Last year the PTA in one of the communities, for example, undertook a study of the "purpose of the schools."³²

³¹ Contributed by Alvin H. Hanson, supervisor, Milwaukee County Schools, Milwaukee, Wisconsin.

³² Contributed by Howard G. Sackett, superintendent, Second Supervisory District, Lewis County, Port Leyden, New York.

The administration of a testing program is provided for the schools in Iroquois County (Illinois). All of the school districts in the county participate to some extent in this program. Last year the program included testing for mental maturity, achievement, and reading ability at various grade levels.³³

As in many other areas, the enforcement of attendance laws in Genesee County (Michigan) has progressed beyond the truant officer stage. The matter of attendance of children in school often involves more than the question of misbehavior on the part of either parents or children. Consideration of mental health, proper grade placement, economic factors, and family status and problems often become a part of the attendance behavior of children. A full-time attendance supervisor is provided to serve the 68 districts in this county, including the 22 districts maintaining a secondary program. Although each of the local schools maintains the attendance records and does preliminary work on attendance problems, difficult cases are referred to the county attendance supervisor.³⁴

In Dane County (Wisconsin) a similar attendance service is provided. In many instances it is found that the compulsory attendance law must be interpreted to parents. Plans for an educational program suited to the interests of children who are chronic attendance problems are developed cooperatively with the elementary- or high-school administrators. Efforts are made to discover the child's interests and appropriate adjustments in his school program are made whenever possible and desirable.³⁵

The service of attendance or membership accounting is new this year in the program of Wayne County (Michigan) as a result of legislation in that state which requires the auditing of membership records of all school districts. Reports are received and checked and such spot checks as are necessary to determine the accuracy of the membership reporting are made. Assistance is given to the school districts in the county in set-

³³ Contributed by R. P. Roberts, superintendent, Iroquois County Schools, Watseka, Illinois.

³⁴ Contributed by Mrs. Daisy E. Howard, superintendent, Genesee County Schools, Flint, Michigan.

³⁵ Contributed by James N. Langer, transportation and attendance director, Dane County Schools, Sun Prairie, Wisconsin.

ting up pupil accounting records and in interpreting the regulations and directives of the state program.³⁰

HEALTH SERVICES

The health of both pupils and teachers has a great influence upon learning activities. Pupil health is of such importance that attention needs to be given to the careful screening and checking of pupils to assure their fitness for school attendance and for participation in various aspects of the school program. In some areas, health services are adequately provided by other than school agencies, but in many places it is necessary for the schools to provide the services needed. Even where adequate health services are available, coordination of the facilities available and the needs of the schools are essential. Many of the smaller schools which are unable to provide or have the services of a nurse-teacher, a dental hygiene program, or even to have the services of a doctor, have been able to get assistance from the intermediate unit through a cooperative program with other schools in the area. Many health services can be administered more effectively when the larger area is involved.

Part of the workshop for teachers held prior to the opening of school in Fulton County (Georgia) has been devoted to a consideration of health problems and the health program. The total school staff in the county was involved in this workshop and they met in three groups—high-school teachers, elementary-school teachers, and other school employees such as lunchroom workers and custodians. Teachers discussed the use of the health record card which is a part of the permanent record which is kept for each child from his entrance in school to his graduation. The dental staff explained their preventative program and gave suggestions as to how the classroom teacher could prepare the children in her class for the dental mobile. A doctor discussed the preparation and selection of pupils for the school physical examination. Hearing and vision surveys were explained and follow-up procedures discussed. Plans were made for the best use of the time in each

³⁰ Contributed by Charles E. Brake, deputy superintendent, Wayne County Schools, Detroit, Michigan.

school for the county health nurse. Ways in which the safety program could be improved were planned. A sanitary engineer discussed standards of cleanliness with lunchroom workers and custodians. The supervisor made plans with lunchroom managers to improve the nutritional standard of the school lunch which plays such an important part in the health of the school child.

Chest x-rays are given to every teacher as a part of the regular yearly program. Complete physical examinations are required every two years. The importance of a physically fit teacher is stressed in the health program of this county. The liberal sick leave benefits encourage each teacher to be in the classroom only when ready to do a good job in every way.³⁷

A planning conference for the teachers in Tift County (Georgia) at the beginning of the school year recognized health problems as among the most serious of those needing immediate attention. They agreed that for a program to be effective the following topics should receive attention and study throughout the year: providing a healthful school environment, providing for prevention and correction of physical defects, planning a more effective program for the control of communicable diseases, planning a more effective recreation program for the school and communities, and improving the nutrition program. The teachers recognized the need for the health education program to be concerned with the whole life of the child, to give him learning experiences which would produce desirable changes in his personal, social, physical, and emotional health, and to give him an opportunity to think through and help solve problems.³⁸

As an outgrowth of a state workshop, a county health council composed of the leaders of chairmen of organizations in Meade County (Kansas) has been developed. Workshops have been held in which teachers and health workers have considered the health problems common to the various schools and communities within the county. Thirty-six county agencies

³⁷ Contributed by Mary Brooks, supervisor of home economics and health, Fulton County Schools, Atlanta, Georgia.

³⁸ Contributed by Frances Benson, supervisor, Tift County Schools, Tifton, Georgia.

were represented at a recent workshop in addition to teachers, parents, and school administrators.²⁰

The teachers in Breathitt County (Kentucky), meeting in small groups with representatives of various county agencies, considered the importance of the need for teachers to have a clear and definite understanding of the techniques involved in living and learning everyday health practices. As a result of their efforts, a comprehensive guide for health and physical education was developed for use by the teachers.²¹

A pre-entrance physical examination for children about to enter each of the 25 local community schools in Dallas County (Texas) has become a regular service of the intermediate office in cooperation with the public health department and other groups. Each fall a clinic is set up in each school where every child can be examined by county school physicians and local physicians whenever possible. The program has required that a parent or other adult bring each child and his record of immunizations to the place of examination. Local PTA's assist in the project, help to maintain the quarters, take charge of registrations, and weigh and measure the children. The public health nurses in the district record the child's health history, and confer with each mother regarding the general health of the child and of other children in the family. A nutritionist discusses the child's diet and eating habits. The children's teeth are examined and parents are advised when dental problems are discovered. The school physician examines each child or when parents prefer, provides a report form for an examination by the family physician so that a record of the child's physical condition will be available. Nurses discuss the recommendations of the nutritionist and doctors advise the parents as to ways and means of arranging for any medical care recommended for the children. Immunization and booster shots are administered when needed. The examinations are thorough and the cooperation and good will developed is valuable to both the parents and the schools.

²⁰ Contributed by Ola Granger, superintendent, Meade County Schools, Meade, Kansas.

²¹ Contributed by Marie R. Turner, superintendent, Breathitt County Schools, Jackson, Kentucky.

Another part of the health service program provided for the schools in the county has been the screening of children for hearing and vision defects. Cases which indicate the possible need for medical care are reported to the parents for referral to physicians.⁴¹

The program of pre-entrance physical examinations for school children in the 12 districts in Polk County (Wisconsin) places a great deal of emphasis on nutrition and educational and emotional readiness as well as physical readiness. The county's public health nurse assists school staff members in the program.⁴²

In Oakland County (Michigan) the intermediate superintendent's office and the community schools in the county cooperate with the county health authorities in a program of general health services. Although the employment of nurses, their general assignment to areas of service, and the financing of the program of health services is administered by the public health authorities in the county, certain aspects of the health services are provided by school personnel—organizing pre-school physical examinations, hearing and vision testing, and morning health checks of all children.⁴³

Many areas of the country are not so fortunate as to have well developed health services available for the schools. Health services for the five small reorganized school districts in sparsely populated Lewis County (New York) are being cooperatively provided through a program administered by the intermediate superintendent. The services of a school doctor, a dental hygienist, and a nurse-teacher are provided in this manner for the separate schools in the area.⁴⁴

⁴¹ Contributed by L. A. Roberts, superintendent, Dallas County Schools, Dallas, Texas.

⁴² Contributed by L. R. Bune, superintendent, Polk County Schools, Balsam Lake, Wisconsin.

⁴³ Contributed by William J. Emerson, superintendent, Oakland County Schools, Pontiac, Michigan.

⁴⁴ Contributed by Howard G. Sackett, superintendent, Second Supervisory District, Lewis County, New York.

CHAPTER 4

Services To Help Teachers Meet the Needs of Pupils

AGATHERING of children does not make a school. Neither do fine buildings, modern equipment, new textbooks, and other types of materials. It is the teacher—guiding growth, developing skills, planning for and arranging experiences, planting the seeds of higher hopes and endeavors—who changes an assembly of youth into an institution of living and learning. In the final analysis, the teacher is the school.

The preceding chapter has identified and described briefly a few operating programs of educational services, developed cooperatively by the several community schools in a county or similar area with the assistance and coordination of the intermediate administrative unit. The emphasis in that chapter is upon services provided directly to the pupils. Many of the services which are shared by the community schools in an intermediate area are of a type which more indirectly benefit the pupils, i.e., through the teachers. It is the purpose here to call attention to such services, although it should again be emphasized that very few of the programs described are exclusively within the bounds of this emphasis. The somewhat arbitrary classifications have been established only to facilitate discussion.

Just as the good teacher guides the growth of the child, so should the process of educational administration provide opportunities for teacher growth and for improving instructional effectiveness. Most school systems are not sufficiently large to adequately provide the needed services from their own resources. They can be made available through the development of special resources on a larger area basis. Special consultants and instructional materials assistance for teachers are examples of such services.

04,85/87

p. 75 blank
p. 86 non-reproducible
photo

IMPROVING INSTRUCTION THROUGH SUPERVISION

The first significant educational service provided to teachers and to the small schools by the intermediate unit was instructional supervision. Traditionally the county or rural area superintendent performed this supervisory service himself. The supervisory service provided was often an inspection of the school or classroom motivated by a legal requirement that the schools be "visited" one or more times during each year. In such instances, little attention could be given to actually helping a teacher with the problems of instruction; in many instances the superintendent was not competent to give genuine assistance. Where the need for improving instruction was recognized, the value of the supervisory service was often greatly increased by the employment of a competent assistant, helping teacher, or supervisor who was assigned responsibility for the improvement of instruction.

Instructional supervision which takes on a stimulating, facilitating, coordinating, and evaluating character is a common service provided by most intermediate units in areas where there are still many small schools. In those instances where the individual community school districts are able to provide adequate general supervision of instruction, the nature of the services which intermediate units provide is frequently broader in scope. Here it may be directed to all phases of the school system and include teachers, administrators, and parents in the over-all improvement of education. Complementing such services are those of special coordinators and teacher-consultants who are expert in certain distinct fields where teachers frequently need specialized assistance, such as, for example, reading consultants or curriculum coordinators.

Although not a populous area, the educational needs of the schools in Brown County (South Dakota) offer many challenges. Supervision of instruction is provided for the small schools by the intermediate unit—not through the expenditure of large sums of money but through energy, alertness, and vision. Assistance is given to teachers as classroom problems are identified, and when desirable, specialists and consultants are brought in from outside the county. Curriculum commit-

tees and other groups of teachers meet frequently to discuss instructional problems and to plan ways of solving them. Bulletins and other special types of publications are developed for teacher guidance by the intermediate office in order to coordinate policies and the projects underway by the teachers in the county.¹

A helping teacher is a member of the intermediate unit staff in Ingham County (Michigan) where efforts are directed to assisting teachers in becoming better teachers by improvement of their philosophy and practices and in acquainting them with the availability and use of teaching materials. The work of the helping teacher in this county is carried on through classroom visitations, study groups, consultant services, and inservice education programs. The service is provided for the teachers in all schools in the county not employing superintendents and is available upon request in other school districts. It should be noted that those school districts having local superintendents frequently do request the service.²

Nearly one-third of the more than 30,000 children enrolled in the schools in Lane County (Oregon) are in small schools in the rural areas. In order to assist the teachers in these schools, two elementary teacher-consultants have been added to the intermediate unit staff. These consultants assist teachers in securing and using teaching materials, in improving teaching methods, in planning daily work schedules, and in coordinating the work in various subject areas. They are able to acquaint teachers with successful practices and teaching methods observed in other schools and to assist in organizing inservice study groups for educational improvement. Their efforts help in building better working relationships among the teachers and among the schools in the county. They are able to assist teachers by bringing instructional problems to the attention of the local community school administrators and the county school superintendent, by securing consultants in special fields,

¹ Contributed by Ruth Johnson, superintendent, Brown County Schools, Aberdeen, South Dakota.

² Contributed by Alton J. Stroud, superintendent, Ingham County Schools, Mason, Michigan.

and by coordinating the county school program with the total state program.³

For the past three years, Rowan County (North Carolina) has had three general supervisors of instruction. These supervisors serve in the capacity of helping teacher and are on call to any of the 25 school centers in the county. They serve as consultants for the specific problems of individual teachers or groups of teachers, assist in introducing and familiarizing teachers with new materials of instruction, and give help in planning the programs of instruction. They organize workshops in which teachers participate and learn through experience. They assist in orienting new and beginning teachers, in administering and interpreting the results of the testing program, in helping teachers evaluate their work, and in diagnosing the needs of each teacher's situation. Their activities are aimed toward using the full potentialities of every person connected with the school and in encouraging teachers to create and do for themselves.

The three supervisors are well trained and experienced teachers. One has special training in health and physical education, mathematics, and social studies. A second is a specialist in early childhood education with emphasis on curriculum development, supervision, and music. The third has served as a teacher and principal and is a specialist in organization, administration, and supervision. There are no supervisors in the county in special subject areas, but specialists are brought in from the state education department staff when needed to assist the supervisors in helping the teachers in special areas.⁴

Many examples of professional cooperation among community school and intermediate unit staff members which have resulted in the improvement of instruction through supervision can be identified. The few examples reported here are perhaps sufficient to indicate that, when supervision is directed toward assisting teachers with their individual instructional

³ Contributed by Mrs. Lucille L. Klinge, superintendent, Lane County Schools, Eugene, Oregon.

⁴ Contributed by Charles C. Irwin, superintendent, Rowan County Schools, Salisbury, North Carolina.

problems, the demands for supervision are great. Teachers need help, and very often the specialized help is not available in the local community school system. Participation in the supervisory services in the many school districts in Douglas County (Nebraska), for example, is on a voluntary basis. Although enthusiasm on the part of local school superintendents was somewhat reserved when the program was begun, it developed rapidly as they saw the results of the program contribute to the improvement of instruction in their local schools. Periodically the program is evaluated and suggestions made for improvement. The local school districts have asked for more supervisors and for other types of expanded service from the intermediate office. There is general recognition that the cost of specialized services prohibits their being provided by the local schools themselves. The supervisory services have been expanded, and, in addition to general supervision, they include speech correction, education for retarded children, music education, library services, and audio-visual materials.⁵

The needs of teachers in a system of education which attempts to provide a comprehensive program of opportunities for all children are great and varied. Few classroom teachers are equipped with the knowledge, skills, and temperament to be all things to all pupils. The need for specialists in education is increasingly evident. This does not mean that the classroom teacher is to be relegated to a minor role or is to have less responsibility; it means that his part in the educational process is to be strengthened and enriched through the assistance of a supporting cast of specialists in such fields as art, music, physical education, health, guidance, reading, and other aspects of the curriculum.

INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS CENTERS

The performance of a teacher and the quality of the product resulting from teacher efforts is affected as much by the tools available to do the job as is the performance and quality of the work of the cabinet maker, the lens grinder, or the machinist.

⁵Contributed by William L. Hawer, superintendent, Douglas County Schools, Omaha, Nebraska.

The job of each can often be done with simple tools, but if it is done in this manner the results are frequently crude and amateurish. Effective teaching requires adequate and appropriate instructional materials. Community school districts have been able to develop very effective centers through which instructional materials are available for use by teachers through sharing with other community schools in their area in a program administered by the intermediate unit.

Seventeen of the 31 school districts in Livingston County (Illinois) belong to the county film library, a voluntary cooperative program operated by the county school office. The library now owns about 150 films as well as filmstrips, projectors, viewmaster reels, and other equipment. The program began in 1947 and has increased in terms of the films and other equipment available each year. Films are stored, cleaned, repaired, and mailed out from the materials center and are loaned to member schools for a period of one week; the loan may be extended by request if the film has not been reserved by any other school for a second week. Film correlations for the chief elementary textbooks used by the schools of the county have been worked out and copies are provided all the schools in the county. Teacher film committees for subject matter and grade levels preview and select the films to be purchased. The assistant county superintendent who serves as an instructional supervisor assists teachers with the use of films and suggests those which might appropriately be used in class projects. The program is financed by yearly membership dues from the participating schools. One faculty member from each participating school serves on the governing board of the library; this governing board makes all rules and regulations regarding the film center. In addition to the film center, the intermediate office makes an effort to have copies of recently published textbooks available for examination purposes as well as samples of various other types of educational equipment and materials. A wide variety of professional books are available for loan to teachers.⁸

⁸ Contributed by Mrs. Lucile Goodrich, superintendent, Livingston County Schools, Pontiac, Illinois.

A program of audio-visual materials has existed in Coos County (Oregon) for many years. A collection of various types of materials—pictures, books, and recordings—were available to the schools in the county and were delivered to the teachers as the county superintendent traveled about the county. These materials proved very helpful to teachers and the continued interest in the provision of instructional materials was responsible for the development of the present County Audio-Visual Library. When the interest indicated that the program should be expanded, a committee, each member representing a different area of the county, was established to survey the needs and to make recommendations for the type of program which could be realized. Because funds were limited, the program began slowly. The committee decided that it would be necessary, if the program was successful, to develop an effective system for the circulation of materials. The procedures adopted are simple and helpful to teachers in planning their work. Now in its second year of operation, the library has nearly 1000 filmstrips and recordings. The materials have been selected so as to be useful for various aspects and levels of the school programs. Much of the material is also of interest to adults and, if a district has contributed to the support of the program, its PTA, Grange, and other organizations are free to borrow from the library. Many teachers send in mail orders for an entire week while others prefer to come into the county office to preview before ordering. The school districts in the county vary from four one-teacher schools to seven districts which enroll from 1000 to 3000 pupils. Contributions from the districts in support of the program range from \$ to 400 dollars. Two of the first-class districts in the county are now participating in this shared service. The enthusiasm for the contribution of this cooperative effort to the educational program in the county is expressed by the county superintendent: "The teachers definitely feel that the library makes their classroom work more efficient as well as adding a great deal of enjoyment. You need not hesitate because your area is small. With care, a workable plan can be found."¹

¹ Contributed by Lillian Farley, superintendent, Coos County Schools, Coquille, Oregon.

Several of the community administrators in Barber County (Kansas) together with the county superintendent were able to make a start with a county teaching materials library three years ago. The difficulty of obtaining films for classroom use when they were needed, as well as the experience of county film libraries observed in other states, provided the incentive. The teachers in the county were organized into committees for previewing and selecting the films which were purchased. Local school districts agreed to contribute to the purchase of these films over a three-year period. Workshops and extension classes were organized to help teachers in the use of films and other materials. Although the teachers now consider films as much a part of teaching equipment as pencils and paper, they are supplemented by the county book library, tape recorders, and a library of recordings.

Soon after the Barber County library was begun, the schools in a number of other counties in Kansas organized to pool their resources and efforts in a cooperative program. Programs are now well under way in Meade, Harper, Gray, Pratt, and Butler Counties. The Meade County library is more than strictly a county library, for several nearby schools outside the county have purchased films in the cooperative program and use the library the same as county schools.²

The film library in Beckham County (Oklahoma) got its start in 1945 at one of the regular monthly meetings of the community school administrators in the county. The plan was completed and approved in a county teachers meeting and a five-member board was elected to administer it. The county school superintendent is directly in charge of the library. The first 50 films were purchased by the schools on a five-year lease-to-own-plan. The administrative board is appointed each year by the Executive Board of the Beckham County Teachers' Association. Films are available to teachers without any charge other than what is paid by the school district in support of the program. Each of the participating schools pays into the library fund an amount equal to the average daily attendance times 25 cents. This annual payment plus state matching funds

² Reported in *Kansas Schools* 9:4, May 1955. Kansas State Education Department.

has paid for approximately \$18,000 worth of films, filmstrips, recordings, and equipment in the few years that the program has been in operation."

The intermediate office in Grant County (South Dakota) makes available a wide variety of instructional materials for the 60 schools and 63 teachers in the county. Among the services are a filmstrip library and projection equipment, a lending library of more than 5000 books, a lending library of other teaching aids such as charts, recordings, and pictures, a professional library for teachers, and a supply of textbooks and other instructional materials which are available for purchase by the schools."

The Curriculum Materials Center in Bucks County (Pennsylvania) has a number of functions: it cooperates with the community schools in making available a variety of aids to instruction and over-all program operation which the individual schools or school systems could not provide efficiently or economically for themselves, and it is continually sensitive to suggestions for material selection; it seeks to encourage and assist local initiative in producing and obtaining materials for individual school or school system ownership and circulation; it strives to meet the inservice and other professional needs of school personnel and those who work with the teachers. For a number of years the intermediate unit staff in collaboration with the leadership and resources of community school personnel have purchased, obtained free, produced, and promoted the use of a variety of outstanding curriculum materials for the schools in the county. These items included art, filmstrips, photographs, slides, and wall (photo) murals. Cooperative film purchases were initiated in 1944 to stimulate the use of visual teaching aids in the classrooms. Until two years ago, the countywide circulation of these films was administered by one of the local community school administrators and the films distributed from that building. By 1952, however, the accumu-

"Contributed by Mrs. Ruby F. Bunnell, superintendent, Beckham County Schools, Sayre, Oklahoma.

"Contributed by Helen Jyborup, superintendent, Grant County Schools, Milbank, South Dakota.

lation of materials and the needs of the schools were such that the Curriculum Materials Center was formed and a professional person added to the intermediate unit staff to help administer and supervise organization, evaluation, procurement, production, selection, and distribution of the materials and equipment.

Currently, the curriculum materials are distributed once each week by automobile to the booking schools' areas for an annual fee of \$22. This service is safe, swift, and economical. It is estimated that the time saved by this delivery service is the equivalent of having one-third more materials. Within one day, shipments of all materials are loaded, delivered, and returned items collected and unloaded at the Center. This vehicle (owned by the employees) averages 150 miles on each trip and, in addition to the curriculum materials, delivers other kinds of materials to the schools. Within each of the local school systems, the supervisors and administrators assume responsibility for the materials. In individual buildings, the librarian is frequently the local coordinator.

The Center owns many types of audio-visual equipment and accessories for use by other intermediate unit staff consultants in their work and for use in the production of materials. These include photographic equipment, a laminating machine, recording equipment, motion picture and special automatic slide projectors and cabinets, sign making equipment, and others. Films, filmstrips, equipment, disc and tape recordings, slides, photographs, study prints, murals, and a museum are among the materials available for loan to the schools. Among the special materials available through the Center are "school administration portfolios" (consisting of collections of pamphlets, folders, and booklets of particular interest to school board members, administrators, supervisors, and curriculum and inservice improvement committees) and a traveling art gallery which includes works in oil, water color, pastel, crayon, etching, charcoal, sculpture, ceramics, plastic, and stained glass. County artists are heavily represented in the collection which is valued at \$46,000; about 90 percent of the collection has been contributed by individuals as memorials. The Center sponsors showings by individual artists and groups almost every month.

during the school year. Where an individual artist is involved, an interview with him is recorded as he talks about his work on display. Each showing is publicized and open to anyone. Colored slides and photographs are used with the recordings for circulation among the schools. Other exhibits which include laminated oversize mounted photographs, protected parchment deeds, and mounted collections of minerals and fossils representative of the county (together with descriptive literature and labels) are also available for circulation among the schools.¹¹

Although most instructional materials are purchased from outside sources, the Department of Instructional Materials in Alameda County (California) produces some types of teaching aids. The materials produced include study prints, charts, some filmstrips, and some 2 x 2 slide sets. One commercial artist and two photographers are employed to render these production services. The purpose of local production is to make available to the teachers individualized materials that meet specific needs in the local instructional program, or to supply required materials that cannot be located from outside sources. The following indicates kinds of materials being produced:

Teacher Education Packets. These might be considered pictorial resource units and are of two types: (a) a series of 8 x 10 captioned photographs showing the sequential development of a unit study, and (b) an assortment of random shots depicting a variety of activities for a particular unit of study. These packets are used for the inservice education of teachers and portray such units as: "The Dairy Farm," "Furniture Construction for Primary Grades," "The United Nations," "The School Garden," and "Upper Elementary Arithmetic."

Teacher Education Charts. Charts of varying sizes are designed for the inservice education of teachers and cover such subjects as: "Art Can Help" (a series of posters showing the integration of art with other aspects of the instructional program), "Map Selection Chart" (factors to be considered in the selection of maps and globes), "Suggestions for Your Science Program" (a series of posters offering suggestions for the elementary science program).

Unit Study Packets. These packets are designed for classroom use and are comprised of 11 x 14 color plates, or 11 x 14 mounted photographs, such

¹¹ Contributed by Robert Z. West, Audio-Visual Aids, Bucks County Schools, Doylestown, Pennsylvania.

is, for example: "The Three Little Pigs" (dental health for the primary grades), "The Post Office," "Farm Animals of Alameda County," "Circus Animals," "Circus Performers," and "Immunization."

Classroom Charts. Charts are designed as classroom teaching aids and cover such subjects as: "Early California Indians," "Geological Formation of a Volcano," "The Vikings," and "Geological Formation of the Hayward Area."

Films, and many other types of instructional materials are available for use by the teachers in the school districts in the county. The professional staff of the instructional materials center is also available to work with other intermediate unit staff consultants in the inservice education programs carried on within the county by the various school systems. Their services are in great demand by the local school districts.¹²

A somewhat different kind of intermediate unit service which makes instructional materials available for teachers is the textbook rental program developed in Howard County (Iowa). The textbooks used by the pupils in all of the rural schools in the county are provided on a rental basis. The program, managed by a librarian in the office of the county school superintendent, began 10 years ago on an experimental basis. The advantages were felt to be so great that all textbooks have been provided on a rental basis since that time. The program is reported to be very satisfactory—the pupils like it, the parents like it, and the teachers like it. The rental cost is approximately one-fourth the cost of buying books new. It enables the pupils to start the first day of school with a full set of equipment whereas delays of one or more weeks were formerly common in most schools. Changes in the textbooks are made with ease whenever desirable. The program is economical and no large outlays of funds are necessary for the parent to equip a child for school work. An important part of the program is the responsibility which each child assumes for the materials he uses.¹³

¹²Contributed by Vaughn D. Seidel, superintendent, Alameda County Schools, Oakland, California.

¹³Contributed by Abner A. Hendrickson, superintendent, Howard County Schools, Cresco, Iowa.

CURRICULUM LEADERSHIP

Although curriculum determination within the broad areas established by the state appropriately belongs in each community, certain types of coordination and leadership for the community schools in an intermediate area have been very effective. Such leadership can be of real assistance to teachers when it makes materials and resources available as instructional aids and coordinates the activities of each school with those of the other schools in the area in common curriculum concerns. The manner in which this kind of leadership has assisted teachers can be illustrated with a few brief reports of programs now in operation on a larger area basis.

Like most school systems, one of the most important aims of the school programs in Polk County (Wisconsin) is good health for every school child. Among the aspects of health education, instruction in nutrition and food habits has been stressed for the past three years in all of the schools. After the first year of the program, an evaluation indicated that during the year 51 schools had conducted an eating habits survey; 41 reported improvements in pupils' eating habits, such as: more breakfasts were eaten, pupils brought better lunches to school, more pupils brought milk in their lunch, more pupils were eating green and yellow vegetables, pupils were eating more varieties of food and were taking more time to eat their noon meal. A meeting of the community school administrators, the county agent, the home demonstration agent, the county nurses, the county school superintendent, and creamery representatives considered the possibility of providing more milk for the schools. As a result, milk venders or milk dispensers are now being acquired to replace soft drink machines in the schools.

In order to assist teachers in the matter of conducting their own projects during the study of a unit on nutrition, a *Nutrition Bibliography* and a *List of Nutrition Visual Aids Material* were prepared and made available for all teachers. Films available through the state board of health were found to be very suitable for classroom use and most helpful to teachers in nutrition education. Emphasis on nutrition has increased the number of children participating in the school lunch program. A

county-wide evaluation of the lunch programs has resulted in improvement in menu planning, in the quality of the food served, in sanitation, and in the physical equipment provided. *Eat and Learn* bulletins were distributed to all the schools, and pupils were encouraged to share their nutrition experiences by writing articles on the nutrition activities in their school. Kindergarten mothers' clubs have been organized and the work in nutrition education was made a part of the "Readiness for School Program." Each year the program has been evaluated, progress determined, and plans for the following year developed cooperatively by the teachers.¹⁴

The elementary teachers of Blair County (Pennsylvania) began working together on curriculum materials about six years ago, motivated by an opportunity to help develop a new state elementary curriculum. At first, the efforts were organized and directed by the community school administrators in the county, but within two years responsibility and direction was gradually turned over to the classroom teachers. The county executive board appointed a county workshop committee to take over the inservice education program, and, although administrators were represented, the committee was dominantly teachers. Enthusiasm developed rapidly and practical and profitable plans were prepared for the year's work. These plans were offered to a local steering committee in each of the five elementary workshop areas into which the county had been divided. The membership of each of the local committees included at least one member of the county planning group as well as a representative of the community school administrators.

In each area the groups agreed that the program should: (a) give priority to local curriculum problems as discovered by the teachers in the local area; (b) involve a maximum of activity on the part of each teacher; (c) involve as frequently as possible newer teaching techniques—field trips, sensory aids, sociodramas, and other group activities as opposed to memorization and passive listening; (d) encourage a maximum of good

¹⁴ Contributed by Alvina F. Seary, supervising teacher, and L. R. Bunn, superintendent, Polk County Schools, Balsam Lake, Wisconsin.

fellowship among the teachers in each workgroup; and (e) develop in teachers a sense of responsibility for continuous professional growth. The first two years of work under the county steering committee was felt to be a real beginning. Provision was then made to give more teachers an opportunity to participate in this educational experience as members of the steering committee.

Each year that the program has been in operation emphasis has been given to some aspect of curriculum development. Last year emphasis was upon citizenship and social usage. These areas of study were selected because (a) the unsettled world conditions had alerted every teacher to the need to protect and further the American way of life; (b) the 1951 Pennsylvania Legislature had made mandatory one period of citizenship training each week in every school and many teachers were eager to explore ways in which this time could be made vital and interesting; and (c) there was a feeling that the highest type of character is developed only when there is a real, positive, and emotional response to the basic elements of democratic living. The county committee and local committees cooperated in arranging the workshop groups which met throughout the year. So much excellent material was shared in these workshops that all felt it should be placed in permanent form where anyone might make use of it. A course of study in citizenship was developed—a product of the thinking of the classroom teachers.¹⁷

All public schools have been teaching conservation and resource development for a long time. One of the major problems has been in vitalizing this information in such a way that each individual pupil could visualize and take his part in the nation's development. Instruction is not enough, since the strength of our nation and the future economy depends upon a feeling on the part of all citizens of personal responsibility in promoting the proper use of resources.

This year marks the fifth year of a program in conservation education developed in Klamath County (Oregon). The pro-

¹⁷ Contributed by James E. Butts, superintendent, Blair County Schools, Hollidaysburg, Pennsylvania.

gram developed is planned for all students, Grades 1-12. The program has been organized in such fashion that concentrated study is given to selected topics and yet is sufficiently flexible to include all subject areas at the different grade levels in all types of schools. A five-year cycle plan has been developed in which the emphasis for an entire year is given to a single topic. Although it is recognized that the areas studied each year are related and cannot be completely separated, it was felt that too broad a study might cause failure in achieving the total objective in terms of adequate understanding. Birds, fish and wildlife, soil, water, and forests were set up as the objectives for the first five years. Inservice education for teachers began one year before the program was put into operation and has continued since that time. Included among the activities for teachers have been field trips to factories, forests, reclamation projects and farms, lectures, movies and other visual presentations, demonstrations, and extension courses. Many agencies, both public and private, have participated in the inservice education program.

Since all grade levels participate in the program, a great variety of activities have been desirable. In the elementary classrooms the correlation has taken a pattern most desired by the teachers. In the secondary schools the correlation has been on a subject basis, determined according to the nature and content of the offering. Science and the social studies have probably carried the major portion of the informational offerings. Outstanding work has been done in the areas of art and the language arts through developing the information offered in the other subject areas. Art activities have included modeling with clay, posters, dioramas, mobiles, and basketry with natural materials. The language arts projects have included poems, essays, short stories, news items, radio scripts, plays, speeches, and magazine articles. Other activities have included tree planting, bird feeding, grass seeding, wild game preparations, harvesting and preparation of wild fruits and seeds, lumber grading, mapping of water areas and conservation districts, soil testing, bird counts, construction of bird feeders, and all varieties of field trips.

Although a complete evaluation of the program cannot be made until the present students participate in their communities as adult citizens, many results are already apparent. Among them are: (a) an improved attitude by both students and parents toward conservation matters; (b) excellent public relations in each community; (c) a broader view of the entire educational process by subject minded teachers; (d) more creative work and better motivation in the language arts; (e) a more realistic approach in science and the social studies; and (f) some actual conservation work in tree planting, grass seeding, and range improvement by the pupils.¹⁴

INSERVICE EDUCATION FOR TEACHERS

Programs for the inservice education and improvement of teachers can often be very successfully managed by community schools. For some aspects of these programs, however, the cooperation of the community schools in an intermediate area greatly enhances the value of the time and efforts which teachers spend. This broader base for developing an inservice education program is of particular value when: (a) certain types of teachers are employed in limited numbers by community schools and an inservice program cannot be developed primarily for their particular needs, e.g. kindergarten teachers, or teachers of agriculture, homemaking, modern languages, mentally retarded, or other special areas; (b) the type of inservice program established requires the direction and assistance of specialized personnel which cannot be provided by the community school, e.g. reading consultants, speech therapists, guidance specialists, psychologists, or audio-visual consultants; (c) the emphasis of the program makes coordination among all the schools in the intermediate area desirable. Examples of various types of programs reported earlier in this chapter and in the preceding chapter have included many aspects of inservice education programs. Teacher growth results from almost every educational activity which is a part of the school program. A few additional examples, specifically programs for the inservice

¹⁴ Contributed by C. B. Howe, superintendent, Klamath County Schools, Klamath Falls, Oregon.

improvement of teachers, are included here because of the significant values which can accrue to teachers through community school-intermediate unit cooperation.

The inservice education program of Bucks County (Pennsylvania) is a year-round, continuous program originating in each local community school district, with leadership and resources furnished by the intermediate unit staff at the request of the local communities. Local committees composed of administrators and faculties function in each area in the county to determine appropriate emphases for individual programs. Teacher requests for help and other devices for determining local needs, are used extensively in planning programs. Considerable variation exists in the programs among the schools. The program is effective and has won the cooperation of teachers because help is afforded in each community in response to expressed needs, which means that each local planning committee begins "where they are." Teachers are given time to work on the problems they consider important, and, as leadership and resources have been provided, the need for and effectiveness of the program has become evident. The teachers have requested that the time devoted to inservice education be extended. Included in the school calendar in each of the schools in the county for the past nine years have been four days devoted to inservice education, the result of a decision of local school superintendents. These four days have been extended, at the request of local faculties, to as many as 10 days in some communities.

The intermediate superintendent and his staff assist the local school districts, upon request, in providing resources and leadership for any or all of their meetings. Intermediate staff consultants work with committees in planning the annual County Institute and frequently meet with local committees planning the inservice program in their community. At the request of these groups, they assist in developing emphases and topics for meetings, in deciding upon the type of group structure best suited for working on specific problems, in providing bibliographies or materials from the county education library, in training teachers in group leadership techniques, or in provid-

ing leadership for local community school programs. Intermediate staff members act as discussion leaders, consultants, or resource people in many local inservice programs every year. Often they assist local school districts in securing outstanding people from outside the county to serve in such capacities. The intermediate superintendent and his staff, at the request of local communities, carry on an inservice education program with local leadership in addition to the work with classroom teachers: the intermediate superintendent meets monthly with all the local community school administrators; one assistant meets monthly with directors of secondary education and with the nurses; the assistant in charge of elementary education meets monthly with local elementary supervisors; and the psychologist meets monthly with local school guidance counselors. The psychologist also meets monthly with guidance counselors and elementary supervisors who join together to spend two hours with the psychiatrist of the county mental health clinic in studying child behavior and development. The program and organization of each of these groups are determined by the group itself.

In addition to these group meetings, the intermediate superintendent and his staff are available to local school leaders or committees for individual conferences and consultation. In fact, many local areas regularly reserve time, once each month, in the schedule of county staff members at which time the staff member goes to the individual school and consults on local school problems. Inservice education in Bucks County is a developing, ongoing process—not a series of "programs" but a service to be used by local community schools in whatever ways they feel can be of most help to them.¹⁷

An inservice education program for teachers has been in progress for the past four years in Lincoln County (Oregon) including, among other activities, workshops and extension classes in cooperation with higher education institutions. Administrative and supervisory conferences are held in the county each month and have been devoted to such subjects as "Super-

¹⁷ Contributed by Charles H. Boehm, superintendent, Bucks County Schools, Doylestown, Pennsylvania.

vision of Instruction," "Improvement of the Teaching of Language Arts," "School Budget," "Public Relations," "Maintenance of Buildings and Grounds," and "The Use of Audio-Visual Aids." Results of the program are apparent in the improvement of learning and the development of good relations among pupils, teachers, and parents.¹⁸

Each year in Hamilton County (Ohio) an orientation workshop is held for beginning teachers and those who are new to any of the school districts in the county. Members of boards of education, community school administrators, experienced classroom teachers, state education department officials, county health officers, members of the county PTA, and others participate in the workshop to give the new teachers an overview of the school community in which each will work. Workshops and child study groups which meet throughout the year are also a part of the program.¹⁹

Inservice education has been emphasized during the past nine years as one of the main objectives of the intermediate unit in Douglas County (Nebraska). Each year the program has been evaluated by teachers and administrators. These evaluations have been helpful in guiding the program and have resulted in adaptations and improvements. Among the various activities included in the program are:

Preschool Individual Conferences. Teachers meet individually with supervisors throughout the summer months to study test results, determine individual pupil needs and plan programs to meet these needs, especially for the gifted child and the slow learner, and to discuss any problems which the teacher may have.

Demonstration Teaching. Each teacher is given an opportunity throughout the year to observe skilled teachers at work in a classroom situation similar to his own. Teaching demonstrations are followed by a discussion period.

Discussion Groups. Small groups of teachers meet together regularly to discuss various aspects of the teaching-learning process. Exhibits of various teaching materials, equipment, and charts are available to stimulate

¹⁸ Contributed by J. T. Lonetellow, superintendent, Lincoln County Schools, Toledo, Oregon.

¹⁹ Contributed by Charles B. Crouch, superintendent, Hamilton County Schools, Cincinnati, Ohio.

the informal discussion. Teachers have an opportunity to ask questions, share ideas, consider problems, and get better acquainted.

County Workshop. Arrangements have been made with the University of Omaha to give college credit for a workshop held in the county for teachers in the area. The workshop is conducted by the intermediate superintendent and his staff and others in accordance with the needs and wishes of the participating teachers.²⁶

At the request of a number of teachers in Wexford County (Michigan) for special help in art, music, science, and conservation, an inservice program has been developed which includes extension classes, workshops, and visits to nearby laboratory schools. Assistance from the Central Michigan College of Education, the soil conservation district technicians, and many others have contributed to the program which has had such outgrowths as a county-wide music program, child study groups, recreation programs and play days, and an enriched educational program in all of the schools in the area.²⁷

Inservice education for teachers is an important part of the guidance program in Lewis County (New York). A guidance specialist as a member of the intermediate unit staff meets once each two weeks with the faculty groups in each of the community schools in the area. A few of the study topics in which these groups have been concerned are: "How To Help Pupils Improve in Study Skills," "How To Improve the Reading Program," "Case Studies and Case Conferences," "Working with Groups." Child study groups have also been organized as a part of this program for interested teachers.²⁸

A music program in Washtenaw County (Michigan) in co-operation with the University of Michigan Broadcasting Service has been developed in a manner which not only enriches music education among the schools in the county but also contributes to the abilities of teachers. The program developed involves the teaching of music by radio with follow-

²⁶ Contributed by William J. Hansen, superintendent, Douglas County Schools, Omaha, Nebraska.

²⁷ Contributed by Olive M. Porttade, superintendent, Wexford County Schools, Cadillac, Michigan.

²⁸ Contributed by Howard G. Sackett, superintendent, Second Supervisory District, Lewis County, Pier-Leyden, New York.

up activities after each broadcast directed by the classroom teacher. The effective use of radio in teaching vocal music involves more than merely listening. To most of the teachers participating in the program, the utilization of radio teaching has been an entirely new field. It has been necessary, therefore, to provide instruction to the teachers through special courses, demonstrations, and workshops. The director of broadcasting for the university and his staff, together with the intermediate superintendent and his staff, have cooperated in planning and carrying out an inservice program for teachers. This has resulted in a very successful program of radio teaching.²²

Students preparing for teaching usually spend some part of their program in a classroom under the guidance of an experienced teacher. In most instances, these experiences are as valuable to the regular teacher as to the student. Such has been the experience in Alameda County (California) where a program developed in cooperation with the California College of Arts and Crafts is providing on-the-job training for teacher trainees interested in gaining firsthand experiences in audio-visual education. The experiences are gained through the activities of the intermediate unit's Department of Instructional Materials from which library books, films, slides, filmstrips, study prints, charts, models, exhibits, and other types of teaching tools and equipment are distributed to the schools of the county. The student trainees are given an opportunity to work with the variety of materials and equipment that are used in the instructional program from kindergarten through the secondary school. Their training involves detailed instruction in the operation of various types of audio-visual equipment. They also work with the schools' photographer in learning the uses of photography in education as well as photographic laboratory techniques. In the graphic arts unit, they are given experience in creating picture packets, graphs, pictorial charts, and other visual materials that are used in the classroom. The value of this training program is not only beneficial to the students in terms of their direct experiences

²² Contributed by Howard C. Thayer, deputy superintendent, Washtenaw County Schools, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

in an actual educational operation, but is, because of the student's professional training in art, valuable to the work being carried on by the intermediate unit staff and the teachers in the community schools.²⁴

Local community school districts frequently request the intermediate unit to coordinate and to help staff study groups and inservice education programs. Since interdistrict sharing of practices and knowledge is essential, intermediate unit staff members engage in many activities to open and to keep open channels of communication throughout the intermediate area. Area teacher institutes are conducted, special teacher groups are organized and assisted, and visitations of administrators and teachers to other districts are arranged. Communication is also aided through a variety of printed and audio-visual materials prepared and distributed by the intermediate superintendent's office. Among such materials is often a type of curriculum periodical which describes examples of good teaching and promising practices in the various schools in the intermediate area. Such a publication not only shares good ideas and experiences, but gives recognition to those individuals and schools doing outstanding work.

Only a few of the ways by which intermediate units and community schools are cooperating to assist teachers in meeting the needs of their pupils have been reported in the foregoing sections of this chapter. Complete descriptions of these programs have not been possible. The examples included are sufficient, however, to demonstrate that where there is cooperation, regardless of the size of the area or the number of pupils and teachers involved, the educational program in all of the community schools can be greatly enriched.

²⁴ Contributed by Vaughn D. Seidel, superintendent, Alameda County Schools, Oakland, California.

CHAPTER 5

Services To Facilitate the Educational Program

THE intermediate unit can often assist local community schools through certain administrative and business services essential for the effective functioning of school districts and school programs. Many of the services in these areas derive from the original official or jurisdictional functions of the county or other intermediate superintendent and remain legally required actions of the office. Despite the fact that certain of these official assignments relate to the era when emphasis was placed on the superintendent as an inspector, a guardian of funds, and a clerical functionary rather than a professional educator, there has been a healthy development, in a few states reflected by a partial legislative redefinition, in the service aspect of the superintendent's administrative role. Considerable evolution has occurred in providing administrative and business services which are legally permissive and discretionary for the intermediate unit. Much of this advance has occurred because of leadership exerted by intermediate superintendents throughout the country and, as a result, of requests by local community school districts for expanded services.

In most states, the original duties of the intermediate superintendent's office were keeping records, making reports to the state education department, visiting schools, and approving some types of school disbursements. Educational services have been much more recent and are the subject of most current discussions of the role of the intermediate unit. The two preceding chapters have included a number of different types of educational services and programs of service which have developed through the cooperative efforts of the community schools in an intermediate area. The purpose of this chapter is to indicate certain services which have been developed to

110 / 111

p. 110 non-reproducible
photo

facilitate the educational programs in the community schools—services largely in the areas of administration, business, and general coordination. For example, the intermediate unit represents the local community school units and their needs in many of their dealings with the state education department and, in turn, transmits and interprets state requirements to the local districts. Intermediate units usually assist the local districts in properly carrying out their legal obligations in the support and management phases of the school program. This assistance frequently includes such services as the processing of warrants and official reports, e.g. attendance or pupil census reports on which state financial support is based, the maintaining of accounting records, the handling of elections, and the complying with certification requirements for teachers and administrators. In addition, many community school districts benefit from such intermediate unit services as guidance and assistance in the preparation of annual school budgets, planning of school buildings, financing of school construction, pupil transportation, centralized purchasing, legal interpretations, procuring of teachers, school business office management, and general coordination of programs. Not all intermediate units are able to offer a full range of the services indicated. The underlying philosophy of administrative services is that the specific functions are not end goals; rather they are the necessary contributing elements in the development of a comprehensive program of educational opportunities for children and communities.

The advantages of an intermediate unit which serves both the local community school districts in its area and the state education department are quite apparent as regards the administrative and business functions of education. Each school district has, close at hand and immediate, the decision-making power or the dependable counsel which enables it to act expeditiously and with a minimum loss of time or effort. On the other hand, the state education department can deal with the over-all planning and development of the state's educational program without the need for such an impossible task as dealing individually with the many local school districts, each having

a multitude of detailed problems requiring current action. Through the intermediate unit, the state education department receives the composite of such of these problems as require action which cannot be taken locally.

There are numerous types of services related to administration in which community schools and intermediate units have developed cooperative programs. Some of these are legally required of some intermediate units; others are often logical extensions of certain of the required functions of intermediate units; still others are legally permissive or have developed because of the mutual benefits derived and the absence of legal barriers preventing such action. Brief descriptions of a few operating programs for certain specific types of services which facilitate the educational programs of community schools are included in the following sections of this chapter.

FINANCIAL SERVICES

In many states, certain types of financial services are required functions of intermediate units. While in some instances these services are performed in a perfunctory manner, most intermediate units perform them diligently and well. In some states, for example, intermediate units are legally required to examine and approve school orders to permit district payments for materials, supplies, services, and the salaries of teachers and other employees. Warrants are processed after checking supporting documents, such as contracts or invoices, and returned to the districts as negotiable warrants following approval by an auditor. A related service sometimes provided is the maintenance of control accounting records for all the funds of each district in the area. This service, where it is provided, facilitates school district preparation of budgets and financial statements and reports. Many intermediate units also keep the retirement records for all certificated and noncertificated employees of the districts. Budget counseling, processing, and approving are often a part of the legal requirements in some states.

Many intermediate units provide financial services far beyond those which are legally required of the office. An example of

how the intermediate unit can function in expediting the work of both the local community school districts and the state may be seen in the area of federal aid to districts. In many sections of the country military or civilian government activities have resulted in federal acquisition of property with a consequent loss of tax base to local school districts. Federal aid is available to affected districts for maintenance and operation and for school construction to compensate for this loss of normal tax support. In addition, federal aid is available to schools for vocational education and, in the form of cash reimbursements and surplus commodities, for the school lunch program. In most states, all district requests for federal financial assistance are channeled through the intermediate superintendent's office, which counsels with the individual school districts regarding their applications, and examines, approves, and forwards them to the state education department.

In San Diego County (California) a special federal aid committee has been established. Made up of representatives of the local school districts and the intermediate unit staff, this committee studied and made recommendations in regard to preparing federal aid applications. Since each applicant school district was required to furnish specified statistical data relating to each federal property where the parents of pupils were employed, the duplication of efforts by each of the individual districts would otherwise have been considerable. The committee therefore worked with the Eleventh Naval District in developing a plan for certifying those pupils having a parent employed by the Navy. The intermediate office was delegated to submit all school district documents to the Navy for certification and to make a survey of all business firms working on federal contracts. As a result of this procedure, instead of 32 school districts individually collecting all the needed information and compiling the required data, a cooperative group working through the intermediate unit performed the function.¹

Financial services in Wayne County (Michigan) include

¹ Contributed by Cecil D. Hardesty, superintendent, San Diego County Schools, San Diego, California.

assistance to the local school districts in accounting procedures. This service was started as a result of requests by local school administrators and members of local boards of education for assistance in record keeping and proper reporting. All school districts in the county now receive advisory help in matters of finance scheduling, budgeting, breakdown of current tax collections, and similar finance matters. The intermediate staff which provides this help also distributes all the state funds paid to local school districts in support of their educational program, nearly all delinquent taxes, and the bulk of the local taxes.²

The latest addition to the intermediate unit staff in Kent County (Michigan) is an auditor. Services are now available to all the school districts in the area in the checking of both financial and pupil accounting records. This service has been established as a result of a 1953 legislative act in that state requiring each school district to provide audited records.³

SCHOOL BUILDING PLANNING AND MAINTENANCE

In many states the intermediate unit performs an important service in assisting local school districts in the purchase of school sites and in the functional planning of new school buildings and facilities. In a few states they are required to approve, in both preliminary and final form, the specifications and school building plans of all school districts in the intermediate area; in a number of states this approval and control is delegated to a school building division of the state education department. In either case, cooperation between the intermediate unit and a community school district undertaking a building project usually avoids confusion and delay. Consultant services in both the construction and business aspects of a project provided for local school district boards of education and administrators have been very valuable in some instances. These services include assistance regarding bond issue programs and applications for state and federal aid.

²Contributed by Charles E. Brike, deputy superintendent, Wayne County Schools, Detroit, Michigan.

³Contributed by Lynn H. Clark, superintendent, Kent County Schools, Grand Rapids, Michigan.

Consultation in the early states of schoolhouse planning is considered especially important in San Diego County (California). It has been found that many of the potential obstacles can be overcome through a careful study conducted well before commitments are made, as well as having at hand a logical and comprehensive explanation of the district's plan for presentation to the public and to official agencies. To aid in this type of planning, the intermediate office assists districts in methods of studying community educational needs. Latest information and materials on schoolhouse construction and plant design are kept current for reference by local boards of education and administrators. A set of colored slides showing recent construction and accepted best practices in classroom and building design is available for use in discussing building problems with school district personnel. These materials provide an idea file and a record of what is being done in the county and in other parts of the state and nation.

A monograph suggesting procedures which local boards of education might wish to follow in selecting an architect who might best serve their community needs, together with a list of architects who have either worked on school buildings or have indicated an interest in this field and a record of the work they have done, has been developed by the intermediate office and is available to any school district in the area. Architectural ideas are also discussed and shared during many of the educational conferences. Annual conventions of the California Association of School Administrators, for example, sometimes feature complete architectural displays. Following one recent convention, the display was housed in the Alameda County Superintendent's office so that interested administrators could study it throughout the year.⁴

Related to the problems of schoolhouse construction is the matter of school plant and building maintenance. Much of the complex and expensive equipment included in modern school buildings, especially heating and ventilating equipment, is used ineffectively or is actually damaged because of improper

⁴Contributed by Cecil D. Hardesty, superintendent, San Diego County Schools, San Diego, California.

maintenance and untrained maintenance personnel. Maintenance of school buildings and equipment, like any other service, can be expected to be as efficient and adequate as the personnel responsible. Most community school administrators have neither the knowledge and understanding of the complexities involved in the proper maintenance of equipment nor the time to devote to assure an adequate program. In many intermediate areas, community schools have developed cooperative programs for the training of maintenance workers or for providing maintenance service.

A one day institute was held last fall in Blair County (Pennsylvania) for the school janitors and custodians employed by the local school districts. In this institute problems of cleaning, the maintenance of mechanical equipment of the school, and the maintenance of electrical equipment were stressed. A very important section of the time was devoted to fire hazards and fire control methods in the schools. A basic consideration of the institute program was that service personnel are important elements in the total educational scheme. Their importance to children's safety and welfare and their responsibilities were emphasized.⁵

A similar program is held annually for another group of school building workers, the school lunch personnel and cooks, in Iroquois County (Illinois). Approximately 50 school lunch workers participate in this training program.⁶

A continuous training program is conducted for building maintenance and custodial employees by a full-time member of the intermediate unit staff in Los Angeles County (California). In these training activities emphasis is placed on the most efficient ways of doing the various maintenance jobs and the best materials to use. The educational implications of the fact that this work is done in the school situation are also given considerable attention.⁷

⁵ Contributed by James E. Butts, superintendent, Blair County Schools, Hollidaysburg, Pennsylvania.

⁶ Contributed by R. P. Roberts, superintendent, Iroquois County Schools, Watseka, Illinois.

⁷ Contributed by C. C. Trillingham, superintendent, Los Angeles County Schools, Los Angeles, California.

A somewhat different kind of school building maintenance service has been developed in Orange County (California). Partly because of the heavy demands for services of contractors and craftsmen on new construction, many school districts in that area have had difficulty in adequately maintaining their physical facilities. In some of the localities, skilled workers have not been available for short-term jobs, and quality work could not be guaranteed with the workers available. At times, quoted costs of maintenance and repair work were found to be excessive, especially in the rural situations where there was virtually no competition among contractors. In order to assure that the premises and properties of the school districts are properly maintained at reasonable costs, a cooperative maintenance program administered by the intermediate unit has been developed. The services provided to the participating schools in this program include carpentry, painting and decorating, roofing, plumbing, electrical repairing, and floor refinishing.⁸

CENTRALIZED PURCHASING

In some areas community school districts are making substantial savings in the supplies, materials, and equipment they need for their educational program through a cooperative program of purchasing. It has long been true that more favorable prices can be obtained through large quantity purchases made through competitive bidding by distributors and merchants. The limited funds of school districts, particularly the smaller community school districts, have often necessitated the purchasing of supplies in small quantities to meet immediate needs. The discounts available to school districts the same as other purchasers for the prompt payment of invoices are often ignored. Payments must frequently be postponed from month to month until the board of education has sufficient funds to approve payment, and the possible savings of prompt payment are lost.

Only in recent years have some intermediate units begun to explore the possibilities of organizing a cooperative purchasing

⁸Contributed by Linton T. Simmons, superintendent, Orange County Schools, Santa Ana, California.

program in which all the community school districts in their area can participate. By pooling orders, larger quantity purchases of the many needed items can be made. The large quantity orders are attractive to the competitive bidding of suppliers, and, in many instances great savings have accrued to the participating schools. Careful advanced planning also makes it possible to take advantage of any discounts which might be available.

Nearly 90 percent of the supplies and equipment used by the rural school districts in King County (Washington) are purchased through the King County Directors Purchasing Association. This association has been in operation since 1937 for the primary purpose of effecting savings to school districts through quantity purchases. The association is governed by a five-member board of directors selected from the directors of the participating schools. This governing board holds regular meetings to establish policies which seem to be in the best interest of the member schools. Order-form booklets which include the many different kinds of items available for group purchase are prepared and distributed to the local schools. Purchases each year total several thousands of dollars with savings approximately 30 percent.⁹

A similar purchasing association has been organized in Spokane County (Washington) as a part of the intermediate superintendent's office. A revolving fund established by the county commissioners has made it possible for purchases to be made on a cash basis.¹⁰

A cooperative purchasing program has been in operation in Multnomah County (Oregon) for the past few years. Any of the school districts in the intermediate area are able to purchase supplies and equipment through the program. Since the initiation of this program, the intermediate superintendent has become a member of the area association for the purchasing agents of area business and industrial organizations. Such association provides more than

⁹ Contributed by L. M. Dimmitt, superintendent, King County Schools, Seattle, Washington.

¹⁰ Contributed by Clifton A. Hussey, superintendent, Spokane County Schools, Spokane, Washington.

the usual insight into purchasing procedures. Items purchased cooperatively by the schools range from all kinds of paper products to school buses and other major school equipment. By drawing up detailed specifications for the purchase of school buses and agreeing that they would all accept the same make and model which met these specifications, for example, eight separate school boards last year were able to save more than 1000 dollars on each of the eight buses purchased through competitive bids in a group order.¹¹

Savings to all the school districts in Grant County (South Dakota) are realized through the centralized purchasing by the intermediate unit office of textbooks, art materials, and other supplies which the various school districts in the county need. A stock of the various types of materials is kept in the central office and may be purchased through the year by the schools as needed. The inventory is necessarily limited, but the quantity purchase of sufficient materials and textbooks for all of the schools is possible through the provision of a county textbook fund.¹²

A centralized purchasing and distribution program is responsible for substantial savings in the school lunch program provided in De Soto Parish (Louisiana). As in a number of school systems, the school lunch has become an integral part of the total educational program—providing education in health, nutrition, citizenship, social living, and desirable habits. A full time director is a member of the central staff and is responsible for the supervision and management of the lunch program. With the help of the state's food preservation supervision, a warehouse with refrigeration has been provided. Here commodities are prepared and stored for distribution to the different schools in the area. Canning is done on a basis of carload lots. In addition, there are four community food preservation centers, used not only for canning certain of the commodities purchased but also those products bought locally or raised in school gardens. The cost of the commodities

¹¹ Contributed by Errol Rees, superintendent, Multnomah County Schools, Portland, Oregon.

¹² Contributed by Helen Iydstруп, superintendent, Grant County Schools, Milbank, South Dakota.

canned is considerably less than the wholesale cost of the same items. Meat animals bought at auction are slaughtered, chilled, and prepared for use in the school lunches at a saving of approximately 30 to 40 percent of market costs. As a result of the economies effected by this program and in accordance with the philosophy that the school lunch program is an educational activity, a free lunch which meets all federal and state nutrition requirements is available to all of the more than 6500 children in the parish.¹³

Another type of cooperative purchasing in which many intermediate units coordinate community school efforts and effect savings is in regard to instructional materials. There are many examples throughout the country of school districts pooling funds for the purchase of library books and audio-visual materials and equipment. A number of examples of such programs are indicated in the descriptions included in each of the two preceding chapters. In the most effective programs, the intermediate unit furnishes leadership in arranging this cooperation, establishes contractual procedures or other means for financing the program, and often provides for the collection and distribution of the materials to community schools.

PUPIL TRANSPORTATION

The transporting of pupils to the schools in the United States is one of the largest single passenger-carrying operations in the world. It is estimated that this year approximately 8 million elementary and secondary public-school pupils are transported to school daily in the 115,000 school buses and 15,000 station wagons and other vehicles which make up the total pupil transportation fleet. The one-way distance traveled by these pupils will reach about 2.5 million miles during this year, 1953-54, and public expenditures for this transportation service will amount to about a quarter of a billion dollars.¹⁴

¹³ Contributed by S. M. Shows, superintendent, De Soto Parish Schools, Mansfield, Louisiana.

¹⁴ A full chapter on the status of pupil transportation based upon 1950-51 data is included in the 1953 Yearbook of the Department of Rural Education. See: National Education Association, Department of Rural Education, *Pupil Transportation*. Yearbook 1953. Washington, D. C.: the Department, 1953, 190 p.

Despite the magnitude of the present operation, further development in pupil transportation will be necessary if all rural children and communities are to have the comprehensive program of educational opportunities needed. The continued reorganization of the many small local school districts into community districts will depend upon increased pupil transportation facilities. In terms of the short period of time in which the pupil transportation service has been developed, tremendous progress has been made in management and operation, in the training of school bus drivers, in teaching pupils how to be good bus passengers, and in the production and maintenance of transportation equipment. Progress has been rapid and it can be expected to continue. Any appraisal of present status, however, reveals many aspects of pupil transportation programs in which further exploration and study are needed as well as many areas where present knowledge of desirable practices has not yet been put into effect.

Considerable variations exist among the states in the matter of the relationships of community schools and intermediate units in the provision of the pupil transportation service. In some states the intermediate unit assists the local school districts in determining the kind of transportation program to be carried on, i.e., whether by district-owned buses, by contract, by common carriers, by other school districts, or by payments made to parents in lieu of transportation service. It is often the legal responsibility of the intermediate unit to review and approve the program adopted. Many intermediate units assist the local districts in arranging for the financing of the transportation program, in keeping the necessary records, in making claims for state support, and in meeting other legal requirements. Many assist in other matters related to operating efficiently, such as, for example, furnishing advice to districts on types and amounts of insurance desirable, providing assistance to local boards of education in the development of regulations which clarify district policy in regard to transportation, effecting economies through the cooperative purchase of supplies and in the servicing and maintenance of equipment, exploring ways of avoiding some of the difficulties characteristic

of a pupil transportation operation, and arranging bus driver training and safety programs.

A division of transportation and attendance has been organized as a part of the intermediate unit in Dane County (Wisconsin). As in many parts of the country, the increased amount of highway traffic in most areas of the county has made it extremely hazardous for many children to walk to school as they once did. Assistance is given to the local school districts in the planning of bus routes in order to secure approval for the route plan by means of proper application to the county school committee and the state education department. Assistance is also given to local districts in securing the financial support, both county and state, that is provided for the school district transportation programs. This procedure is greatly facilitated by the service of the intermediate unit, since a number of the independent districts in the county do not provide any secondary-school program for their children. In some instances, the pupils from a single district attend several different neighboring high schools. This situation makes it very difficult for the individual districts to gather the necessary information for adequate reporting and application for available aid without intermediate unit assistance.¹⁵

With the assistance of the state education department, an institute for all the school bus drivers in Blair County (Pennsylvania) was held just prior to the opening of school last fall. Included in the program were discussions of such topics as the state laws related to the transportation of pupils, desirable qualifications of bus drivers, caring for the school bus, and meeting first-aid emergencies. Considerable interest was shown by the drivers in the tests designed to measure and record any psychological or sensory weaknesses which might have a bearing on their driving—perception of depth, recovery from glare, keenness of vision, reaction time, physical control, and angular vision. Drivers experimented eagerly in this phase of the program. Also included were actual driving practice and demonstration. Drivers were given instruction and practice in plac-

¹⁵ Contributed by James N. Langer, transportation and attendance director, Dane County Schools, Sun Prairie, Wisconsin.

ing buses in restricted areas, front and back, in driving through narrow passageways, and in quick stopping. One of the most exciting demonstrations for the drivers concerned their reaction time in stopping a moving vehicle. The time and distance required for each driver to apply the brakes and stop a bus driven at 25 miles per hour was measured. This demonstration, also conducted at other speeds, impressed upon drivers in a very dramatic way the importance of their reaction in emergencies and of the need for adequate brakes on every vehicle. One of the important characteristics of the institute was an emphasis on the importance of the school bus driver to the educational program and the safety of children; nearly as important was the development of good fellowship and morale on the part of the bus drivers.¹⁶

School officials of both the intermediate unit and the local community school districts, law enforcement officers, and others cooperated in an intensive campaign in Kitsap County (Washington) during the spring of 1953 to reduce the hazards to the children in the county who were transported by school bus. Unusually hazardous conditions in the county are the result of heavy, high-speed motor traffic and the narrow, winding roads which the school buses must travel. Eighty-one school buses in this county transport more than 9000 pupils over nearly 5000 miles of state and county highways each day. One of the hazards results from the failure of many motorists to stop when they approach a school bus which is loading or unloading children. Last year one child was struck by a passing vehicle and slightly injured; several others have had narrow escapes because of motorist violations of the stop law.

In order to attack the problem, a county-wide School Bus Safety Committee was organized to plan and carry out a campaign of public education through newspapers, radio, television, the Puget Sound Naval Station safety education committee, and the public schools. Many parents of the transported pupils took an active part in the work of the committee. The state highway patrol and the county sheriff's office cooperated in the

¹⁶ Contributed by James E. Butts, superintendent, Blair County Schools, Hollidaysburg, Pennsylvania.

program and intensified their enforcement of the laws regarding the passing of school buses. The problem involved education, engineering, enforcement, and legislation. All agencies contacted cooperated, and bus drivers have reported that motorists are responding by being noticeably more careful as they approach school buses. The program is continuing since traffic is still increasing and it is important for all motorists to be aware of the hazards and do everything possible to assure safe transportation for the school pupils.¹⁷

SECURING AND PLACING TEACHERS

The intermediate unit has certain legal responsibilities in many states regarding the teaching personnel employed by the school districts in its area. These responsibilities are usually in regard to certification, recommendation for tenure, and such matters. In some instances, the services provided for the community schools in the intermediate area as regards the securing and placement of teachers and administrators is much greater than that required of the office.

For the past several years, because of the rapid population growth and the shortage of qualified teachers, the intermediate superintendent's office in Alameda County (California) has given assistance to local district superintendents in their efforts to secure competent teachers. Upon the identification of the teacher needs of the local school districts, teacher applications were referred to the local school administrators and boards of education. In effect, the intermediate superintendent's office has served as a clearing house for applicants. This year, it was apparent that more of this kind of help would be needed if the required number of qualified teachers were to be recruited. The need for securing many teachers from outside California in order to meet the demands of an increasing school population was evident.

In response to the demands, the intermediate office made vigorous efforts to persuade good teachers to accept positions

¹⁷ Contributed by DeFore Cramblitt, superintendent, Kitsap County Schools, Port Orchard, Washington.

in California. Information concerning salaries, retirement plan for teachers, and the procedure for obtaining state teaching credentials were made available. Credentials received were evaluated and applications accepted. These were in turn made available for the review of local school district administrators. The results of these efforts are evident in the fact that many teachers from various parts of the country now have contracts to teach in the schools of Alameda County next year.¹⁸

The intermediate office in San Diego County (California) maintains a file of all certificated teaching personnel who are actively teaching in any of the districts in the county and assists both the individual teacher and the school districts in conforming to legal requirements and state education department regulations pertaining to credentials. Teachers are provided with current information and counsel on credential requirements and are assisted in obtaining the appropriate credential for their teaching assignment. Help is given in assessing college transcripts to determine eligibility and in completing application forms. Current information is provided to all districts concerning laws and regulations governing specific credential situations. Both teachers and districts are notified upon the expiration of credentials and information is provided concerning renewal requirements.

A related service, known as advisory personnel placement service, has been developed to assist districts in obtaining qualified teaching and other professional personnel and to help individuals make contact with the employing districts. Some candidates apply to the intermediate office directly; others are located through relationships with colleges, universities, and other placement agencies. Applications are examined and applicants interviewed and referred to local school districts. Local community school districts report their staff vacancies to the intermediate office and assistance is given in locating teachers and staff members who meet the special needs of the district.¹⁹

¹⁸Contributed by Vaughn D. Seidel, superintendent, Alameda County Schools, Oakland, California.

¹⁹Contributed by Cecil D. Hardesty, superintendent, San Diego County Schools, San Diego, California.

In many parts of the country, intermediate superintendents meet regularly with all the community school administrators in the area. Although these meetings are often informal, they almost always contribute to the coordination of the educational efforts in the intermediate area. Problems of mutual interest are discussed and plans for solving them cooperatively developed. Among the other critical problems is the matter of securing teachers. Frequently the staff needs of each of the participating school districts are made known and referrals made among the schools. This type of activity can be expected to increase, perhaps even become more formalized, as a result of the increasing need for teaching staff and the decreasing number of teacher candidates available.

RESEARCH SERVICES

Frequently there is need for certain types of research activities in the planning, developing, and evaluating of the many aspects of educational administration and the educational program. Planning for the reorganization of school districts involves an appraisal of the current educational opportunities available, an inventory of the educational needs, an examination and projection of pupil enrollment, a study of existing and needed facilities, and a financial projection including projected budgets, projected tax rates, and projected resources. School building programs involve a study of the educational program for which the building is designed, an examination of the financial structure of the district and the means by which construction can be financed, and a study of the various types of equipment which will be provided. Salary schedules for teachers and other types of school district employees need to be studied, developed, and evaluated. Board of education policies need to be examined periodically, defined, and clarified. Each of the educational services, each aspect of the curriculum, various types of teaching methods, the procedures used in the inservice improvement programs, the methods used for reporting pupil progress to parents, the appropriateness of the school program in meeting pupil needs, the holding power of the school, the desires and expectations of the community for their

school—these are but a few of the areas for which careful study and examination are needed.

Many of the various types of research activities necessary to insure the adequacy of the educational program provided can be carried on by individual teachers or groups of teachers, by specialized personnel who are members of the community school staff, or by the community school administrators. Many require a type and quality of consultative and technical assistance which is beyond the scope of the time and professional ability of the community school staff members. Many can be more valuable when the research design includes all of the schools in the area; this is especially true in the study of problems which are general to all schools or to regional or area problems which are not confined to a single school district, e.g., how to provide educational services for the children of migratory agricultural workers.

A number of intermediate units provide assistance to local community school districts in the study of certain types of problems. These intermediate units which provide the services of such highly specialized staff members as instructional supervisors, reading consultants, psychologists, curriculum coordinators, accountants, school lunch and pupil transportation supervisors, building engineers, and other types of consultants are often able to assist the local districts in the study and appraisal of various aspects of the community school's educational and administrative program. Certain types of research data needed by other governmental and private agencies and organizations can also be more effectively obtained through the intermediate unit; this source for information is frequently called upon for many types of research activities.

The actual amount of research carried on by most intermediate units and the assistance given local community school districts in research undertakings is as yet extremely limited. But it is increasing rapidly as the needs for these activities are being recognized. In the southern area of Fairfield County (Connecticut), for example, community school administrators have been studying the organization of a jointly supported and administered research service for the public schools in that area.

Recently a subcommittee of the group presented a detailed plan for the operation of such a center, and, after suggestions and modifications, the plan was adopted. Briefly, the plan adopted (a) recognizes the important role of research in any school system, (b) establishes a council of participating school districts to establish broad operational policy, (c) proposes an administrative structure including the budget, personnel, and physical facilities needed, (d) provides for the cooperative financial support by the participating school districts, (e) suggests kinds of problems which need careful study, and (f) recommends the continued study of the proposal with a view toward launching the project in September 1954.²⁰

COORDINATION OF EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS

Intermediate units frequently have opportunities for activating the energies of professional and community groups and for giving assistance and guidance with educational problems. The scope of such services often lies in coordinating the educational programs of all the community school districts in the intermediate area, toward the end that each may make the maximum use of the local, state, and national resources. Coordination requires that the intermediate unit work closely and continuously with the educational personnel and lay groups of the districts when called upon to assist in any phase of the educational program. This is necessary so that common understandings can be built, needs can be identified and problems defined, and cooperative solutions can be reached. There are a variety of means by which these goals can be accomplished. Among them are: inservice education programs for teachers, administrators, members of boards of education, and other types of school employees; area-wide curriculum development activities; communications programs, including publications and public information; and various types of cooperative studies, activities, and services. A number of illustrations of programs which involve coordination of the local community school districts have previously been reported.

²⁰ Reported in *CPEA Highlights*, edited by Harold J. Mahoney, State Department of Education, Hartford, Connecticut.

The adequacy of the support afforded the educational program of any school district depends upon the extent to which it is understood and to which it meets the needs, desires, and expectations of the public. Recognizing the need for letting the public know the facts about the schools *in advance* and on a *year-round basis*, a program for securing and maintaining public support has been established in Baltimore County (Maryland). Although a modified school public relations program had been in operation in the county for many years, a centralized program was set up in the office of the superintendent of schools in 1948. Secure in the knowledge that each staff member, teacher, and pupil are public relations representatives in fact, if not by appointment, the ultimate program goal is a continuing policy of self-betterment in all phases of the school program. An advisory council of prominent lay citizens serves as a policy making agency for the program. Included among the activities are:

1. A staff member has been assigned part-time to issue year-round news and feature press releases that appear at various times in three Baltimore city daily newspapers, two Baltimore city Sunday editions, and eight Baltimore county weekly newspapers.
2. During the school year, correspondents at various schools, under the direction of the school administrators, keep the city and county newspapers and the local radio stations advised of newsworthy happenings and coming events.
3. Administrators, teachers and other school personnel are encouraged to contribute to professional and trade periodicals.
4. At various times selected committees prepare and edit brochures on such subjects as community resources, civil defense, school services, and the school beginner.
5. A graphic exhibit that pictures the reasons for mounting school enrollments and illustrates master-planning in new school construction is made available for PTA and other public meetings.
6. Administrators and other school personnel have appeared by invitation on radio and television programs, usually as a result of press stories on school achievements.
7. Administrators and teachers fill numerous speaking engagements at school, civic, and other functions.

The few activities outlined above are in addition to the school-community programs carried on by each of the individual schools. The objectives of the program are cooperation and coordination. Like food that is eaten, the resultant good of a functional public relations program is not readily discernible. However, when applied with the same regularity as meals, the positive effects are there nonetheless. To carry the analogy to a conclusion, outcomes of a diligent school public relations program—like the food that is eaten—are stored up as potential aid to serve when needed.²¹

SCHOOL DISTRICT REORGANIZATION

School district reorganization usually involves the combination of several small neighborhood districts with a village district to form a new legal entity, a community school district. The very nature of this process which involves a number of independent school districts requires the guidance of an administrative authority having a larger area of jurisdiction than any one of the single districts. Most state education departments provide assistance to local groups seeking help in a program of reorganization, but much of the assistance must be provided, and is usually legally required, by the intermediate unit. In many of the states which have permissive legislation for reorganizing of districts, the making of a survey is required of county committees or by the county boards of education in order to develop plans and make reorganization recommendations. Initiation of surveys often come by action of these committees, at the request of local boards of education and trustees, or at the request of groups of citizens within the districts. In most states, either through referendum elections or by petition, voters in the local school districts make the final determination of whether the proposed reorganization shall be adopted.

Cooperative action on the part of the local school districts involved in a reorganization proposal, the intermediate unit,

²¹Contributed by Edward G. Stapleton, superintendent, Baltimore County Schools, Baltimore, Maryland.

and the state education department is needed if redistricting is to be successful. Types of state action often needed include: (a) special grants to newly organized districts, both for operation and buildings; (b) support for pupil transportation; (c) required state approval of building plans for all districts, to eliminate large expenditures for buildings in inefficient districts; (d) technical assistance to local study committees; (e) reduction of state-provided incentives for the maintaining of inefficient schools or districts. The local districts with the assistance of the intermediate unit have responsibility for stimulating and providing leadership to the local study committee in (a) making comprehensive studies of local conditions and framing clearcut recommendations, (b) developing public understanding through discussion and the dissemination of information, and (c) identifying factors which might cause a rejection of the reorganization proposal. In most programs of school district reorganization, the major role of the intermediate unit is that of educating the public thoroughly, not just in order to assure a favorable vote, but to develop an adequate understanding of the full meaning of the improved program. Although the local school districts, the intermediate unit, and the state education department share the responsibility of district reorganization, the intermediate unit has a key importance. The state education department is necessarily too far removed to be sensitive to the peculiar local problems and issues; at the same time, the smaller local districts are seldom able to view the proposal in terms of its over-all effect on the educational opportunities for the boys and girls in the total area involved.

Examples of the services performed by intermediate units in programs of reorganization could be cited in almost every area where reorganization has taken place. These programs have also affected the other kinds of educational services made available by intermediate units to the newly formed community school districts. A report from McDonough County (Illinois) illustrates the changing emphasis. In that county—as in 101 of the 102 counties in the state—the reorganization of school districts has been a major educational concern for several years. As a result, many changes have occurred in the organization

of the school program and in the curricular opportunities provided the pupils in the various schools in the county. Pupils now attend school in more concentrated groups where they profit from participation in an enriched curriculum which includes, among many other advantages, a hot lunch program, vocal and instrumental music, physical education, transportation, and special education programs. Instead of reducing the responsibilities of the intermediate office, reorganization has in reality increased them. Improving educational opportunities for the pupils in community schools is rapidly coming into focus through strengthening and increasing the intermediate unit services which can be made available for the schools. Emphasis is now mainly upon the development of cooperative educational services and activities. Among the services which have been developed and in which the reorganized community school districts share is a large cooperative film library.²²

This chapter has attempted to indicate some of the different types of administrative services and coordination that the intermediate unit can provide for local community schools and school districts. Any examination of the kinds of leadership and services which many intermediate units are beginning to provide reflects the emerging character of the intermediate superintendency in a dynamic and changing society. The changing demands for educational services have caused changes in administrative responsibilities. Instead of merely exercising legal authority for educational control, efforts are being increasingly directed toward those activities which will enable the local community school districts to continuously improve their educational programs.

²² Contributed by Dorothy I. Dixon, assistant superintendent, McDonough County Schools, Macomb, Illinois.

CHAPTER 6

The Search for Direction— A Review of Current Studies

THE outlook for better education in the years ahead is encouraging. Individuals, organized groups, institutions, and agencies have been increasing their efforts to examine educational organization, to justify its existence and its demands, and to develop appreciation and comprehension of its ends and its means. When uncertainty, unrest, and dissatisfaction give rise to study and experimentation, the outlook is indeed encouraging.

This chapter attempts to review some of the recent studies and projects which have bearing on the community school and the intermediate unit. The studies included are only a small part of those related to the two concepts with which this year-book is concerned. The purpose is mainly to give some indication of the extent and nature of current studies, not to report a detailed summary or synthesis.

Attention is directed primarily upon indications of trends, recommendations, and conclusions rather than to the specific data or empirical generalization which support them. In several instances only a portion of the complete study is reported. It should be emphasized, therefore, that reference be made to the original studies and reports if there is a desire to follow-up the suggestions and conclusions reported or implied in this review.

ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURE AND FRAMEWORK

Behind the question of how to provide the best educational program obtainable for children and communities and behind such problems as bond issues, budgets, and boundaries lie constitutional provisions, statutes, court decisions, and state education department policies. They provide the framework

128 / 135

p. 134 non-reproducible
photo

within which schools operate. They determine the relationships of educational administrative units to the state. They establish the degree to which responsibility for education is shared.

A few areas related to administrative framework which have received particular attention and some of the recent studies and findings related to them are reported.

Reorganization of Local School Districts

A result of changing economic and social conditions has been a distinct trend toward developing larger local units of school administration. The problems associated with the very many small districts have been recognized for many years and reorganization programs have made considerable progress in a number of states. Especially within the past decade has the move to reorganize local school districts become widespread.

The National Commission on School District Reorganization, in one of its earliest reports, called attention to the ineffectiveness and wastefulness of the many small school districts. The following facts were outlined:

1. Most of our people—especially our rural boys and girls—need broader and better education than they are getting.
2. In thousands of school districts the education offered is not good enough—even for yesterday.
3. The states are charged with responsibility for giving suitable education to all within their borders.
4. It is sound American practice to give citizens an opportunity to share responsibility for education through local school districts; but
5. The state has a duty to see that school districts are satisfactory and to change them when they are not.
6. Districts are satisfactory only when:
 - a. They are able to provide education comprehensive enough to meet the needs of all in the area served
 - b. They permit efficient and economical school administration
 - c. They give citizens an active share in shaping the policies of schools serving their communities.¹

In its final report this Commission again called attention to the number of school districts in terms of "too many and too

¹ National Commission on School District Reorganization. *A Key to Better Education*. Washington, D. C.: Department of Rural Education, National Education Association, 1947 p. 6-7.

small."² Pointing out specific inadequacies and deficiencies in a large proportion of the existing districts, desirable characteristics of attendance centers and administrative units were outlined on a basis of the enrollment required to support an effective program of educational services. The report concluded that to perform the services essential in a satisfactory local school administrative unit, the enrollment should be at least 1200 pupils and, if possible, as many as 10,000. Following a recommendation of procedures which might be followed by any state to implement the desirable reorganization of school districts, a detailed report of reorganization programs in a number of selected states was included.

In order to determine certain characteristics of recently reorganized districts, Fitzwater, in a study conducted by the U.S. Office of Education, surveyed 552 districts in 8 selected states.³ Most of the districts included in the study were reorganized in 1947 or later. The sample for which usable data were reported revealed that more than 90 percent of the original districts included in these reorganizations had previously made no provision for education above the elementary level. At the time the reorganized districts were formed, one-third had not been operating any school. The area included in these newly reorganized districts showed wide variation, although three-fourths continued to be less than 144 square miles. The study reported that 40 percent of these reorganized districts had territory in more than one county, showing little regard for county boundary lines. Less than 2 percent had areas that covered an entire county. Although a small number of the reorganized districts included in the sample were in densely populated metropolitan suburbs, most had largely a rural area which surrounded and included a trading center such as a village or small city. In some instances the districts had more than one such center. Only slightly more than 7 percent of

² Dawson, Howard A.; Reeves, Floyd W.; and others. *Your School District*. Report of the National Commission on School District Reorganization. Washington, D. C.: Department of Rural Education, National Education Association, 1948. 286 p.

³ Fitzwater, C. O. *Selected Characteristics of Reorganized School Districts*. Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Bulletin 1953, No. 3. Washington, D. C.: Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, 1953. 49 p.

the districts for which usable data was available, however, included a population center of 5000 or larger. The median enrollment of the new districts was 626 pupils. One-fourth had total enrollments of fewer than 380 pupils while an equal number had 1037 pupils or more.

The extent of local school district reorganization is shown in a recent survey of all types of school districts.⁴ The total number of school districts for specific years since 1932 are as follows:

1932—127,529 districts	1948—98,312 districts
1938—119,410 "	1950—81,710 "
1940—110,270 "	1953—66,472 "

Although the total number of districts has been reduced to nearly half in the 21-year period included in this study, most of this reduction has occurred since 1948. The number of operating one-teacher schools has been reduced from 148,711 in 1930 to 75,105 by 1948 and to 48,814 during the 1952-53 school year. The study reported that more than 1000 reorganized districts were formed during the school year 1952-53.

Despite the great extent of reorganization revealed by this study, there is little evidence to indicate that the movement has as yet run its course. The evidence is actually to the contrary. During the school year 1952-53 there were 11,113 independent school administrative units which did not operate a school of any kind. An additional 40,172 districts operated schools for elementary pupils only and depended entirely upon other districts to provide education for their secondary pupils. There are still many school districts and many of them are still unnecessarily small.

In some states, programs for the reorganization of local school districts are just beginning. The following report from Kansas is by no means atypical of the situation which can be found in a number of states:

At one intersection in Doniphan County there are three high schools within a radius of three miles. These three plus another high school are so

⁴ Dawson, Howard A., and Ellena, William J. *Status of Schools and School Districts, 1950-53*. Washington, D. C.: Department of Rural Education, National Education Association, 1954.

close together that any one of the four is not more than five miles from another high school.

These four rural high schools—Severance, Bendena, Denton, and Leona—had a combined enrollment of 101 pupils last year. Aided by information from County Superintendent Alden Simpson, patrons in the districts studied their problem, discovered they could offer these pupils a better secondary education program with one high school at less cost than the four were spending separately.

W. C. Kampschroeder, director of school facilities service said a consolidated rural high-school district could erect a \$400,000 building and with an \$8,500,000 valuation have a smaller combined bond and operating levy than any of the schools now levy separately for operating purposes alone.

After much discussion, three of the districts—Severance, Bendena, and Denton—voted this summer (1953) to form consolidated rural high-school district number 1 of Doniphan County. It became the first consolidated rural high-school district in Kansas history.⁵

Reorganization of Intermediate Units

One aspect of educational structure which is beginning to receive much thoughtful consideration is the intermediate administrative unit. The major stimulus is easily understood. The interrelationships of autonomous local school districts, intermediate units, and the state education department are such that any major changes which take place at one point in the structure compel adjustments at the others. The reorganization of local administrative units indicated in the preceding section of this chapter has been accompanied with very little change in the intermediate superintendency.

The same social and economic forces—with the accompanying increase in the demands made of education—which have been responsible for the reorganization of local units have also affected the intermediate units. But without substantial adjustment, the intermediate administrative unit is generally operating at a low level of effectiveness in meeting these increased and changing demands. In most instances the structural design for the intermediate unit continues to be for a system of schools which, except for a few very sparsely populated areas, is largely obsolete or may already have disappeared.

One of the first studies of the intermediate unit and prob-

⁵ Kansas State Department of Education. *Kansas Schools* 10: 1-2; September 1953.

ably the most comprehensive yet undertaken was made in New York.⁶ The study began with a pilot project in a single county in which about half of the local school districts had been re-organized into central school districts. Enrollment in these re-organized districts (elementary and secondary combined) ranged from 175 pupils in the smallest school to 660 in the largest.⁷ Many deficiencies were reported. It was discovered that a much larger proportion of those who enrolled in the smaller rural high schools dropped out before graduation than was the case in the larger rural high schools and the one city school system in the county. While the city schools provided speech correction work, lip reading instruction, special work for the mentally slow, sight conservation, and special work for the physically handicapped, only 8 percent of the handicapped children in the rural sections of the county received special instruction. Vocational opportunities, guidance counseling, and health services were also extremely meager in the rural high schools. One of the early reports of this pilot project reported the following conclusions after comparing the rural and city programs:

1. Rural children have less educational opportunity.
2. There are whole segments of educational needs that are not being met in rural communities.
3. Many of the educational opportunities now available in rural communities are being provided on a very uneconomical basis.
4. In view of existing conditions, a careful study is needed to determine whether or not a new type of intermediate unit is desirable and, if so, to indicate what should be its function, size, and organization.⁸

The larger study of the entire state was continued with major attention being given to (a) the tentative laying out of proposed intermediate districts, (b) the possibilities of area schools for special purposes, (c) the possibility of including in the

⁶ *A Study of the Intermediate District in New York State*. This was a three-year (1944-45 to 1946-47) cooperative study financed by the state, carried on through sponsorship of the New York State Council on Rural Education under the general supervision of the Research Division of the State Education Department, and with the cooperation of advisory committees representing the State Association of District Superintendents, the State Association of Secondary Principals, and the Council of City and Village Superintendents.

⁷ New York State Council on Rural Education. *Are We Giving Them the Opportunity They Deserve?* Ithaca, N. Y.: the Council, 1954. 22 p.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 20.

intermediate districts the "independent" school systems of larger villages, (d) the financing of the intermediate districts, and (e) suggestions as to means of extending educational facilities in areas not yet ready to accept the new type of intermediate district organization proposed.⁹

One of the unique approaches of the New York study was its attempt to determine the size and boundaries of the proposed intermediate districts. The socio-economic theory of local school districts—that local districts should be defined by the area within which people cooperate for social and economic purposes, i.e., the natural sociological community—was used as a guide. Similar techniques were applied to determine the "tertiary" community—a larger socio-economic area made up of a cluster of communities surrounding a small city or large village. The result of the application of such techniques was the suggestion that to take the place of the 181 supervisory districts then existing, 65 intermediate districts should be created. The boundaries of the proposed areas showed little over-all relationship to political boundaries. In 16 out of the 65 intermediate areas proposed, the boundaries corresponded roughly to those of the county; in seven areas they corresponded roughly to the existing supervisory districts. Even without the inclusion of the "independent" village school systems, these proposed intermediate districts had at the time of the study a median enrollment of 5551 pupils.

Legislation permitting the establishment of intermediate districts of the type proposed by the study was passed in 1948 and modified to provide additional state support in 1953.¹⁰ The law provides for the appointment of an intermediate district board of education by an intermediate district council. The intermediate district council, made up of all the trustees and school board members in the area, would serve as a liaison group between the intermediate district board and the constituent local school districts. The responsibilities of the intermediate districts were limited in the basic law to certain speci-

⁹ Morrison, J. Cayce, and others. *The Intermediate District in New York State; Special Studies*. Bulletin No. 1356. Albany: New York State Education Department, 1948.

¹⁰ *Laws of New York*. Chapter 861, Article 40, sec. 1950-58.

fied services—provision of industrial education, the education of handicapped children, adult education, and the administration of attendance and transportation. Provision was also made for the transfer of other functions to the intermediate district when they could be performed more effectively and economically than by the constituent districts.

A study directed by McLure included an intensive observation of a few county intermediate units in Illinois where local districts had been reorganized. The purpose of the study was to identify certain assumptions and hypotheses regarding changes in the nature of the role of the intermediate superintendent.¹¹ Also included was a preliminary test of two propositions: (a) some type of intermediate administrative unit is needed to provide specialized services and leadership, (b) the intermediate unit has a unique function of leadership to perform even after the reorganization of local districts. The conclusions reached were regarded as tentative because of certain limitations of the study but were regarded as sufficiently marked to warrant further study and verification. Among the tentative conclusions were several which pointed out that local district reorganization had created a distinct need for the modification of the formal (legal) structure of the intermediate office. In addition to needed changes in the pattern of administrative functions, attention was called to a number of changes in the pattern of communication and in the interpersonal relationships between the intermediate office and the personnel of local districts—fears of encroachment, uncertainty as to who should be doing what, and other psychological difficulties. The opinions of a representative sample of superintendents in all types of positions in Illinois suggested a number of other conclusions including the following:

1. Some type of intermediate administrative unit is needed to provide services which supplement those which can be administered best and at most economical cost through the local administrative units.

2. The county is not necessarily the most appropriate area for the intermediate administrative unit. In some cases it is too small, and in others it does not conform to the appropriate area to be served by such a unit.

¹¹ McLure, William P. *The Role of the Intermediate Type of County Superintendency*. (Tentative Draft). Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois, 1942. 97 p. (Mimeo.)

An attempt to determine the functions most appropriate to the intermediate unit in Washington was the purpose of a study carried on by Loree.¹² Surveying all types of school districts in terms of the services being provided by the intermediate unit, the need for additional services, and the relationship of the intermediate unit to the additional services desired, the report concluded:

If the office of the county (intermediate) superintendent is to fulfill the responsibilities placed upon it by the state; if it is to provide the educational services which are needed by the school districts as reported in this study; if it is to play its part as it responds to and participates in the expanding role of education, then the office of the county superintendent must be reshaped and reoriented to the emerging needs in education.

One of the significant findings of this study in Washington was a much more substantial expression of need for intermediate unit services on the part of the larger districts than was the case for the smaller districts.

A study of the intermediate superintendency in Indiana by Pound included a similar attempt to determine the functions and services being performed by the intermediate districts in that state and, to the extent possible, (a) the functions and services that should be provided, (b) the personnel necessary to perform these functions and services adequately, (c) the budget required for financing the intermediate district, and (d) the school population needed to provide the required budget at a reasonable cost.¹³ A number of structural handicaps were reported. The relationship of the intermediate unit to county government was such that, although the entire county was called upon to help support the county office, certain school districts in the county received only occasional intermediate unit services. A number of the counties had limited pupil populations which resulted in much higher costs than counties with larger populations. The study concluded that if intermediate districts were increased in size to a minimum of 3000 resident pupils, and preferably to from 4000 to

¹² Loree, Ira. *What Is the Role of the County Superintendent in Washington?* Mount Vernon, Wash.: the Author, 1933. (Mimeo.)

¹³ Pound, Clarence A. *The Changing Status of the County Superintendency in Indiana.* Doctor's thesis. Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana University, 1933. (Typewritten)

5000, needed services to local school administrative units could be provided more effectively and economically. This criterion for the desirable size of intermediate units would entail the combination of counties in some instances.

Ingraham's study of the intermediate superintendency in California reported the need for a redefinition of their role in the rapidly expanding program of education in that state.¹⁴ A series of structured interviews revealed a variety of practices which exist in spite of a single code of law applicable to all of California's 58 counties. These differences which have resulted in certain inequalities of educational opportunity among the counties were attributed largely to the individuality of the county superintendent of schools and the environment within which he operated. Further variations of practice were attributed to ignorance of the law, interpretation of the law, disregard of the law, and combinations of these three factors. The study reported that the replies to questions of the structured interview expressed a different and emerging concept of the intermediate superintendent in California. The developing emphasis is on professional training, competence, and leadership, and the development of county-wide programs of educational service.

An analysis of the factors which have resulted in changes in the structure of the intermediate unit in Idaho was made by Clem.¹⁵ Reporting the adoption by the Idaho legislature in 1947 of most of the recommendations of a state-wide survey in 1945, the study indicated a period of transition that brought about many changes in the state. This was coupled with the reorganization of many of the small local school districts.

Considerable unrest and confusion resulted. In 14 Idaho counties, for example, the entire county was reorganized into a county-unit district. There was a duplication of superintendencies over the same area. In such circumstances either another function was found for the county superintendent or

¹⁴ Ingraham, J. Roland, Jr. *The Role of the County Superintendent of Schools in California*. Doctor's thesis. Stanford University, Calif.: Stanford University, 1953. (Typewritten)

¹⁵ Clem, Beryl E. *Changes in the Role and Professional Status of the County Superintendent in the State of Idaho Since 1947*. Master's thesis. Pullman, Wash.: Washington State College, 1953. (Typewritten)

he was dismissed and the district superintendent became both county and district superintendent. The study reports a number of factors including (a) a lack of adequate interpretation of the 1947 statute creating county boards of education, (b) the difficult interrelations of intermediate units and reorganized districts, and (c) the removal of certain educational services previously rendered by the intermediate units as responsible for the situation which resulted in the abolishment in 1953 of the intermediate structure in all fully reorganized counties.¹⁶

The Texas County Superintendents Association through a survey of its membership indicated that in some instances the county was not sufficiently adequate as an effective intermediate unit and in such instances should be replaced by another and larger one.¹⁷ Sparsity of population was the primary factor.

A workshop for county superintendents in Oregon in 1952 reported a number of conclusions regarding the structure of the office.¹⁸ They recognized that the status of the intermediate superintendent in that state had been altered considerably as a result of local district reorganization. They concluded that they must look increasingly to the state legislature for the strengthening of the office.

A study of the intermediate superintendency in New York, undertaken jointly by the State Association of District Superintendents, the State Education Department, and the CPEA—Middle Atlantic Region, included among its conclusions the existence of a continued need for an intermediate administrative unit in that state and made a number of specific recommendations for its structure:¹⁹

1. The structure of the intermediate district must take account of social and economic factors; the reality of a community is of more importance than a given size of school.

¹⁶ House Bill 210. Idaho State Legislature, 1953.

¹⁷ Texas Association of County Superintendents. Study of the county superintendency in Texas. Austin: the Association, 1951-1953.

¹⁸ Klinge, Lucille L. *CPEA Project Summary. A Report of the Pacific Northwest County School Superintendents*. Eugene, Oreg.: University of Oregon, 1953. 52 p. (Mimeo.)

¹⁹ Buell, W. R., chairman. *Rural Leadership and Service, Part II: Structure*. Report of the Committee on Changing Status of the District Superintendency. Albany: New York State Education Department, 1953. 76 p.

2. In order to be effective, the intermediate unit requires the following:
 - a. A lay board of control with limited powers (Area Superintendency Council) to function primarily as a policy-making and advisory group.
 - b. A representative lay body (School Committee), elected by the people, with responsibility for appointing the control board (Council) and reviewing and approving the budget.
 - c. An administrative officer (Area Superintendent) selected by the control board and eligible for tenure after a successful probationary period.
 - d. An adequate staff of specialists selected by the superintendent to serve the needs of the area.
 - e. Adequate fiscal support, both from state and local districts.

Also included in the report were specific suggestions for organization, for functions and duties, for financing, and for development.

A seminar for intermediate superintendents held at Syracuse (New York) in 1952 endeavored to clarify the emerging functions and characteristics of the superintendency and their implications for changing the administrative framework within which they work.²⁰ This group concluded that five to seven reorganized districts of moderate size (not defined) would constitute an intermediate district of desirable size. They further concluded that the competence of individual intermediate superintendents was a greater factor in the development of effective intermediate units than the structure of their office.

Recognizing that varying conditions in different parts of the country would cause somewhat different patterns of intermediate units to be developed, the 1950 Yearbook of the Department of Rural Education, NEA, described several general guides for the organizational structure:

1. An intermediate district board of education should be established to exercise administrative control over the broad aspects of the educational program and their responsibility for providing essential educational services to supplement the programs of local districts.
2. The intermediate district board of education should have taxing power to form a budget for carrying on an educational program to supplement the programs of local districts.

²⁰ Hurd, Merrill. *The New York State District Superintendency and Continued Professional Growth*. Syracuse, N. Y.: School of Education, Syracuse University, 1952. 19 p.

3. The intermediate superintendent should be appointed by the intermediate district board of education.

4. The professional qualifications of the intermediate superintendent should be raised, the salary for the position made comparable to that of smaller and medium-sized cities, and the professional staff of the intermediate district increased.

5. The state should assist the intermediate district in maintaining an adequate educational program through financial aid.

6. The intermediate district should be made responsible for the provision of essential services that cannot be provided economically and effectively by local administrative units.²¹

As indicated in most of the studies cited, the intermediate unit has been greatly affected by the increasing reorganization of local school districts. While this has brought about a need for the reorientation of intermediate functions, the structural changes required have not yet come about to any appreciable extent. The results are strains in the interpersonal relations between intermediate and local district personnel, curtailment of certain functions in some states, and a high degree of stimulation on the part of groups of intermediate superintendents to examine their status and functions and recommend changes for strengthening their position to serve education. The relationships between local school district organization and the structure of the intermediate unit are still in need of careful study and clarification.

Financing the Educational Program

Financial planning in terms of both immediate and long range educational needs is increasingly necessary. Fiscal policy must be clear-cut and understood. Many of the old "rules-of-thumb" are no longer applicable. All public service institutions, including the public schools, must be sensitive to the relationship between the level of expenditures and the quality of their services.

When the Public Education Finance Committee of the National Citizens Commission for the Public Schools began in 1950 to plan materials on finance appropriate for lay under-

²¹Cushman, M. L., and Cooper, Shirley. "The Emerging Intermediate District." *The County Superintendent of Schools in the United States. Yearbook 1950*. Washington, D. C.: Department of Rural Education, National Education Association, 1950. Chapter 6, p. 158-59.

standing, it became apparent that a summary of research findings and of significant experiences was needed. The National Conference of Professors of Educational Administration undertook this project through a special committee. A few general conclusions included in the report of this committee are indicated here:

1. Good public schools are essential to a satisfactorily functioning democratic form of government, in that major policy decisions must be made by the people who must be reasonably well educated if they are to make sound decisions.

2. While generous financial support alone will not assure satisfactory schools, good schools are not likely to be provided unless adequate financial support is assured.

3. Financial support is not likely to be satisfactory unless (a) the people who must support the schools believe in the educational program and participate in its formulation, and (b) the entire program, educational and financial, is based on the best evidence and soundest concepts available and is constantly improved as the need and opportunity for such improvement becomes apparent.²²

Implications and recommendations for financing the educational program have been included in the reports of a number of studies. The National Commission on School District Reorganization reported:

The state should either provide all the funds necessary to pay the cost of a satisfactory minimum educational program or it should guarantee funds to supplement local resources to the extent necessary to maintain such a program. Some states have found it expedient to combine these two types of financing.²³

Pointing out that many communities, especially in rural areas, do not have the financial resources necessary to maintain an adequate program of educational opportunities, the Commission called for state support for schools on an equalization basis, i.e., in inverse proportion to the local community's ability to support a desirable educational program.

The differences which exist among states and among communities within any state in their ability to support education

²² Johns, R. L.; Morphet, E. L.; and others. *Problems and Issues in Public School Finance*. Report of a Committee of the National Conference of Professors of Educational Administration. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1952, 492 p.

²³ Dawson, Howard A.; Reeves, Floyd W.; and others, *op. cit.*, p. 141.

are great. In reviewing some of the implications of educational finance at the close of 1953, Morphet called attention to this situation:

Some states are approximately three times as able, on a per capita basis, to support education and other governmental services as others. The differences among districts in ability to support schools in the small district states are several hundred to one; even in the large district states they are seven or more to one.²⁴

In his study of recently reorganized school districts, Fitzwater discovered this wide range in the local ability of school districts to finance their educational program.²⁵ Using the valuation of real property as a measure of local ability, and making allowances for varying assessment practices, he reported wide differences in per pupil valuations among both the districts and states included in the study. The median per pupil valuation in Illinois, for example, was "more than eleven times greater than Minnesota's median, four times greater than the medians in Michigan and Missouri, and nearly three and one-half times that of New York." The range of per pupil valuations among the reorganized districts in the eight states included in the study were even greater. Of the 116 districts in Illinois for which data were reported, the ratio between the most and least able districts was 10 to 1. Differences were even greater in others of the states.

In addition to ability to support a program of education, one of the significant considerations is cost. Costs vary widely. In rural areas where the transportation of pupils is required, a cost is added which communities not providing transportation do not have. For districts providing transportation, costs vary considerably depending upon the density of population, the type of roads, and many other factors. One of the studies which takes into account the necessary extra costs resulting from sparse population was made by McLure.²⁶ He developed

²⁴ Morphet, Edgar L. "The Tug of War for Money for Schools." *School Executive* 73: 90-93.

²⁵ Fitzwater, C. O., *op. cit.*, p. 45-48.

²⁶ McLure, William P. *Effect of Population Sparsity on School Cost*. Contributions to Education, No. 929. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1947. 64 p.

a "sparsity correction factor" which was adopted and included in the recommendation of the Intermediate District Study in New York.²⁷

An analysis of financial ability for the support of education has recently been completed by Wakefield.²⁸ Selecting eight counties in four states which ranged from high-percentage rural to high-percentage urban, he related economic potential (as measured by the size of the labor force) to educational need (as measured by the school-age population). He found an inverse relationship between the size of the labor force and the school-age population (ages 5-17 inclusive) in the counties studied, i.e., when one is larger the other is smaller. The report also indicated a significant ratio for the size of the labor force to the degree of rurality with lower ratios in rural counties and states, i.e., as the degree of rurality increased, the number of children also increased, but the size of the labor force decreased—fewer persons working to support an educational program for more children.

In his study of intermediate units in Indiana, Pound found wide cost differences and indicated population as one of the important factors.²⁹ He reported that counties with limited resident pupil populations spend three times as much per resident pupil as do other counties with a larger pupil transportation.

Factors other than population often cause cost differentials. Inefficient districts and schools tend to result in a system which is relatively expensive. The study in Tompkins County (New York) reported excessive costs due to small classes.³⁰ In spite of the fact that approximately half of the county had been reorganized, more than 25 percent of all classes in the rural high schools in the county had at the time of the study enrollments of fewer than 10 pupils. The report concluded that

²⁷ Morrison, J. Cayce, and others, *op. cit.*

²⁸ Wakefield, Howard. Unpublished Study. Columbus, Ohio: the Author, School-Community Development Study, Ohio State University, 1954.

²⁹ Pound, Clarence A., *op. cit.*

³⁰ New York State Council on Rural Education, *op. cit.*

"some plan must be found to reduce the number of small classes or there is grave danger that some courses will be discontinued because of high cost."

While the reorganization of school districts often permits some reduction of high costs due to small classes, it does not offer a panacea for financial problems. Most reorganized school districts depend upon a system of pupil transportation and the cost of this service is in addition to the costs of the other aspects of the educational program. Often they depend upon the provision of new school-plant facilities. Fitzwater reported that 72.3 percent of the reorganized districts included in his study had either constructed new school buildings or had remodeled or enlarged one or more of the existing school buildings.³¹ The National Commission on School District Reorganization, in recommending that each state should establish budget provisions for the transportation service and assist its local units either in new building programs or in servicing the debt necessary to finance such programs, recommended:

In providing funds for the general program or for transportation and buildings, the state should be sure that its method of apportionment does not place a penalty upon the reorganization of local school units. Not only should the state avoid penalizing changes in school district structure; it should endeavor to place premiums and rewards upon proper reorganization.³²

The changing times create additional problems in finance which are becoming more clearly recognized. In his review of certain continuing financial problems, Morphet pointed out that in some communities the number of children to be educated is increasing more rapidly than the resources of the community.³³ This fact is particularly true in communities where new housing developments have caused substantial population growth while as yet only limited business and industrial development has taken place. In addition, he reports, the demands for other governmental services and the costs for such

³¹ Fitzwater, C. O. *Educational Change in Reorganized School Districts*. Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Bulletin 1953. No. 4. Washington, D. C.: Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, 1953. p. 50.

³² Dawson, Howard A.; Reeves, Floyd W.; and others, *op. cit.*, p. 142.

³³ Morphet, Edgar L., *op. cit.*

services are still increasing. The competition for tax funds is likely to become more serious and to continue so for some time.

Obtaining Needed Legislation

Although most examinations of educational structure have indicated some inadequacies and have recommended changes in the legal framework within which community schools and intermediate units function, specific legislative programs or the establishment of principles to guide legislative development have seldom been included. In only a few instances has legislative action been proposed as an outgrowth of a particular study or project. The single case reported here is illustrative.

Throughout the Intermediate District Study in New York a strong conviction was held by all those participating that, if and when the final conclusions were suggested to the state legislature for enactment into law, they would insist that the acceptance of such legislation for use in any given community should be entirely on an optional basis. This recommendation for *permissive* legislation was included in the final report of the study³¹ and incorporated into the legislation adopted.³² The law provides considerable freedom of action on the part of each new intermediate district established as regards providing educational services. The intermediate district board may contract for any or all services with a nearby city or village; it may contract with one or more of the constituent districts for any or all services; or it may establish an area school or schools. The flexibility provided in the law was developed from the findings of a particular part of the total study that probably no one method of providing services would always be preferred.³³

A study completed by Wakefield explored the possibilities of developing broad understanding of the emerging concept of the intermediate unit through adapting the medium of mass communication known as picture continuity—a technique for

³¹ Morrison, J. Cayce, and others, *op. cit.*

³² *Laws of New York, op. cit.*

³³ Scott, Don. "Methods of Implementing the Educational Program in Different Intermediate Districts." *The Intermediate District in New York State: Special Studies*. Bulletin No. 1356. Albany: New York State Education Department, 1948. p. 43-78.

presenting ideas through a series of related pictures.³⁷ The development of general understanding will, of course, be necessary for really effective operation. Legislative understanding will be necessary for appropriate modifications of the intermediate unit structure.

Changes in the administrative structure is ultimately the responsibility of the state legislature. Whether school organization is revised through mandate or through permissive legislation often reflects the basic philosophy of future operation. The degree to which the legislature participates in developing changes which will provide community schools and intermediate units adequate to meet present and developing educational needs might also have some long range significance. The frequent tendency of legislators not to separate support and control of education handicaps educational improvement in the area where it counts most—the local community.

IMPROVING THE CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

An adequate program of education in rural areas must serve a wide range of needs. It must reach those in remote and isolated areas as well as those in larger towns and villages. It must serve equally well those who will spend their lives in the communities in which they were born and those who must seek occupational opportunity in cities or other areas.

Extensive research in the way children grow and develop and in the way they learn has given many teachers and school administrators the task of gaining new knowledge and greater understanding. More and more school systems have tried to establish programs that really help children learn to live better. The number of clinics, workshops, institutes, and other types of inservice improvement programs is increasing. Teaching generally is of higher quality than it has ever been.

Some of the findings of a few recent studies which deal with more adequate curricular offerings and better teaching methods are reported briefly in this summary. The particular studies

³⁷ Wakefield, Howard. *Using Picture Continuity To Diffuse Ideas about a Major Function of the Intermediate Superintendency*. Doctor's thesis. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1953. (Typewritten)

and the areas included are limited to those which have a definite relationship to the development of community schools and intermediate units and their interrelations. Only these aspects of the studies are identified.

Better Teachers and Teaching

The teacher is to a large extent the key to the quality of education. Good schools have good teachers; they cannot be good if teachers are inferior. There is some evidence to indicate that good community schools and effective intermediate units can through their cooperative efforts improve both the competence of their teachers and their service to their community.

One of the measures of performance is the teacher's degree of satisfaction with the job. A recent study by Grimm in Illinois surveyed the opinions of a number of teachers in 30 Illinois counties.³⁸ All of the teachers included had formerly taught in one-room or small village schools and were at the time of the study employed in community unit districts. The median total years of teaching experience of the teachers surveyed was 23. Considerable advantage in favor of the community unit was shown in terms of better salary opportunities, more helpful supervision, and opportunity for professional advancement and growth. Although the teachers indicated new problems such as transportation, crowded classes, and difficulties in communication and public relations, they also reported (in their opinion) better curricular offerings, better school buildings and environment, and much more adequate instructional supplies and equipment. The teaching of fundamental subjects (reading, writing, arithmetic, spelling, language) was believed by 76 percent to be better in the community unit districts than had been the case in the smaller schools.

In his study of reorganized school districts, Fitzwater reported that the college preparation of teachers employed in the area before and after reorganization was one of the most widespread of all the educational changes revealed in the entire

³⁸ Grimm, Lester R. "Teachers Prefer Community Units." *Illinois Education* 41: 56-57; October 1912.

study.³⁹ (It might be assumed that this resulted from higher standards for employment.) Of the districts reporting, 88.2 percent had a teaching staff with a higher level of college preparation than that held by the teachers employed by the old districts at the time of reorganization. This increase in the amount of college preparation of teachers in the reorganized districts was shown in each of the eight states included in the study.

An evaluation of an inservice education program provided by the intermediate unit in Douglas County (Nebraska) is somewhat unique from most studies of its kind in that many of the rural elementary teachers participating in the program had little college preparation, and were generally young teachers with limited teaching experience.⁴⁰ The program evaluated had been operating for six years and included a variety of activities: teachers meetings, study groups, institutes, and workshops; college credit classes; classroom visitation by a helping teacher; individual conferences; demonstration teaching; and professional materials and bulletins. Teachers met together frequently in both small and large groups. One of the significant findings was that the particular inservice activities regarded most helpful by younger teachers differed somewhat from those considered most helpful by more experienced teachers. Teacher rating of the effectiveness of the different types of activities also varied with the number of years of college preparation.

Substantial percentages of all teachers reported improvement in each of the nine major areas covered by the program. The teachers' appraisal of the program revealed most value when they understood the purposes to be achieved. The study concluded that teacher improvement was in direct proportion to the interest and enthusiasm of the administrators and supervisors.

A study in Pennsylvania reported by Prestwood concluded that the school administrator should encourage his staff to grow

³⁹ Fitzwater, C. O., *op. cit.*

⁴⁰ Sollenberger, Lucille. *Evaluation of In-Service Education of Douglas County*. Master's thesis. Omaha, Nebr.: University of Omaha, 1953. (Typewritten)

professionally by setting an excellent example.⁴¹ He must find time to improve his own professional competence.

Expanding and Improving the Curriculum

The limitations of educational programs provided in many rural schools tends to place the children of these districts at a serious disadvantage. Numerous studies and school surveys have pointed up specific services needed but not provided. Some of the implications of these curricular shortcomings are included in the reports of studies in earlier sections of this chapter.

The study made in Tompkins County (New York) called attention to the fact that the rural high schools in that county offered so few programs of a vocational nature that rural youth had little opportunity to become familiar with a variety of vocational fields.⁴² Comparing these rural schools with the one city school system in the county, the study reported that 60 percent of the pupils who enroll in the four smallest rural high schools in the area leave school before graduation, 37 percent in the four largest rural high schools, and 33 percent in the city schools. The study concluded that the desire of youth to stay in school is influenced by the school's ability to meet vocational needs.

A comprehensive study of those who drop out of school before graduation has recently been completed in Kentucky and a number of curricular implications reported.⁴³ The early school leavers included in the study were requested to indicate changes in their local school program which might have prolonged their enrollment in the secondary school. While the reason most frequently given for leaving school was "Preferred work to school," the two changes most frequently suggested were the provision of work experience and the desire for specific vocational instruction. Business subjects (which included

⁴¹ Prestwood, Elwood L. *The Job of the District Superintendent of Schools in Pennsylvania*. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1953. 62 p.

⁴² New York State Council on Rural Education, *op. cit.*

⁴³ Hecker, Stanley E. *Early School Leavers in Kentucky*. Bulletin of the Bureau of School Service. Lexington: College of Education, University of Kentucky, 1953. 78 p.

typing, shorthand, bookkeeping, office machines, accounting, and salesmanship) were listed by 45 percent as the subject or type of training most needed or desired since leaving school and which were not obtainable while they were enrolled.

Another study reported by Miller pointed out that business subjects were listed by more than 9000 Virginia graduates and early school leavers and more than 1500 business and industrial employers as the leading response in what they considered the "fundamentals" of public secondary education.⁴⁴ Included among the recommendations of the Kentucky study were the following:

1. Local school systems should provide the services of one full-time trainer counselor to each 500 pupils.
2. The school curriculum should be diversified in order to provide experiences that meet the general and special needs, interests, and abilities of all pupils.
3. The extracurricular program should be extended to provide social experiences for all pupils.
4. A work experience program related to the needs of the pupil, business, and the local community should be organized in those communities in which such a program is feasible.

Most of the reorganized school districts included in the study by Fitzwater had either added new courses and instructional services or had definite plans to do so.⁴⁵ Analyzing the courses added in terms of enrollment, the study reports that the range of courses added by schools in the different size-groups did not vary as greatly as might have been expected. Except for specialized shop courses and diversified occupations programs reported by some of the larger districts, courses in all of the subject fields included were reported by one or more smaller districts. The most common additions by the smaller districts, however, were in the fields of homemaking and industrial arts as compared to the larger districts where courses or complete programs were added in other subject fields such as commercial or business, physical education, driver education, music, and art.

⁴⁴ Miller, Leonard M. "Graduates and Drop-Outs in Virginia." *School Life* 34:94; March 1952.

⁴⁵ Fitzwater, C. O., *op. cit.*

The use of community resources in the curricular program was explored by a group of county superintendents in Ohio.⁴⁶ They recommended that (a) lay persons should be encouraged to lend time and talents to advising on phases of the school program, and (b) efforts should be made to integrate the educational program with the established institutions in the communities—helping to build community schools. Similar recommendations grew out of a study in Pennsylvania as school superintendents considered how community resources might be used not only to enrich the educational program itself but also to promote citizens' interest in their schools.⁴⁷ Emphasizing the interrelationship of school and community, the study described how objectives of improved relations might be reached through such activities as work experience programs, creative programs of adult education, and followup and placement services.

Expanding Educational Services

Part of the emphasis of the studies reported in this section is on particular educational services, but attention is also given to how these services might be provided.

Numerous studies, surveys, and empirical observations have pointed up the smallness of most schools and the limitations of their resources. The increasing complexity of our technical civilization has created new social problems (migratory workers, mobility, occupational specialization, etc.) and has accented others which previously had not been considered sufficiently serious to warrant organized attention (unemployables, delinquents, etc.). Schools have undertaken the meeting of certain of these problems, but many small schools are very inadequate for the task. Even after consolidations and reorganizations, many community schools are not equipped to provide special educational services for handicapped children where these are needed, adequate school health services, guidance and counseling, psychological and psychiatric services, vocational educa-

⁴⁶ West, Joseph S. *A Study of the First Ohio County Superintendents' Workshop*. Master's thesis. Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State University, 1953. (Typewritten)

⁴⁷ Haring, Roy J. *The Role of the Superintendent in the Interrelationship of School and Community*. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1953. 52 p.

tion, adult education, and the many other services needed for a comprehensive program of education. A number of recent studies have sought to determine how these services might be provided, particularly in smaller communities and rural areas.

Several of the studies reported in the section on *Reorganization of Intermediate Units* include conclusions and recommendations regarding the provision of particular services. The law passed by the New York Legislature in 1948, an outgrowth of the Intermediate District Study and permitting the reorganization of intermediate units, indicated that certain specified services could and should be provided to constituent school districts—the education of handicapped children, industrial education, adult education, supervision, the administration of attendance, and the administration of transportation.⁴⁸ A later study of the District Superintendency in New York describes five functions of the intermediate unit—adaptation, general consultant, coordination, special cooperative services, and administrative procedures.⁴⁹ The function of “special cooperative services” is defined specifically as curricular related services which enrich local community school programs. Since the philosophy of service was dominant throughout the study, the other functions are also primarily services—both to communities and community schools.

In Pennsylvania during 1952-53 18 area meetings were held at which lay and professional persons exchanged views about the intermediate unit—its potentialities, its values, the existing needs, and ways of working to strengthen it. From these discussions, a series of pamphlets was developed to describe actual and needed services and suggest ways for implementing and improving programs. The titles of the first four pamphlets in this series indicate the concerns:

1. *Providing Improved Educational Opportunities for Rural and Suburban Children and Physically and Mentally Handicapped Children Through County Boards of School Directors.*

2. *Has the Time Come for a Further Reorganization of the County Superintendency in Pennsylvania?*

⁴⁸ *Laws of New York*, op. cit.

⁴⁹ Buell, W. R., chairman, op. cit.

3. *Work for the Reading Consultant and for the Corrective Speech Consultant.*
4. *New Services Wanted from County Superintendents' Offices.*

The four states of the Pacific Northwest (Idaho, Montana, Oregon, Washington) have joined efforts in looking at the broader problems of providing services. The following recommendations for a proposed action program grew out of workshop deliberations in Oregon:

1. The establishment of a county service fund on an average daily attendance basis (somewhat after the pattern of the present California County Service Fund).
2. The enactment of cooperative service legislation, permitting local districts to support needed services cooperatively.
3. Additional research and study into the effectiveness of phases of the service program.⁵⁰

In West Virginia, a rather extensive study of the county-unit is underway and current progress reports show that certain of the service functions appear to be more effective on a county-wide basis.⁵¹ The study also directs attention to the school-community concept and to the importance of public interest in, and understanding of, education. Reports have not yet indicated attempts to reconcile these conflicting factors—local interest and wider operation.

In many states, groups and state associations of county and intermediate superintendents have been exploring the possibilities of providing needed educational services to their constituent community schools—services which cannot be provided economically or effectively by the communities alone. Some of these efforts are as yet not more than informal inquiry, however enthusiastically undertaken. Some are organized studies. The findings of the studies which have been made indicate that the intermediate superintendency is in state of transition. Many of its newer operations are only beginning to emerge. It is somewhat difficult to characterize, a fact which may, in large part, explain the great interest the office is generating. Both in 1952 and 1953 the programs of the

⁵⁰ Klinge, Lucille L., *op. cit.*

⁵¹ West Virginia Association of School Superintendents. Progress reports of the West Virginia Leadership Project. Huntington, W. Va.: Marshall College, 1952.

national conference of the Division of County and Rural Area Superintendents of the Department of Rural Education, NEA, have been devoted to developing an understanding of the changing role of the intermediate unit. The primary emphasis of these conference programs, of the various state studies, and of the less formal explorations is that of assisting local community schools by making available those educational services which otherwise are not likely to be provided. Much progress has been made during the past few years. More and more intermediate superintendents are finding ways to develop the educational services desired by constituent districts, despite the often severe limitations in resources and personnel and the impediments of the legal structure within which they function.⁶² In all regions where the intermediate unit exists, superintendents are building on the patterns which exist, developing what they have. This is significant; the various patterns of development are increasingly providing experience which can give guidance to further achievement.

Studies which might be helpful in establishing desirable standards for each of the various educational services which should be available for every school are yet to be undertaken. Experience in providing many of the possible services is very limited, and reports of this limited experience are not generally available. Only recently have studies been undertaken which consider the intermediate unit as a possible source of services to community schools. This relationship might be illustrated by citing a few recent studies which concern a particular educational service.

One of the educational services which seems to hold great promise for the future of rural schools is that of instructional supervision. A study by Vannatter re-emphasizes the belief that to be most valuable, provision must be made to furnish and administer supervisory services (a) at a level close to the teachers on the job, (b) in keeping with the needs of the area served, and (c) in a manner designed especially for the par-

⁶² A number of examples of current programs of educational services are included in Chapters 3, 4, and 5. The Texas County Superintendents' Association is now collecting reports of successful intermediate-level practices carried on in 50 different states, and will report the results later in 1934.

ticular community.⁵³ To measure the adequacy of direct supervision for teachers, the study involved a nation-wide survey which included an appraisal of the number of supervisors employed as well as the corresponding number of teachers and schools for which each was responsible. Data were secured for 2428 (71.2 percent of all) county or other intermediate units having rural areas. Only 38.6 percent employed persons could definitely be classified as instructional supervisors available to rural teachers. In some cases their help was likewise given to nonrural schools. Intermediate units providing supervisory service had an average of 2.1 supervisors, although 61.4 percent had none. Regional differences were reported both in terms of the provision of supervision and in the number of teachers for whom a supervisor had responsibility. The Jeanes Teachers, for example, have by administrative policy been considered too heavily burdened when the count of teachers supervised went above the 40 mark; 30 has been held to be a more satisfactory number. In 40 states the study reported that a typical elementary-school supervisor's load was 84.7 teachers in 27.5 schools. The study indicated (a) the need to determine the objectives of rural supervision in terms of meeting community needs, and (b) the importance of intermediate unit leadership as the key to progress in the promotion and success of rural supervision.

A study by Farley included an evaluation of the supervisory services available to rural elementary schools in Nebraska.⁵⁴ Nebraska had 6268 school districts in 1953. The study reported that rural elementary teachers in Nebraska are permitted to secure regular teaching certificates without any college training and that individuals serving as elementary supervisors in rural areas are required to have at least two years of college education. Supervisory services must, therefore, give consideration to raising the professional status of both teachers and supervisors. Pointing out that instructional supervision could

⁵³ Vannatter, Harold H. *A Study of the Organization and Administration of the Supervisory Services Available for Rural Teachers in the United States*. Doctor's thesis. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1952.

⁵⁴ Farley, Rosalie W. *A Study of Rural Supervisory Services for Elementary Schools in Nebraska and a Suggested Program for Improvement of Supervision*. Doctor's thesis. Lincoln: University of Nebraska, 1953.

be more adequately provided if consideration were given to reorganization of responsibilities, reorganization of school districts, and provisions for cooperative activities with teacher education institutions, the study concluded that some Nebraska counties were too large to provide adequate supervision under prevailing conditions while others were too small to encourage and maintain a well-planned supervisory program. A suggested program for rural schools was developed as a part of the study.

The findings of this study in Nebraska are closely associated with that of Sollenberger previously reported.⁶⁵ The latter was confined to an appraisal of the inservice education program of one Nebraska county (Douglas County).

The absence of definitive studies concerning the provision of specific educational services makes necessary the wide range of experimentation evident in the experiences reported in Chapters 3, 4 and 5. This experimentation is desirable. However, it will be important that studies be undertaken to determine the desirable nature and scope of each of the particular services needed and to establish desirable standards to guide in the provision of programs. Attention must also be given to how these educational services can be provided. Since the needs of children and communities exist regardless of the administrative organization of the schools, programs of educational services to small communities and rural areas will to a large extent depend upon an effective means of providing them. Encouraging, indeed, is the increasing experience.

IMPROVING EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

Educational leadership involves many people; it frequently shifts from individual to individual. It involves pupils, parents, teachers, administrators, members of boards of education and of state education departments, and many others. In particular, it involves those who have some responsibility for carrying out the functions of the educational program.

This summary has been limited to focus upon administra-

⁶⁵ See page 155.

tive leadership only. Many findings of the studies reported have application to leadership in its broadest sense, however. The basis upon which the studies reported were selected as illustrative of this area has been that the quality of administrative leadership in education is not so much determined by the organizational structure as it is by its sensitivity to changing needs, its ability to bring about social change, and its relations to both the community and the profession as a whole.

The Leadership Function

The functions of educational administration have been given a great deal of attention in recent years in almost every section of the country and by various groups on a national basis. Much of this attention has followed a pattern of studies of the present duties of administrators in an effort to discover clues as to proper functions and responsibilities—the “proper” ones often presumed to be those the majority are performing, although in a number of instances projections of “what ought to be” have been considered. One of the ever present functions, however difficult it has been to identify, has been that of leadership.

The dependence of any state system of education upon decentralized leadership has long been recognized. As was stated by the National Council of Chief State School Officers, state leadership, however good, can accomplish little unless there is a chain of leadership reaching into every community and every classroom.⁵⁶

Defining leadership as an interplay among persons in such a way that common direction is given to their efforts, the National Conference of Professors of Educational Administration undertook a study of the implications of leadership in the preparation of school administrators.⁵⁷

An analysis of the elements of what is termed “democratic leadership,” with particular emphasis upon the rural educa-

⁵⁶ National Council of Chief State School Officers. Annual Meeting of the Council held in Los Angeles, Calif., December 1947.

⁵⁷ National Conference of Professors of Educational Administration. *Educational Leaders—Their Function and Preparation*. Report of the Second Work Conference, Madison, Wisconsin, 1948. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1948. p. 1.

tional leader, was made by Butterworth and Dawson.⁵⁸ They reported the problems of educational leadership in a community as follows: (a) to know what education can do to improve the quality of living, (b) to visualize the specific elements in a program that will enable a school to do what it ought, (c) to seek the contributions from as many as possible of the thoughtful members of the community in deciding upon a wise course of action, and (d) to get the community as a whole to accept the course of action that seems most promising and to participate in making it effective.

This process of democratic leadership with special reference to county superintendents was discussed in the 1950 Yearbook of the Department of Rural Education.⁵⁹ A great deal of emphasis was given in this report to the process and the need for administrators to understand the functioning of groups. It was indicated that basic to good group dynamics is communication which precedes, is a part of, and follows group action. The report concluded that the superintendent who fills this role of educational leader works with pupils and parents, teachers and trustees, committees and communities. He helps these groups evolve the organizational devices that will make possible the effective and efficient solution of problems. His leadership brings about better education for children and youth, better understanding of and participation in the educational program by citizens of the community, and better morale.

A recent study in Pennsylvania attempted to discover the nature of the job of administrators in communities with populations over 5000.⁶⁰ This study, like many others based upon empirical observation, was carried on by a series of intervisitations among the school systems. The teams of observers were made up of superintendents, principals, teachers, school

⁵⁸ Butterworth, Julian E., and Dawson, Howard A. *The Modern Rural School*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1952. Chapter 18, "Leadership as the Basic Means of Improving Education," p. 313-27.

⁵⁹ Carroll, John S., and others. "Democratic Leadership Procedures." *The County Superintendent of Schools in the United States. Yearbook 1950*. Washington, D. C.: Department of Rural Education, National Education Association, 1950; Chapter 4, p. 76-100.

⁶⁰ Priestwood, Elwood L., *op. cit.*

board members, and citizens. The report of the study which identifies problems and issues confronting school administrators in the many aspects of administration and reports successful practices also includes a number of specific suggestions regarding leadership responsibilities.

Most studies of educational leadership have recognized distinctions between the *ascribed* or *positional* role and the *real* or *actual* role of the administrator. The study by Ingraham of the present practices of county superintendents in California with relation to their legal role (as defined by the education code of that state) reported wide variations.⁶¹ He attributes this development of differing practices, in spite of the single code of law applicable to all counties, in large part to the leadership ability and individual philosophy of county superintendents.

This distinction between ascribed and actual roles is perhaps most evident in studies of the functions and duties of intermediate administrators. For many this position is regarded as an "office" and this has importance, prestige, political value, and professional standing. Even in such instances, however, the administrator often lacks power to discharge the responsibilities ascribed to him. This was quite clearly indicated by Pound in his study of the county superintendency in Indiana.⁶² He reported that in that state the county superintendent has few powers although many responsibilities are delegated to or expected of him. He must therefore rely almost entirely upon his powers of persuasion to satisfactorily discharge these responsibilities. Except for his authority as an appeal agent in adjudicating matters between constituent districts and their citizens and as a liaison officer for the State Department of Public Instruction, he has no real power over the officers and schools in the local administrative units in his county. Nevertheless, the study concludes that, in spite of this difficult administrative and supervisory position, county superintendents through their efforts to supplement and enrich the educational programs of schools are emerging to a position of real educational leadership.

⁶¹ Ingraham, Roland J., *op. cit.*

⁶² Pound, Clarence A., *op. cit.*

The Study of the District Superintendency in New York, in identifying five distinct functions of the intermediate superintendent, reported the leadership function as an important part of each function.⁶³ The need for leadership was particularly evident in the function termed "adaptation"—assisting people to bring about changes and improvements in their schools. The study pointed out the relationship of educational administration and the people in the community. It concluded that the process of continuously developing and stimulating ideas is far more effective and constructive in its results than waiting until there is need to instigate discussions that have to muster public opinion. A second function having many leadership implications was that of "coordination." The design for the study was limited to an analysis of the functions of intermediate superintendents, and the function of coordination was limited to activities between the state education department and local school districts. Leadership is also needed to coordinate (a) the efforts of the many groups and agencies in a community with those of the schools, and (b) the efforts of groups within a school system toward common objectives. Leadership aspects were also present in each of the other functions outlined—general supervision, special cooperative services, and administrative procedures.

A workshop group of county superintendents in Montana compiled a detailed list of specific duties and responsibilities which their report related to curriculum, business, administration, and auxiliary services.⁶⁴ They included the leadership function of coordination by listing among their activities (a) coordinating the rural and urban elements within the county, and (b) coordinating the school program with other agencies, both public and private—local, state, and federal.

A different approach to educational leadership has been made by a study which attempted a "3-D" analysis of what was termed the "superintendency of education."⁶⁵ Three groups

⁶³ Buell, W. R., chairman, *op. cit.*

⁶⁴ Klinge, Lucille L., *op. cit.*

⁶⁵ Davies, Daniel R. *CPEA Reports to the Profession on—A Developing Concept of the Superintendency of Education*. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1913. 40 p.

of related elements included in this analysis—the job, the man in the job, and the social setting in which both the job and the man must function—were described and their interrelationships thus indicated. The study developed each of these elements in relation to the three dimensions—the nature of the tasks to be performed, the process through which they might be accomplished, and the relationship of time or sequence. Although reaction to this approach is not yet available, it is a unique approach to administrative leadership in the sense that it is neither wholly abstract nor descriptive. Its objective appears to be a development and definition of concepts without the need for isolating them or removing them from their context.

Selection and Qualification of Administrators

The ultimate success of any program regardless of administrative structure, is dependent upon the professional staff employed to carry out its functions. The quality and efficiency of the work will be equivalent to the total of skilled performance of the staff. Without trained and competent personnel the program cannot hope to reach the objectives desired. The importance of competency on the part of the school administrator is immediately obvious.

The purpose here is to report a few recent studies which have been concerned with the qualifications of administrators and the method used in their selection. It should be pointed out that the studies included concern both the administrators of community schools and intermediate units, although this creates some difficulty in reporting as regards the method of selection—almost all community school administrators are appointed by boards of education but very frequently intermediate administrators are elected by some form of popular vote. The elective method of selection often, although by no means always, has a direct relationship to the level of qualifications that can be expected.

A study in Alabama included the problem of selection and concluded that the appointive method usually results in a better

school system than the elective method.⁶⁶ Among the reasons reported were:

1. A board of education representing the people is in better position to make investigations and evaluate qualifications of a prospective superintendent than is the voting public.

2. Conflicts of authority and responsibility are likely to develop when the board of education and executive are both selected by popular vote.

3. An appointed superintendent is more free to base his recommendations regarding policies upon the needs of children without a fear of political consequences.

4. The market place from which a superintendent is appointed is much broader than one from which he is elected by popular vote.

An even more recent survey of conditions in Florida reported conclusions similar to those of the Alabama study.⁶⁷ In this instance qualification requirements under the elective system were reported as virtually nonexistent.

The recommendation most commonly reported from studies of the status of administrators of both community schools and intermediate units and an examination of their qualifications, salary, tenure, and method of selection has been for the general upgrading of requirements. In one instance the conclusion was reached that the competence of individual superintendents affects the quality of the educational program more than the structural framework within which they function.⁶⁸

In many states efforts have been made to upgrade the certification requirements for intermediate superintendents. In a few instances this has been done. Ingraham's study in California emphasized the fact that county superintendents in that state are required to hold the highest credential offered by the state and that these requirements, despite the elective system, have assured competent and professionally trained administrators.⁶⁹ A report by Archer and Wollitz indicated that

⁶⁶ American Council on Education, *Public Education in Alabama. A Report of the Alabama Educational Survey Commission*. Washington, D. C.: the Council, 1945. 452 p.

⁶⁷ National Education Association, National Commission for the Defense of Democracy Through Education, *Report of an Investigation—Miami, Florida, An Example of the Effects of the Injection of Partisan Politics into School Administration*. Washington, D. C.: the Commission, 1952. 47 p.

⁶⁸ Hurd, Merrill, *op. cit.*

⁶⁹ Ingraham, Roland J., *op. cit.*

legislative action would be necessary to raise the standards of the office of the county superintendent in Minnesota.⁷⁰

A survey of the requirements for qualification, the method of selection, and the term of office of county or other rural area superintendents was reported in the 1950 Yearbook of the Department of Rural Education.⁷¹ Although the level of requirements ranged widely, both in the amount of professional preparation and the number of years of experience in education, the general level was markedly higher than had been reported in earlier studies.⁷²

A rather detailed survey of the qualifications, salary, selection, and tenure of office of county superintendents in Indiana was included in the study by Pound.⁷³ He reported that 80 of that state's 90 county superintendents during 1951-52 had an advanced degree. Their median annual salary had been increased from 1933 to 1952 substantially more than could be expected because of changing economic conditions, although they receive only about half the amount of the expense of their necessary travel. According to the judgments of incumbent county superintendents, partisan politics was considered an important factor in the selection and retention of county superintendents in Indiana. The median years of tenure for all county superintendents, however, was found to be 8 and their median years of service in education was 30. The primary reason given as to why county superintendents leave their positions was "changes in county board of education politics."

The study concluded that in training, experience, and tenure of office, county superintendents compare favorably with other school administrators in Indiana. There was also sufficient evidence to conclude that county boards of education do not take the initiative in filling a vacancy in their superintendency.

⁷⁰ Archer, C. P., and Wollitz, N. "The County Superintendency in Minnesota." *Minnesota Journal of Education* 29(19): February 1949.

⁷¹ Cooper, Shirley, editor. *The County Superintendent of Schools in the United States, Yearbook 1950*. Washington, D. C.: Department of Rural Education, National Education Association, 1950. p. 177-82.

⁷² See Butterworth, Julian E. *The County Superintendent in the United States*. U.S. Department of Interior, Office of Education, Bulletin 1932. No. 6. Washington, D. C.: Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, 1932. 50 p.

⁷³ Pound, Clarence A., *op. cit.*

County boards, it was reported, do not act as units in seeking applicants to fill vacancies when they occur. Instead, either individual board members initiate action or action is initiated by prospective applicants with individual board members.

A number of professional groups have recently indicated a great deal of concern regarding the supply and demand, qualifications, certification, and tenure of school administrators. In many states the supply of persons holding administrator's credentials is many times the number of positions. This situation appears to have a tendency to cause the applications of many more candidates when a vacancy occurs than a board of education can possibly consider and to shorten the tenure of administrators.

At its last meeting, the National Conference of Professors of Educational Administration established a special committee to organize a cooperative study of the nature and effect of state requirements for the selection, preparation, and induction of school administrators.⁷¹ Recommendations regarding desirable qualifications and certification requirements for all types of school administrators can be expected.

The evidence seems to indicate that educational leadership, at least to the extent that it can be measured by the amount of professional preparation and experience required of administrators, has been improving. But competency cannot be measured in these terms alone. Wholesome personality, non-judgmental and objective attitudes about human behavior, and a sincere concern for the best education obtainable—all are as important to good performances as are the actual professional training and acquisition of tested techniques in carrying out the specific job. There is some evidence that institutions preparing administrators will increasingly provide for these considerations in their programs of professional preparation.

Inservice Improvement of Administrators

The administrative leadership which will be available to serve both community schools and intermediate units in the

⁷¹National Conference of Professors of Educational Administration. Special Committee on Certification of Educational Administrators. (R. L. Hopper, University of Kentucky, chairman.)

years immediately ahead must, to a large extent, come from those who are now in these or comparable positions and those who are now preparing for such positions. Like workers at any job or professionals in whatever their practice, teachers and school administrators improve their abilities through experience. This is generally recognized and is reflected in the desire of school boards to employ persons with experience whenever possible. But because the experience of any one individual can include only a small part of the range of possible experiences, and because the body of educational understanding is so great that programs of preparation which cover two, four, six, seven, or even more years can include only a limited amount, more and more attention has been given in recent years to organized programs of professional improvement for persons who are employed, who are "on the job." Usually referred to as inservice programs, the nature of specific activities varies from the very informal to additional professional preparation of the most formal type.

Much of this inservice improvement as regards educational administrators is carried on through conferences, clinics, workshops, and other types of work groups. These are increasingly evident on a county, state, regional, and national basis. Many are sponsored and conducted by professional associations or subgroups of those associations. It would, of course, be impossible to identify all such activities. Of particular significance to the areas with which this yearbook is devoted, however, are four distinct types which are illustrative. The first and by far the largest is the Annual Convention of the American Association of School Administrators.⁷⁶ Although this convention meets on a regional basis every third year under present operating policy, it is primarily a national meeting. Another important group which meets on a national basis is the National Conference of County and Rural Area Superintendents.⁷⁷ As reported elsewhere in this chapter, this group

⁷⁶ More than 18,500 attended the AASA Convention in Atlantic City, N. J., February 1954.

⁷⁷ The eighth annual conference of the Division of County and Rural Area Superintendents of the Department of Rural Education, NEA, was held in Omaha, Nebraska, October 1953.

has given considerable attention to developing and clarifying the changing concept of the intermediate unit. A third type, which might to some extent be considered as subgroups of the second, is the series of conferences and workshop meetings of state associations of county superintendents. This activity is increasing very rapidly and the reports from some of these groups are included in this and other sections of this chapter. Still another and important series of conferences are those on Administrative Leadership Serving Community Schools.⁷⁷ These conferences, usually called "drive-in" conferences, are designed primarily for the administrators of community schools and of the smaller school systems.

All of these conferences and work groups, as well as many of those not reported here, are designed to focus attention upon problems which are of vital concern to administrators. Making available some of the best educational leaders in the nation and providing for the active participation of all who attend through discussion, demonstration, and general exchange of ideas, these programs constitute a significant inservice improvement program.

A considerable amount of activity designed for the inservice improvement of school administrators has been undertaken by colleges and universities. These activities are increasing. In some areas, active school study councils have been organized. Many institutions have increased their efforts to provide off-campus extension classes. Some have established a form of extension service through which administrators can obtain special types of assistance and guidance. While formal classes and courses have always been an important part of the inservice development of most administrators, especially during summer sessions, there has been a distinct trend in recent years to organize seminars and workshops more suited to the inservice needs of practicing administrators. Because the demands and complexities of administering a school system have increased to the point where few administrators can afford the

⁷⁷ Sponsored jointly by the American Association of School Administrators; the Department of Rural Education; and the National Council of Chief State School Officers. During 1953-54 three regional conferences were organized as follows: Northwest, Spokane, Wash., November 1953; Midwest, St. Paul, Minn., April 1954; Southwest, Hot Springs, Ark., May 1954.

six to eight weeks involved in a regular summer program, there is an increasing tendency for institutions to organize workshops and clinics for a two, three, or four week period. This response on the part of institutions to changing demands is indeed encouraging.

A study of the county superintendency in New Jersey made a notable contribution to the idea of inservice growth.⁷⁸ It recommended the establishment of a program of internship for administrators prior to the time they assume the responsibility of an intermediate superintendent. The internship, now spreading rapidly in other areas of public education, is of value to the changing concept of the intermediate unit. If interns could be assigned to the most outstanding intermediate organizations, this type of activity would multiply the influence of sound intermediate administration and give a stronger impetus to the kinds of uniqueness which characterize the intermediate superintendency.

A workshop group of Ohio county superintendents reported a number of recommendations, all of which indicated encouraging growth.⁷⁹ Among them are some which are distinctly related to inservice improvement:

1. The setting up of additional and periodic workshops similar to the Urbana Workshop.
2. The establishment of college courses specifically covering the county superintendent's office.
3. The creation of a position in the state education department of a consultant to assist newer county superintendents.

A special committee of the National Conference of Professors of Educational Administration has been concerned with the continuing professional development of school administrators and at the time of this writing is preparing a report which will present "portraits" of promising inservice practices.⁸⁰

⁷⁸ Dawson, George W. *A Report of Progress of the New Jersey CPEA*. Trenton, N. J.: New Jersey State Education Department, 1953. 13 p.

⁷⁹ Pollock, F. L., and Pond, Millard Z. *Ohio County Superintendents Think Together on the Improvement of Instruction: Conference Report*. Columbus, Ohio: School-Community Development Study, Ohio State University, 1953. 3 p. (Mimeo.)

⁸⁰ National Conference of Professors of Educational Administration. Special Committee on Inservice Education. (M. R. Sumption, University of Illinois, chairman.)

A series of organized investigations of various related aspects of administrative leadership have been carried on in a manner involving both superintendents of schools and university groups. These groups have been considering: concept and function of the job of superintendents; recruitment and selection of qualified personnel for training in educational administration; basic professional preparation of candidates in school administration; continued professional development of superintendents; structure, organization, and cost programs of pre-service and inservice education for school executives. Progress reports from the "professional education development teams" will undoubtedly have an impact on programs for developing administrative leadership in education. Although the reports are considered to be only tentative, they represent a simultaneous approach to many aspects of developing administrative competence. A report by Neagley points out the need for local school systems, state education departments, and professional schools to assume some joint responsibility for a program of recruitment and selection of school administrators.⁸¹ Among the numerous research projects suggested in the report as necessary to provide evidence on certain hypotheses indicated is an examination of the suggestion that the personal value patterns form the basis from which leadership evolves.

In the area of college preparation programs for school administrators, a report by Fisk indicates an increased activity in the appraisal of curricular offerings and requirements and in adaptations of programs to make them better suited to the needs identified.⁸² Another report explores in considerable detail one of the adaptations in which several universities have already established experimental programs—an internship in educational administration.⁸³

⁸¹ Neagley, Ross E. *CPEA Reports to the Profession on—Recruitment and Selection of School Administrators*. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1933. 31 p.

⁸² Fisk, Robert S. *CPEA Reports to the Profession on—Pre-Service Preparation of School Administrators*. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1933. 49 p.

⁸³ Newell, Clarence A. *Handbook for the Development of Internship Programs in Educational Administration*. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1933.

Still another aspect related to the development of programs for improved administrative competence is reported by Baldwin.⁸⁴ In describing a variety of ways by which on-the-job administrators can improve in their abilities to meet obligations and responsibilities more adequately, the report indicates that there has been "lots of motion but not much direction." Among the conclusions of the study is the need for an over-all agency to plan and coordinate inservice improvement programs for administrators in each state. Suggesting that state education departments are best equipped and in a most strategic position to do this, a program which might be implemented is outlined.

While the scope of this series of studies includes a wide range of concerns related to educational leadership, and their recommendations and conclusions have broad implications, there are two further conclusions evident which are not included in any of the reports: (a) the process of exploration involving both university professors and superintendents of schools has brought about an increased and wholesome understanding and appreciation by each professional group for the other, and (b) the efforts of university professors and superintendents of schools to explore professional development have amounted to a significant program for the inservice improvement of all those from both groups who have participated.⁸⁵

CONCLUSION

Within the past few years, the activities of educators, either as individuals or in groups, have increasingly included an examination of the educational process and the means by which it might be facilitated. Many of the conclusions which have resulted are as yet tentative. Some must continue to be so, since the conditions and circumstances to which they relate are constantly changing.

⁸⁴ Baldwin, Robert D. *CPEA Reports to the Profession on—Continuing Professional Development of School Administrators*. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1955. 39 p.

⁸⁵ Although these conclusions are reported in relation to the series of projects carried on by the Cooperative Program in Educational Administration in the Middle Atlantic Region, professors working together with the same mutual benefits, the activities of other CPEA regions, as well as by several colleges and universities independently of the CPEA program, have also involved groups of school superintendents and pro-

The studies reported in this chapter vary considerably in scope and purpose. They have been related to but three major areas of concern to community schools and intermediate units. A comprehensive review has not been attempted. The purpose has been only to identify the extent of current activity, and the studies included are illustrative rather than definitive of these efforts.

Individual studies must necessarily be limited in order to insure thoroughness and validity. Each suggests additional studies needed. But the total of past, present, and future efforts has cumulative value to educational knowledge and understanding. There are many problems remaining to be solved. Our greatest hope lies in our continued search for direction.

CHAPTER 7

Adapting Intermediate Units To Meet Community School Needs

THERE is substantial basis for the assumption that community schools have needs they cannot meet. It is increasingly apparent that a comprehensive program of educational opportunities for every community will depend upon the development of adequate intermediate units.

The needs of any community school are the needs of the people and the community. Among them is the need to safeguard the values of community life. Educational administration, like any other public function, should give strength to the community. By combining their efforts, the community school and the intermediate unit can provide the needed program of educational opportunities without destroying or interfering with individual community autonomy.

Accomplishment of this objective will require the continued development of strong community schools, more functional intermediate units which can provide the necessary leadership and services, and a state education department capable of giving aid in the development of an adequate educational program for every community and every school. It requires that all three—the community school, the intermediate unit, and the state education department—make up a well integrated state system of schools. It requires that all three have the same general objectives. But even assuming this development, there are many real problems.

On what basis might specific functions be allocated? What services can and should the intermediate unit undertake? What services should community schools provide? What should be the basis for determining who does what?

What kind of educational structure does an adequate intermediate unit require? How can the intermediate unit be financed? What kind of leadership is needed?

178 / 179
p. 178 non-reproducible photo

Providing a comprehensive program of educational opportunities in most communities will depend upon finding satisfactory answers to questions such as those raised above. The answers are not obvious; probably no one has a single answer. But the questions must be asked and answers found. The implications of a few of these questions will be considered.

HOW CAN A PROPER ALLOCATION OF FUNCTIONS BE DETERMINED?

Without functions which it can perform more appropriately than any other, no unit of educational administrative organization has a legitimate basis for existence. The allocation of specific functions depends upon desirable standards of performance and the development of desirable relationships and responsibilities. This is applicable to all types of organization, but it is especially important that it be characteristic of public enterprise.

Different Types of Organizational Patterns

Several types of organization, parallel to some extent to the administration of schools, are found in other areas of public administration. Since the central responsibility for education rests with the state, a brief consideration of the need and basis for allocating functions for different state governmental activities may have pertinence to this discussion.

State government is usually departmentalized for effective operation. Departments perform their specific functions through a one-unit, two-unit, or three-unit type of organization. The type established by any particular department depends primarily upon its purpose, the nature of its activities, and the need and desirability for functions and responsibilities to be decentralized.

Some departments of state government are illustrative of the one-unit type of organization. Their administration rests entirely with a central department which is accountable to only one constituency—the people of the state at large. The state treasury department, the secretary of state's office, the

state auditing department, and the office of the comptroller are examples.

Certain other departments of state government perform their functions with a two-unit type of organization. The administration of operations is delegated to a number of regional or area branches which function independently of each other. The organization is often such that the area constituencies, usually counties, have considerable responsibility and control for financing and operation. Within the framework of state policies and supervision, these more local agencies often have a great deal of autonomy. This two-unit type of organization is frequently characteristic of welfare administration, port authorities, drainage authorities, park authorities, state colleges and universities, and various other types of specialized state institutions — prisons, schools for the blind, mental institutions, hospitals and sanitariums, etc. In a few states the public schools function within this two-unit type of organization.

In most states, the majority of functions of government are performed under a three-unit type of organization. The three levels of administration are usually the state, the county, and the local incorporated village, town, or city. The state provides general over-all policies and supervision. The localities are the operating units and, although their functions are established and regulated by state statutes, they usually have a large degree of responsibility and control. The county (or other intermediate level in the organizational structure) performs coordinating, supervisory, and facilitating functions as well as providing a channel of communication between the state and local levels. Education, law enforcement, courts, the maintenance of streets and roads, health and sanitation, and building and zoning are examples of functions which in most states come within the three-unit type of organization.

The three-unit type of organization is also common in other kinds of large scale operation. Most federal government agencies are so organized. Most large business organizations operate through a central office, regional offices, and branch offices or plants. The three-unit type of organization is also character-

istic of most large scale membership organizations—lodges, unions, and professional associations. The National Education Association, for example, is a federation of national, state, and local associations.

The public schools in most states, like many other types of both public and private activities, are operated within a three-unit type of organizational structure—state, intermediate, and local. Functions are decentralized as much as possible. This type of organization is a bulwark against the arbitrary exercise of centralized power as well as a facility for adaptation to local conditions and circumstances.

The Allocation of Functions

When any kind of public activity is decentralized, particularly in instances where local constituencies are involved, there is always a question as to which functions should be retained in the central office and which should be allocated to the intermediate and local units. Best tradition and practice have provided a principle for the allocation of these functions which will apply to the advantage of educational organization.

A function should be allocated to that unit closest to the people where it can be carried out with completeness, equity, and efficiency.

The application of this principle requires that each function to be performed should be considered first with relation to the unit closest to the people. In other words, functions should be allocated from the bottom up, not from the top down. From time to time the functions of all units should be tested against this principle so that changing conditions will be reflected in an up-to-date administrative organization. In most state systems of schools such a reallocation of functions is needed.

Functions of the Intermediate Unit

The principle of keeping functions close to the control of local communities emphasizes that *the role of the intermediate unit should be that of assisting the local community schools in developing their own programs.* The intermediate unit

should not undertake any functions which community schools can perform, *unless* it can definitely perform them with greater "completeness, equity, and efficiency." Functions performed by the intermediate unit should be turned over to community schools if or as soon as these schools become able to carry them out with comparable effectiveness.

Developing Understanding

The efforts of community schools, intermediate units, and the state education department should be complementary. By serving as a coordinating agency for the several community schools in its area, the intermediate unit can supplement the educational services provided by each community—but only as needed to assure each an educational program adequate in terms of the highest standards. This relationship would need to depend upon leadership for its effectiveness.

The development of a functional intermediate administrative unit calls for a general understanding of its possibilities. But especially needed is understanding on the part of educational officials in each of the three units of organization—local, intermediate, and state. Much of the difficulty encountered in efforts to strengthen the intermediate unit arises from a lack of understanding as to a proper allocation of functions. Part of the present misunderstanding also arises from an inadequate concept of a comprehensive educational program and what is required to get it. Both by law and by consensus an understanding of functions should be established.

Acceptance of the concept of service rather than authority would aid greatly in strengthening and developing the intermediate unit. This concept may be illustrated in the field of instructional supervision: When a supervisor goes into a school, he is subject to the administrative responsibility of the local principal. This practice is based upon concepts of service, leadership, democratic procedures, and professional integrity.

WHAT SERVICES SHOULD THE INTERMEDIATE UNIT PROVIDE?

Traditionally, the intermediate superintendent has provided clerical services. The intermediate unit has been an adminis-

trative means for accomplishing certain routine duties directly related to the needs of the state education department—the collection of information, the communication of state directives, and the distribution of state funds. These functions have had little stimulating effect upon the development of educational programs in local communities. But even in this atmosphere of “clerical efficiency,” there were some intermediate superintendents who sensed the possibilities of their office. By putting their efforts to the development of services for the schools in their area, they were able to make direct contributions to the educational opportunities provided.

The situation today in many states is very similar—intermediate units performing largely clerical functions coexisting with other intermediate units providing programs of educational services. The organizational structure within which many of these programs have been developed has often been an obstacle which had to be overcome. In every instance where outstanding programs of service have developed, the intermediate unit has had the highest type of professional leadership.

Also a part of the situation today is the growing awareness of the possibilities of richer programs than have ever before been provided by schools in the smaller communities and rural areas. Increasing technological requirements are giving industry cause to look hopefully at the strengths and resources that young rural people can contribute to the labor pool. Recognition of industrial dependence upon the rural labor surplus and of the potential buying power of the rural population is increasing. The facts that rural children make up a large part of each generation, that the public health problems in rural areas can be removed through the application of scientific knowledge, that the level of rural living is improving very rapidly, that the areas of population growth are outside the urban centers—all have great promise to our national well-being. Their effects are widespread. In a day of high mobility of population, rural resources can be capitalized upon to give our nation even greater strength. But, especially because of the mobility of population, rural deficiencies must become the concern of everyone.

Improvements have been made through the reorganization of many small districts into community school units. The increased resources of the reorganized districts and the financial equalization possible through a broader tax base have gone a long way to improve the educational opportunities of some rural areas. However, it is apparent that district reorganization is not enough, and the limitations of reorganized districts in terms of a comprehensive program of education are being recognized.

The first community schools to overcome their initial eagerness "to do all" were the first to cast about for a means of sharing services with other community schools. In some instances the intermediate unit understood and was willing and able to help. Earlier chapters include many examples where this has been done. The programs of services which have been developed by some intermediate units are indeed encouraging. But much remains to be done. The educational needs of communities demand the application of research, common sense, and leadership to the development of functional intermediate units which are able to serve all community schools which are in need of intermediate unit assistance.

Intermediate Unit Services

The services which should be provided in every community, regardless of its size or location, are those which constitute a comprehensive program of educational opportunities. Tentative general specifications of what should be included are outlined in the first chapter of this yearbook. The specifications include those aspects of educational opportunity which are common to all communities.

However, these general specifications must be translated into specific services. The needed program of services should be the joint concern of the community school, the intermediate unit, and the state education department. Together they should consider the services provided and the services needed, how the needed services might be obtained, and which services might best be provided by the community school and which by the intermediate unit.

A basis for determining those services which should be provided by the community school and those which should be provided by the intermediate unit is found in the principle set forth in the preceding section regarding the allocation of functions. Every community should accept responsibility for providing those elements of the program that can be provided efficiently through its own facilities and financial structure. Because communities vary widely in their specific needs and in their abilities to meet them, it should be expected that the services provided by different intermediate units will vary. These variations might in fact be considerable. Even within a given intermediate unit, the specific services may vary somewhat among the community schools.

Certain types of needs are more general to all community schools. These schools are continually faced with problems which require more than the local resources can provide in the way of specialized personnel and information. Some of the specific types of service in this area are: research, school building planning, legal services, business services, and services for the training or inservice improvement of people employed by the community school in limited numbers. It is an unusual school administrator who has not at times needed assistance or wished for relief from the situation where he is expected to be an expert in transportation, cafeteria management, building maintenance, budgeting, accounting, purchasing, insurance, reorganization, personnel selection and management, and the many other administrative functions. Each is an area of specialization in itself. The search for information concerning the multiplicity of problems faced daily by the community school administrator frequently prevents him from giving more than cursory attention to the details of the educational program. In many of the specialized administrative areas he can get little help in the local community; he must look toward the intermediate unit for assistance.

Fortunate is the handicapped child who lives in a community school district that provides special services for children who have his particular handicap. On the other hand, there are many communities where the epileptic, the partially

sighted, or the crippled have been exempted from formal instruction because there are no facilities for them. Sometimes it would require only leadership to get the community to recognize the need for services to such children and to make the cooperative effort necessary to provide the facilities. In other communities the resources are too scant for the community to provide the instructional facilities necessary. In either case, the intermediate unit could assist.

In areas where services are already being rendered by existing nonschool agencies, it is extremely doubtful that the intermediate unit should attempt to displace or duplicate their services. Coordination is the service that might better be provided. In states where an excellent public health service is already operating, for example, the intermediate unit should assist in coordinating these services with the program of the public school. In states where the groundwork has already been laid for a mental health program, the intermediate unit should discover ways by which the schools might cooperate with the agency responsible to make the program more effective.

The range of specific services which might be provided by the intermediate unit is virtually unlimited. Just a simple listing of the services which different intermediate units are now providing demonstrates some of the possibilities:

- Adult education
- Audio-visual library
 - Equipment, films, etc.
- Communication
 - Reports, bulletins, handbooks, etc.
- Cooperative or centralized purchasing
- Curriculum laboratory
- Curriculum leadership
 - Conservation, safety, radio and TV programs, etc.
- Services for exceptional children
 - Gifted children
 - Mentally retarded
 - Physically handicapped (Crippled)
 - Partially sighted (Sight saving class)
 - Speech defectives
 - Hard of hearing (Lip reading)
 - Homebound

- Financial services
 - Accounting
 - Auditing
 - Financial counseling
 - Reporting
- Health services
 - School nurse
 - School doctor
 - Dental health and hygiene
- Inservice education
 - Teachers
 - Administrators
 - School board members
 - Bus drivers
 - Clerical personnel
 - Custodians
 - School lunch personnel
- Instructional materials center
- Instructional supervision
- Legal services
- Library services
 - Books, films, recordings, etc.
 - Exhibits, collections, models, etc.
 - Professional library and materials
- Professional personnel services
 - Teacher placement service
 - Substitute teacher pool
 - Salary schedule development and coordination, sick leave policies, etc.
- Pupil personnel services
 - Attendance supervision
 - Guidance and counseling
 - Testing
 - Psychological and psychiatric services
 - Mental health clinic
- Pupil transportation services
 - Administration of transportation
 - School bus maintenance
 - Bus driver training
- Recreation programs
- Research
- School building services
 - Planning and maintenance
 - Building clinics
 - Architectural service

- School lunch services
 - Coordination
 - Supervision
- Special teachers
 - Art, music, agriculture, homemaking, physical education, etc.
- Special consultants and coordinators
 - Reading consultant, science consultant, etc.
- Trade and industrial education

In many instances some of the above services are a part of the regular program of the community schools. In other instances the community schools must share them if they are to be at all available.

Identifying the Services To Be Provided

Certain services will be performed by intermediate units because of statutory requirements. Although these services vary to some extent among the states, they might be indicated in terms of the following general functions:

Communication. The administration of a system of reports and the compiling, checking, handling, and interpreting of accurate information.

Coordination. The establishment by consensus of bases and standards for practice among the local community school units within the intermediate area.

Arbitration. The settlement or handling of affairs involving two or more local districts within the intermediate area.

Interpretation. The discovery, documentation, and definition of problems peculiar to the local community school units in the area. The interpretation and application of state policies and rulings among the local community school units.

Representation. The representation of the particular interests of local community school units in the intermediate area in the formulation of state policy and through intercession with state school officials. Conversely, representing the interests of the state with local officials.

Other functions which might most appropriately be performed by the intermediate unit are those which result from the need to coordinate the various types of governmental service units and other organizations and agencies which function in an area corresponding to the intermediate area with the needs and efforts of the schools.

The development of programs of educational services will depend to a large extent upon adequate communication between the intermediate unit and the community schools as well as among the community schools. When the need for an educational service is identified by a community school, the assistance of the intermediate unit might be considered. The intermediate unit may be better equipped in terms of finances, personnel, and other resources to deal with the particular problem. In some instances the intermediate unit may be the first to identify the need. When this is the case, it will be necessary for the leadership of the intermediate unit to assist the personnel of the community school in becoming aware of the need as well as in exploring ways and means for meeting it. It does not follow that the intermediate unit should provide the service. The community school should provide all services that it can provide with equal or more effectiveness.

It has been emphasized that the specific services which the intermediate unit should make available to the community schools in its area will vary. They depend upon the character of the particular intermediate unit and the needs of the constituent community schools.

HOW SHOULD THE INTERMEDIATE UNIT BE ORGANIZED TO PROVIDE SERVICES?

There are many services needed in the operation of a good educational program that most local communities cannot provide from their own resources. Some of these services can be and are being provided by intermediate units. Questions may be raised, however, relating to the type of intermediate unit organization which will be capable of providing services in the best possible manner. What is an effective organization for providing supplementary services to the community schools? What guidelines are needed?

Among the issues regarding the organization of intermediate unit services are those having to do with (a) the size of the area served by the intermediate unit, (b) the administration of the program, and (c) the variation in types and scope of services needed.

The Size of the Intermediate Area

Justification of the intermediate unit primarily in terms of the service it can give to community schools leads to the proposition that *the size of the intermediate area may be determined best on the basis of efficient provision of the educational services it is called upon to render.* Experience has shown that the community school unit functions best if its boundaries conform to those of the natural sociological community. The area served by the state as a unit of educational administration is clearly and permanently defined.

The county has traditionally served as the intermediate area in most states, and as the intermediate area, the county has many advantages. It is an established political and governmental unit. As such, it is the administrative base for a number of services—public health, welfare, law enforcement, civil records, etc. Coordination of certain of these county services is greatly facilitated when the areas involved are identical. In many instances, perhaps most, the county might well be the area for which the educational services of the intermediate unit can most effectively be provided.

But counties vary. They vary in size, population, and resources. Some counties are very small; some are large. A careful study of the issues involved may result (and is resulting in some instances) in recommendations for the development of more effective service units. If, in some states, it is deemed desirable to retain existing units, such study might result in a more selective assignment of responsibility for particular services to the intermediate units involved, and provisions developed for cooperation among intermediate units when larger service areas are needed.

The basic principle that a function should be carried out with "completeness, equity, and efficiency" implies, at once, certain maximum and minimum limitations on the size of the intermediate unit. In order to make intelligent decisions regarding size, more explicit standards for service are needed. What should be the role of a school psychologist? What is an adequate instructional materials center? Standards for service

cannot be set up until much more careful study than has heretofore been undertaken is planned with regard to the type and extent of service needed as part of a good educational program. Such standards would be of value whether services are provided by the community school district, by the intermediate unit, or by the state. The standards would be helpful guides to determine the unit most appropriate to provide the service. It is not impossible that such studies would show that some types of services might best be provided by units as large as the state itself.

Attention to the need for maintaining good communication between the intermediate unit and the people served would tend to limit the size of the area involved. Problems of transporting services and personnel in a large area may reach a point of diminishing returns. Providing leadership in district reorganization, in curriculum improvement, in coordination of educational programs among community school districts, and in many other areas designated in the lists of services requested of the intermediate unit, demands a high level of communication and understanding among the staff members of the intermediate unit and the schools and communities being served. Experts in group dynamics have presented some research on the optimum size of groups involved in discussion and action projects. Perhaps similar study needs to be done on problems of communication and involvement in the programs of intermediate service units by local communities, with a view toward establishing standards for size.

Many specific questions are suggested by a consideration of the desirable size of the intermediate unit. What have been some of the problems faced by existing "big" intermediate units? To what extent do local school districts fear that the intermediate unit is trying to "build an empire" and take away the independence or prerogatives of the community school? Have these fears resulted from poor communication and other problems related to size? How is transportation cost related to efficiency of providing such services as instructional supervision, audio-visual materials, or instruction for the physically handicapped child? What arrangements have been or might

be made to decentralize certain services to smaller areas within the intermediate districts so that transportation costs in time and money are reduced?

One somewhat different type of problem must be faced in studying the structural relationship of the intermediate unit to the local district—the danger that in emphasizing the efficiency of the intermediate unit in providing certain services, the uneconomical local units will be encouraged to maintain their status quo, rather than to reorganize into sound community units. This is but one aspect of the larger problem of providing incentives for reorganization.

The Administration of Intermediate Unit Services

One of the characteristics of a community school is that the people in the community actively participate in its administration, in determining its policies, and in developing its program. *The people served by the intermediate unit—the teachers, pupils, board members, parents, and citizens of the several community school areas—should participate in determining the services needed and in defining the policies and procedures of the intermediate programs.*

Administrative arrangements that will facilitate the accomplishment of functions assigned to the intermediate unit need to be determined. Of primary concern is the service character of the functions. When emphasis is upon a *service relationship* with the community school districts rather than upon *administrative control* over aspects of the local programs, provisions must be made for participation by those served in policy and program definition. How are such opportunities provided through the present structure of the county or other intermediate superintendent's office? Do county boards of education, where they have been established, reflect an understanding of and a concern for the service needs of the various community school districts within the county? How much of the participation of local districts in defining the program of the intermediate unit should be advisory and to what extent should it be a direct, legal responsibility? What implications do some

of the administrative features of New York State's Boards of Cooperative Educational Services have, for example, for this problem of providing representation for those affected by the program on the controlling board?

The participation of each community in the administration of the intermediate unit is necessary to maintain its proper relationship with the community schools. Throughout this yearbook a philosophy of intermediate unit administration has been emphasized. *The services of the intermediate unit should supplement the efforts of the community school.* Centralized services may tend to concentrate authority in the intermediate unit unless this philosophy is firmly established.

This might be illustrated by briefly considering two approaches to such a seemingly innocuous service as cooperative purchasing. If the intermediate unit provides information about various types of supplies and equipment, coordinates the requests of the various community schools into supply lists, and seeks bids on those lists in an attempt to obtain the economies of larger quantity purchases, it will truly be performing a service for the constituent community schools. In some instances the intermediate unit may be able to test or experiment with certain types of supplies and equipment, or provide information of such tests or experiments carried on by other intermediate units or other school systems. If, however, the intermediate unit establishes a cooperative purchasing program in which the specifications for all the supplies and equipment are determined by the intermediate unit, its activity would to an extent be directing local programs.

Related to the issue of control is the matter of selecting staff members who will render the services from the intermediate unit—the superintendent, consultants, and coordinators. How can provision be made for these staff members to be selected from among educators who have had background and experience with community school problems, who understand rural interests as well as the interests of urban centers within the area? What machinery for participation in the selection of personnel can be set up so that the counsel of those who will be served is secured?

A further administrative problem has to do with personnel relationships. Should the teacher of physically handicapped children, a member of the intermediate unit staff, be coordinately responsible to the principal of the building in which he is working, to the superintendent of the community school district he is serving, as well as to the intermediate unit superintendent? How can a teacher-consultant, working out of an intermediate unit, gain acceptance by the teachers of a local school? "Is she one of us, or not?" Does or can this personnel possibly find time to attend all the faculty meetings, curriculum committee meetings, and PTA sessions of each of the local school districts served? Careful study needs to be made of this problem of the relationship between staff members of the intermediate unit and the teachers, children and parents whom they serve.

Flexibility of Intermediate Unit Services

The program of services administered by the intermediate unit is determined by the needs of the local community schools. As these needs change, the administrative structure must be capable of adaptations. *Flexibility and variation in types and scope of services must characterize the intermediate unit's program.*

It is not easy for an intermediate unit staff to take responsibility for developing a program, to guide it through its precarious infancy, to support it in its adolescence, and to have it finally settle down to smoothly flowing maturity only to realize that local districts have grown in their interest and ability to support the program to the extent that it could now be carried by the community school units directly. This responsibility for initiating and then releasing, for stimulating, starting, and then transferring, should be studied. What psychological maturity is needed to thus produce and then relinquish? What supports can be given an intermediate unit staff so that satisfactions are gained through such enterprises?

The service role may change in many ways, especially in this day of rapidly growing communities. Here, for example, an intermediate unit has developed a highly satisfactory library

service, a large pool of instructional materials purchased and administered by an efficient central staff. The time comes when one of the cooperating districts sees advantages in building a local school library and wishes to modify its participation in the cooperative service. Can arrangements be made that will permit a smooth transition? Are there some aspects of service, such as cooperative purchasing, repairing of books, and cataloguing that might still be accomplished more efficiently and economically centrally?

Attention must also be given to means of providing continuity and stability to a program of services from the intermediate unit, so that, while being responsive to the immediate needs and interests of any one of the local districts, it also protects the interest of the total group of districts and of the staff members involved. The insecurity among intermediate unit staff members created when a program is supported only by year-to-year contracts with the districts has operated in some cases against the retaining of high quality people in such positions.

Occasionally it may be desirable to centralize certain functions that may have been started on a small scale in local community units but which could be performed with greater economy or improved quality if a larger population were served. Administering a pupil transportation program is an example. How may this change of program be accomplished smoothly? Study of this process would be helpful.

Many intermediate units include a variety of local districts ranging from sparsely populated rural areas to large metropolitan areas. A problem faced under such circumstances has to do with the relationship among services provided to these districts of varying needs. What values accrue when a large urban district contributes one-half the support to a cooperative audio-visual library? Or when a large group of urban pupils is held to a curriculum developed for pupils with a background of rural living, or vice versa? Are needs of all districts equally well served? Should distinctions be made between the type of service given an urban district contrasted with that given more rural areas?

Flexibility with regard to use of the resources of other agencies to provide needed services is another aspect of this problem area. Intermediate unit relationship to other agencies has been indicated in the preceding section on services. In situations where the public health departments are interested and able to furnish excellent school nursing service, for example, it would seem desirable to promote such service, and to give support and assistance in making it of greatest value. Studies need to be made of the possibility of encouraging other agencies to "carry the ball." What are the potentialities for service from such agencies? How may they be coordinated so that they contribute most effectively to the educational program of the community school? What responsibilities should be accepted by the intermediate unit for this coordination? What responsibility for stepping in with a substitute program if none is forthcoming from the agency?

The Administrative Structure Needed

It is evident from the many questions which have been raised that much needs to be done in exploring the type of administrative organization that will enable the intermediate unit to provide the most effective program of services possible to the community schools in its area. The relationships between each community school and the intermediate unit are dynamic. Research into the nature of these relationships will do much to promote improved educational programs for the community schools.

There are, however, some substantial guides for determining a desirable organizational structure for intermediate units. Some of these are characteristic of the existing intermediate units in a few states:

1. Provision should be made for an intermediate unit board of education and an executive officer. A board of education is essential for an effective educational administrative organization. The board would serve as a policy making body. It should be a small group to assure efficient functioning, although the actual size may depend to some extent upon local circumstances. Among its functions should be that of appointing a qualified superintendent.

2. Provision should be made for the administrative participation of representatives of the community schools in the area. The service nature of the intermediate unit requires that it be sensitive to the needs of the community schools. The intermediate unit board of education must determine policies with respect to the collective demands and interests of the community schools. Representation might be provided through an advisory council made up of the combined members of the community school boards of education. They should meet at regular intervals with the intermediate unit board for planning and evaluation. Special advisory and study groups may also be desirable in relation to special problems.

3. Provision should be made for administrative coordination. An administrative advisory group, made up of all the community school administrators in the intermediate area, could meet regularly and advise with the intermediate superintendent. Problems regarding the selection and functioning of intermediate unit staff, evaluation of specific services, schedules, and the many other details of administration must be planned cooperatively. Plans for additional services and their possibilities need to be tested and information and resources pooled.

4. The intermediate area should be sufficiently large to assure a program of services adequate to meet the unmet needs of community schools. An optimum size has not been determined. But the intermediate unit should be large enough to provide efficiently most of the services which will be needed by the schools in the intermediate area. It should not, however, be so large that it precludes close personal relationships among intermediate unit and community school staff members or creates decreased effectiveness resulting from "bigness."

5. Provision should be made so that the structure can be adjusted to meet changing functions. The services which the intermediate unit should provide will vary from place to place and from time to time. Services which are initiated by the intermediate unit may, in some instances, be transferred to the community schools, and vice versa. Since the specific intermediate unit services should be those which supplement community school programs, and since the programs which different community schools can provide for themselves can be expected to vary considerably, it would seem unwise for any specific services to be mandated to intermediate units. An exception would be those services which assist the state education department in the administration of the state system of schools. At the same time, it would probably be equally unwise to prohibit intermediate units from providing any specific educational services.

6. Provision should be made for cooperation among intermediate units. The desirable service area for a few specialized services may be larger than a single intermediate unit. Considerable advantage may be gained through the sharing of such a service by two or more intermediate units.

7. Provision should be made for the adequate financing of a program of services. Implications are discussed in the succeeding section of this chapter.

As indicated previously, there are many questions regarding the administrative structure needed for an intermediate unit which can provide effectively educational services which supplement the programs of community schools. For example, to what extent should the identification of the local communities to the intermediate unit be sought? Is such identification important to its operation? When intermediate unit board of education members are popularly elected, a certain loyalty is engendered; would plans for representation through community school district boards result in the loss of this value? Many questions are yet to be answered. Many studies are needed.

HOW CAN INTERMEDIATE UNIT SERVICES BE FINANCED?

Educational services cost money. Funds are just as necessary for the support of services provided by the intermediate administrative unit as they are for services performed directly by the state administrative unit or by the local community school district. Yet, in most states under present practice, the intermediate unit of school administration operates at a disadvantage. Only a few intermediate districts have been granted power to levy taxes for the support of a service program while in most cases both the state administrative unit and the local community unit are fiscally independent.

This yearbook has emphasized that a number and variety of educational services can often be most effectively and economically provided by an intermediate unit. How are these services to be financed?

While current practice varies among the several states, intermediate units are at present securing funds from one or more of the following sources: (a) state grants, (b) county funds, (c) independent tax levies, and (d) contractual agreements with local districts.

State Support for a Basic Program

As an integral part of our state system of public education the intermediate unit performs functions on behalf of the state as well as for its constituent school districts. The concept that

the state should provide a basic or foundation program for the children of the state is generally accepted. It follows, therefore, that the state should underwrite the minimum program to be provided by the intermediate districts within the state.

A number of states do allocate some funds for the support of the intermediate unit. The state of Illinois, for example, directly pays the salaries of the county superintendent and of an assistant superintendent in each of the 102 counties of the state. In addition, the state provides each county superintendent an annual grant for the expenses of his office. A number of other states have similar provisions.

The educational services provided by the intermediate units in California are supported directly by the state. A state appropriation of \$3.57 per ADA is allocated to a County School Service Fund administered through the county superintendent's office.

All states provide some form of state aid for the support of public schools. These funds are usually distributed to the local school districts through the intermediate superintendent of schools as one of the commonly accepted functions of his office. Should legislation be enacted which would permit the intermediate unit to retain some percentage of these funds for the support of the educational services provided? The answer is not clear-cut.

The availability of state aid for the support of services to be provided by intermediate units gives recognition to the principle that state support should be based on an equalization formula assuring a foundation program in all of the intermediate superintendencies of the state.

Desirable as state support may be—and such support should be expanded considerably in many states—the need for and the use of these funds should continually be re-examined in the light of changing conditions. Are there any dangers in the liberal support of intermediate unit service functions paid out of state funds? Would it tend to perpetuate the continuation of certain services which could better become the function of the community school districts? Would it tend to lead to a weakening of local responsibility and initiative for determining

the value and need of certain services? Would it encourage overemphasis in the support of one phase of the school program at the expense of other phases? Are these real dangers inherent in any state aid program? Or are they merely objections created in the minds of those who oppose state support for schools in any form?

Support from County Funds

Intermediate units should be allowed and encouraged, under the provisions of any foundation program, to exceed the minimum levels of performance set forth therein. The concept of local determination should apply as fully to the intermediate district as it should to the community school district.

Under present laws most intermediate units of school administration are organized as county districts under the administration of a county superintendent of schools. Activities or services sponsored by the county superintendent's office are usually eligible for support out of county funds appropriated by the County Board of Supervisors or Commissioners. In most instances under present practice the county furnishes the county superintendent with office space and equipment and usually allows him some funds for clerical help. It may also provide for travel expense and other ordinary costs of running an office. *When the boundary lines of an intermediate area are coterminous with those of a political unit, the general taxing authority of the governmental unit furnishes a justifiable source of funds for the support of intermediate unit functions.*

However, the attitude of many county supervisors or commissioners is frequently one of indifference when they are asked to vote funds for the support of educational services to be provided on a county-wide basis. The county superintendent must exercise all of his talents of leadership if he is to be successful in obtaining tax funds from this source for initiating new services from his office.

The situation may be somewhat easier in those instances where a particular service is first inaugurated through the efforts of some other agency or through the cooperative action of the community school districts. Having proved its worth

and desirability to the public, the county board may more readily see the value of supporting the service on a more permanent basis by an appropriation of county funds.

This might be illustrated. In Kenosha County, Wisconsin, a county-wide program of mental hygiene service was inaugurated by the Wisconsin State Division of Mental Hygiene. This program received its financial support under the Federal Mental Health Act during its first three years of operation. This program was very successful and was transferred to the administration of the county superintendent of schools and supported entirely by county funds.

The Power To Levy Taxes

In some states the intermediate unit is fiscally independent and has the authority to adopt a budget and levy taxes. Fiscal independence with the complete power of decision regarding the expenditure of budgeted funds follows the American tradition of local responsibility and independence of action. When intermediate board of education members are elected, either by a direct vote of the people or by the members of the constituent community school districts, there is little likelihood of extravagance or of the intermediate unit usurping functions which can better be performed by the local communities.

One of the objections likely to be raised against the granting of taxing powers to intermediate units of school administration is that it creates another governmental taxing authority to be added to an already complicated tax structure. This cannot be denied. In instances where the intermediate unit is not granted complete fiscal independence, it may through a referendum of the people obtain the right to levy a special tax for the support of a particular service. While this procedure for raising funds is unlikely to become a common practice, its possibilities should be explored.

Financing Services Through Cooperative Action

Obtaining funds for providing educational services by the intermediate unit through contractual agreements with local

community school districts is a relatively recent development that has already received widespread acceptance. Each community district contributes some specified amount toward the joint support of a particular service administered by the intermediate unit.

Although this procedure involves the voluntary participation on the part of individual community school districts and, therefore, has limitations, it also has much to recommend it. The community schools share directly in the support of the services established for their benefit. Contractual agreements for educational services also facilitate another kind of sharing. They promote a cooperative attack on common problems of the several community school districts in the intermediate area. The staff members involved participate in area-wide educational activities which serve to broaden the resources available to each community school district in the solution of its problems. Contractual agreements serve as another means of equalizing educational opportunity for the pupils of the intermediate district. It brings to each local community the efficiencies and economics that large scale operations make possible, as in the procurement, processing, and maintenance of materials. At the same time the control and power of decision remains in each community.

As the public and the members of the profession come to appreciate fully the educational opportunities that can be made available through the sharing of financial effort, a rapid expansion in this method of providing services by or through the intermediate unit can be expected. The possibilities are practically unlimited.

Examples of actual operating programs of service described in earlier chapters of this yearbook indicate that several different methods of computing the rate of payment by the separate cooperating districts are being utilized. Methods commonly used include those based on (a) a flat rate per school, (b) pupil enrollment or average daily attendance, (c) number of classroom or teacher units, (d) assessed valuation, and (e) cost of service per hour or per day. Often a combination of two or more of these methods is used in determining the local district's

contribution. The use of "true" or equalized valuation as one of the bases for computing the rate of contribution has an equalization feature about it that is commendatory. Assessments on a flat rate per district basis completely ignore both the factors of ability to pay and the quantity of the service rendered.

In spite of the many desirable features of contractual arrangements, complete dependence by the intermediate unit for support of its service program on funds obtained through the cooperative action of the constituent community districts raises certain problems. They must be recognized and considered.

Most serious is the lack of permanence and stability for any service program that depends entirely on voluntary support. Will it be possible to offer professional employees the security to which they are entitled? Can these employees be guaranteed the privileges of tenure and retirement which they would receive if employed by community school districts? If not, well qualified staff members may hesitate to accept a position in an intermediate unit, even though the position may in other respects be exceedingly attractive and challenging.

A second problem concerns the modification of a contract service to meet changing conditions. A participating local district may, as a result of increased enrollments, increased revenue, or other cause, find that it is able to assume direct responsibility for the service and wish to withdraw its support from the intermediate unit program. In accordance with the general principle that a service should be performed by the local community if it can be carried out with "completeness, equity, and efficiency," this action should be encouraged. What then happens to the program in those remaining districts which are still unable to provide the service except on a cooperative basis? Will the service need to be discontinued in these districts? Can the intermediate unit continue to provide it?

Circumstances will vary, but in actual practice this problem may not be as difficult of solution in most instances as it might at first appear. The remaining districts may be able and willing to furnish additional funds for the support of the particular

service program in return for the increased service that would be available to them. Or intermediate unit staff members whose duties have been lessened may be used for inaugurating some additional service that is needed and can best be provided by the intermediate unit. Or, if the state has an equalization program for intermediate units, any needed service could still be guaranteed. The widespread and rapid growth of the contract method of providing educational services indicate that the problems are not insurmountable.

Guides for Financing Intermediate Unit Services

Actual practice and what is believed to be *ideal practice* are often widely separated in a discussion of methods for financing a program of educational services. Although it may appear to be impossible to realize the "ideal," or for that matter even agree as to what is ideal practice, there is considerable agreement as to the principles that should serve as "guides to action." It is quite possible, perhaps even probable, that present guides may need to be changed as new ideals and insights are developed, as conditions change, or as research or experience suggest the desirability of new principles.

The following tentative principles are listed in the hope that they will be helpful as guides to those who are responsible for developing methods or procedures for financing a program of intermediate unit services:

1. Financial support should be adequate to provide for those services which can most effectively and economically become a function of the intermediate unit.
2. The state should share in financing the intermediate unit's program of services.
3. The state should assume responsibility for a foundation program by underwriting the minimum program to be provided by the intermediate units within the state.
4. The state's contribution should be based on the principle of equalization.
5. Intermediate units should be permitted and encouraged to exceed the foundation program. Necessary funds may be obtained by levying a tax equally upon the entire intermediate area as determined by the intermediate district's board of education. This may be collected by the general taxing authority of the district or by its constituent community districts.

6. The financial structure should provide for creative and experimental programs.

7. Indirect financing through contractual agreements between the intermediate administrative unit and local community districts should be used as a method of supporting those types of intermediate unit services which are of a special or temporary nature. The development of pilot programs or the support of services which are not to be extended to all constituent community districts are other examples of the desirable use of contract financing. However, when a service becomes a generally recognized function of the intermediate unit, contract financing should be replaced by direct financing to guarantee consistency of service and efficiency of administration.

8. A budget for all intermediate district activities should be prepared by the intermediate district superintendent and approved by the intermediate district board in accordance with state regulations and practice.

9. Compensation of employees of the intermediate district should be based upon a salary schedule that recognizes the experiences, qualifications, and responsibilities demanded for efficient service on this level and should include all privileges accorded professional workers in other types of districts of the state.

10. The salary of the intermediate superintendent should be determined by a board of education that recognizes its responsibility for providing educational services and leadership that will make a comprehensive program of educational opportunities available to every community.

11. The financial structure of the intermediate unit should be reviewed at frequent intervals and kept sufficiently flexible that it can be changed in the light of experience and research.

WHAT LEADERSHIP IS NEEDED FOR A PROGRAM OF SERVICES?

A community school will provide a comprehensive program of educational services to the extent that the citizens understand their need for the services and are willing and able to pay for them. The real question of providing a new service or of maintaining one already established is whether or not it "measures up" when considered against other educational services or personal wants.

The services essential to a comprehensive program of education have previously been outlined. Some can best be provided by each community school while others are likely to need inter-community development and financing. Yet, in a democratic society, it is not the educator (superintendent, principal, or teacher) who decides what services shall comprise the educa-

tional program; it is the people themselves. *"The rôle of the educational leader in the development of educational service is that of making it possible for a community to act wisely on matters of educational concern."*

To the administrator of an intermediate unit this means the cooperation of his own staff, service to the various communities through the staffs of the community schools, stimulation of the boards and lay groups concerned with public school education, and encouragement of other formal and informal agencies and groups.

The administration of the intermediate unit should be based firmly upon an understanding that its major purpose is that of supplementing the efforts of the community schools. This kind of leadership role is somewhat different from and more difficult than that usually required or provided. It is very likely that the development of a program of services will depend more upon the quality of the educational leadership than upon the particular administrative structure within which the leadership functions. Every decision made at the intermediate level must be in keeping with the principle of local community responsibility. The leadership must be aware of the historical bases of American education and the American community to insure against implementing a program of intermediate unit services from the top down.

Intermediate unit leadership which assures local community responsibility has many important implications. What kind of intermediate unit staff is needed to implement this philosophy? How should such a staff be selected? How can the intermediate unit staff be improved once it is on the job? What are the leadership development implications as regards the community schools? How can the intermediate unit best aid community education through school boards and advisory groups? How can other agencies be stimulated to provide needed services? These questions need to be considered.

Selecting the Intermediate Unit Staff

The program of services developed by the intermediate unit should grow out of the need of individual community schools

for these services. But the success of the program will depend largely upon the way in which the service is provided. Just as the teacher is the heart of a classroom, so the intermediate unit staff specialist or consultant is the key to effective use of the specialized intermediate unit services. A director of transportation who is well adjusted socially and whose relationships with the community school principals or superintendents is at a high professional level will find his service more effectively used than will a director whose middle name is "Grumpy" and whose professional spirit is null and void. In the development of intermediate unit services to communities, it is essential that great care be taken to select the best people to handle the special jobs. The intermediate superintendent has the greatest leadership responsibility for the selection of a staff which will assure the development of a successful program of services.

In addition to finding the staff with the right personal characteristics for the job, it is essential that the staff be competent, that they know their specialties well. This should be in terms of both formal training and experiences. A curriculum coordinator who is personally well adjusted and gets along with teachers may not be an asset to the staff if his training and experience are so meager or unrelated to his particular position that no real aid is given to the communities served. The intermediate superintendent has a dual responsibility in this regard—the selection of an appropriate and competent staff and the encouragement of a more significant and realistic training experience for intermediate staff by the colleges and universities.

In addition to personal characteristics, professional competence, and experience, it is essential that persons selected for significant positions with the intermediate unit staff understand the nature of rural communities and their people. Knowledge of rural life and living and experience in them, if possible, may be just as significant for an art consultant's success as his knowledge of art and the teaching of art. Unfortunately many teachers and administrators working in rural areas are lacking in an understanding of and appreciation for rural living—its values and problems.

The selection of the intermediate unit staff points up several

real problems that must be faced by rural educators. What kind of person makes the greatest contribution in an educational program for rural children? Do specialists for the intermediate unit need a somewhat different type of preparation for their job? Do college programs need to be adjusted to meet the needs of the intermediate unit staff? Do the best classroom teachers make the best personnel for the intermediate unit staff?

Some of these questions might be answered from the pooling of past experiences; others will require sound investigation.

Improving the Intermediate Unit Staff

The intermediate superintendent has responsibility for preparing staff members for their role as leaders in their various specialties. The intermediate superintendent may be solely responsible for this leadership role in the development of services when he is the only person with intermediate unit responsibilities. However, when his staff increases to four, ten, or twenty or more professional workers, the leadership responsibilities shift to his co-workers. This broadening of the base of leadership responsibility cannot be accomplished by merely designating tasks. It must be done by inservice development on the part of the staff and by advanced professional preparation. Leadership by the intermediate superintendent should continually keep in focus the end product of better service to rural communities.

In some states rather basic steps may first have to be taken to assure the intermediate superintendent an acceptable leadership role. Where the intermediate superintendent is an elected official and where the professional requirements needed to qualify for the job are low, he may never be looked to for leadership by the administrators of community schools. Such intermediate superintendents may have served a leadership role in relation to schools when six or eight grades of education were an acceptable maximum for rural children. But today the intermediate superintendent should be among the most able professional persons in the entire area which he serves. High standards for selection are essential in any developing program

of rural education. If high standards cannot be attained when he is an elected official, then unceasing efforts should be exerted for making it an appointive position.

Regardless of the present level of development of the intermediate units in a given state, the potential for improving the staff is great. It is important to recognize the position from which to start but even more important is the need to begin at once. A program of services to supplement the efforts of community schools should not wait for laws to be passed or all differences to be reconciled.

Leadership for Community Schools

Equally significant to the role of the intermediate superintendent in the leadership development of his own staff is that of leadership development within the various community school units of the area. Any educational service provided by the intermediate unit is useful only to the extent that its use is accepted and encouraged by the community school. The community school administrator and the teachers of the community school have important leadership roles in their school and in their community. They have leadership roles in relation to intermediate unit personnel. They must understand their relationship and importance to their particular responsibility, to their school and community, to the intermediate unit staff, and to the various intermediate unit services. Very often they are the interpreters; psychological services are likely to become meaningful to the parent of a fourth-grade boy through his regular teacher. Leadership skill is needed.

The professional staff of the intermediate unit must be aware of the need and assist in the development of leadership on the part of community school personnel. Often this means simple acceptance of intermediate unit workers by the community school administrators. This acceptance as well as the effective development of leadership responsibility will depend almost entirely upon the competence and personal characteristics of intermediate unit staff. The importance of desirable qualities in the selection of the staff has already been discussed. In-

service improvement programs for the teachers in a community school which utilize the guidance of intermediate unit specialists and consultants are one means of gaining both dual understanding and interacceptance of both units. An additional inservice role may be accomplished by the intermediate unit specialists working with groups of teachers from a number of the community units of the area. For example, the music teachers in all of the community schools in the intermediate area may meet once a month with a music coordinator for the purpose of considering jointly a number of problems in the teaching of music.

When services for children or teachers are established, it is essential that they be maintained at a level acceptable to the citizens of the community. It is through numerous contacts among community school and intermediate unit staffs that the best decisions regarding a particular service can be determined.

There are numerous unsolved problems as to the leadership responsibility of the intermediate unit in situations where it is desirable to work through community school personnel. However, this kind of leadership is so vital that attention must be given to it as a means of providing a more effective program of community education.

Leadership for Boards of Education and Advisory Groups

Community school boards of education and those of intermediate units are responsible for the major policy decisions regarding the educational program. Fact finding regarding the needs for a particular service and proposals as to how it might be financed are within the scope of the community school and intermediate unit administrators' responsibilities. Once the need is recognized and proposals for financing are determined, the focal responsibility of the administrators becomes one of leadership. In this case it is leadership for the provision of a new service or toward developing a better way of operating an existing service. It means education and conviction. It entails preparation of clear and forthright proposals with the necessary supporting information. It often encompasses community education programs that involve not

only boards of education but various advisory groups who have particular interests in the proposals being made.

For example, both the intermediate superintendent and the several community school administrators may be convinced that a school psychologist is needed to aid the guidance counselors in the schools of the area. A consideration of proposals for financing the service indicates that the community schools might contract for the service if it were provided by the intermediate unit. Another proposal suggests the levy of an additional intermediate unit tax in order to obtain the necessary funds. Let us assume that, in either case, the state would supply 40 percent of the cost. Before the proposed service can be made operative, however, it must be accepted by the separate community boards of education. The boards must be assured that the service is needed and desirable, and parents must be aware of the value which can accrue from such an additional tax increase. Perhaps in no other type of situation is the leadership ability of the intermediate administrator put to so stringent a test. Here his leadership must involve his fellow administrators in the community units, the teachers concerned with children needing psychological aid, the boards of education, the advisory groups concerned, the organizations such as PTA and mothers clubs, community agencies, service clubs, the Grange, the Farm Bureau, media of mass communications, and the individual citizen who eventually pays his share of the bill.

The intermediate unit's leadership through boards and advisory groups is complex, but in a democratic system it is most essential. The decisions made by boards of education and the policies they establish are dependent to no small degree on the leadership ability of the administrator. Basically, the administrator provides the leadership which determines policy decisions to be administered. If he is unable to provide this leadership, he may have nothing to administer.

Stimulation of Other Agencies

One of the objectives of educational leadership is to get the needed service to the needy by the most effective means. If

we truly believe in effective service, then the means by which that service is supplied is of concern only to the extent that it is in line with pre-established concepts of democracy. The relationship of the intermediate unit in coordinating the services of nonschool agencies has previously been indicated in this chapter. However, the leadership implications of this task need to be considered.

If a service such as health inspections and follow-up can be accomplished most effectively in a given situation by an agency other than the school, for example, then they should be so accomplished. However, if they cannot or are not thus provided and the communities believe that health inspections and follow-up are essential to a comprehensive program of education, then school leadership should be exerted to get the job done. In either situation, certain leadership responsibility to see that the need is met rests with the school. Likewise it could co-exist in the health agencies of a county or region.

There are numerous other needs that have several groups with leadership responsibility to see that they are accomplished. Homemaking programs for adult women are of significance to the Agricultural Extension Service as well as to the school. The same is true for adult education programs in agriculture. The Soil Conservation Service and the community school's agriculture program may have similar objectives.

The responsibility of the intermediate unit in situations of this type may be basically one of stimulation. If other than school agencies are able to do the job effectively, the school people should be stimulated to cooperate in every possible way. If other than school agencies prefer that the school organize to meet the need, then these agencies need to be stimulated to aid the schools in every way possible. In some instances, both groups forget the prime focus of meeting the needs of rural people and thus succumb to "empire building." In such a situation at the community level, the intermediate superintendent should possess sufficient leadership and courage to arbitrate for the best interests of the public. Occasionally the role may be reversed and the community school administrator may find it necessary to bring the public good back into focus.

If the acceptance of responsibility in the leadership core of a community becomes part and parcel of the community school philosophy, and if this role is recognized by intermediate superintendents, it will be possible to coordinate the work of the numerous educational and noneducational agencies to a greater extent than has previously been done. Coordination by the intermediate unit is just beginning to be effective in a number of states and needs considerable study and research before specific techniques and methods can be suggested. At present it provides a challenging area for exploration by capable intermediate superintendents.

Intermediate Unit Leadership

Leadership for the determination and establishment of needed services and for the improvement of presently operating services is the major leadership task of the intermediate superintendency. This leadership cannot be provided by a single person or by a single administrative group. It may begin with the superintendent but involves leadership in his total staff, leadership by community school personnel, leadership with and by boards of education and advisory groups, and leadership with respect to other agencies and organizations at both local community and intermediate area levels. It is a complicated task requiring the best in professional training and a variety of essential experiences. Leadership of the type necessary for the intermediate unit is in its developmental stage. Study and interpretation as means of improvement are needed. This study and interpretation might be jointly undertaken by the associated professional organizations, the Department of Rural Education, NEA, and interested colleges and universities. It might be stimulated by the National Commission on the Intermediate Administrative Unit.

HOW SHOULD THE INTERMEDIATE UNIT BE DEVELOPED?

Throughout this chapter an attempt has been made to describe a functional intermediate unit. This intermediate unit would be able to serve the state education department in much

the same manner as at present, perhaps even more effectively. It would be the natural channel of communication between the state education department and the local community schools. But the intermediate unit has been described as having another and more important function—that of helping the local community schools, through their cooperative efforts to provide a comprehensive program of educational opportunities.

It has been indicated that the concept of the intermediate unit is not new. In some form, an intermediate unit of educational administration has been in existence for more than 100 years. Yet, in terms of its purposes and functions, the intermediate unit described here is new. It is somewhat different from that which now exists in any state. If what has been described in the previous sections of this chapter can be considered an "ideal" intermediate unit, there are a few states and a number of scattered instances in other states where much progress has been made toward approaching it. But most intermediate units in most states have a long way to go before they will begin to approach the concept which has been discussed. Attention needs to be directed to how this development can and should take place. A blueprint and detailed specifications for this needed development should not be expected. Our concern here is to examine some of the implications.

Developing More Functional Intermediate Units

The specific nature of intermediate units varies considerably among the 34 states which now have some form of intermediate organization. It can be expected, therefore, that the development of the intermediate units in each of the various states will continue to follow varying patterns.

The thesis of this yearbook has been that the community school is the most important unit of school operation. The efforts and activities of the intermediate unit and the state education department should be such that the ability of community schools to reach their objectives is increased. Changes in the educational structure which are necessary to the development of adequate intermediate units should always be made in terms of this relationship.

The development of the intermediate unit believed necessary and the structural changes and modifications which will be required can be accomplished by alternative procedures. A parallel might be drawn in terms of the remodeling of a house. First, of course, the need to remodel must be recognized. Then the end product of the changes determined. Plans for the desired changes can then be made and implemented in light of the resources available. But the specific plans and the manner in which changes are made are likely to be different if the house to be remodeled is that of a small boy, made of blocks, or a real house which must remain inhabited throughout the operation. In the first instance it might be much easier and more desirable to tear down the pile of blocks and start again. But where the house is real, the problem is somewhat different. The expensive and established foundation, the exterior walls, the joists and sills—all must be considered. They may prescribe what can be done and how it should be accomplished.

It is not impossible that the development of the type of intermediate unit desired, once the need for change has been recognized, could be accomplished much as the house of blocks is remodeled. A state legislature could abolish all the existing intermediate units in the state and re-establish that which is desired. The wisdom of such action is seriously questioned. The possibility that it could happen is very unlikely. People are involved. What happens to the people who are now in intermediate unit positions? Are they likely to support such a change? What about established loyalties and traditions? Are they to be ignored? How will the new plan be received? Are people ready for it? Can the kinds of relationships between community schools and intermediate units that are necessary for effective operation be included in the legislation? Who will support such a proposition?

The development of a functional intermediate unit which can assist the local community schools in its area to develop their own educational programs will be much more difficult and complex. But a principle to guide in this development is increasingly clear. *A functional intermediate unit in each state should evolve from the existing administrative structure.*

In this manner the development necessary will be gradual. It cannot be expected to be accomplished in 1954, by 1955, or by 1960. But efforts should begin now to plot the direction. Efforts should begin now to determine the specific changes which are needed to help the intermediate unit become the type of educational organization it should be. Through a more gradual but steady development the relationships necessary for effective operation can be strengthened, the possibilities of intermediate unit assistance recognized by the individual communities and community schools, these same possibilities understood by intermediate superintendents, and modifications tested and evaluated.

Development Now in Progress

In almost every state where an intermediate unit exists there has been progress toward developing a more purposeful organization. In some states this progress has as yet been made only in scattered instances. Where the leadership has been especially alert to community needs, however, programs of service to the community schools have been developed. A few have been identified in previous chapters. Most of these programs have been developed within a structure which has imposed many limitations and handicaps. But in spite of the obstacles, programs of service have developed. They should be encouraged, present obstacles should be removed, and additional services should be begun in accordance with the particular needs and desires of the community schools in each area.

The evidence of the present programs of intermediate unit services adds to the possibility that development will depend more upon leadership than upon legislative action and structural change. Reorganization of the present operational framework is badly needed in many states. The key to development, however, will remain in the leadership provided. Intermediate superintendents who sit back and wait for a new type of intermediate unit to be legislated will seldom see its potentialities in their own intermediate area. The present zeal of most intermediate superintendents indicates that this will seldom be the case.

Further evidence of present development can be demonstrated by the situation in New York. It has been recognized for a number of years that most of the existing intermediate units in that state are too small for effective operation in terms of the changing concept of service functions. In some instances in New York there are as many as 4 or 5 intermediate units within a single county. The Intermediate District Study proposed in 1947 that the total number of intermediate units be reduced to 67, and since then state policy has appeared to be deliberately working in that direction. The number of intermediate units has been reduced from 181 in 1947 to 151 in 1953. This development has been gradual. It has come about without displacing any individual. Where intermediate superintendent vacancies have occurred, the area has been combined with an adjacent intermediate area or divided among adjacent areas if this was desirable. When it has not been desirable, the vacancies have been filled as usual. Progress of this type takes considerable time but is accomplished without autocratic decree, without general structural upheaval, and in the best interests of professional relations. But, however gradual, the progress has been definite as regards the objective desired.

CONCLUSION

This yearbook is being concluded with questions, not answers. If definite answers exist, they have escaped the committee which has assumed responsibility for a consideration of community school and intermediate unit relationships. We look to the research which we hope this yearbook will stimulate. We will look to the guidance of the continued experience of intermediate units as they serve local community schools in developing programs of community education. And we look with encouragement, appreciation, and enthusiasm for those who pioneer in the development of new educational horizons for the smaller communities and rural areas of America.

But we also conclude with convictions. We believe that *every child* and *every community* should have access to a comprehensive program of educational opportunity. We believe that control and responsibility should be kept as close to the

people as possible without interfering with effective operation. We believe in the community school. But we believe that most community schools will not be able to provide the comprehensive program of opportunities desired. We believe the intermediate unit is necessary. We believe that the intermediate unit and the state education department should assist and supplement the efforts of local community schools, should help community schools emerge. We believe that the problems of Harvey and Betty Lou and Bruce are not insurmountable. We believe the key is in leadership.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ALEXANDER, FRED M. *Education for the Needs of the Negro in Virginia*. Washington, D. C.: Southern Education Foundation, 1943. 297 p.
A comprehensive description and analysis of the social and economic conditions of the Negro in Virginia. The special problems are discussed and illustrated. Of special value are the recommendations regarding a program of education and development of instructional procedures which relate schools to the communities they serve.
- AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS. *The American School Superintendency*. Thirtieth Yearbook. Washington, D. C.: the Association, a department of the National Education Association, 1952. 663 p.
A comprehensive discussion of the superintendent's role as an educational leader in a community. Included are leadership functions relating to the board of education, the curriculum, instruction, and other aspects of the educational program. Also included are chapters devoted to a discussion of the rural superintendent of schools and the intermediate superintendent.
- BUTTERWORTH, JULIAN E., and DAWSON, HOWARD A. *The Modern Rural School*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1952. 494 p.
Identifies the important social and economic bases of the unique problems in the field of rural education, the kind of educational program needed for better living in rural communities or for adjustment to urban life, and, from this context, recommends means by which the desired program can be achieved. Specific chapters are devoted to developing more effective school districts and expanding educational programs through intermediate unit services.
- COOPER, SHIRLEY, and FITZWATER, CHARLES O. *County School Administration*. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1954. 566 p.
A detailed description and analysis of the county school administration in terms of the socio-economic framework within which it functions. Many practical suggestions and descriptions of specific practices together with the underlying principles of democratic leadership are included. Special emphasis is given to the organization, structure, and service functions of the intermediate unit.
- DAWSON, HOWARD A.; REEVES, FLOYD W.; and OTHERS. *Your School District*. Report of the National Commission on School District Reorganization. Washington, D. C.: Department of Rural Education, National Education Association, 1948. 286 p.
Points out many of the social and economic factors related to school district organization, the various types of existing school districts in the several states, and the characteristics of effective districts. Major emphasis is given to the need for the reorganization of school districts, suggestions as to how it might be accomplished, and principles which might be used by states in undertaking programs of reorganization.

- ESSERT, PAUL L., and HOWARD, ROBERT WEST. *Educational Planning by Neighborhoods in Centralized Districts*. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1952. 132 p.

A descriptive account, to some extent narrative and romanticized, of the development of reorganized school districts on a community school basis in New York State. Brief descriptions of the reorganization process and resultant educational programs for a number of communities are included.

- EVERETT, SAMUEL, editor. *The Community School*. New York: Appleton-Century Co., 1938. 487 p.

A discussion of the developing philosophy of the community school and programs of community education, including reports of programs in both rural and urban areas. The educational principles which distinguish the community school from the conventional pattern.

- FOX, LORENE K. *The Rural Community and Its School*. New York: King's Crown Press, 1948. 233 p.

A well documented case study of a rural county (Chautauqua) in New York State. Analyzes the interrelationships of rural living—the county's social and occupational structure; its home and community patterns; its political, religious, and educational institutions; and the historical backgrounds of these characteristics—and the educational program.

- KREITLOW, BURTON W. *Rural Education: Community Backgrounds*. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1954.

An analysis of the many social and economic forces, associations, and organizations in rural communities and their relationships to education. Special emphasis is given to leadership functions and the integral responsibility of a number of educational agencies for community development. Two sections of learning aids at the ends of the chapters are designed for use in classroom or in community discussion groups.

- NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION, DEPARTMENT OF RURAL EDUCATION. *The Rural Supervisor at Work*. Yearbook 1949. Washington, D. C.: the Department, 1949. 242 p.

Curriculum leadership and instructional improvement for rural schools is the major emphasis of this volume. Guide lines for practical leadership and effective working relationships are well developed and illustrated. The many reports of successful experiences include examples of intermediate unit programs serving community schools.

- NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION, DEPARTMENT OF RURAL EDUCATION. *The County Superintendent of Schools in the United States*. Yearbook 1950. Washington, D. C.: the Department, 1950. 188 p.

A forward look at the future of the county superintendent of schools with emphasis on the educational possibilities of the position. Included is

a rather comprehensive survey of status, recognition and identification of existing inadequacies, many reports and illustrations of promising practices, and a discussion of the emerging intermediate district. The need for democratic professional leadership is indicated throughout.

NATIONAL SOCIETY FOR THE STUDY OF EDUCATION. *The Status of Rural Education*. Thirtieth Yearbook, Part I. Bloomington, Ill.: Public School Publishing Co., 1931. 272 p. (Now available from University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Ill.)

A comprehensive description of education in rural areas a quarter of a century ago. Excellent background for an understanding of the factors which resulted in renewed interest and efforts to reorganize school districts.

NATIONAL SOCIETY FOR THE STUDY OF EDUCATION. *Education in Rural Communities*. Fifty-First Yearbook, Part II. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1952. 359 p.

Describes many of the trends and forces which affect rural life and how different types of communities and school systems have organized to meet their changing educational needs. Emphasis is given throughout to an educational program rooted in the particular needs and resources of each community. Curriculum, school district reorganization, professional co-operation, and evaluation are among the areas related in this volume to a rural setting. Numerous case descriptions offer many suggestions.

NATIONAL SOCIETY FOR THE STUDY OF EDUCATION. *The Community School*. Fifty-Second Yearbook, Part II. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1953. 292 p.

An analysis of the various aspects of the educative process as they relate to the problems and people of each community. Special emphasis is given to the development and definition of the community school concept, the nature of community organization, and the interdependence of community educational goals and the attainment of better community living. Descriptive accounts of actual experiences are included and represent a variety of community settings.

OLSEN, EDWARD G., editor. *The Modern Community School*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1953. 246 p.

An expansion and refinement of the community school concept with special relation to curriculum. Descriptions of current best practice in community education programs are included for different types of communities. The philosophy of the community school and its development is well presented.

SEAY, MAURICE F. "The Community—School Emphasis in Postwar Education." *American Education in the Postwar Period: Curriculum Reconstruction*. Forty-Fourth Yearbook, Part I. National Society for the

Study of Education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1945. Chapter 10, p. 209-28.

Calls attention to developments in American society which require a school curriculum based upon community resources and their development, preservation, and utilization. The significance of the community school concept for all types of communities, the preparation of teachers, and the development of instructional materials for problems peculiar to community schools are discussed, and the principles emerging from a variety of successful experiments identified.

TIREMAN, L. S., and WATSON, MARY. *A Community School in a Spanish-Speaking Village*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1948.

A report of a community education program in an isolated village which holds to the customs and beliefs of early Spain. The problems faced, the cooperative efforts in studying the land, water, and irrigation, and the manner in which pupil activities are based largely upon use of the natural resources which surround them make a fascinating account of a school and community which are inseparable.

THE DEPARTMENT OF RURAL EDUCATION

Dues: \$4.00 (Effective beginning January 1, 1954).

Membership: All persons engaged or interested in rural education are eligible for membership, provided they are members of the National Education Association. The membership year is the calendar year. Members are eligible to attend the annual convention meetings of the Department, to vote, to hold office, and to receive: The Yearbook, the *NEA Research Bulletin* (4 issues per year), *Rural Education News*, and other publications as available.

Meetings: Annual meeting at the time of AASA meeting, program meeting in connection with the NEA Representative Assembly.

The Department of Rural Education, which gives leadership in solving distinctive problems of rural education and promotes the general advancement of rural education, grew out of the Department of Rural and Agricultural Education authorized by the NEA Board of Directors in 1907. In 1919 it was reorganized under its present name. Since 1936 the Department of Rural Education has had the assistance of the NEA Division of Rural Service, with the same headquarters staff serving both. Existing divisions as provided for under the Department Constitution are: (a) County and Rural Area Superintendents, and (b) Pupil Transportation.

ACTIVITIES DURING 1953-54

Meetings sponsored involved both professional and lay persons in planning and program. The theme for the Department's annual meeting in Atlantic City in February 1954 was "Developing Community Schools." The Eighth National Conference of County and Rural Area Superintendents, held in Omaha, Nebraska, October 1953, was planned and organized to clarify and illustrate some ways in which superintendents provide educational leadership and services. The topic of the Department's summer meeting in Miami Beach, June 1953, was "Rural People Want Better Educational Opportunities for Their Children."

Conferences on rural life and education were held in five regions, and three regional conferences on administrative leadership serving community schools were sponsored jointly with AASA.

The Department's Standing Committee on Publications and Constructive Studies has played an important role in the development of the 1954 Yearbook. In addition, the Department has three special committees working on important phases of its responsibilities. They are: The Committee on Rural Life and Education on the World Scene, The Committee on Teacher Recruitment and Preparation, and The Joint Committee with the Rural Sociological Society.

The 1953 Yearbook of the Department, *Pupil Transportation*, is now in its third printing. The 1954 Yearbook will serve as basic material for the National Commission on the Intermediate Administrative Unit whose purpose is to explore and develop an understanding of the contributions that the intermediate unit can make to education in rural areas.

Rural Education News is published quarterly and distributed to members and a selected list of other persons in this country and abroad who are interested and concerned with rural education. Occasional publications are produced in cooperation with other agencies.

OFFICERS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF RURAL EDUCATION

(Terms expire in February)

*President—M. L. Cushman, professor of rural education, Iowa State College, Ames

President-elect—Mrs. Lucille Klinge, superintendent, Lane County Schools, Eugene, Oregon

*Vice President—Mrs. Mary Watson, director, Division of Elementary Education, State Department of Education, Santa Fe, New Mexico

Executive Secretary—Howard A. Dawson, director, Division of Rural Service, NEA

Executive Committee

President, Vice President, Presidents of Divisions, plus:

*Mrs. Marjorie B. Leinauer, retiring president, superintendent, DeKalb County Schools, Sycamore, Illinois

Charles E. Brake, deputy superintendent, Wayne County Schools, Detroit 26, Michigan (1954)

- *H. C. DeKock, coordinator of field experience, College of Education, State University of Iowa, Iowa City, (1956)
- Leila C. Ewen, Rural Department, State Teachers College, Minot, North Dakota (1957)
- Rosalie W. Farley, coordinator, Elementary Field Program, University of Nebraska, Lincoln (1954)
- Mrs. Lucille Klinge, superintendent, Lane County Schools, Eugene, Oregon. (1957)
- Clarence A. Pound, associate professor and consultant in rural education, Purdue University, Lafayette, Indiana (1955)
- R. E. Tidwell, dean, Extension Division, University of Alabama, University (1956)
- Mrs. Marie R. Turner, superintendent of schools, Breathitt County, Jackson, Kentucky (1955)
- Thomas E. Robinson, president, State Teachers College, Glassboro, New Jersey (1958)
- Howard G. Sackett, district superintendent of schools, Port Leyden, New York (1958)

Division of County and Rural Area Superintendents

(Terms expire in October)

- President—Cecil E. Shuffield, supervisor of schools, Howard County, Nashville, Arkansas
- First Vice President—Edward G. Stapleton, superintendent, Baltimore County Schools, Towson, Maryland
- Second Vice President—B. O. Wilson, superintendent, Contra Costa County, Martinez, California
- Executive Secretary—Howard A. Dawson, director, Division of Rural Service, NEA

Executive Committee

President, Vice President, Plus:

- *Sampson G. Smith, superintendent of schools, Somerset County, Somerville, New Jersey, past president.
- Ernest Barker, superintendent, Pottawattamie County Schools, Council Bluffs, Iowa (1955)
- Hugh K. Cassell, division superintendent, Augusta County Schools, Staunton, Virginia (1954)
- H. G. Greer, superintendent, Monroe County Schools, Monroeville, Alabama (1954)
- Audrey James, superintendent, Murray County Schools, Slayton, Minnesota (1955)
- *(Denotes members of the Department's Executive Council)

Division of School Transportation

(Terms expire February)

President—John L. Vickers, director of pupil transportation, State Department of Education, Frankfort, Kentucky

Vice President—J. F. Lautenschlager, county superintendent of schools, Coshocton County, Coshocton, Ohio

Executive Secretary—Howard A. Dawson, director, Division of Rural Service, NEA

Executive Committee

T. Wesley Pickel, assistant director, Division of Schoolhouse Planning and Transportation, State Department of Education, Nashville, Tennessee

Michael J. Haggerty, transportation supervisor, State Department of Education, St. Paul, Minnesota

Earl Darnell, director, School Transportation, Greenbrier County, Lewisburg, West Virginia

The National Commission on the Intermediate Administrative Unit

In order to assure an effective school system with the wisest use of resources, provide education of the character and depth essential for effective citizenship in a democracy, make possible equal educational opportunities, develop more effective participation of lay citizens and professional staff in improving education, in the opinion of many becomes necessary to develop and support a functional intermediate superintendency which provides leadership and services. The National Commission on the Intermediate Administrative Unit was established by the Division of County and Rural Area Superintendents to explore and develop an understanding of the organization, functions and services which should be provided by this unit of organization. A 48-member advisory Council was established to work with the commission. Members of the National Commission are:

Charles H. Boehm, co-chairman, superintendent, Public Schools of Bucks County, Doylestown, Pennsylvania

Alvin E. Rhodes, co-chairman, superintendent of schools, County of San Luis Obispo, San Luis Obispo, California

La Verne Arnold, county superintendent, Osborne County, Osborne, Kansas

Julian E. Butterworth, professor of educational administration, emeritus, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York

William J. Emerson, superintendent, Oakland County Schools, Pontiac, Michigan

Clarence A. Pound, associate professor of education, Purdue University, Lafayette, Indiana

William S. Smith, superintendent, Charlton County School System, Folkston, Georgia

Roe M. Wright, superintendent, Central Community Unit Schools, District Number 2, Robinson, Illinois

DEPARTMENT YEARBOOKS THAT ARE AVAILABLE

1. *Pupil Transportation*. Yearbook, 1953. Robert M. Isenberg, Ed. 196 p. \$2.00 paper
2. *Guidance in a Rural Community*. Yearbook, 1952. By Amber Arthun Warburton. 176 p. \$2.00, paper
3. *The Child in the Rural Environment*. Yearbook, 1951. By Fannie W. Dunn. 253 p. \$3.00, cloth
4. *The County Superintendent of Schools in the United States*. Yearbook, 1950. Shirley Cooper, Ed. 188 p. \$2.50 cloth; \$2.00 paper
5. *The Rural Supervisor at Work*. Yearbook, 1949. Marcia A. Everett, Ed. 242 p. \$1.00, paper
6. *Health, Physical Education and Recreation in Small Schools*. Yearbook, 1948. Elsa Schneider, Ed. 67 p. \$.50
7. *On-the-Job Education in Rural Communities*. Yearbook, 1947. Roy W. Roberts, Ed. 139 p. \$.75
8. *Education of Teachers for Rural America*. Yearbook, 1946. Kate V. Wofford, Ed. 142 p. \$.50
9. *Rural Schools for Tomorrow*. Yearbook, 1945. Julian E. Butterworth, Ed., 152 p. \$.50
10. *Conservation Education in Rural Schools*. Yearbook, 1943. Effie G. Bathurst, Ed. 114 p. \$.50
11. *Community Resources in Rural Schools*. Yearbook, 1939. Kate V. Wofford, Ed. 109 p. \$.50
12. *Newer Types of Instruction in Small Rural Schools*. Yearbook, 1938. Kate V. Wofford, Ed. 144 p. \$.50
13. *Economical Enrichment of the Small Secondary-School Curriculum*. Yearbook, 1934. Frank W. Cyr, Ed. 94 p. \$.50
14. *Organization of Curriculum for One-Teacher Schools*. Yearbook, 1933. Fannie W. Dunn, Ed. 44 p. \$.25

GOALS FOR THE CENTENNIAL ACTION PROGRAM OF THE UNITED TEACHING PROFESSION

Adopted by the NEA Representative Assembly at San Francisco, California,

1951

1951—1957

These goals are the concern of Rural Department members as they are the concern of all teachers.

1. An active democratic local education association in every community.
2. A stronger and more effective state education association in every state.
3. A larger and more effective National Education Association.
4. Unified dues—a single fee covering local, state, and national and world services—collected by the local.
5. 100% membership enrolment in local, state, and national professional organizations.
6. Unified committees—the chairman of local and state committees serving as consultants to central national committees.
7. A Future Teachers of America Chapter in every institution preparing teachers.
8. A professionally prepared and competent person in every school position.
9. A strong, adequately staffed state department of education in each state and a more adequate federal education agency.
10. An adequate professional salary for all members.
11. For all educational personnel—professional security guaranteed by tenure legislation, sabbatical and sick leave, and an adequate retirement income for old age.
12. Reasonable class size and equitable distribution of the teaching load.
13. Units—school administration large enough to provide efficient and adequate elementary and secondary educational opportunities.
14. Adequate educational opportunity for every child and youth.
15. Equalization and expansion of educational opportunity including needed state and national financing.
16. A safe, healthful, and wholesome community environment for every child and youth.
17. Adequately informed lay support of public education.
18. An able, public spirited board of education in every community.
19. An effective world organization of the teaching profession.
20. A more effective United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization.
21. (Additional goal approved by the NEA Executive Committee.) More effective cooperation between adult, higher, secondary, and elementary education with increasing participation by college and university personnel in the work of the united profession.

ROSTER OF MEMBERS

THE DEPARTMENT OF RURAL EDUCATION

A Department of the National Education Association of the United States

This roster is arranged by states, and lists alphabetically for each member his name, position and location. It does not indicate street addresses except where no other information is available. All libraries and institutional members are listed under their respective states.

ALABAMA

Balch, R. L., Superintendent, Macon County Schools, Tuskegee
Baxter, Solomon, Superintendent, Houston County Schools, Dothan
Barnes, Crawford H., Superintendent, Mobile City and County Schools, Mobile
Barnside, T. F., Supervisor of Negro Education, State Department of Education, Montgomery
Bash, J. O., Superintendent, Choctaw County Schools, Butler
Benson, L. D., Superintendent, Pike County Schools, Troy
Carnoll, Thomas W., Superintendent, Covington County Schools, Andalusia
Coleman, Hilda, Superintendent, Lowndes County Schools, Hayneville
Culp, D. P., Associate Professor of Education, School of Education, Alabama Polytechnic Institute, Auburn
Gibson, K. V., Superintendent, Saint Clair County Schools, Ashville
Greer, Hugh G., Superintendent, Monroe County Schools, Monroeville
Greer, Solomon, Superintendent, Marion County Schools, Hamilton
Hicks, Delbert, Superintendent, Jackson County Schools, Scottsboro
Hill, W. W., President, State Teachers College, Livingston
Johnson, Kermitt A., Superintendent, Tuscaloosa County Schools, Tuscaloosa; Advisory Council to the National Commission on the Intermediate Administrative Unit
Jones, W. J., Superintendent, Wilcox County Schools, Camden
Jordan, Leon, Principal, Aberfoi Junior High School, Union Springs
Lawrence, R. J., Superintendent, Bullock County Schools, Union Springs; State Director
Leavorn, J. Lem, Superintendent, Randolph County Schools, Wedowee
McLure, John R., Dean, College of Education, University of Alabama, University
Melton, Elgin W., Superintendent, Sumter County Schools, Livingston
Newell, C. Frank, Superintendent, Calhoun County Schools, Anniston
Norton, E. B., President, State Teachers College, Florence
Nunnally, N. F., Superintendent, Talladega County Schools, Talladega
Oliver, Tossie M., Supervisor, Negro Schools, Bullock County Schools, Union Springs
Pate, Harvey G., Superintendent, Conecuh County Schools, Evergreen
Pastorian, E. C., Professor of Sociology, Athens College, Athens
Ponjoy, W. E., Business Manager, Madison County Board of Education, Huntsville

Philpot, Frank, Supervisor, Resource Education, State Department of Education, Montgomery
Richardson, O. P., Assistant Director, Division of Administration and Finance, State Department of Education, Montgomery
Self, Geddes, Director, Secondary Education, State Department of Education, Montgomery
Self, Ruben, State Teachers College, Jacksonville
Simmons, I. F., Superintendent, Jefferson County Schools, Birmingham; Chairman, Division of County and Rural Area Superintendents Committee on Rural Scouting
Smith, C. B., President, State Teachers College, Troy
Smith, Guy W., Supervisor of Instruction, Division of Secondary Education, State Department of Education, Montgomery
Tait, Hugh L., Extension Division, University of Alabama, University
Terry, W. J., Superintendent of Education, State Department of Education, Montgomery
Tharp, S. M., Superintendent, Baldwin County Schools, (retired), Bay Minette
Tidwell, R. E., Dean, Extension Division, University of Alabama, University; Executive Committee of the Department; Planning Committee, Mid-south Regional Conference on Rural Life and Education
Walker, L. G., Superintendent, Perry County Schools, Marion

INSTITUTIONAL MEMBER

Library, Alabama Polytechnic Institute, Auburn

ARIZONA

Beck, (Mrs.) Florence, Teacher, Winslow
Bradt, George M., Teacher, Tucson
Edmondson, E. I., Principal, Gadsden School, Gadsden
Fleetham, Fay, Head Teacher, Douglas
Friday, Roy R., Teacher, Skull Valley School, Skull Valley
Frost, (Mrs.) Beatrice L., Teacher, Forrest School Dist. No. 31, Bisbee
Haldeman, Della M., Teacher, Ganado
Hamilton, (Mrs.) Anna W., (retired), 1622 East 10th, Tucson
Hurt, W. D., Teacher, Sunnyhope
Janston, (Mrs.) Lillian B., Assistant State Superintendent of Public Instruction, State Department of Education, Phoenix; State Director; Planning Committee, Western Regional Conference on Rural Life and Education
Keller, Mrs. A. W., Teacher, Yarnell
Martin, (Mrs.) Mary McCollum, Teacher, Eloy
Moore, (Mrs.) Carolyn M., Teacher, Roosevelt

-230/231

p. 230 blank

Morgan, T. E., Principal, Cactus
 Nieman, James E., Principal, Oak Creek
 School District No. 16, Cornville
 Oles, (Mrs.) Wilma B., Teacher, Salome
 Peterson, Mrs. G. A., Principal, Oracle Ele-
 mentary School, Oracle
 Schultz, (Mrs.) Alberta, Teacher, Phoenix
 Smith, Harold, Superintendent, Elementary
 Schools, Glendale
 Spencer, Mrs. R. W., Principal, Forrest
 School District No. 81, Douglas
 Stocks, (Mrs.) Ruth M., Teacher, Tuba City
 Thomas, (Mrs.) Mabel Lee, Teacher, Wick-
 enburg
 Udall, R. Keith, Superintendent, Fredonia
 Schools, Fredonia

ARKANSAS

Albright, J. G., Supervisor, Jackson County
 Schools, Newport
 Anderson, Homer L., Supervisor, Ouachita
 County Schools, Camden
 Armstrong, W. V., Supervisor, St. Francis
 County Schools, Forrest City
 Arrant, Mrs. M. C., Supervisor, Elementary
 Education, State Department of Education,
 Little Rock
 Asmore, W. M., Superintendent of Schools,
 Branch
 Baiver, W. E., Supervisor, Cleveland County
 Schools, Rison
 Bankston, Marvin, Supervisor, Ashley County
 Schools, Hamburg
 Bell, N. H., Supervisor, Pope County Schools,
 Russellville
 Blankenship, P. V., Supervisor, Madison
 County Schools, Huntsville
 Holding, G. P., Supervisor, Sevier County
 Schools, De Queen
 Bollen, F. M., Superintendent of Public
 Schools, Omaha
 Bollen, J. D., Supervisor, Faulkner County
 Schools, Conway
 Bradford, David E., Supervisor, Van Buren
 County Schools, Clinton
 Brown, E. R., Supervisor, Hempstead County
 Schools, Hope
 Russell, Carey, Superintendent of Schools,
 St. Paul
 Carpenter, J. A., Supervisor, Sharp County
 Schools, Evening Shade
 Casper, Revis, Supervisor, Lawrence County
 Schools, Pochutan
 Cassidy, Robert S., Supervisor, Pike County
 Schools, Murfreesboro
 Castleberry, W. E., Supervisor, Prairie
 County Schools, Des Arc
 Christen, L. L., Supervisor, Crawford County
 Schools, Van Buren
 Cooper, (Mrs.) Opal, Supervisor, Craighead
 County Schools, Jonesboro
 Craft, C. R., Principal, Newport School,
 Newport
 Ely, Wallace A., Supervisor, Miller County
 Schools, Texarkana
 Fincher, Allen, Supervisor, Columbia County
 Schools, Waldo
 Foster, B. H., Supervisor, Baxter County
 Schools, Mountain Home
 Franks, C. D., Superintendent of Schools,
 Ashdown
 Futrell, Alma, Supervisor, Lee County
 Schools, Marianna
 Gaines, L. N., Superintendent of Schools,
 Altus
 Gattin, Leroy, Superintendent of Schools,
 Dierks
 Gnagay, L. J., Supervisor, Benton County
 Schools, Bentonville
 Griswold, J. G., Supervisor, Dallas County
 Schools, Fordyce
 Ham, Custer, Supervisor, Newton County
 Schools, Jasper
 Hamilton, N. M., Supervisor, Pulaski County
 Schools, Little Rock
 Haynes, W. W., Superintendent of Schools,
 Charleston
 Head, Robert A., Superintendent of Schools,
 Lamar
 Hicks, Charles A., Supervisor for Negro
 Schools, State Department of Education,
 Little Rock
 Hinosly, M. M., Supervisor, Cross County
 Schools, Wynne
 Holmes, O. G., Supervisor, Boone County
 Schools, Harrison
 Hughes, James M., Supervisor, Chicot County
 Schools, Lake Village
 Isenmen, Anne, Arkansas Education Assoc-
 iation, Little Rock
 Jacobs, Fay, Supervisor, Franklin County
 Schools, Ozark
 Jeffers, Les D., Richard B. Harrison High
 School, Blytheville
 Jones, Arline, Arkansas Education Assoc-
 iation, Little Rock
 Keaton, William T., Superintendent, Howard
 County Training School, Mineral Springs
 Keeling, A. J., Supervisor, Searey County
 Schools, Marshall
 Keeter, G. B., Supervisor, Marion County
 Schools, Yellville
 Kennan, J. R., Supervisor, Washington
 County Schools, Fayetteville
 Lee, Eugene, Supervisor, Johnson County
 Schools, Clarksville
 Leslie, Joe, Supervisor, Stone County Schools,
 Mountain View
 Little, E. W., Supervisor, Greene County
 Schools, Paragould
 Logan, Coy, Supervisor, Carroll County
 Schools, Berryville
 Londermilk, H. C., Supervisor, Perry County
 Schools, Perryville
 Lyman, Joe, Supervisor, Saline County
 Schools, Benton
 McCuiston, Ed., Director, Division of Negro
 Education, State Department of Education,
 Little Rock
 Mallard, W. B., Supervisor, Boone County
 Schools, Harrison
 Martin, John H., Supervisor, Arkansas
 County Schools, Dewitt
 Mayes, John, Supervisor, Mississippi County
 Schools, Blytheville
 Middleton, W. E., Superintendent, Acorn
 Consolidated School, Mena
 Moore, Fred, Supervisor, Jefferson County
 Schools, Pine Bluff
 Moore, G. H., Supervisor, Independence
 County Schools, Batesville
 Morgan, Roy H., Supervisor, Garland County
 Schools, Hot Springs
 Nichols, Mrs. Greer, Assistant County Super-
 visor, Franklin County Schools, Ozark
 Northcutt, Jasper O., Huntsville
 Orr, W. E., Supervisor, White County
 Schools, Searey
 Overbey, Harold L., Mountain Home
 Overton, H. H., Supervisor, Hot Springs
 County Schools, Malvern
 Parker, Herbert W., Supervisor, Little River
 County Schools, Ashdown
 Patterson, T. E., Superintendent, Childress
 School, Nashville
 Petty, Paul V., Associate Professor of Educa-
 tion, College of Education, University of
 Arkansas, Fayetteville
 Polk, L. R., Supervisor, Crittenden County
 Schools, Marion
 Priteel, Custer, Supervisor, Conway County
 Schools, Morrilton
 Potts, W. C., Principal, Marion
 Pyle, H. R., Executive Secretary, Arkansas
 Education Association, Little Rock
 Rapp, J. C., Supervisor, Desha County
 Schools, McGehee

Rhoads, Silas, Supervisor, Scott County Schools, Waldron
 Ritchie, J. Bryan, Supervisor, Nevada County Schools, Prescott
 Roberts, O. E., Supervisor, Sebastian County Schools, Greenwood
 Roberts, Roy W., Head, Department of Vocational Teacher Education, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville; Planning Committee, Midsouth Regional Conference on Rural Life and Education
 Robinson, L. B., Supervisor, Clay County Schools, Piggott
 Ross, Clyde, Supervisor, Drew County Schools, Monticello
 Rozzell, Forrest, Field Secretary, Arkansas Education Association, Little Rock
 Scott, Emma, Editor, *Journal of Arkansas Education*, Arkansas Education Association, Little Rock
 Shufeld, Cecil E., Supervisor, Howard County Schools, Nashville; Executive Council of the Department; President, Division of County and Rural Area Superintendents; State Director; Advisory Council to the National Commission on the Intermediate Administrative Unit; Planning Committee, Southwest Regional Conference on Administrative Leadership Serving Community Schools
 Simpson, Tom, Supervisor, Izard County Schools, Melbourne
 Smith, Earl, Supervisor, Randolph County Schools, Pochontas
 Smith, T. L., Supervisor, Poinsett County Schools, Harrisburg
 Snell, H. Z., Supervisor of Finance, State Department of Education, Little Rock
 Suck, R. A., Supervisor, Phillips County Schools, Helena
 Talbot, Ivey S., Supervisor, Calhoun County Schools, Hampton
 Teeter, C. K., Supervisor, Lincoln County Schools, Star City
 Thornton, R. H., Supervisor, Grant County Schools, Sheridan
 Thomason, R. B., Supervisor, Clark County Schools, Arkadelphia
 Toll, Yashti, Arkansas Education Association, Little Rock
 Terry, Harry, Supervisor, Monroe County Schools, Clarendon
 Trice, (Mrs.) Grace B., Supervisor, Woodruff County Schools, Augusta
 Trice, J. A., Supervisor of Rural Education, State Department of Education, Little Rock
 Turner, Jessie, Supervisor, Bradley County Schools, Warren
 Wheat, M. Edward, Supervisor, Lonoke County Schools, Lonoke
 Whitworth, Mrs. Robin H., Supervisor, Logan County Schools, Booneville
 Williams, R. G., Superintendent, Walker School District, Walker High School, Magnolia
 Williamson, Horace, Supervisor, Union County Schools, El Dorado
 Wilson, E. B., Supervisor, Yell County Schools, Danville
 Wilson, W. B., Supervisor, Lafayette County Schools, Lewisville
 Woolsey, Edgar, Superintendent of Schools, Ozark
 Wright, Roy, Supervisor, Montgomery County Schools, Mount Ida

INSTITUTIONAL MEMBER

Torreyson Library, Arkansas State Teachers College, Conway

CALIFORNIA

Atkins, Charles H., Superintendent, Amador County Schools, Jackson
 Handy, Eleanor K., Superintendent, Yolo County Schools, Woodland
 Britton, Edward C., Professor of Education, Sacramento State College, Sacramento
 Clark, George W., Superintendent, Merced County Schools, Merced
 Cragen, (Mrs.) Dorothy Clara, Superintendent, Inyo County Schools, Independence
 Dooley, Helen A., San Jose State College, San Jose
 Emmerson, (Mrs.) Juanita H., Superintendent, Eldorado County Schools, Placerville
 Erro, Mercedes, Elementary Coordinator, San Luis Obispo County Schools, San Luis Obispo
 Ferguson, Harry L., 1108 West Cove Place, West Covina
 Fikes, Edith E., Superintendent, Santa Cruz County Schools, Santa Cruz
 Gansberg, Lucille, Superintendent, Lassen County Schools, Susanville
 Gerholdt, Anna F., General Supervisor, Sonoma County Schools, Santa Rosa
 Gibson, Carmen, Court House, El Centro
 Gravelle, (Mrs.) Dorothy M., 49 Birch Street, Redwood City
 Hanson, W. Roland, Superintendent, Lake County Schools, Lakeport
 Hardesty, Cecil D., Superintendent, San Diego County Schools, San Diego
 Hayes, John D., Assistant Superintendent, Orange County Schools, Santa Ana
 Heffernan, Helen, Bureau of Elementary Education, State Department of Education, Sacramento; Planning Committee, Western Regional Conference on Rural Life and Education
 Hill, (Mrs.) Margaret F., Teacher, Santa Barbara
 Hoffman, (Mrs.) Howardine G., Director, Division of Elementary Education, Los Angeles County Schools, Los Angeles
 Houx, Kate, Consultant in Elementary Education, Santa Barbara County Schools, Santa Barbara
 Hubbard, O. S., Superintendent, Santa Clara County Schools, San Jose
 Johnson, Ray W., Superintendent, Riverside County Schools, Riverside
 Kaar, Harold W., Assistant Superintendent, Educational Service, Contra Costa County Schools, Martinez
 Kopley, (Mrs.) Ruth A., Superintendent, Imperial County Schools, El Centro
 Leonard, Emily C., General Supervisor, Contra Costa County Schools, Martinez
 Martin, Walter G., Superintendent, Fresno County Schools, Fresno
 McGouran, Foresta, General Supervisor, Auburn
 Mead, (Mrs.) Agnes Weber, Superintendent, Yuba County Schools, Marysville
 Morphet, Edgar L., Professor, School of Education, University of California, Berkeley
 Myers, Helen G., Curriculum Consultant, San Bernardino County Schools, San Bernardino
 Nance, (Mrs.) Afton, Elementary Consultant, State Department of Education, Sacramento
 Overfield, Ruth, Consultant in Rural Education, Lassen County Schools, Susanville
 Price, Thomas B., County and District Superintendent, Mariposa County Unified School District, Mariposa
 Redding, Ray G., District Superintendent, Julian Union High School, Julian

COMMUNITY SCHOOL AND INTERMEDIATE UNIT

Rhodes, Alvin E., Superintendent, San Luis Obispo County Schools, San Luis Obispo; National Commission on the Intermediate Administrative Unit
 Seidel, Vaughn D., Superintendent, Alameda County Schools, Oakland
 Simmons, Linton T., Superintendent, Orange County Schools, Santa Ana
 Spencer, (Mrs.) Irene, General Supervisor, Contra Costa County Schools, Walnut Creek
 Stockton, Jesse D., Superintendent, Kern County Schools, Bakersfield
 Stone, Gladys, Superintendent, Monterey County Schools, Salinas
 Stroud, Clara, Staff Member, Imperial County Schools, El Centro
 Tierney, (Mrs.) Hallie M., Superintendent, Modoc County Schools, Alturas
 Triggs, Dean E., Superintendent, Ventura County Schools, Ventura
 Trillingham, C. C., Superintendent, Los Angeles County Schools, Los Angeles
 Walsh, (Mrs.) Mary Agnes, Elementary Coordinator, San Diego County Schools, (on leave), Orinda
 Walter, R. B., Chief Deputy County Superintendent, Los Angeles County Schools, San Gabriel
 Williams, J. Post, Superintendent, Tulare County Schools, Visalia
 Wilson, B. O., Superintendent, Contra Costa County Schools, Martinez; Second Vice-President, Division of County and Rural Area Superintendents; State Director; Advisory Council to the National Commission on the Intermediate Unit; Committee of County and Rural Area Superintendents to Work with CPEA.

INSTITUTIONAL MEMBERS

California State Library, Sacramento
 Dunbar Union Elementary School, Glen Ellen
 Honnold Library, Claremont College, Claremont
 Library, Chico State College, Chico
 Library, Educational Service Center, Santa Barbara County Schools, Goleta
 Library, Fresno State College, Fresno
 Library, San Jose State College, San Jose
 Library, University of California, Berkeley
 Library, University of California, Davis
 Library, University of California, Los Angeles
 Library, University of Redlands, Redlands
 Library, University of Southern California, Los Angeles
 Nian Teachers Club, Doris Sallows, President, Del Mar
 San Diego State College, San Diego

COLORADO

Auld, (Mrs.) Lucy C., Administrative Assistant, State Department of Education, Denver
 Bean, Luther E., Professor of Education, Adams State College, Alamosa
 Bishop, W. E., Superintendent, Englewood Public Schools, Englewood; Planning Committee, Rocky Mountain Regional Conference on Rural Life and Education
 Creaque, (Mrs.) Nan S., Superintendent, Prowers County Schools, Lamar
 Dever, O. L., (retired), Box 110, Boulder
 Grauburger, (Mrs.) Janet, Superintendent, Logan County Schools, Sterling
 Heid, Bertha, Superintendent, Adams County Schools, Brighton
 Kettle, Frances E., Superintendent, Custer County Schools, Westcliffe

Lockwood, Marian, Superintendent, Morgan County Schools, Fort Morgan
 Lytle, Ruth R., Superintendent, Otero County Schools, La Junta; Advisory Council to the National Commission on the Intermediate Administrative Unit; State Director
 Martin, (Mrs.) Hazel L., Superintendent, Bent County Schools, Las Animas
 Penneck, Glen Wildman, Superintendent, Boulder County Schools, Boulder
 Savage, Martha, Superintendent, Delta County Schools, Delta
 Webb, Eddy, Director of Field Service, Colorado Education Association, Denver

INSTITUTIONAL MEMBER

Library, Colorado State College of Education, Greeley

CONNECTICUT

Graff, George E., Superintendent of Rural Education, State Department of Education, Rockville; Committee of County and Rural Area Superintendents to Work with CPEA.
 Gustin, Margaret, Elementary Supervisor, State Board of Education, Unionville
 Hoctor, Cathryn R., Elementary Supervisor, New Haven
 McDonald, (Mrs.) Helen B., Elementary Supervisor, State Department of Education, Winsted
 Nichols, Marjorie H., Elementary Supervisor, Northeast District, State Office of Rural Education, Putnam
 Nybakken, Ernest O., Chief, Bureau of Rural Supervisory Service, State Department of Education, Hartford; State Director; Advisory Council to the National Commission on the Intermediate Administrative Unit; Executive Committee of the Department
 Reilly, John C., Superintendent, Supervisory District, Willimantic; Planning Committee, New England Regional Conference on Rural Life and Education
 Shultz, Wilmer L., Superintendent of Rural Education, State Department of Education, Canaan
 Stoddard, Paul W., Principal, Housatonic Valley High School, Falls Village
 Umberger, Willis H., Superintendent, Supervisory District, Norwich
 Walker, Mrs. M. E., President, Educational Publishing Corporation, Darien

DELAWARE

Afflerbach, Calvin E., Rural Supervisor, State Department of Public Instruction, Georgetown; State Director
 Baltz, Austin D., Principal, Oak Grove School, Elmore
 Caum, Jack H., Cowlyck School, New Castle
 Cheavens, Anne E., Supervisor, Art Education, State Department of Education, Dover
 Eisenbrey, Preston G., Supervisor of Transportation, State Department of Public Instruction, Dover
 Harrison, Mrs. Arrie J., Teacher, Millsboro
 Hastings, Grace E., Teacher, Farmington School, Bridgeville
 Heck, (Mrs.) Phyllis M., Supervisor, Rural Schools, Western New Castle County, Wilmington
 James, J. Stanley, Principal, Georgetown
 Johnson, (Mrs.) Elva M., Teacher, Millsboro
 Leasure, (Mrs.) May R., Teacher, New Castle County, Bear

ROSTER OF MEMBERS

235

Monroe, Mary Elizabeth, Sussex County Music Supervisor, State Department of Public Instruction, Georgetown
Norwood, Hilda C., Teacher, Lewes
Piper, (Mrs.) Viola W., Teacher, Milton School, Milton
Scott, (Mrs.) Agnes Norwood, Teacher, Lewes
Scott, Edith L. C., Principal, Milford
Short, Walter T., Principal, Gumboro School No. 27, Millsboro
Stewart, Robert C., Director of Research and Publications, State Department of Public Instruction, Dover
Simpson, William B., Superintendent, Caesar Rodney School, Camden

INSTITUTIONAL MEMBER

Library, University of Delaware, Newark

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Adkins, Lee W., Staff Associate, Rural Division, Automotive Safety Foundation
Bathurst, Effie, Research Assistant, Instructional Problems, Elementary Education Division, U. S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare; Committee on Publication and Constructive Studies
Carney, N. L., Office of Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare
Clark, Lois M., Assistant Director, Division of Rural Service, National Education Association
Connor, Frances Partridge, Research Assistant, Education of Handicapped Children, U. S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare
Cooper, Shirley, Assistant Executive Secretary, American Association of School Administrators, National Education Association
Dawson, Howard A., Director, Division of Rural Service; Executive Secretary to the Department, National Education Association
Early, Anne Lola, Division of Rural Service, National Education Association
Ellena, William J., Assistant to the Director, Division of Rural Service, National Education Association
Fitwater, C. O., Specialist in County and Rural School Administration, U. S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare; Chairman, Joint Committee with the Rural Sociological Society
Franseth, Jane, Specialist in Rural Education, Elementary Education Division, U. S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare
Gaumnitz, W. H., Specialist in Rural Education Problems, Secondary Education Division, U. S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare
Hess, Walter E., Managing Editor, National Association of Secondary-School Principals, National Education Association
Isenberg, Robert M., Assistant Director, Division of Rural Service, National Education Association
Lewis, Gertrude M., Specialist for Upper Grades, Elementary Education Division, U. S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare
McClure, Worth, Executive Secretary, American Association of School Administrators, National Education Association
Pope, Farnham, Dependent Schools Section, I and E Branch, Personnel Services Division PMP-12B, Director of Military Personnel, Air Force Headquarters

Taylor, J. L., Specialist in School Plant Management, U. S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare

FLORIDA

Christian, Floyd T., Superintendent, Pinellas County Schools, Clearwater
Darden, Woodrow J., Superintendent, Brevard County Schools, Titusville
Farnell, J. Crockett, Superintendent, Hillsborough County Schools, Tampa; State Director; Advisory Council to the National Commission on the Intermediate Unit

GEORGIA

Adams, E. F., Principal, Wrens
Attaway, Eugene, Sylvester
Bacon, Mrs. Jordye M., Superintendent, Liberty County Schools, Hinesville
Boddiford, J. Knapp, Superintendent, Screven County Schools, Savannah
Boyd, Willis M., Chairman, Rural Service Committee, Georgia Congress of Parents and Teachers, Adairsville
Burnham, Reba, Director, Resource-Use Education, Department of Education, University of Georgia, Athens
Clark, R. Stafford, Superintendent, Troup County Schools, La Grange
Collins, M. D., State Superintendent of Education, State Department of Education, Atlanta
Cook, L. H., Superintendent, Laurens County Schools, Dublin
Cox, Johnnye V., Director, Supervisor Training Program, University of Georgia, Athens
Deariso, Elizabeth J., Instructor Supervisor, Worth County Schools, Sylvester
Dempsey, Mrs. N. D., Consultant, Georgia Negro Elementary Schools, State Department of Education, Atlanta
Donovan, Elizabeth, Instruction Consultant, State Department of Education, Atlanta
Early, W. A., Superintendent, Catham County Schools, Savannah; Committee of County and Rural Area Superintendents to Work with CPEA
Hughes, Frank M., Superintendent, Cook County Schools, Adel
Mitchell, Mary Edward, Rockmart
Murdock, J. F., Superintendent, Floyd County Schools, Rome
Pafford, W. E., Director, State School Supervision, State Department of Education, Atlanta; Planning Committee, South Atlantic Regional Conference on Rural Life and Education
Rogers, N. A., Superintendent, Heard County Schools, Franklin
Saxon, J. Harold, Executive Secretary, Georgia Education Association, Atlanta
Smith, William S., Superintendent, Charlton County Schools, Folkston; State Director; National Commission on the Intermediate Administrative Unit
Southard, Orby, Professor of Education, North Georgia College, Dahlonega
Sprayberry, W. P., Superintendent, Cobb County Schools, Marietta
Strickland, A. J., City Superintendent of Schools, Trion
West, Paul D., Superintendent, Fulton County Schools, Atlanta

INSTITUTIONAL MEMBERS

W. C. Bradley Memorial Library, Columbus
Gwinnett County Library, (Mrs.) Ethlyn Potter Rolfe, Lawrenceville

Library, Georgia Teachers College, Collegeboro
 Library, North Georgia College, Dahlonega
 Library, University of Georgia, Athens

IDAHO

Butler, Violet, Superintendent, Power County Schools, American Falls
 Crossley, Edith E., Elementary Supervisor, Clearwater County Schools, Orofino; Advisory Council to the National Commission on the Intermediate Administrative Unit
 Eakin, Katharine S., Superintendent, Jerome County Schools, Jerome
 Eastman, Gertrude, State Elementary Supervisor, State Department of Education, Boise
 Goodman, (Mrs.) Elma M., Superintendent, Elmore County Schools, Mountain Home
 Grammer, Mary M., Superintendent, Owyhee County Schools, Murphy
 Grawell, Melvin, Superintendent, Fremont County District A-215, St. Anthony; Planning Committee, Northwest Regional Conference on Administrative Leadership Serving Community Schools
 Hulme, Amos B., Elementary Supervisor, Bear Lake County Schools, Paris
 Ockert, Clayton P., Principal, Lewiston
 Robinson, L. C., Superintendent of Schools, Moscow
 Stradley, Doris, Superintendent, Twin Falls County Schools, Twin Falls
 Williams, Homer D., Principal, Grace

INSTITUTIONAL MEMBER

Library, Idaho State College, Pocatello

ILLINOIS

Apt. Chris S., Superintendent, Henderson County Schools, Oquawka
 Arends, Ralph F., Superintendent, McLean County Schools, Bloomington
 Bailey, Dwight L., Director of Rural Education, Western Illinois State Teachers College, Macomb
 Battershell, B., Superintendent, Shelby County Schools, Shelbyville
 Black, Luther J., Secretary, State Teachers Certification Board, State Department of Public Instruction, Springfield; Committee on Recruitment and Preparation of Rural Teachers
 Blair, Clarence D., Superintendent, St. Clair County Schools, Belleville
 Bracewell, George, Associate Professor, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale
 Brudi, Lawrence E., Superintendent, Carroll County Schools, Mt. Carroll
 Carney, Mabel, Life Member, Rt. No. 2, Marseilles
 Chase, Francis S., Director, Education Communications Service, University of Chicago, Chicago
 Conklin, Paul S., Superintendent, Winnebago County Schools, Rockford
 Conway, Verne C., Superintendent, Warren County Schools, Monmouth
 Crackel, Verne E., Superintendent, Will County Schools, Joliet
 Deem, John C., Jacksonville
 Deweese, Forest L., Office of the Superintendent, Community Unit Schools, District No. 3, Taylorville
 Dickey, A. W., Superintendent, Dewitt County Schools, Clinton
 Dixon, Dorothy L., Assistant County Superintendent in Charge of Supervision, McDonough County Schools, Macomb

Dodds, A. Gordon, Superintendent, Franklin County Schools, Benton
 Elliott, R. H., Superintendent, Vermillion County Schools, Danville
 Endres, (Mrs.) Mary P., Superintendent, McHenry County Schools, District No. 10, Woodstock
 Ernest, Robert R., Superintendent, Macon County Schools, Decatur
 French, John H., Superintendent of Schools, Beecher
 Goodrich, (Mrs.) Lucile, Superintendent, Livingston County Schools, Pontiac
 Grant, Lodge, Superintendent, Hamilton County Schools, McLeansboro
 Hance, Wayne, Superintendent, Cumberland County Schools, Toledo
 Harshbarger, Ernest M., Superintendent, Champaign County Schools, Urbana
 Hoins, Helen L., Elementary Supervising Teacher, Macomb
 Keefe, J. A., Superintendent, Ford County Schools, Paxton
 Karp, Hester L., Superintendent, Scott County Schools, Winchester
 Leffler, Harold G., Superintendent, Jasper County Schools, Newton
 Leinauer, (Mrs.) Marjorie B., Superintendent, De Kalb County Schools, Sycamore; Executive Council of the Department; Advisory Council to the National Commission on the Intermediate Administrative Unit
 Leinbaugh, Howard M., Superintendent, Fulton County Schools, Lewistown
 McCannon, Roland, Manager, Illinois Pupil Reading Circle, Lincoln; Committee on Publications and Constructive Studies
 McCoy, E. E., Superintendent, Kane County Schools, Geneva
 Meek, Paul, Assistant Superintendent, Community Unit District No. 3, Waterloo
 Meyer, Pauline, Superintendent, Menard County Schools, Petersburg
 Miller, Van, Professor of Education, University of Illinois, Urbana
 Morgan, Lewis V., Superintendent, DuPage County Schools, Wheaton
 Olsen, Hans C., Director, Rural Education, Eastern Illinois State College, Charleston
 Parks, Catherine E., Assistant Superintendent, State Department of Public Instruction, Springfield
 Peck, J. R., Superintendent, Knox County Schools, Galesburg
 Pfisterer, T. R., Superintendent, Stephenson County Schools, Freeport
 Provatt, Philip A., Superintendent, Perry County Schools, Pinckneyville
 Puffer, Noble J., Superintendent, Cook County Schools, Chicago
 Rendleman, Russell D., Superintendent, Union County Schools, Jonesboro
 Rice, Eva Mae, Teacher, Le Roy
 Rice, Wilfrid E., Superintendent, Morgan County Schools, Jacksonville
 Roberts, R. P., Superintendent, Iroquois County Schools, Watseka
 Rosenstill, (Mrs.) Edith E., Assistant Superintendent, Jo Daviess County Schools, Galena
 Sax, Maurice F., Professor, Department of Education, University of Chicago, Chicago
 Torrens, John A., Superintendent, Lee County Schools, Dixon; State Director
 Tureman, (Mrs.) Cuba M., Superintendent, Calhoun County Schools, Hardin
 Vincent, Grace E., Sublette
 Walker, Lillias K., Superintendent, Grundy County Schools, Morris
 White, Arthur L., Superintendent, Henry County Schools, Cambridge
 Wilkins, George T., Superintendent, Madison County Schools, Edwardsville

ROSTER OF MEMBERS

Wilson, R. Dale, Superintendent, Saline County Schools, Harrisburg
Wrench, Frank, Superintendent, Piatt County Schools, Monticello

INSTITUTIONAL MEMBERS

Chicago Public Library, Chicago
General Library, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale
Illinois State Library, Springfield
Library, Eastern Illinois State Teachers College, Charleston
Library, National College of Education, Evanston
Library, Northern Illinois State College, De Kalb
Library, Northwestern University, Evanston
Library, University of Chicago, Chicago
Milner Library, Illinois State Normal University, Normal

INDIANA

Adair, Joseph N., Superintendent, Noble County Schools, Albion
Beck, Paul H., Superintendent, Randolph County Schools, Winchester
Brannock, Robert J., Superintendent, Lake County Schools, Crown Point
Crawford, Eldon R., Superintendent, Posey County Schools, Mt. Vernon
Davison, John H., Superintendent, Miami County Schools, Peru
Gardner, Hawley A., Superintendent, Union County Schools, Liberty
Gerichs, G. W., Superintendent, Pulaski County Schools, Winamac
Gladden, Robert F., Superintendent, Marion County Schools, Indianapolis
Grayson, Cecil A., 116 Goldsboro Street, Crown Point
Groff, Forrest R., Superintendent, Hamilton County Schools, Noblesville
Huntington, Ira L., Superintendent, Jasper County Schools, Rensselaer; Planning Committee, Great Lakes Regional Conference on Rural Life and Education
Kelsay, H. Paul, Superintendent, St. Joseph County Schools, South Bend
O'Hara, Warren, Director, Indiana Department of Education, Indiana Farm Bureau, Inc., Indianapolis
Peregrine, Donald, Superintendent, Stark County Schools, Knox
Pound, Clarence A., Associate Professor of Education and Consultant in Rural Education, Purdue University, Lafayette; Executive Committee of the Department; State Director; National Commission on the Intermediate Administrative Unit
Ratliff, Fred, Superintendent, Grant County Schools, Marion
Smith, Harold A., Superintendent, Huntington County Schools, Huntington
Strickler, Robert W., Notre Dame University, Notre Dame
Sutton, Clyde S., Superintendent, Elkhart County Schools, Goshen
Tower, J. Harold, Superintendent, La Porte County Schools, La Porte
Weising, Ralph J., Superintendent, Morgan County Schools, Martinsville
Wilkinson, Ross, Superintendent, Steuben County Schools, Angola
Williams, Edgar P., Superintendent, Benton County Schools, Fowler; Advisory Council to the National Commission on the Intermediate Administrative Unit
Yoder, Harry, Superintendent, Whitley County Schools, Columbia City
York, I. R., Superintendent, Daviess County Schools, Washington

INSTITUTIONAL MEMBERS

Ball State Teachers College, Muncie
Hicks Body Company, Inc., Lebanon
Indiana State Library, c/o Walter H. Lange, Indianapolis
Library, Butler University, Indianapolis
Library, Indiana State Teachers College, Terre Haute
Teachers Special Library, Indianapolis Instruction Center, Indianapolis
Wayne Works, Inc., Richmond

IOWA

Albers, Martin Z., Superintendent, Hardin County Schools, Eldora
Amen, Clarence E., Superintendent, Henry County Schools, Mt. Pleasant
Barker, Ernest W., Superintendent, Pottawattamie County Schools, Council Bluffs; Executive Committee, Division of County and Rural Area Superintendents
Barnes, Edna, Superintendent, Adair County Schools, Greenfield
Beran, Don L., Assistant Professor, College of Education, Drake University, Des Moines
Borreson, R. O., Superintendent of Schools, Sheldon
Bowersox, F. C., Superintendent, Clinton County Schools, Clinton
Brouhard, F. E., Superintendent, Shelby County Schools, Harlan
Byerley, (Mrs.) Edith, Superintendent, Hamilton County Schools, Webster City
Chappell, (Mrs.) Hazel V., Superintendent, Cerro Gordo County Schools, Mason City
Cleveland, G. S., Superintendent, Worth County Schools, Northwood
Coen, Edwin, Superintendent, Crawford County Schools, Denison
Culver, M. M., Superintendent of Schools, Gowrie
Cushman, M. L., Professor of Rural Education, Iowa State College, Ames; President of the Department, 1953-54; Planning Committee, Midwest Regional Conference on Rural Life and Education
Davis, Floyd A., Superintendent of Schools, Knoxville
DeKock, H. C., Coordinator of Field Experience, College of Education, University of Iowa, Iowa City; Executive Council of the Department
Dickens, Vera F., Superintendent, Ringgold County Schools, Mount Ayr
Dreier, William H., Instructor, Rural and Elementary Education, Department of Education, Iowa State Teachers College, Cedar Falls
Dunsmore, Gerald, Superintendent of Schools, Leon
Edgren, W. T., Director of Transportation, State Department of Public Instruction, Des Moines; State Director
Edie, Irwin W., Superintendent of Schools, Rudd
Ellson, Floyd L., Superintendent of Schools, Webb
England, J. H., Superintendent of Schools, Leon
Erickson, Dwight A., Superintendent, Warren County Schools, Indianola
Esbeck, Leo J., Superintendent of Schools, Ventura
Evans, Ralph C., Superintendent, Clarke County Schools, Osceola
Farris, Ralph J., Superintendent, Buchanan County Schools, Independence
Ferguson, C. L., Superintendent, Panora Public Schools, Panora
Fitzgerald, H. J., Superintendent, Elk Horn Public Schools, Elk Horn

- Friman, Maude, Superintendent, Adams County Schools, Corning
- Gill, Lester N., Superintendent, Cedar County Schools, Tipton
- Godfrey, Lloyd E., Superintendent, Dallas County Schools, Adel
- Goede, M. H., Superintendent, Allamakee County Schools, Waukon
- Green, R. J., Superintendent of Public Schools, Greenfield
- Hadley, C. G., Superintendent, Woodbury County Schools, Sioux City
- Hansen, C. Arthur, Superintendent of Public Schools, Earlham
- Harrison, A. E., Superintendent, Buena Vista County Schools, Storm Lake
- Hartman, W. Harold, Superintendent, Blackhawk County Schools, Waterloo
- Hendrickson, Abner A., Superintendent, Howard County Schools, Cresco
- Horgen, Gladys, Elementary Supervisor, State Department of Public Instruction, Des Moines
- Howell, Fannie G., Superintendent, Floyd County Schools, Charles City
- Hungerford, J. B., Superintendent of Public Schools, Cozmon
- Izenberger, W. W., Superintendent, Norway Consolidated School, Norway
- Johnson, L. E., Superintendent, Appanoose County Schools, Centerville
- Keho, Clifford, Superintendent of Schools, Coin
- Kiburz, (Mrs.) Gladys, Superintendent, Lucas County Schools, Chariton
- Kinkaid, Richard L., Superintendent of Schools, Terril
- Konarska, C. H., Superintendent, Guthrie County Schools, Guthrie Center
- Krabill, Lester B., Superintendent, Washington County Schools, Washington
- Lake, Carl H., Superintendent of Schools, Emerson
- Leon, Orissa, Superintendent, Jefferson County Schools, Fairfield
- Manchip, Raymond, Superintendent of Schools, Van Borne
- Martin, Charles F., Executive Secretary, Iowa State Education Association, Des Moines
- Mehlhaus, Ella, Superintendent, Benton County Schools, Vinton
- Messer, Frances I., Superintendent, Humboldt County Schools, Dakota City
- Milligan, Donald C., Superintendent, Davis County Schools, Bloomfield
- Malsberry, W. W., Superintendent, Keokuk County Schools, Sigourney
- Morris, Paul B., State Executive Secretary, Isaac Walton League of America, Inc., Des Moines
- Morris, R. A., Superintendent, Greene County Schools, Jefferson
- Norris, Ralph C., Superintendent, Polk County Schools, Des Moines; Advisory Council to the National Commission on the Intermediate Administrative Unit
- North, Ward T., Superintendent, Van Buren County Schools, Keosauqua
- Parker, Jessie M., State Superintendent, State Department of Public Instruction, Des Moines
- Pickett, L. L., Superintendent of Schools, Ruthven
- Polton, R. C., Superintendent of Schools, Tabor
- Price, W. K., Superintendent, Monona County Schools, Onawa
- Quintard, A. M., Superintendent, Kossuth County Schools, Algona
- Ralston, Frank, Superintendent, Muscatine County Schools, Muscatine
- Reed, Lula B., Superintendent, Montgomery County Schools, Red Oak
- Ringold, R. C., Superintendent, Marshall County Schools, Marshalltown
- Ritter, E. L., Director, Extension Service, Iowa State Teachers College, Cedar Falls
- Robinson, J. Clare, Superintendent, Webster County Schools, Fort Dodge
- Rowley, K. R., Superintendent, Butler County Schools, Allison
- Rupert, Charles L., Superintendent, Lee County Schools, Fort Madison
- Sankey, Claude W., Superintendent, Wright County Schools, Clarion
- Schindler, E. P., Superintendent, Story County Schools, Nevada
- Shannon, Boyd, Superintendent, Monticello Schools, Monticello
- Shepherd, Lou A., Extension Service, Iowa State Teachers College, Cedar Falls
- Shupp, Walter A., Superintendent, Linn County Schools, Cedar Rapids
- Simmmons, Ernest P., Superintendent, Tama County Schools, Toledo
- Smith, J. E., Superintendent, Palo Alto County Schools, Emmetsburg
- Snider, F. J., Superintendent, Johnson County Schools, Iowa City
- Speake, Jay B., Superintendent of Schools, George
- Spicknall, Howard J., Superintendent, Taylor County Schools, Redford
- Stoen, Charles G., Superintendent, Winnebago County Schools, Decorah
- Thomas, C. E., Superintendent of Schools, Manila
- Thomas, C. S., Superintendent, Marion County Schools, Knoxville
- Tweed, S. T., Superintendent, Winnebago County Schools, Forest City
- Tye, Charles H., Superintendent, Sioux County Schools, Orange City
- Vanderlinden, J. S., Superintendent, Perry Public Schools, Perry
- Vogel, A. O., Superintendent of Schools, Rock Rapids
- Wald, R. E., Superintendent of Schools, Carson
- Watson, R. R., Superintendent of Public Schools, Sheffield
- Whitney, Charles S., Superintendent, Hancock County Schools, Garner
- Woodruff, L. L., Superintendent, Des Moines County Schools, Burlington
- Young, (Mrs.) Frances, Superintendent, Pochontas County Schools, Pochontas

KANSAS

- Arnold, LaVerne R., Superintendent, Osborne County Schools, Osborne; National Commission on the Intermediate Administrative Unit
- Berk, Emma, Superintendent, Douglas County Schools, Lawrence
- Brown, Minter E., Director of Professional Relations, State Teachers Association, Topeka
- Clark, Lottie M., Superintendent, Pratt County Schools, Pratt
- Chek, Mabel, Superintendent, Johnson County Schools, Olathe
- Correll, Frank E., Superintendent, Dickinson County Schools, Abilene
- DeBolt, Alma, Superintendent, Labette County Schools, Oswego
- Downs, (Mrs.) Elsie, Superintendent, Miami County Schools, Paola
- Eddington, (Mrs.) Olive, Superintendent, Seward County Schools, Liberal
- Engstrand, Agnes, Elementary School Supervisor, State Department of Education, Topeka; State Director
- Gahnstrom, Ruth, Superintendent, Saline County Schools, Salina

ROSTER OF MEMBERS

239

Golladay, (Mrs.) Edna, Superintendent, Bourbon County Schools, Fort Scott.
 Graf, (Mrs.) Christina D., Superintendent, Russell County Schools, Russell.
 Granger, Ota, Superintendent, Meade County Schools, Meade.
 Harris, Edith, Superintendent, Rooks County Schools, Stockton.
 Herr, F. Floyd, Certification and College Accreditation, State Department of Public Instruction, Topeka; Planning Committee, Midwest Regional Conference on Rural Life and Education.
 Holroyd, Flora E., Assistant Professor of Rural Education, Kansas State Teachers Coll. in Pittsburg.
 Johnson, Homer L., Associate Professor of Education, Kansas State Teachers College, Pittsburg.
 Kappelman, G. B., Superintendent, Cloud County Schools, Concordia.
 Kelly, (Mrs.) Tressa, Superintendent, Republic County Schools, Helienville.
 Kensler, Pearl, Superintendent, Sedgwick County Schools, Wichita.
 King, John E., President, Kansas State Teachers College, Emporia.
 Kugler, Floyd, Superintendent, Smith County Schools, Smith Center.
 Laydie, Genevieve, Superintendent, Brown County Schools, Hiawatha.
 McBride, Mollie, Superintendent, Rawlins County Schools, Atwood.
 McKinley, (Mrs.) Jennie, Superintendent, Barber County Schools, Medicine Lodge.
 Menhusen, A. T., Superintendent, Jewell County Schools, Markata.
 Micha, J. Florence A., Superintendent, Harvey County Schools, Newton.
 Miller, (Mrs.) Ethel L., Superintendent, Grant County Schools, Ulysses.
 Moore, (Mrs.) Edna, Superintendent, Greeley County Schools, Tribune.
 Munsell, Marie, Superintendent, Morris County Schools, Council Grove.
 Nelson, (Mrs.) Winifred M., Superintendent, Jackson County Schools, Holton.
 Olson, (Mrs.) Iris R., Norton.
 Osborne, Viola M., Superintendent, Hamilton County Schools, Syracuse.
 Pettey, (Mrs.) Leda, Superintendent, Clay County Schools, Clay Center.
 Pope, (Mrs.) Myrtle M., Superintendent, Allen County Schools, Iola.
 Rambo, W. L., Superintendent, Crawford County Schools, Girard.
 Roether, Jane E., Superintendent, Geary County Schools, Junction City.
 Rosel, (Mrs.) Leora, Superintendent, Stevens County Schools, Hugoton.
 Roth, Anthony E., Superintendent, Ellis County Schools, Hays.
 Seerest, (Mrs.) Madge L., Superintendent, Riley County Schools, Manhattan.
 Sexton, (Mrs.) Ruth Flory, Superintendent, Elk County Schools, Howard.
 Snell, (Mrs.) Mabel M., Superintendent, Wichita County Schools, Leoti.
 Steele, (Mrs.) Martha, Superintendent, Sherman County Schools, Goodland.
 Stencepher, E. E., Life Member, 1914 South Leost, Pittsburg.
 Sturges, (Mrs.) Catharine, Superintendent, Cheataqua County Schools, Sedan.
 Taylor, (Mrs.) Beulah, Superintendent, Ford County Schools, Dodge City.
 Taylor, H. T., Superintendent, Mitchell County Schools, Beloit.
 Therkelsen, Marie, Superintendent, Montgomery County Schools, Independence.
 Throckmorton, Adol F., State Superintendent of Public Instruction, State Department of Education, Topeka.

Vinson, (Mrs.) Ida M., Superintendent, Chase County Schools, Cottonwood Falls.
 Williams, (Mrs.) Cora, Superintendent, Haskell County Schools, Sublette.
 Young, Orville C., Superintendent, Rush County Schools, La Crosse; Advisory Council to the National Commission on the Intermediate Administrative Unit.
 Zeller, Dale, Professor of Education, Kansas State Teachers College, Emporia.

INSTITUTIONAL MEMBER

Porter Library, Kansas State Teachers College, Pittsburg.

KENTUCKY

Ambrise, Luther M., Chairman, Department of Education, Berea College, Berea; Committee on Rural Life and Education in the World Scene.
 Archer, M. L., Superintendent, Scott County Schools, Georgetown.
 Bell, Ira, Superintendent, Wayne County Schools, Monticello.
 Brown, E. D., Superintendent, Breckinridge County Schools, Hardinsburg.
 Burkhead, C. C., Superintendent, Hardin County Schools, Elizabethtown.
 Carty, P. J., Director, Public Relations, Eastern Kentucky State Teachers College, Richmond.
 Cole, Mary L., Western Kentucky State Teachers College, Bowling Green.
 Dodson, J. M., Acting Executive Secretary, Treasurer, Kentucky Education Association, Louisville.
 Ferrell, D. Thomas, Head, Department of Education, Eastern Kentucky State Teachers College, Richmond; Planning Committee, Midsouth Regional Conference on Rural Life and Education.
 Ginger, Lyman V., University of Kentucky, Lexington.
 Graham, Charles C., Professor of Education, Berea College, Berea.
 Haggan, Henry C., Head, Department of Agriculture, Morehead State College, Morehead.
 Hall, Floyd, Superintendent, Boyd County Schools, Catlettsburg.
 Henry, Victor P., President, Lindsay Wilson College, Columbia.
 Jagers, Richard E., Professor of Education, Eastern Kentucky State College, Richmond.
 Jessee, Mabel C., Supervisor, Rural School Improvement Project, Bentleysville.
 Jones, Lee Francis, Head, Department of Education, Western Kentucky State College, Bowling Green.
 Maxpin, Audrey, Supervisor, Clinton County Schools, Albany.
 McGuire, H. H., Superintendent, Carter County Schools, Grayson.
 Moore, W. J., Dean, Eastern Kentucky State College, Richmond.
 Sutton, Elizabeth, Educational Coordinator, Breathitt County Schools, Jackson; State Director.
 Swearingen, Orville L., Superintendent, Pulaski County Schools, Somerset.
 Taylor, Sam B., Assistant Director, Division of Supervision, State Department of Education, Frankfort.
 Turner, (Mrs.) Marie, Superintendent, Breathitt County Schools, Jackson; Executive Council of the Department.
 Turpen, N. C., Superintendent, Fayette County Schools, Lexington.
 Van Hoose, Richard, Superintendent, Jefferson County Schools, Louisville.
 Walker, Garnet, Attendance Officer, Wayne County Schools, Monticello.

Ward, (Mrs.) Emma R., Superintendent, Anderson County Schools, Lawrenceburg; Advisory Council to the National Commission on the Intermediate Administrative Unit
 Ward, E. R., Assistant Superintendent, Fayette County Schools, Lexington
 Watts, David, Principal, Elementary School, Jackson

INSTITUTIONAL MEMBERS

Johnson Camden Library, Morehead State College, Morehead
 Lees Junior College, Jackson

LOUISIANA

Babin, Larry J., Life Member, Donaldson; Planning Committee, MidSouth Regional Conference on Rural Life and Education
 Barrow, Clark L., Director of Higher Education, State Department of Education, Baton Rouge
 Brunson, W. C., Principal, Dutch Town High School, Dutch Town
 Champagne, R. E., Principal, St. Amant High School, St. Amant
 Collette, Mabel, Supervisor, State Department of Education, Baton Rouge
 Daniel, J. L., Jr., Assistant High School Supervisor, Baton Rouge
 Easley, Mrs. A. M., Elementary Supervisor, Tallulah
 Foste, John M., Life Member, Baton Rouge
 Glaze, Henry P., Principal, Gonzales High School, Gonzales
 Hanchev, K. R., Superintendent, Beauregard Parish Schools, De Ridder
 Koonce, John David, Superintendent, Jackson Parish Schools, Jonesboro
 Landry, Grace N., Jeanes Supervisor, Minden
 Laverne, Kerai, Superintendent, West Baton Rouge Parish Schools, Port Allen
 Pearce, H. L., Supervisor of Schools, Livingston
 Richard, C. V., Principal, Galvez Elementary School, Port Vincent
 Terrellone, L. P., Life Member, Plaquemine
 Thatcher, Fred G., Executive Secretary, Louisiana School Boards Association, Baton Rouge
 Thomas, H. M., Superintendent of Schools, Oak Grove
 Thompson, James B., Jr., Superintendent, Richland Parish Schools, Rayville
 White, Roscoe H., Superintendent, Caddo Parish Schools, Shreveport; State Director; Advisory Council to the National Commission on the Intermediate Administrative Unit

INSTITUTIONAL MEMBERS

Materials Library, Richland Parish Schools, Rayville
 Russell Library, Northwestern State College, Natchitoches

MAINE

Aikens, Frederick H., Superintendent, Supervisory Union No. 15, South Windham
 Gilman, Stanwood C., Superintendent, Supervisory Union No. 48, Sebago Estates
 Quinn, (Mrs.) Villa E. Haden, State Elementary Supervisor, State Department of Education, Augusta

MARYLAND

Ahalt, Arthur M., Professor and Head, Department of Agricultural Education, University of Maryland, College Park

Bennett, J. M., Superintendent, Wicomico County Schools, Salisbury
 Boston, W. T., Division of Accreditation, State Department of Education, Baltimore
 Brish, William M., Superintendent, Washington County Schools, Hagerstown; Advisory Council to the National Commission on the Intermediate Administrative Unit
 Brown, (Mrs.) Lola P., Supervisor of Pupil Personnel and Colored Elementary Schools, Board of Education, Centerville
 Burdette, Eunice E., Elementary School Supervisor, Prince Georges County, Hyattsville
 Carlson, C. Allen, Superintendent, Somerset County Schools, Princess Anne
 Claxton, P. P., Life Member, 314 Leighton Avenue, Silver Spring
 Cooper, Paul D., Superintendent, Worcester County Schools, Snow Hill
 Corr, Reade W., Superintendent, Kent County Schools, Chestertown
 Davis, J. Willard, Superintendent, Talbot County Schools, Easton
 Dent, Lettie M., Superintendent, St. Mary's County Schools, Leonardtown
 Dunkle, Maurice A., Superintendent, Calvert County Schools, Prince Frederick
 Gordon, Walter M., Supervisor of Transportation, Hyde
 Hardesty, R. Bowen, Superintendent, Garrett County Schools, Oakland
 Hawkins, Elmer T., Principal, Garnett High School, Chestertown
 Hobbs, (Mrs.) Pauline V., Elementary Supervisor, Baltimore County Schools, Baltimore
 Hoffmaster, Paul L., Director of Transportation, Frederick County Schools, Frederick
 Huffington, Paul E., 2 West Redwood St., Baltimore
 Hughes, H. R., Prince Frederick
 Jenkins, David S., Superintendent, Anne Arundel County Schools, Annapolis
 Jenness, Samuel M., Superintendent, Carroll County Schools, Westminster
 Martin, T. C., Superintendent, Charles County Schools, La Plata
 Murray, Ray A., University of Maryland, College Park
 Norris, Forbes H., Superintendent, Montgomery County Schools, Rockville
 Oliver, J. A., Professor, Rural Life and Education, Maryland State College, Princess Anne
 Rannels, M. W., Superintendent, Cecil County Schools, Elkton
 Rhodes, Harry C., Superintendent, Queen Anne County Schools, Centerville
 Stapleton, Edward G., Superintendent, Baltimore County Schools, Towson; First Vice-President, Division of County and Rural Area Superintendents; State Director
 Webster, Ralph R., Superintendent, Allegany County Schools, Cumberland
 Willis, C. W., Superintendent, Harford County Schools, Bel Air
 Wilson, (Mrs.) Caroline, Elementary School Supervisor, Garrett County Schools, Oakland
 Yingling, John E., Superintendent, Howard County Schools, Ellicott City

MASSACHUSETTS

Mitchell, Donald, Harvard Graduate School, Waltham

INSTITUTIONAL MEMBER

University of Massachusetts, Education Department, Amherst

MICHIGAN

Ansel, James O., Associate Professor of Education, Department of Rural Life and Education, Western Michigan College of Education, Kalamazoo
 Bacon, Mrs. Ruth N., Superintendent, St. Clair County Schools, Port Huron
 Bickford, Fern E., Life Member, Coldwater Board, Russell L., Superintendent, Mecosta County Schools, Big Rapids
 Brake, Charles E., Assistant Superintendent, Wayne County Schools, Detroit; Executive Committee of the Department; Vice-President of the Department, 1954-55
 Brumbaugh, Donald S., Principal, Detroit High School, Detroit
 Dondineau, Mrs. Bernice, Wayne County Schools, Detroit; Committee on Rural Life and Education in the World Scene
 Fischer, Fred C., Superintendent, Wayne County Schools, Detroit
 Fox, Robert S., Principal, University Elementary School, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor; Chairman, Committee on Publications and Constructive Studies
 Francis, John R., Superintendent, Sanilac County Schools, Sandusky
 Holmquist, E. O., Superintendent, Missaukee County Schools, Lake City
 Howard, Mrs. Daisy E., Superintendent, Genesee County Schools, Flint
 Jaffee, Abraham, Superintendent, St. Joseph County Schools, Centerville
 Kaufman, Jennie M., Superintendent, Ottawa County Schools, Grand Haven
 Le Fevre, Harold E., Superintendent, Macomb County Schools, Mount Clemens
 Main, William M., Rural Supervisor, Genesee County Schools, Flint
 McCallum, Gladys, Superintendent, Livingston County Schools, Howell
 Owen, J. Willis, Superintendent, School District 4, Dearborn Township, Dearborn School, Dearborn
 Petrude, Olive M., Superintendent, Wexford County Schools, Cadillac
 Rice, C. Alfred, Superintendent, Branch County Schools, Coldwater
 Robinson, William McKinley, Director, Department of Rural Life and Education, Western Michigan College of Education, Kalamazoo; Chairman, Committee on Recruitment and Preparation of Rural Teachers
 Rollin, Russell A., Superintendent, Iosco County Schools, Tawas City
 Sanders, Luelle E., Secretary, Department of Rural Life and Education, Western Michigan College of Education, Kalamazoo
 Simmons, W. T., Superintendent, Montcalm County Schools, Stanton
 Sixma, S. H. M., Superintendent of School Boards, Muskegon
 Slavens, Opal, Rural Supervisor, Macomb County Schools, Mount Clemens
 Smith, Mrs. F. Margaret, Superintendent, Shiawassee County Schools, Corunna
 Squire, Fred, Superintendent, Midland County Schools, Midland
 Stearns, Troy L., Head, Department of Elementary Education, Michigan State College, East Lansing
 Temple, Ben L., Superintendent, Huron County Schools, Bad Axe
 Thayer, Howard C., Deputy Superintendent of Schools, Washtenaw County Schools, Ann Arbor; Planning Committee, Great Lakes Regional Conference on Rural Life and Education
 Torrant, Lyle A., Superintendent, Jackson County Schools, Jackson; State Director
 Welliver, Edith L., Supervisor, Wayne County Schools, Detroit

Whetstone, Clinton F., Superintendent, Calhoun County Schools, Marshall; Advisory Council to the National Commission on the Intermediate Administrative Unit

INSTITUTIONAL MEMBERS

Detroit Public Library, Detroit
 Library, Central Michigan College, Mount Pleasant
 Library, Michigan State Normal College, Ypsilanti
 Library, Western Michigan College of Education, Kalamazoo

MINNESOTA

Anderson, Harriett, Superintendent, Meeker County Schools, Litchfield
 Archer, Clifford P., Professor of Education, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis; Chairman, Committee on Rural Life and Education in the World Scene
 Armstrong, Grace, Assistant Director of Professional Education, State Teachers College, Mankato
 Burneman, George H., Superintendent of Schools, Tracy
 Byrd, Esther, Superintendent, Kanabec County Schools, Mora
 Burbie, Mrs. Gertrude Hall, Superintendent, Itasca County Schools, Grand Rapids
 Chord, Mrs. Minnie O., Teacher, Aitkin County Schools, Palisade
 Christianson, Charles, Superintendent, Roseau County Schools, Roseau; Advisory Council to the National Commission on the Intermediate Administrative Unit
 Coleman, Mrs. Jennie, Superintendent, Isanti County Schools, Cambridge
 Corneliusen, Alice L., Principal, College Elementary Laboratory School, State Teachers College, Moorhead
 Craig, Mrs. L. E., Redwood Falls
 Cross, C. Willard, Superintendent of Schools, Faribault
 Dittes, W. H., Superintendent, Indian Consolidated District No. 47, New York Mills
 Douglas, Ruth, Superintendent, Mille Lacs County Schools, Milaca
 Elke, Estelle L., High School Teacher Training, Little Falls
 Engum, T. C., Director, Ungraded Elementary Schools, State Department of Education, St. Paul; Joint Committee with the Rural Sociological Society
 Erickson, Mrs. Mabel O., Superintendent, Douglas County Schools, Alexandria
 Fox, Abe L., Superintendent of Schools, Minnesota Lake
 Frost, Jennie M., Superintendent, Lyon County Schools, Marshall
 Gordhamer, Mrs. Linna V., Superintendent, Wilkin County Schools, Breckenridge
 Haggerty, Michael J., Supervisor, Transportation, State Department of Education, Minneapolis; Executive Committee, Division of School Transportation
 Halvorson, G. R., Superintendent of Schools, Chatfield
 Hanson, Mrs. Norene, Superintendent, Stevens County Schools, Morris
 Hanson, Sena, Teacher Training, East Grand Forks
 Hanson, Willard E., Consultant, School Survey and Reorganization, State Department of Education, Brainerd
 Heck, Frank V., Supervisor of Elementary Schools, New Ulm
 Hill, Dolson W., Superintendent, Tri-Mont Schools, Triumph
 Howe, Caroline J., Superintendent, McLeod County Schools, Glencoe

Hughes, J. A., City Superintendent of Schools, Forest Lake
 James, Audrey, Superintendent, Murray County Schools, Slayton; Executive Committee, Division of County and Rural Area Superintendents
 Jansen, John R., Superintendent of Schools, Madelia
 Johnson, Carroll M., Superintendent of Schools, Sanborn
 Kohlhaas, J. C., Superintendent, Koochiching County Schools, International Falls
 Koivisto, E. J., Principal, Homecroft School, Duluth
 Lapham, Gladys H., Superintendent, Houston County Schools, Caledonia
 Larsen, (Mrs.) Myrtle K., Superintendent, Pine County Schools, Pine City
 Malmquist, M. L., Superintendent of Schools, Grand Rapids
 Mainrose, (Mrs.) Addie N., Superintendent, Watonwan County Schools, St. James
 Matejka, (Mrs.) Myrtle, Superintendent, Clay County Schools, Moorhead
 Mathews, Gladys, Superintendent, Todd County Schools, Long Prairie
 Matson, Margaret, Superintendent, Waseca County Schools, Waseca
 McKee, John C., Fergus Falls
 Melin, (Mrs.) Nordica, Superintendent, Chisago County Schools, Center City
 Meyer, Eugene, Supervisor, School District Survey, State Department of Education, St. Paul
 Miller, Ralph E., Associate Professor, School of Agriculture, University of Minnesota, St. Paul
 Murphy, Edna I., Life Member, Grand Rapids
 Nelson, Agnes H., Superintendent, Big Stone County Schools, Ortonville
 Nelson, Lowry, Professor of Sociology, University of Minnesota, St. Paul
 Niernberg, W. O., Superintendent, Rice County Schools, Faribault
 Parker, Glenn C., Superintendent of Schools, Walker
 Paulson, Myrtle J., Superintendent, Becker County Schools, Detroit Lakes
 Petersen, Harold A., Superintendent of Schools, Tyler
 Peterson, Milo J., Head, Agricultural Education Department, University of Minnesota, St. Paul; Planning Committee, Midwest Regional Conference on Rural Life and Education
 Plumb, Valworth R., University of Minnesota, Duluth Branch, Duluth
 Rippey, (Mrs.) Elizabeth, Superintendent, Lake of the Woods County Schools, Baudette
 Salmi, W. W., Superintendent, St. Louis County Schools, Duluth; State Director
 Schimming, Vernice, Superintendent, Renville County Schools, Olivia
 Schmidt, Harlan A., Superintendent of Schools, Rapidan
 Scott, Robert E., Superintendent, Hennepin County Schools, Minneapolis
 Shaw, Glenn R., Superintendent, Walnut Grove Schools, Walnut Grove
 Skog, Melville, Superintendent of Schools, Herman
 Stapleton, C. L., Superintendent, Beltrami County Schools, Bemidji
 Swanson, Gordon I., Instructor, Agricultural Education, University of Minnesota, St. Paul
 Swenson, Louise, Superintendent, Carlton County Schools, Carlton
 Thorpe, Clara, Superintendent, Yellow Medicine County Schools, Granite Falls
 Thorson, (Mrs.) Dorothy, Superintendent, Kandiyohi County Schools, Willmar

Tellefson, Dora L., Superintendent, Mower County Schools, Austin
 Vig, A. M., Superintendent, Freeborn County Schools, Albert Lea
 Walien, (Mrs.) Valborg, Superintendent, Chippewa County Schools, Montevideo
 Webster, Jerome O., Superintendent of Schools, Winnebago
 Weitzman, (Mrs.) Blanda C., Superintendent, Nobles County Schools, Worthington
 Williams, Bernice, Rural Supervisor, State Teachers College, St. Cloud
 Wylie, John W., Superintendent of Schools, Frazee
 Younggren, Ruth I., Superintendent, Kittson County Schools, Hallock
 Zicafoose, Lawrence, Superintendent, Borup Consolidated School, Borup

INSTITUTIONAL MEMBERS

Library, State Teachers College, Moorhead
 Library, State Teachers College, St. Cloud
 Minneapolis Public Library, Minneapolis
 Winona State Teachers College, Winona

MISSISSIPPI

Barrett, John L., Superintendent, Neshubee County Schools, Macon
 Raggan, W. E., Superintendent, Franklin County Schools, Meadville
 Cunningham, J. W., Superintendent, Winston County Schools, Louisville
 Daniel, Mrs. Fort, Superintendent, Marshall County Schools, Holly Springs
 Haymon, C. E., Superintendent, Sardis Public Schools, Sardis
 Luther, Barney, Superintendent, Pontotoc County Schools, Pontotoc
 Manroe, Otho, Superintendent of Schools, Senatobia
 Mayo, Robert M., Superintendent, Hinds County Schools, Jackson; State Director; Advisory Council to the National Commission on the Intermediate Administrative Unit
 McKenzie, Norman H., Superintendent, Holly Springs City Schools, Holly Springs
 McMillan, W. W., Manager, Bus Sales, Superior Coach Corporation, Southern Division, Kosciusko
 Middleton, Ben F., Executive Secretary, Mississippi State Textbook Purchasing Board, Jackson
 Montgomery, (Mrs.) Annie Kelly, Jeanes Teacher, Water Valley
 Moor, Bluford L., Superintendent, Oktobeha County Schools, Starkville
 Nix, Herbert, Superintendent, Monroe County Schools, Aberdeen
 Rawson, E. P., Assistant State Supervisor, State Department of Education, Jackson
 Richey, Elizabeth, Elementary Supervisor, Tiptah County Schools, Ripley
 Travis, J. A., Assistant Secretary, Field Service, State Education Association, Jackson; Planning Committee, Mid-south Regional Conference on Rural Life and Education

INSTITUTIONAL MEMBER

Library, University of Mississippi, University

MISSOURI

Beck, J. Abner, Superintendent, Mississippi County Schools, Charleston
 Brand, J. H., Superintendent, Crawford County Schools, Steelville

Brandt, Viola A., State Supervisor of Elementary Schools, State Department of Education, Jefferson City
Burnside, J. A., Superintendent, Carroll County Schools, Carrollton
Capps, A. G., Professor of Education, University of Missouri, Columbia
Clements, Homer M., Superintendent, Jackson County Schools, Independence
Dillingey, Minda J., Elementary Principal, Rich Hill
Elmore, Charles, Calneville
Eubanks, Mrs. Don L., Superintendent, Bates County Schools, Butler
Graves, Mary F., Superintendent, Macon County Schools, Macon
Guth, Mrs. Ora N., Superintendent, Perry County Schools, Perryville
Henry, W. R., Superintendent, Camden County Schools, Camden
Hills, Mrs. Stella, Superintendent, Adair County Schools, Kirksville
Hudson, Bessie, Superintendent, Knox County Schools, Edina
Jenkins, Mrs., Nannie, Superintendent, Hickory County Schools, Hermitage
Jones, Leonard, Superintendent, Buchanan County Schools, St. Joseph
Lloyd, Alfred W., Superintendent, Monticau County Schools, California
McDonald, Moss, Superintendent, Morgan County Schools, Versailles; State Director, Advisory Council to the National Commission on Intermediate Administrative Unit
Milligan, Ruth, Superintendent, Harrison County Schools, Bethany
Mittler, E. F., Northeast Missouri State Teachers College, Kirksville
Myers, Mrs. W. Leslie, Superintendent, Clinton County Schools, Plattsburg
Oliver, Stanley C., Professor of Education, Southwest Missouri State College, Springfield
Owen, John, Superintendent, Benton County Schools, Warsaw
Pattinson, Sallie, Assistant Professor of Rural Education, Northeast Missouri State Teachers College, Kirksville
Ridings, G. H., Superintendent, Dunklin County Schools, Kennett
Rinehart, Mrs., Vera, Superintendent, Linn County Schools, Brookfield
Scotten, C. F., Superintendent, Pettis County Schools, Sedalia
Smith, Callie C., Superintendent, Scotland County Schools, Memphis
Snarr, Mrs., Ruth G., Superintendent, Montgomery County Schools, Montgomery City
Stewart, W. Donald, Superintendent, Cass County Schools, Harrisonville
Summers, Arthur L., Director of Reorganization of School Districts, State Department of Education, Jefferson City; Planning Committee, Midwest Regional Conference on Rural Life and Education
Thorp, Cary Dean, Superintendent, Boone County Schools, Columbia
Wells, Nellie F., Superintendent, Johnson County Schools, Warrensburg
Wright, John A., Superintendent, Stoddard County Schools, Bloomfield
Young, Gertrude, Superintendent, Mercer County Schools, Princeton

INSTITUTIONAL MEMBERS

Kent Library, Southeast Missouri State College, Cape Girardeau
Library, Central Missouri State College, Warrensburg

MONTANA

Barnard, Lula, Superintendent, Flathead County Schools, Kalispell; Advisory Council to the National Commission on the Intermediate Administrative Unit; Committee on Publications and Constructive Studies
Cafe, Arden B., Superintendent, Missoula County Schools, Missoula
Condon, Mary M., State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Helena
Cooper, Mrs., Agnes Hannon, Superintendent, Ravalli County Schools, Hamilton
Deegan, Mrs., Margaret, Superintendent, Sweet Grass County Schools, Big Timber
Fossen, Mrs., Alice, Superintendent, Rosevelt County Schools, Wolf Point
Haigh, Mrs. Rex, Director, State Correspondence School, Missoula
Haynes, Mrs., Martha, Superintendent, Gallatin County Schools, Bozeman
Hopkins, Albert, Head, Department of Education and Psychology, Northern Montana College, Havre
Kozack, Wallace W., Superintendent, Clinton Public School, Clinton
McLean, Mrs., Marie A., Rural Teacher, Garrison
Mikkelsen, Mrs., Agnes, Superintendent, Jefferson County Schools, Boulder
Moore, Mrs., Winifred H., Missoula
Morris, La Vella V., Superintendent, Broadwater County Schools, Townsend
Paterson, Hilfred R., Superintendent, Park County Schools, Livingston
Peterson, Mrs., Lillian L., 605 Seventh, Kalispell
Sherle, Mrs., Opal, Superintendent, Hill County Schools, Havre
Spearin, Mrs., May Y., Superintendent, Golden Valley County Schools, Ryegate
Squires, Genevieve, Deputy State Superintendent, State Department of Public Instruction, Helena
Strand, Mrs., Lura P., Superintendent, Big Horn County Schools, Hardin
Ternstrom, Alice H., Superintendent, Liberty County Schools, Chester
Thersen, Mildred, Superintendent, Richland County Schools, Sidney
Turner, Mrs., Thelma R., Superintendent, Blaine County Schools, Chinook

NEBRASKA

Baldridge, Chlo C., Teacher, Lincoln
Barnes, Eva M., Superintendent, Boyd County Schools, Butte
Bennett, Jennie, Superintendent, Sheridan County Schools, Rushville
Bigelow, Doris, Superintendent, Gosper County Schools, Elwood; State Director
Boone, G. T., Superintendent, Jefferson County Schools, Fairbury
Bratten, Mrs., Edna, Superintendent, Red Willow County Schools, McCook
Bugee, H. D., Superintendent, Nemaha County Schools, Auburn
Canaday, Golda, Superintendent, Kearney County Schools, Minden
Casteck, John, Superintendent, Dawes County Schools, Chadron
Colligan, Bernard, Superintendent, Burt County Schools, Tekamah
Comstock, Mrs., Hazel, Superintendent, York County Schools, York
Cox, Susie, Deputy Superintendent, Custer County Schools, Broken Bow
Cramer, Mrs., Miriam B., Superintendent, Nuckolls County Schools, Nelson
Cunningham, Eldon P., Superintendent, Hall County Schools, Grand Island

Day, (Mrs.) Marietta C., Superintendent, Thomas County Schools, Thadford
 Day, (Mrs.) Myrtle V., Superintendent, Dixon County Schools, Ponca
 Decker, F. B., State Superintendent of Public Instruction, State Department of Public Instruction, Lincoln
 Deisinger, Lena C., Superintendent, Howard County Schools, St. Paul
 Dixon, Clair C., Superintendent, Merrick County Schools, Central City
 Dodson, Mary, Superintendent, Saline County Schools, Wilber
 Eckard, Bessie F., Superintendent, Pawnee County Schools, Pawnee City
 Eggers, (Mrs.) Elizabeth, Superintendent, Keith County Schools, Ogallala
 Elliott, Allen A., Supervisor, School Lunch Program, State Department of Public Instruction, Lincoln
 Ellison, (Mrs.) Elizabeth A., Superintendent, Saunders County Schools, Wahoo
 Estes, Glen C., Superintendent, Rock County Schools, Bassett
 Extrom, Paul E., Superintendent, Lincoln County Schools, North Platte
 Farley, Rosalie W., Coordinator of In-Service Program, Teachers College, University of Nebraska, Lincoln; Executive Committee of the Department
 French, Alice L., Superintendent, Holt County Schools, O'Neill
 Gilman, (Mrs.) Missetta, Superintendent, Madison County Schools, Madison
 Gilmore, Mary, Superintendent, Custer County Schools, Broken Bow
 Gorman, Frank H., Dean, College of Education, University of Omaha, Omaha; Committee on Recruitment and Preparation of Rural Teachers
 Grosshans, (Mrs.) Irma, Superintendent, Kimball County Schools, Kimball
 Hamaker, (Mrs.) Grace A., Superintendent, Brown County Schools, Ainsworth
 Hanika, Mrs. R. A., Superintendent, Richardson County Schools, Falls City
 Hanley, (Mrs.) Ada, Superintendent, Hayes County Schools, Hayes Center
 Harris, Wenona, Superintendent, Adams County Schools, Hastings
 Hauser, W. J., Superintendent, Douglas County Schools, Omaha
 Henthorn, E. C., Superintendent, Sarpy County Schools, Papillion
 Hill, (Mrs.) Alice, Superintendent, Logan County Schools, Stapleton
 Huber, (Mrs.) Anna M., Superintendent, Washington County Schools, Blair
 Jackson, (Mrs.) Elva, Superintendent, Buffalo County Schools, Kearney
 Konecni, (Mrs.) Virginia, Superintendent, Dakota County Schools, Dakota City
 Kessler, Jessie G., Superintendent, Nance County Schools, Fullerton
 Larson, Lillian, Supervisor of Elementary Education, Fremont
 Lawson, (Mrs.) Minnie D., Superintendent, Wheeling County Schools, Bartlett
 Lee, (Mrs.) Kathryn F., Superintendent, Banner County Schools, Harrisburg
 Marshall, (Mrs.) Edith M., Superintendent, Hitchcock County Schools, Trenton
 McElth, Olive M., Superintendent, Polk County Schools, Osceola
 McClelland, Marion, Superintendent, Furnas County Schools, Beaver City
 McQuiston, (Mrs.) Ruth, Superintendent, Perkins County Schools, Grant
 Oldershaw, Edith, Superintendent, Cheyenne County Schools, Sidney
 Ottoman, Clara, Superintendent, Thurston County Schools, Pender
 Phillips, Joe, Superintendent, Dodge County Schools, Fremont

Quick, Robert A., Superintendent, Platte County Schools, Columbus; Advisory Council to the National Commission on the Intermediate Administrative Unit
 Renken, Emma, Superintendent, Fillmore County Schools, Geneva
 Rippetrau, (Mrs.) Mary W., Superintendent, Clay County Schools, Clay Center
 Rock, (Mrs.) Dora, Superintendent, Knox County Schools, Center
 Shedd, Jess, Superintendent, Scotts Bluff County Schools, Gering
 Snyder, Willard E., Superintendent, Keya Paha County Schools, Springview
 Sollenberger, Lucille, Helping Teacher, Douglas County Schools, Omaha
 Stoneman, Merle A., Professor of School Administration, Teachers College, University of Nebraska, Lincoln; Planning Committee, Midwest Regional Conference on Rural Life and Education
 Tate, Zetta C., Superintendent, Cherry County Schools, Valentine
 Thomas, H. Jeannette, Assistant Professor of Rural Education, Nebraska State Teachers College, Chadron
 Thompson, Oma G., Superintendent, Boone County Schools, Albion
 Waite, Evangeline, State Supervisor of Elementary Education, State Department of Public Instruction, Lincoln
 Waring, (Mrs.) Bess J., Superintendent, Stanton County Schools, Stanton
 Warp, Paul A., Warp Publishing Company, Minden
 Wilcox, Mary E., Superintendent, Deuel County Schools, Chappell

INSTITUTIONAL MEMBERS

Library, Midland College, Fremont
 Library, Nebraska State Teachers College, Chadron
 Library, Nebraska State Teachers College, Kearney
 Library, Nebraska State Teachers College, Wayne

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Appleton, David, Superintendent, Supervisory Union No. 9, Conway; State Director; Planning Committee, New England Regional Conference on Rural Life and Education
 Badger, Lester H., Superintendent, Supervisory Union No. 27, Peterborough
 Bennett, Phil A., Superintendent, Supervisory Union No. 23, Woodsville
 Danielson, Arthur W., Somersworth
 Good, Jonathan A., Superintendent, Supervisory Union No. 33, Salem
 Toll, Arthur E., Superintendent, Supervisory Union No. 25, Somersworth

NEW JERSEY

Bair, Carl M., Superintendent, Ocean County Schools, Toms River
 Bean, Albert M., Superintendent, Camden County Schools, Camden
 Everett, Marcia A., Life Member, Belvidere
 Hoppock, Anne, Assistant in Elementary Education, State Department of Education, Trenton
 Johnson, Helen W., Teacher, Medford
 Knipe, (Mrs.) Edythe M., Helping Teacher, Gloucester County Schools, Pitman
 Matthews, W. B., Superintendent, Cape May County Schools, Cape May Court House
 Matzner, G. C., Assistant Professor of Education, School of Education, Rutgers University, New Brunswick

ROSTER OF MEMBERS

Morgan, John, Superintendent, Burlington County Schools, Mt. Holly
 Ranshoff, (Mrs.) Priscilla B., Director of Rehabilitation, 138 Bath Avenue, Long Branch
 Robinson, Thomas E., President, State Teachers College, Glassboro; Executive Committee of the Department
 Rodgers, J. Harvey, Superintendent, Gloucester County Schools, Woodbury; State Director, Advisory Council to the National Commission on the Intermediate Administrative Unit
 Sickler, Edna F., Helping Teacher, Gloucester County Schools, Pitman
 Smith, Sampson G., Superintendent, Somerset County Schools, Somerville; Executive Committee, Division of County and Rural Schools, North Atlantic Regional Conference on Rural Life and Education; Committee of County and Rural Area Superintendents to Work with CPEA
 Snyder, (Mrs.) Melda Chabre, Pittstown
 Stratton, Mason A., Superintendent, Atlantic County Schools, Mays Landing
 Straub, J. Harold, Superintendent, Passaic County Schools, Paterson
 Winchell, Lawrence R., Superintendent, Cumberland County Schools, Bridgeton
 Zimmerman, Roy R., Superintendent, Bergen County Schools, Englewood

NEW MEXICO

Doran, (Mrs.) Ruby, Supervisor, Curry County Schools, Clovis
 Foster, Fred W., Superintendent, Grant County Schools, Silver City
 Haile, George T., Superintendent, Otero County Schools, Alamogordo
 Hartnett, Ellen, Director, Elementary and Adult Education, State Department of Education, Santa Fe, New Mexico
 Heckendorf, J. M., Rural School Supervisor, Tucumcari
 Lawler, Gladys M., Supervisor, Dona Ana County Schools, Las Cruces
 Lucero, (Mrs.) Mary B., Superintendent, Guadalupe County Schools, Santa Rosa
 McWhirter, Corina, Superintendent, Torrance County Schools, Estatica
 Melender, Canita, Superintendent, Mora County Schools, Mora
 Pierson, Maude, Superintendent, Curry County Schools, Clovis
 Root, (Mrs.) Aileen E., Superintendent, McKinley County Schools, Gallup
 Samuelson, (Mrs.) Lorine, Superintendent, Lincoln County Schools, Hollywood
 Stinger, W. H., Director, Teacher Education, New Mexico Highlands University, Las Vegas
 Smith, Haskel B., Superintendent, Dona Ana County Schools, Las Cruces; Advisory Council to the National Commission on the Intermediate Administrative Unit
 Thomas, Mrs. R. N., Superintendent, Eddy County Schools, Carlsbad
 Watson, (Mrs.) Mary R., Director, Division of Elementary Education, State Department of Education, Santa Fe; Vice-President of the Department, 1953-54; State Director, Planning Committee, Rocky Mountain Regional Conference on Rural Life and Education
 Wegner, F. Robert, Superintendent, Los Alamos County Schools, Los Alamos
 Wiley, Tom, Superintendent of Public Instruction, State Department of Education, Santa Fe
 Wood, (Mrs.) Alice, Superintendent of Schools, Wagon Mound

INSTITUTIONAL MEMBER

University of New Mexico, Albuquerque

NEW YORK

Aker, William D., District Superintendent of Schools, Schoharie County, Cobleskill
 Akin, Clayton L., Principal, Bemus Point Central Schools, Bemus Point
 Allen, Everett T., District Superintendent of Schools, Clinton County, Peru
 Anderson, J. William, District Superintendent of Schools, Chautauque County, Kennedy
 Baker, Leonard, District Superintendent of Schools, St. Lawrence County, Star Lake
 Barber, George A., District Superintendent of Schools, Genesee County, Batavia
 Belknap, B. H., I. C. Member, Pupil Transportation Consultant, Delmar
 Bartholomew, (Mrs.) Helen B., District Superintendent of Schools, Washington County, Whitehall
 Bell, Robert E., District Superintendent of Schools, Westchester County, Chappaqua
 Bennett, Regina I. R., District Superintendent of Schools, Ulster County, Chichester
 Bildeback, Naomi B., District Superintendent of Schools, Otsego County, Hartwick
 Blam, Victor H., District Superintendent of Schools, Wyoming County, Attica
 Bouck, Olin, District Superintendent of Schools, Albany County, Newtonville
 Bowdman, H. G., District Superintendent of Schools, Montgomery County, Fort Plain
 Brown, Clayton H., District Superintendent of Schools, Saratoga County, Greenfield Center
 Brunner, Edmund De S., Professor of Rural Sociology, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City
 Buell, W. R., District Superintendent of Schools, Erie County, East Aurora
 Bush, (Mrs.) Ailine G., District Superintendent of Schools, Chemung County, Horseheads
 Bitterworth, J. E., Professor of Educational Administration, Emeritus, Cornell University, Ithaca; Life Member; National Commission on the Intermediate Administrative Unit
 Byrnes, John F., District Superintendent of Schools, Franklin County, Brasher
 Carter, G. J., District Superintendent of Schools, Steuben County, Avoca
 Chapman, Mornette L., District Superintendent of Schools, Seneca County, Ovid
 Clark, Claude R., District Superintendent of Schools, Essex County, Bloomingdale
 Clark, F. R., District Superintendent of Schools, Greene County, Athens
 Coddling, James W., District Superintendent of Schools, Clinton County, Chazy
 Craib, (Mrs.) Mildred Hull, District Superintendent of Schools, Rensselaer County, Berlin
 Crist, (Mrs.) Amy Hull, District Superintendent of Schools, Orange County, Montgomery
 Cyr, Frank W., Professor of Education, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City
 Daulton, George R., District Superintendent of Schools, Steuben County, Bath
 Donnan, E. Craig, District Superintendent of Schools, Tompkins County, Newfield
 Eby, Harry K., National Director, School Relations, Boy Scouts of America, New York City
 Elliott, Lloyd H., Associate Professor of Rural Education, Cornell University, Ithaca

- Fahrenholz, Francis J., District Superintendent of Schools, Washington County, Argyle
- Fennell, Edward G., Supervising Principal, Newfield Central School, Newfield
- Fink, John H., District Superintendent of Schools, Schenectady County, Schenectady
- Ford, Mrs. Thomas J., Director of School Relations, Girl Scouts of America, New York City
- Foreman, Lester R., District Superintendent of Schools, Monroe County, Pittsford
- Forrester, Elwood A., District Superintendent of Schools, Jefferson County, Redwood
- Foster, Fred P., District Superintendent of Schools, Chenango County, Afton
- French, Harold P., Life Member, Loudonville
- Frohlich, F. Karl, District Superintendent of Schools, Niagara County, Middleport
- Gibbin, Kenneth E., District Superintendent of Schools, Cattaraugus County, East Randolph
- Griffin, Francis E., Chief, Bureau of Rural Administrative Services, State Education Department, Albany; State Director; Planning Committee, North Atlantic Regional Conference on Rural Life and Education
- Gross, Harry W., District Superintendent of Schools, Nassau County, Mineola
- Hadley, (Mrs.) Audra W., District Superintendent of Schools, Oswego County, Sandy Creek
- Hakes, Elton J., District Superintendent of Schools, Rensselaer County, Troy
- Hakes, W. Gaylord, District Superintendent of Schools, Dutchess County, Poughkeepsie
- Hamilton, Leon W., District Superintendent of Schools, Madison County, Morrisville
- Harkness, Archie W., District Superintendent of Schools, Erie County, Buffalo
- Harrold, John W., District Superintendent of Schools, Clinton County, Ellenburg Depot
- Hausner, Harold S., District Superintendent of Schools, Herkimer County, Mohawk
- Hirst, Eric A., Route 3, Second Street West, Babylon
- Hitchcock, Elwood, District Superintendent of Schools, Greene County, East Jewett
- Hodgdon, Evelyn R., Professor of Education, State Teachers College, Oneonta; Committee on Recruitment and Preparation of Rural Teachers
- Hoffman, M. Gazelle, District Superintendent of Schools, Niagara County, Lewiston
- Hollister, Harold E., District Superintendent of Schools, Westchester County, White Plains
- Holmes, Harold W., District Superintendent of Schools, Columbia County, Copake
- Hopf, John F., Jr., District Superintendent of Schools, Rockland County, New City
- Hopson, E. S., District Superintendent of Schools, Herkimer County, Dolgeville
- Jackson, Carlton J., District Superintendent of Schools, Chemung County, Elmira
- Johnson, Howard R., District Superintendent of Schools, Broome County, Deposit
- Johnson, Ralph H., District Superintendent of Schools, Ulster County, New Paltz
- Keenan, Joseph M., District Superintendent of Schools, Warren County, Bolton Landing
- Kreutziger, A. C., President, Coach and Equipment Sales Corporation, Penn Yan
- Lacy, C. A., District Superintendent of Schools, Cortland County, Marathon
- Livingston, M. J., District Superintendent of Schools, Wayne County, Williamson
- McGuire, John P., District Superintendent of Schools, Suffolk County, Huntington
- McKernan, William T., District Superintendent of Schools, Sullivan County, Summitville
- McWorter, Mrs. M. C., Life Member, Pine City
- Merrill, Ameno W., District Superintendent of Schools, Delaware County, Treadwell
- Miller, Ellsworth, District Superintendent of Schools, Columbia County, Valatie
- Morcy, Julia M., State Teachers College, State University of New York, Oneonta
- Morse, Frances C., Girl Scouts of America, New York City
- Muehe, C. C., District Superintendent of Schools, Ontario County, Stanley
- Munson, J. Paul, District Superintendent of Schools, Tompkins County, Groton
- Olds, Leon A., District Superintendent of Schools, Tompkins County, Ithaca
- Orlowsky, Wallace D., District Superintendent of Schools, Erie County, North Collins
- Osborn, Harold R., District Superintendent of Schools, Orleans County, Kendall
- Palmer, E. Lawrence, Professor of Rural Education, Emeritus, Cornell University, Ithaca
- Pease, Clarke D., President, Agricultural Industrial Marketing Institute and Foundation, New York City
- Radley, Arthur A., District Superintendent of Schools, Oneida County, Waterville
- Rathbun, Mrs. Roy E., District Superintendent of Schools, Cortland County, Cincinnatus
- Rodger, (Mrs.) Mabelle L., District Superintendent of Schools, Cayuga County, Moravia
- Sackett, Howard G., District Superintendent of Schools, Lewis County, Port Leyden; Executive Committee of the Department
- Saltzman, E. A., Field Representative, Field Operations Branch, Region 2, U. S. Office of Education, New York City
- Schmidt, A. W., Assistant Commissioner, Finance and School Administrative Services, State Education Department, Albany
- Schriber, Edgar R., District Superintendent of Schools, Orange County, Middletown
- Sears, Clinton T., District Superintendent of Schools, Ontario County, Homoye
- Shoemaker, Edwin S., District Superintendent of Schools, Oneida County, Yorkville; Advisory Council to the National Commission on the Intermediate Administrative Unit
- Slater, Glenn A., District Superintendent of Schools, Broome County, Binghamton
- Sloan, De Villo, District Superintendent of Schools, Onondaga County, Elbridge
- Smith, Calvin U., District Superintendent of Schools, Steuben County, Painted Post
- Smith, De Alton, District Superintendent of Schools, Onondaga County, Manlius
- Smith, J. E., District Superintendent of Schools, Delaware County, Deposit
- Smith, Orrin M., District Superintendent of Schools, Wayne County, Wolcott
- Southworth, Nathan C., District Superintendent of Schools, Oswego County, East Springfield
- Strang, Ruth, Professor of Education, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City
- Sweeney, Norman J., Vice-Principal, Chenango Forks Central School, Chenango Forks
- Travis, Zena R., District Superintendent of Schools, Delaware County, Roxbury
- Tyson, Harold Canfield, District Superintendent of Schools, Otsego County, Unadilla
- Underwood, Stephen L., District Superintendent of Schools, Yates County, Branchport

Vrooman, Raymond C., District Superintendent of Schools, Oneida County, Camden
Walrath, Grant, District Superintendent of Schools, Cattaraugus County, Salamanca
Ward, Harry B., District Superintendent of Schools, Suffolk County, Riverhead
Wilcox, John, Supervising Principal, Candor Central School, Candor; Committee on Publications and Constructive Studies
Winch, Ruth H., District Superintendent of Schools, Chautauque County, Westfield
Winchester, Milo F., District Superintendent of Schools, Dutchess County, Millerton
Wyckoff, Philip A., District Superintendent of Schools, Herkimer County, Frankfort
Yomans, Ernest G., District Superintendent of Schools, Chenango County, Sherburne
Zeller, Alfred G., District Superintendent of Schools, Madison County, Oneida

INSTITUTIONAL MEMBERS

Butler Library, State College for Teachers, Buffalo
Glass Dome Tours, Inc., 520 Fifth Avenue, New York City
Library, New York State Teachers College, Cortland
Library, New York State Teachers College, New Paltz
Library, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City
New York State Library, State University of New York, Albany
State Teachers College, c/o Miss Helen Hager, Librarian, Oswego
Washington Square Library, New York University, New York City

NORTH CAROLINA

Brimley, Ralph F. W., Superintendent, Forsyth County Schools, Winston-Salem
Duncan, S. E., Supervisor of High Schools, Raleigh
Evans, Paul F., Superintendent, Davidson County Schools, Lexington
Furr, C. A., Superintendent, Cabarrus County Schools, Concord
Guy, T. Ward, Superintendent, Columbus County Schools, Whiteville
Insee, L. S., Superintendent, Nash County Schools, Nashville
Morrill, Maurice B., Associate Professor of Education, Western Carolina Teachers College, Cullowhee
Stumpf, Wippert A., Associate Professor of Education, Duke University, Durham
Tomberlin, R. A., District Superintendent of Schools, Weynerville
Wilkins, E. V., Principal, Roper
Yount, M. E., Superintendent, Alamance County Schools, Graham; State Director; Planning Committee, South Atlantic Regional Conference on Rural Life and Education

INSTITUTIONAL MEMBERS

D. H. Hill Library, North Carolina State College, Raleigh
Library, North Carolina College at Durham, Durham

NORTH DAKOTA

Barnes, James A., Director of Elementary Education, State Teachers College, Mayville
Henson, Allee G., Superintendent, Bowman County Schools, Bowman
Rjork, A. J., Associate Professor, School of Education, University of North Dakota, Grand Forks

Danicourt, Mrs. John, Teacher, Mooreton Special No. 1, Richland County, Mooreton
Evanston, (Mrs.) Lulu, Director of Education, North Dakota Farmers Union, Jamestown
Evingston, Caroline J., Superintendent, Cass County Schools, Fargo
Ewen, Leila C., Rural Training, State Teachers College, Minot; Executive Committee of the Department
Finley, George W., Superintendent, Renville County Schools, Moball
Johnson, Charles A., Rural Supervisor, Dickinson
Johnson, (Mrs.) Luba E., Superintendent, Rolette County Schools, Rolla; State Director; Advisory Council to the National Commission on the Intermediate Administrative Unit
Lynne, Helen G., Superintendent, McLean County Schools, Washburn
Miller, (Mrs.) Esther A., Superintendent, Traill County Schools, Hillsboro
Peterson, M. F., State Superintendent of Public Instruction, State Department of Public Instruction, Bismarck; Planning Committee, Midwest Regional Conference on Rural Life and Education
Shanks, Gladys, Superintendent, Cavalier County Schools, Langdon
Strouse, (Mrs.) Helen, Superintendent, Dickey County Schools, Ellendale
Thompson, Julia M., Superintendent, McKenzie County Schools, Watford City
Wade, Claudia R., Superintendent, Burke County Schools, Bowbells
Yoder, Mrs. Fred, Teacher, Rural School, Walford

INSTITUTIONAL MEMBERS

Library, State Teachers College, Mayville
Library, State Teachers College, Minot

OHIO

Baden, C. A., Superintendent, Darke County Schools, Greenville
Barnes, Vernon W., Superintendent, Jackson County Schools, Jackson
Beery, George C., Superintendent, Franklin County Schools, Columbus; Committee of County and Rural Area Superintendents to Work with CPEA; State Director
Bell, A. C., Superintendent, Paulding County Schools, Paulding
Bixler, Melvin R., Assistant Superintendent, Stark County Schools, Louisville
Brown, Ralph R., Superintendent, Huron County Schools, Norwalk
Coblentz, C. R., Superintendent, Preble County Schools, Eaton
Coffeen, Carl, Superintendent, Summit County Schools, Cuyahoga Falls
Crouh, Charles B., Superintendent, Hamilton County Schools, Cincinnati
Driscoll, W. A., Superintendent, Montgomery County Schools, Dayton
Ely, Ralph, Superintendent, Wayne County Schools, Wooster
Eymann, E. M., Assistant Superintendent of Public Instruction, State Department of Education, Columbus; Planning Committee, Great Lakes Regional Conference on Rural Life and Education
Finley, L. M., Superintendent, Ashtabula County Schools, Jefferson
Gantz, T. A., Superintendent, Morrow County Schools, Mt. Gilead
Gibbens, C. A., Superintendent, Lorain County Schools, Elyria
Goodrich, Ivan, Assistant Superintendent, Huron County Schools, Norwalk
Hatfield, R. F., Superintendent, Warren County Schools, Lebanon

Hawke, Oscar T., Superintendent, Clark County Schools, Springfield
 Hoggatt, Frank R., Superintendent, Clermont County Schools, Batavia
 Humphreys, Phila., Elementary Supervisor, State Department of Education, Columbus
 Jones, B. Lewis, Superintendent, Gallia County Schools, Gallipolis
 Joseph, E. T., Superintendent, Hancock County Schools, Findley
 Kirby, Theresa K., Assistant Superintendent, Hamilton County Schools, Cincinnati
 Kirkpatrick, Ellis L., Professor of Sociology, Marietta College, Marietta
 Knapp, T. C., Superintendent, Stark County Schools, Canton; Advisory Council to the National Commission on the Intermediate Administrative Unit
 Lautenschlager, J. F., Superintendent, Coshocton County Schools, Coshocton; Vice-President, Division of School Transportation
 Laws, W. E., Superintendent, Tuscarawas County Schools, New Philadelphia
 Lodenback, H. M., Superintendent, Champaign County Schools, Urbana
 Martin, Samuel E., Superintendent, Seneca County Schools, Tiffin
 McBride, James L., Superintendent, Columbiana County Schools, Lisbon
 McCowan, E. R., Superintendent, Scioto County Schools, Portsmouth
 Mills, D. T., Superintendent, Marion County Schools, Marion
 Oman, D. W., Superintendent, Wyandot County Schools, Upper Sandusky
 Pollock, Frank L., Superintendent, Monroe County Schools, Woodfield
 Pond, Millard Z., Project Coordinator, CPEA, Ohio State University, Columbus
 Ransdell, Frank C., Superintendent, Hardin County Schools, Kenton
 Rasor, Floyd, Assistant Superintendent, Montgomery County Schools, Dayton
 Rauach, Calvin, Superintendent, Portage County Schools, Ravenna
 Roshon, Ray H., Superintendent, Jefferson County Schools, Steubenville
 Ryder, H. E., Superintendent, Lucas County Schools, Toledo
 Sanders, Herahel W., Assistant Superintendent, Preble County Schools, Eaton
 Schlegel, E. C., Assistant Superintendent, Stark County Schools, East Sparta
 Shanks, Carl H., Superintendent, Clinton County Schools, Wilmington
 Shuman, W. L., Superintendent, Cuyahoga County Schools, Cleveland
 Sollars, S. K., Superintendent, Crawford County Schools, Bucyrus
 Specht, Clarence W., Superintendent, Fort Jennings Local Schools, Fort Jennings
 Stanfield, John M., Superintendent, Logan County Schools, Bellefontaine
 Thompson, C. V., Superintendent, Miami County Schools, Troy
 Wakefield, Howard E., CPEA, Ohio State University, Columbus
 Welshimer, Earl C., Director of Research, Carpenter Body Company, Worthington
 West, Glen C., Superintendent, Mercer County Schools, Celina
 West, H. D., Superintendent, Brown County Schools, Georgetown
 Whitman, William A., Superintendent, Sandusky County Schools, Fremont

INSTITUTIONAL MEMBER

Library, Miami University, Oxford

OKLAHOMA

Abshier, (Mrs.) Leona, Superintendent, Okfuskee County Schools, Okemah
 Boyer, D. L., Superintendent of Schools, Baldo
 Burris, Ted, State Department of Education, Oklahoma City
 Carrier, Joe E., Superintendent, Payne County Schools, Stillwater; Advisory Council to the National Commission on the Intermediate Administrative Unit
 Ferguson, Leslie Guy, Superintendent, Tulsa County Schools, Tulsa
 Fitzgerald, J. C., Assistant Director in Charge of Audio-Visual Center, Oklahoma A & M College, Stillwater; State Director; Planning Committee, Midwest Regional Conference on Rural Life and Education; Executive Committee of the Department
 Foster, W. E., Superintendent, Craig County Schools, Vinita
 Golden, Neal V., Superintendent, Canadian County Schools, El Reno
 Good, Charles, Superintendent, Lincoln County Schools, Chandler
 Grady, C. E., Superintendent, Oklahoma County Schools, Oklahoma City
 Hester, Mrs. Angie, Superintendent, McClain County Schools, Purcell
 Jimeron, Fred, Superintendent, Ottawa County Schools, Miami
 Kimberling, (Mrs.) Mabel, Superintendent, Jefferson County Schools, Waurika
 Knezevich, S. J., Associate Professor of Education, University of Tulsa, Tulsa
 Knowles, S. J., Superintendent, Ellis County Schools, Arnett
 Morgan, G. G., Assistant Director, Rural and Elementary Education, Muskogee Junior College, Muskogee
 Rowe, Omer, Superintendent, Carter County Schools, Ardmore
 Sadler, Steven, Superintendent, Straight School District No. 80, Guymon
 Shoop, William E., Superintendent, Noble County Schools, Perry
 Smart, Jake, Director, Rural and Elementary Education, State Department of Education, Oklahoma City
 Sorenson, Helmer E., Professor of Education, Oklahoma A & M College, Stillwater
 Toon, Paul, Superintendent, McIntosh County Schools, Eufaula
 Yarbrough, Theo, Superintendent, Texas County Schools, Guymon

OREGON

Baker, Helen P., Superintendent, Benton County Schools, Corvallis
 Beardley, Florence E., Supervisor of Elementary Education, State Department of Education, Salem
 Booth, (Mrs.) Agnes C., Superintendent, Marion County Schools, Salem
 Boyer, Estella C., Superintendent, Grant County Schools, Canyon City
 Buckingham, (Mrs.) Velma G., Superintendent, Deschutes County Schools, Bend
 Casiday, (Mrs.) Lois S., Teacher, Bend
 Clem, (Mrs.) Beryl E., Eastern Oregon College of Education, La Grande
 Corwin, George A., Superintendent, Hood River County Schools, Hood River
 Couzens, Veda E., Superintendent, Union County Schools, La Grande
 Dolmyer, W. H., Superintendent, Linn County Schools, Albany
 Eaton, Asa T., Superintendent, Jefferson County Schools, Madras
 Farley, Lillian, Superintendent, Coos County Schools, Coquille

Fleming, Elmer W., Superintendent, Josephine County Schools, Grants Pass
George, (Mrs.) Frances L., Principal, Howard School, Prineville
Gould, Ruth, Elementary Consultant, Lane County Schools, Eugene
Grant, Leslie E., Superintendent, Morrow Rural School District, Heppner
Gubser, Lynn, Superintendent, Yamhill County Schools, McMinnville
Inch, (Mrs.) Una B., Supervisor, Jackson County Schools, Medford
Kent, Lois D., Superintendent, Columbia County Schools, St. Helens
Klinge, (Mrs.) Lucille L., Superintendent, Lane County Schools, Eugene; President of the Department, 1954-55; Advisory Council to the National Commission on the Intermediate Administrative Unit; Committee of County and Rural Area Superintendents To Work with CPEA
Lee, (Mrs.) Myrtle E., Superintendent, Baker County Schools, Baker
Mekvold, Alf B., Superintendent, Jackson County Schools, Medford
Michalek, Mary, Teacher, Portland
Moffitt, L. C., Springfield
Posoy, C. W., Executive Secretary, Oregon Education Association, Portland
Putnam, Rex, Superintendent of Public Instruction, State Department of Education, Salem
Schwepp, Erma, Elementary Consultant, Lane County Schools, Eugene
Shold, Walter O., Supervisor of Elementary Education, State Department of Education, Salem
Sly, Cecil M., Superintendent, Crook County Schools, Prineville
Sprague, Anne, Superintendent, Lake County Schools, Lakeview
Woodcock, Richard W., Director of Special Education, Coos County Schools, Coquille
Voelker, Cliff, Superintendent, Curry County Schools, Gold Beach
Woodworth, E. A., Superintendent, Clackamas County Schools, Oregon City

INSTITUTIONAL MEMBERS

Library, Oregon College of Education, Monmouth
Oregon State Library, Salem

PENNSYLVANIA

Akeley, A. P., Superintendent, Potter County Schools, Coudersport
Ammerman, H. B., Superintendent, Wayne County Schools, Honesdale
App, I. D., Superintendent, Dauphin County Schools, Harrisburg
Barnett, Ralph E., Assistant Superintendent, Somerset County Schools, Somerset
Bartges, Newton L., Superintendent, Clinton County Schools, Lock Haven
Battie, Alfred W., Superintendent, Allegheny County Schools, Pittsburgh
Biemesderfer, D. L., President, Millersville State Teachers College, Millersville
Boehm, Charles H., Superintendent, Bucks County Schools, Doylestown; National Commission on the Intermediate Administrative Unit; Planning Committee, North Atlantic Regional Conference on Rural Life and Education
Botel, Morton, Reading Consultant, Bucks County Schools, Doylestown
Bowen, Genevieve, Consultant, Curriculum and Elementary Instruction, Bucks County Schools, Doylestown; Committee on Rural Life and Education on the World Scene

Bowman, Douglas J., Supervisor of Special Education, Washington County Schools, Washington
Burkhart, J. Paul, Superintendent, Cumberland County Schools, Carlisle
Burkholder, W. Clay, Superintendent, Mifflin County Schools, Lewistown
Butts, James E., Superintendent, Blair County Schools, Hollidaysburg; State Director
Conway, R. F., Superintendent, Lawrence County Schools, New Castle
Eastman, Wesley C., Teacher, Honesdale High School, Honesdale
Faulst, Beaver S., Superintendent, Juniata County Schools, Middletown
Fink, Lynn J., Assistant Superintendent, Dauphin County Schools, Harrisburg
Francis, Thomas, Superintendent, Lackawanna County Schools, Scranton
Hess, Walter L., Teacher of Vocational Agriculture, Slippery Rock
Kolpien, Maurice E., Superintendent, Erie County Schools, Erie
Kurtz, Paul, Assistant Superintendent, Blair County Schools, Hellwood
McConnel, Clarence H., Superintendent, Lycoming County Schools, Williamsport
Maxwell, Charles F., Life Member, Greensburg
Meyer, Nathan G., Head, Department of Education, State Teachers College, East Stroudsburg
Neel, Virginia P., Dean of Women, Wilkes College, Wilkes-Barre
Raffensperger, Charles I., Assistant Superintendent, Adams County Schools, Gettysburg
Robinson, Raymond W., Chief, Consolidation and Transportation, State Department of Public Instruction, Harrisburg
Small, Thelma E., Training Teacher, State Teachers College, Shippensburg
Smith, Ralph C., Assistant Superintendent, Lycoming County Schools, Williamsport
Speidel, Harold O., Assistant Superintendent, Schuylkill County Schools, Pine Grove
Stock, Earl K., Assistant Superintendent, Centre County Schools, Bellefonte; Advisory Council to the National Commission on the Intermediate Administrative Unit
Swartz, H. E., Superintendent, York County Schools, York
Wildrick, John R., Jr., Supervisor of Secondary Education, State Teachers College, East Stroudsburg

INSTITUTIONAL MEMBERS

Clarion State Teachers College, Clarion
Free Library of Philadelphia, Philadelphia
State Teachers College, West Chester

RHODE ISLAND

Noble, Mark C. S., Jr., College of Arts and Sciences, University of Rhode Island, Kingston; State Director; Planning Committee, New England Regional Conference on Rural Life and Education
Potter, Ivy E., Teacher, Saylesville

SOUTH CAROLINA

Bentley, Alma, State Supervisor of Home Economics, Rock Hill
Deerick, T. V., Superintendent, Oconee County Schools, Walhalla
Chastain, W. H., Mauldin High School, Mauldin
Edwards, Katharine, Consultant, School Health, Greenville

Green, Albert, Superintendent, Georgetown County Schools, Georgetown
 Holladay, L. L., Supervising Principal, Simpsonville
 McArthur, L. C., Jr., Superintendent, Beaufort School District No. 1, Beaufort
 Mitchum, Floy O., Jeanes Teacher, Inman
 Peterson, Vord, Pine Haven; Director of Vocational Education, State Department of Education (retired)
 Rawlinson, Lin W., Supervisor of Transportation, Department of Education, Georgetown
 Stackhouse, Esther, Superintendent, Marion County Schools, Marion
 Verdin, T. M., Jr., Director of Rural Service, Division of Instructional Services, School District of Greenville County, Greenville; State Director; Planning Committee, South Atlantic Regional Conference on Rural Life and Education; Executive Committee of the Department
 Ward, W. H., Director, Extension Division, University of South Carolina, Columbia

INSTITUTIONAL MEMBER

Library, Clemson College, c/o Cornelia A. Graham, Librarian, Clemson

SOUTH DAKOTA

Bowdine, Doris, Superintendent, Hamlin County Schools, Hayti
 Bohri, Florence, Superintendent, Clark County Schools, Clark
 Bridges, Nellie, Superintendent, Custer County Schools, Custer
 Byrnes, (Mrs.) Gladys, Superintendent, Spink County Schools, Redfield
 Delzell, Mark W., Dean, School of Education, University of South Dakota, Vermillion; Planning Committee, Midwest Regional Conference on Rural Life and Education
 Fraser, Pearl L., Superintendent, Buffalo County Schools, Gann Valley
 Gehring, (Mrs.) Ada, Superintendent, Miner County Schools, Howard
 Græthe, Amos, Superintendent, Pennington County Schools, Rapid City
 Hervik, O. Edgar, Superintendent, Minnehaha County Schools, Sioux Falls; Advisory Council to the National Commission on the Intermediate Administrative Unit
 Hodges, Harry, Lake Preston
 Johnson, Ruth V., Superintendent, Brown County Schools, Aberdeen
 Jydstrup, (Mrs.) Helen, Superintendent, Grant County Schools, Milbank
 Koehne, Norma, Superintendent, Kingsbury County Schools, De Smet
 Lee, Mabel, Superintendent, Roberts County Schools, Sisseton
 Long, Margaret, Superintendent, Beadle County Schools, Huron; State Director
 Lorenson, (Mrs.) Winifred, Superintendent, Hand County Schools, Miller
 McGinnis, Irene G., Superintendent, Perkins County Schools, Bison
 Martin, (Mrs.) June, Superintendent, Fall River County Schools, Hot Springs
 Metzger, Clara, Superintendent, Hutchinson County Schools, Olivet
 Murray, Hazel G., Box F, New Effington
 Noteboom, Charlotte M., Teacher, University of South Dakota, Vermillion
 Opliger, E. C., Superintendent, Day County Schools, Webster
 Rajewich, (Mrs.) Zona, Superintendent, Mellette County Schools, White River
 Severson, Selma, Superintendent, Moody County Schools, Flandreau

Simmons, (Mrs.) Helen, Superintendent, Brookings County Schools, Brookings
 Strobel, Otto, Superintendent, McPherson County Schools, Leola
 Titus, Edna M., Superintendent, Sanborn County Schools, Woonsocket
 Wells, (Mrs.) Hilda, Superintendent, Lawrence County Schools, Deadwood

INSTITUTIONAL MEMBER

Library, General Beadle State Teachers College, Madison

TENNESSEE

Armour, Quinnie, Superintendent, Hardeman County Schools, Bolivar
 Barnes, George H., Superintendent, Shelby County Schools, Memphis
 Black, R. E., Superintendent, Crockett County Schools, Almo
 Bragg, William, Superintendent, Cannon County Schools, Woodbury
 Darden, Ryma, Associate Professor of Education, Austin State College, Clarkeville
 Davis, Mack P., Head, Department of Education, East Tennessee State College, Johnson City
 Doyle, Mildred E., Superintendent, Knox County Schools, Knoxville
 Faulkner, Shannon D., Superintendent, Tipton County Schools, Covington
 Fitzgerald, N. E., Dean, College of Education, University of Tennessee, Knoxville
 Fret, Norman, Professor of Rural Education, Emeritus, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville; Planning Committee, MidSouth Regional Conference on Rural Life and Education
 Human, W. D., Superintendent, Morgan County Schools, Warburg
 Hunt, Ralph, Principal, Bartlett High School, Bartlett
 Hyder, Gretchen, Director of Field Service, East Tennessee State College, Johnson City
 Keithley, Belt, Associate Professor of Education, Middle Tennessee State College, Murfreesboro
 Kennedy, G. T., Superintendent, Decatur County Schools, Decaturville
 McCharen, W. K., Director, Peabody Demonstration School, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville
 Moore, H. Claude, Superintendent, Dyer County Schools, Dyersburg; State Director; Advisory Council to the National Commission on the Intermediate Administrative Unit
 Moss, J. E., Superintendent, Davidson County Schools, Nashville
 Pickens, H. D., Professor, Carson-Newman College, Jefferson City
 Pierce, Truman M., Professor, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville
 Powers, Sue, Life Member, The Gilmore, Memphis
 Reed, Matney, Superintendent, McMinn County Schools, Athens
 Shannon, W. A., Superintendent, Morristown City Schools, Morristown
 Southernman, Beeler, Superintendent, Rutherford County Schools, Murfreesboro
 Story, Bascom H., Director, School of Education, Memphis State College, Memphis
 Turner, W. E., Director, Division of Negro Education, State Department of Education, Nashville

INSTITUTIONAL MEMBERS

Library, East Tennessee State College, Johnson City

ROSTER OF MEMBERS

251

Library, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville
Library, Middle Tennessee State College, Murfreesboro

TEXAS

Alves, H. F., Director, Southwestern CPEA, University of Texas, Austin
Banks, Robert L., Superintendent, Cherokee County Schools, Rusk
Benne, R. D., Superintendent, Hidalgo County Schools, Edinburg
Brockett, M. L., Superintendent, Hill County Schools, Hillsboro
Bunting, W. D., Superintendent, Brazos County Schools, Bryan
Cambren, Emmett F., Health Coordinator, North Texas State College, Denton
Campbell, Leoma, Superintendent, Coryell County Schools, Gateville
Carlile, Shelma, Supervisor, Lubbock County Schools, Lubbock
Carroll, John S., Head, Department of Education, Texas Technological College, Lubbock; Committee on Rural Life and Education on the World Scene; Division of County and Rural Area Superintendents Committee on Rural Scouting
Chism, T. D., Supervisor, Morris County Schools, Daingerfield
Conoley, Gilbert, Superintendent, Williamson County Schools, Georgetown
Crawley, W. C., Superintendent, Liberty County Schools, Liberty
Elkins, W. E., Superintendent, Runnels County Schools, Ballinger
Faulds, Jack, Superintendent, Burleson County Schools, Caldwell
Foreman, Mary, Superintendent, Hall County Schools, Memphis
Fort, Ben, Superintendent, Bowie County Schools, Boston
Gaston, (Mrs.) Elizabeth A., Elementary Principal, Carlsbad
Hagler, James W., Superintendent, Gregg County Schools, Longview
Haltcheck, (Mrs.) Willie M., Superintendent, Hale County Schools, Plainview
Harris, Robert E., Superintendent, Caldwell County Schools, Lockhart; Planning Committee, Midsouth Regional Conference on Rural Life and Education; Committee of County and Rural Area Superintendents To Work with CPEA
Haskew, L. D., Dean, College of Education, University of Texas, Austin
Herndon, Ellen O., Elementary Teacher, San Angelo
Hill, George W., Superintendent, Austin County Schools, Bellville
Hughes, Mrs. Roy, Superintendent, Wilbarger County Schools, Vernon
Jackson, Frank M., Superintendent, Tom Green County Schools, San Angelo; State Director; Advisory Council to the National Commission on the Intermediate Administrative Unit
Johnson, R. H., Superintendent, Anderson County Schools, Palestine
Kennamer, Clyde H., Principal, Wall Mason, J. Marcus, Superintendent, Houston County Schools, Crockett
McGoyre, Kenneth E., Associate Professor, University of Texas, Austin; Joint Committee with the Rural Sociological Society
Neal, Connally, Superintendent, Bell County Schools, Belton
Peck, Haskell, Superintendent, Red River County Schools, Clarksville
Pickett, R. C., Superintendent, Victoria County Schools, Victoria
Richerson, Ruth M., Superintendent, Donley County Schools, Clarendon

Roberts, L. A., Superintendent, Dallas County Schools, Dallas
Rodgers, John O., Assistant Superintendent of Schools, Midland
Sanders, Mary Shipp, Box 55, Cleburne; Life Member
Smith, (Mrs.) Bernice W., Superintendent, Kleberg County Schools, Kingsville
Smith, Curtis W., Principal, Tankersley
Stowe, O. H., Superintendent, Tarrant County Schools, Fort Worth
Watson, J. C., Superintendent, Navarro County Schools, Corsicana
Watters, (Mrs.) Ruth C., Teaching Principal, Miles
Whittington, Charles W., Superintendent, Potter County Schools, Amarillo
Wilroy, T. J., Superintendent, Angelina County Schools, Lufkin

INSTITUTIONAL MEMBERS

Estill Library, Sam Houston State Teachers College, Huntsville
Libraries, University of Houston, Houston
Library, Stephen F., Austin State Teachers College, Nacogdoches
Library, University of Texas, Austin
Walker Memorial Library, Howard Payne College, Brownwood
West Texas State Teachers College, c/o Librarian, Tennessee Malone, Canyon

UTAH

Chipman, R. S., Superintendent, North Summit School District, Coalville
Frye, Clifford L., Superintendent, Emery County School District, Huntington
Gourley, David, Superintendent, Granite School District, Salt Lake City
Knight, Helen M., Superintendent, Grand School District, Moab
Theurer, Lloyd M., Superintendent, Cache County School District, Logan; Advisory Council to the National Commission on the Intermediate Administrative Unit; State Director

INSTITUTIONAL MEMBER

Library, University of Utah, Salt Lake City

VERMONT

Butler, N. Richard, Superintendent, Rockingham-Westminster District Schools, Bellows Falls
Byrne, Thomas J., Superintendent, Windsor County Southeast District Schools, Windsor
Coddington, Ernest M., Superintendent, Addison Northeast District Schools, Bristol; State Director; Advisory Council to the National Commission on the Intermediate Administrative Unit
Dopp, Raymond D., Superintendent, Rutland Northeast District Schools, Pittsford
Holden, A. John, Jr., Commissioner of Education, State Department of Education, Montpelier
Keniston, Harry A., Superintendent, Orleans Central District Schools, Barton
Maynard, Addie E., State Helping Teacher, Fairhaven
Perrin, J. Newton, 179 South Main, Barre
Sawyer, Charles D., Superintendent, Washington Northeast District Schools, Plainfield
Vannatter, Harold H., Castleton Teachers College, Castleton

INSTITUTIONAL MEMBER

Lyndon Teachers College, Lyndon Center

VIRGINIA

Boggs, Earl R., Assistant Professor of Education, University of Virginia, Charlottesville
 Bradley, C. M., Superintendent, Fauquier County Schools, Warrenton
 Buckland, Roscoe V., Superintendent, Highland County Schools, Monterey
 Burton, George W., Superintendent, Clarke County Schools, Berryville
 Camden, A. J., Superintendent, Amherst County Schools, Amherst
 Cassell, H. K., Superintendent, Augusta County Schools, Staunton; Executive Committee, Division of County and Rural Area Superintendents; State Director
 Chittum, Edwin W., Superintendent, Norfolk County Schools, Norfolk; Advisory Council to the National Commission on the Intermediate Administrative Unit
 Gasque, Q. D., Division Superintendent, Warren-Rappahannock District Schools, Front Royal
 Haka, Alonzo B., Superintendent, Mecklenburg County Schools, Boydton
 Hounshell, Paul, Superintendent, Culpeper County Schools, Culpeper
 Kyle, Roy E., Superintendent, Carroll County Schools, Bedford
 Mauck, J. Leonard, Superintendent, Smyth County Schools, Marion
 McIlwaine, T. J., Superintendent, Prince Edward and Cumberland County Schools, Farmville
 Rhudy, Burt C., Superintendent, Grayson County Schools, Independence
 Vaughan, W. A., Superintendent, Caroline County Schools, Bowling Green
 Warburton, (Mrs.) Amber Arthur, Executive Secretary, Alliance for Guidance of Rural Youth, McLean
 Webb, David B., Superintendent, Hanover County Schools, Ashland
 Wise, Henry A., Superintendent, Accomac County Schools, Accomac
 Washington, Mrs. A. C., Box 608, Culpeper

INSTITUTIONAL MEMBERS

Johnston Memorial Library, Virginia State College, Petersburg
 Library, Longwood College, Farmville
 Library, Radford College, Radford

WASHINGTON

Allen, A. W., Superintendent, Yakima County Schools, Yakima
 Bennett, (Mrs.) Dorothy J., Superintendent, Snohomish County Schools, Everett
 Bethel, (Mrs.) Ruth, Superintendent, Pierce County Schools, Tacoma
 Cramblitt, De Force, Superintendent, Kitsap County Schools, Port Townsend
 Crosby, (Mrs.) Lydia F., Cowlitz County Schools, Kelso
 Dahlke, Florence, Superintendent, Douglas County Schools, Waterville
 Hussey, Clifton A., Superintendent, Spokane County Schools, Spokane
 Kinkade, H. J., Superintendent, Chelan County Schools, Wenatchee
 Loree, G. Ira, Superintendent, Skagit County Schools, Mount Vernon; State Director; Advisory Council to the National Commission on the Intermediate Administrative Unit
 Miles, J. E., Superintendent, Kittitas County Schools, Ellensburg

Pierce, (Mrs.) Mary C., Superintendent, Adams County Schools, Ritzville
 Shields, J. P., 231 West Bonneville Street, Pasco
 Thompson, (Mrs.) Margaret, Superintendent, Benton County Schools, Prosser

INSTITUTIONAL MEMBERS

Central Washington College of Education, Ellensburg
 Library, State College of Washington, Pullman

WEST VIRGINIA

Archer, C. H., Princeton; Superintendent, Mercer County Schools (retired)
 Baldwin, Robert D., Professor of Educational Administration, West Virginia University, Morgantown
 Billups, Cecil W., Supervisor, Madison
 Bonar, Martha, Supervisor, School Lunch Program, State Department of Education, Charleston
 Broyles, Maud, Assistant State Supervisor, Elementary Schools, State Department of Education, Charleston
 Crawford, Robert T., Superintendent, Lewis County Schools, Weston
 Creasy, James L., Superintendent, Berkeley County Schools, Martinsburg; Planning Committee, South Atlantic Regional Conference on Rural Life and Education
 Darnell, William Earl, Supervisor of Transportation, Greenbrier County Schools, Lewisburg; Executive Committee, Division of School Transportation
 Fields, Earl W., Assistant County Superintendent, Kanawha County Schools, Charleston
 Harrah, D. D., Assistant Superintendent, Greenbrier County Schools, Lewisburg
 Harvey, Beatrice Burns, Visiting Teacher, Greenbrier County Schools, Lewisburg
 Hupp, James L., West Virginia Wesleyan College, Buckhannon
 Idleman, H. L., Superintendent, Mineral County Schools, Keyser
 Jones, Daniel M., Assistant Superintendent, Berkeley County Schools, Martinsburg
 Kennedy, Eddie C., Rt. 4, Box 54, Morgantown
 Lambert, (Mrs.) Audra G., Supervisor, Belington
 Marple, Clara, Reading Supervisor, Flatwoods
 McGuffie, Jeannette, General Supervisor, Mineral County Schools, Keyser
 Montgomery, John F., Superintendent, Greenbrier County Schools, Lewisburg; Advisory Council to the National Commission on the Intermediate Administrative Unit; Committee on Rural Life and Education in the World Scene
 Myers, Clifford S., Principal, Elkview
 Oates, H. Brown, 140 Potomac Drive, Keyser
 Robinette, Randolph, Director of Transportation, Princeton
 Shippe, Frank, Assistant Superintendent, Fayette County Schools, Oak Hill
 Snyder, Verl W., Superintendent, Morgan County Schools, Berkeley Springs
 Thompson, (Mrs.) Juanita B., Director of Rural Education, Kanawha County Schools, Charleston; State Director
 Trent, W. W., State Superintendent of Free Schools, State Department of Education, Charleston
 Upton, Arthur V. G., Superintendent, Harrison County Schools, Clarksburg; Division of County and Rural Area Superintendents Committee on Rural Scouting

ROSTER OF MEMBERS

253

Willard, (Mrs.) Margaret, Elementary Supervisor, Fairmont State College, Morgantown
 Willis, Ralph R., Assistant Superintendent, Logan County Schools, Logan

INSTITUTIONAL MEMBER

James E. Morrow Library, Marshall College, Huntington

WISCONSIN

Allen, Rowena L., Superintendent, Portage County Schools, Stevens Point
 Armstrong, John, Consultant, California Test Bureau, Madison
 Berg, Mabel L., Supervising Teacher, La Crosse
 Bock, (Mrs.) Eva N., Superintendent, Jefferson County Schools, Jefferson
 Bower, (Mrs.) Ida May, Superintendent, Winnebago County Schools, Oshkosh
 Brown, Winston D., Superintendent, Waukesha County Schools, Waukesha
 Bone, Lewis R., Superintendent, Polk County Schools, Balsam Lake
 Christenson, Christine A., Superintendent, Marinette County Schools, Marinette
 Cravillon, Ira, Superintendent, Dodge County Schools, Juneau
 Diehl, Margaret, Superintendent, Kenosha County Schools, Kenosha
 Drake, Alice, Director, Rural Education, Wisconsin State College, La Crosse
 Drake, Russell, Superintendent, Clark County Schools, Neillville
 Dunn, Elizabeth, Superintendent, Price County Schools, Phillips
 Ellis, (Mrs.) Lillian, Superintendent, Iowa County Schools, Dodgeville
 Ellsworth, Sheridan, Superintendent, Walworth County Schools, Elkhorn
 Erickson, N. E., Principal, Polk County Normal School, Saint Croix Falls
 Garnett, R. L., Director, Rural Education, Wisconsin State College, River Falls
 Gregg, Russell T., Professor of Education, University of Wisconsin, Madison
 Hake, F. H., Superintendent, Barron County Normal School, Rice Lake
 Hornback, Charles A., Director, Rural Education, Eau Claire State College, Eau Claire
 Johnson, Robert L., Supervising Teacher, St. Croix County, Baldwin
 Jones, Alex M., Superintendent, Grant County Schools, Lancaster
 Jungck, F. W., Principal, Dunn County Normal School, Menomonie
 Kies, Michael S., Superintendent, Milwaukee County Schools, Milwaukee; Advisory Council to the National Commission on the Intermediate Administrative Unit; Chairman, Committee of County and Rural Area Superintendents to Work with CPEA; Division of County and Rural Area Superintendents Committee on Rural Scouting
 Kneide, Matt C., Superintendent, Wood County Schools, Wisconsin Rapids
 Kyeen, Roland A., Principal, Richland County Normal School, Richland
 Kretlow, Burton W., Assistant Professor of Rural Education, School of Education, University of Wisconsin, Madison; Committee on Publications and Constructive Studies
 Lamborg, Arnold A., Supervising Principal, Public Schools Joint District No. 11, Holcombe
 Lee, E. M., Principal, Glenwood City
 Leicht, (Mrs.) Hazel, Superintendent, La Crosse County Schools, La Crosse
 Lindow, Thomas S., Supervising Principal, Gillett Public Schools, Gillett
 Longbotham, G. T., Principal, Lincoln Normal School, Merrill

Losinski, Blanche, Superintendent, Dane County Schools, Mt. Horeb
 Nyberg, Myrtle L., Rural Supervising Teacher, Grantsburg
 Pierce, Milton, Supervising Teacher, Milwaukee County Schools, Milwaukee
 Powers, (Mrs.) Irene Corgan, Superintendent, Green County Schools, Monroe
 Reed, J. M., Superintendent, Oneida County Schools, Rhinelander
 Ritter, (Mrs.) Phyllis, Principal, Dodge County Normal School, Mayville
 Roach, May M., Acting Director, Rural Education, Wisconsin State College, Stevens Point
 Rohling, Ingvar M., Superintendent, Central School District 1, Phillips
 Schoenoff, Kurt R., Superintendent, Sauk County Schools, Baraboo
 Schorta, Elsie, Superintendent, Pierce County Schools, Ellsworth
 Sheeki, Harry, Superintendent, Washington County Schools, West Bend
 Sizer, Woodrow J., Superintendent, Mayville Public Schools, Mayville
 Schrweide, O. J., Superintendent, Buffalo County Schools, Alma
 Sorenson, Theo A., Director of Transportation, Department of Public Instruction, Madison; Planning Committee, Great Lakes Regional Conference on Rural Life and Education
 Stewart, May L., Wisconsin State College, Oshkosh
 Timm, Lester A., Superintendent, Fond du Lac County Schools, Fond du Lac
 Turnell, Edith M., Elementary Supervisor, Poplar
 Twobig, Lauri May, Rural Supervising Teacher, Fond du Lac County Schools, Fond du Lac
 Van Straten, H. J., Superintendent, Outagamie County Schools, Appleton
 Webb, Grace, Elementary Supervisor of Integrated District, Black River Falls
 Webster, Jennie L., Superintendent, Eau Claire County Schools, Eau Claire
 Weiss, Frank, Principal, Bonduel Community School, Bonduel
 Wilhelmine, Sister M., Saint Rose Convent, La Crosse
 Winther, Adolph I., Director of Rural and Elementary Education, Wisconsin State College, Whitewater; State Director
 Yuhas, Theodore Frank, 1900 State Street, Eau Claire

INSTITUTIONAL MEMBERS

Library, Wisconsin State College, Stevens Point
 Library, Wisconsin State College, Whitewater
 Public Library, Milwaukee
 Wisconsin State College, Eau Claire
 Wisconsin State College, La Crosse
 Wisconsin State College, Milwaukee
 Wisconsin State College, Superior

WYOMING

Ackerley, (Mrs.) Violet M., Teacher, Sheridan
 Alleman, Effie, Superintendent, Lincoln County Schools, Kemmerer
 Carson, (Mrs.) Rosella, Superintendent, Laramie County Schools, Cheyenne
 Emmett, H. F., Superintendent, Washakie County Schools, Worland
 Hockett, Rosalie E., Superintendent, Sublette County Schools, Pinedale
 Nelson, Helen J., Superintendent, Albany County Schools, Laramie; Advisory Council to the National Commission on the Intermediate Administrative Unit

Olson, Hazel, Assistant Professor, Rural Education, University of Wyoming, Laramie

Reusser, Walter C., Dean, Division of Adult Education and Community Service, University of Wyoming, Laramie; State Director

Sander, Dorris L., Director, Elementary Education and Education for Handicapped Children, State Department of Education, Cheyenne

Watters, Edith W., State Department of Education, Cheyenne

Warlow, (Mrs.) Viola W., Superintendent, Campbell County Schools, Gillette

INSTITUTIONAL MEMBER

University of Wyoming, Mary E. Marks, Librarian, Laramie

ALASKA

Gilliam, Ivan M., Elementary and High School Teacher, Box 154, Kenai

BRAZIL

Goncalves, Paulo Annes, Instituto de Arroz, Porto Alegre, Rio de Janeiro

CANADA

Eamer, Gilbert D., Saskatchewan Teachers Federation, Saskatoon, Saskatchewan
Flower, G. E., Director, CEA-Kellogg Project, Toronto, Ontario

Sence, Muriel, Director, Education Reference and School Service, Department of Education, Victoria, British Columbia

COSTA RICA

Murillo, Edwin, Professor, Turrialba

EQUADOR

Smith, Dorothy D., c/o American Embassy, Quito

Nordrum, G. B., Education Division, Institute of Inter-American Affairs, c/o American Embassy, Quito

INDIA

Menon, T. K. N., Dean, Faculty of Education and Psychology, Baroda University, Baroda

JAPAN

Lindstrom, D. E., International Christian University, 1500 Osawa, Mitaka-shi, Tokyo

PHILIPPINES

Boquiren, T. N., 47 Old Lucban, Baguio City
De Castro, Iluminado G., Division Superintendent of Schools Bureau of Public Schools, Manila

Santos, Roman L., Division Superintendent, Division of Quezon, Bureau of Public Schools, Lucena

INSTITUTIONAL MEMBER

Philippine Women's University, c/o the President, Manila

PUERTO RICO

Garcia, Ramon, Superintendent of Schools, Department of Education, Rio Piedras

Irizarry, Jose L., Superintendent of Schools, Gurabo

Mendez, Juana A., Superior Education Council, University of Puerto Rico, Rio Piedras

INSTITUTIONAL MEMBER

Librarian, Catholic University of Puerto Rico, c/o Sister Mary Dolores, Ponce

INDEX

- Administrative interrelationships, 139, 142, 147, 166, 179, 183, 185, 191, 193, 194, 198
- Administrative process, citizen participation, 53, 130, 136, 165
teacher participation, 53, 60, 92, 100, 104
- Administrative responsibility (See Educational program)
- Administrative structure, 25, 135, 153, 197
allocation of functions, 180, 182
decentralization of functions, 26, 27, 182, 198
types, 180
- Administrative unit (See School district)
- Administrator, preparation, 171, 174, 175
qualifications, 168, 175
selection, 168, 175
- Adult education, 9, 79, 142, 158
- Area school, 140, 152
- Art, instruction, 6, 66
- Attendance center, 13, 30, 49, 51, 137
- Attendance supervision, 9, 12, 16, 59, 76, 80, 115, 142
- Audio-visual services, 10, 12, 60, 93, 108, 121
distribution, 93, 96, 108
production, 95, 97, 108
- Backward Children (See Mentally handicapped)
- Board of education, responsibility, 13, 39, 169, 170, 211
- Bookmobile, 10, 62, 72
- Budget preparation, 12, 113, 115
- Bus driver (See School bus driver)
- Bus route (See Pupil transportation)
- Business education, 8, 12, 156
- Business services, 12, 111, 186
- Centralized purchasing, 61, 62, 65, 118, 194
- Children of migratory workers, 128
- Circuit teacher, 10
- Citizenship education, 6, 101
- Community, autonomy, 27, 55, 179, 207
boundaries, 22, 30, 31, 141
boundaries, and school district, 22, 31, 35, 38, 50
coordination, 36, 189, 191, 212
educational leadership, 37, 57, 165, 210
educational needs, 14, 57, 116, 163, 179, 195
identification, 31, 35, 52
improvement, 9, 36, 51
individuality, 51, 54
leadership, 36, 214
- Community needs, 163, 179
variation in, 186, 190, 196
- Community pressures, 21
- Community resources, 14, 52, 148, 151
in school program, 5, 34, 36, 78, 129, 158
- Community school, defined, 34
development, 35, 51, 131
needs, 143, 156, 179, 190, 219
program, 34, 35, 192, 206
- Compulsory attendance law, 28, 75, 80
- Conservation education, 6, 101
- Consolidation of schools, 30 (See also School district reorganization)
- Contractual arrangements, 18, 152, 199, 203, 206
- Cooperative purchasing (See Purchasing procedures)
- Counseling (See Guidance services)
- County, as an administrative unit (See County-unit)

- County-unit, type of organization, 27, 47, 144
 advantages, 49
 characteristics, 48, 160
 cooperative arrangements, 20
 limitations, 50
 relation to community schools, 50, 51
- Cooperative purchasing (See Centralized purchasing)
- Curriculum, adjustment, 12, 13, 157
 coordination, 12, 88
 development, 12, 101, 153, 156
 enrichment, 58, 74, 159
 related to community, 5, 8, 27, 35, 37
- Democratic leadership, 164
 process, 6, 7, 35, 36
- Demonstration teaching, 106, 155
- Dental hygiene program, 9, 16, 81, 84
- Drop-outs, 8, 75, 140, 156
- Early childhood education, 7
- Education, state responsibility, 25, 136
 state support, 115, 132, 148-51, 200
- Educational leadership, 50, 52, 99, 104, 163, 171, 176-92, 207, 209, 219
- Educational needs, 52, 127, 148
 changing, 133, 153
- Educational opportunity, improvement, 35, 42, 57, 76, 180, 203
 inequalities, 140, 144, 184
- Educational organization (See Administrative structure)
- Educational policies, community participation, 130, 136, 148, 165
 community responsibility, 4, 27, 50, 52
- Educational program, administrative responsibility, 14, 169, 195, 198
 community participation, 21, 29-50, 72, 106, 124, 158, 193, 212
 community support, 21, 148
 coordination, 13, 54, 90, 99, 103, 125, 127, 129, 167
 evaluation, 13, 90, 127, 155
 financing, 94, 147
 flexibility, 5, 25, 52
 improvement, 59, 88, 133, 153, 156
 population as a factor, 149
 quality, 53, 144, 153, 156, 169
 related to community, 5, 34
 responsibility, 21, 27, 136, 218
 specifications, 5-14
 utilizing community resources, 5, 34, 36, 78, 129, 158
- Elementary education, 5, 138
- Equalization, finance (See Financial equalization)
- Equalization opportunities (See Educational opportunities)
- Evaluation (See Educational program, evaluation)
- Exceptional children, incidence, 10, 11
 services for, 7, 10, 16, 69, 140, 158
 types, 11, 69
- Extension classes, 173
- Federal aid to education, 114, 202
- Film library, 91, 92, 133 (See also Audio-visual services)
- Films and filmstrips (See Audio-visual services)
- Financial, equalization, 42, 149, 150, 185, 205
 services, 113, 122
 support of schools, 25, 53, 149, 150
- Fiscal independence, 49, 202
- Guidance services, 3, 9, 16, 75, 140, 157
- Handicapped children (See Exceptional children)
- Health education, 9, 82, 99

- Health services, 9, 16, 81
- Helping teacher, 11, 88, 155
- High-school education (*See* Secondary education)
- High schools, establishment, 30
- Homebound children, 2, 17
- Home teaching, 2, 70, 71, 73
- Industrial education, 8, 12, 142
- Inservice education, for administrators, 129, 171
for teachers, 11, 64, 66, 79, 81, 100, 103, 129, 155, 210
- Instruction, improving, 88, 153
- Instructional materials, 12, 91
- Instructional supervision, 11, 88, 161
evaluation, 91, 155
- Intermediate area (*See* Intermediate unit area)
- Intermediate district (*See* Intermediate unit area)
- Intermediate superintendent, 26, 42, 146
duties, 40, 43, 54, 111, 166
preparation, 144
qualifications, 39, 46, 147, 169
selection, 39, 147, 169, 197
- Intermediate unit, 38, 54, 146
adaptation, 42, 143, 144, 146, 179, 215
area, 143, 146, 191, 198
board of education, 141, 146, 197, 211
boundaries, 140, 142, 201
changing nature, 133, 142, 161
coordination among, 198
coordination of community services, 189, 191, 212
defined, 38, 144, 146
development, 26, 39, 141, 152, 183, 214-18
financing, 143, 147, 198, 199-206
functions, 40, 43, 143, 147, 166, 167, 182, 189, 200
leadership, 41, 42, 44, 104, 111, 144, 162, 184, 206-14
limitations, 41, 43, 44, 139, 145, 161, 199, 217
need for, 26, 39, 43, 142, 145
relation to political units, 142, 143, 191, 201
reorganization, 139
responsibility, 213
size (*See* Intermediate unit area)
state support for, 147, 199, 205
strengthening, 43, 44, 133
structure, 38, 41, 46, 139-47, 184, 190, 197, 215
variations, 39, 144, 146
- Intermediate unit services, 44, 46, 54, 57, 69, 111, 113, 125, 143, 159, 183-90, 196
administration, 193
expansion, 111
flexibility, 195, 197
variations, 162, 186, 190, 215
- Intermediate unit staff, 143, 192, 194, 196, 209, 214
selecting, 207
- Itinerant teacher, 10, 64, 67
- Kindergarten, 5, 100
- Leadership (*See* Educational leadership)
- Legal services, 112, 186
- Legislation, permissive, 25, 152
- Library services, 9, 10, 12, 59-64, 91-98
supervision, 10, 61
- Local districts (*See* School districts)
- Maladjusted pupils, 70, 77
- Mental health clinic, 17, 77, 105
- Mentally handicapped children, 1, 16, 70, 74
- Mobile units, 10, 62, 72, 81
- Music education, 6, 10, 65, 91
- Neighborhood associations, 29
- Nurse-teacher, 16, 17, 81, 83, 84

- On-the-job training (See Work experience)
- One-teacher schools, 28, 93, 138
- Parent education, 7, 72
- Parent study groups, 72, 79
- Parent-teacher relations, 7
- Partially sighted children, 17, 70
- Permissive legislation, 25, 152
- Personnel services, 12, 125
- Physical education, 6, 12, 67, 83
- Physically handicapped children, 17, 69, 73
- Population, centers, 30, 138
 - change, 13, 125
 - distribution, 13
 - effect on educational costs, 149
 - mobility, 184
- Professional library services, 12, 72, 92
- Psychiatric services, 17, 70, 72, 73, 77
- Psychological services, 16, 17, 70, 76, 77
- Public library services, coordination with school, 9, 10, 62
- Public relations, 103, 116, 130, 132
- Pupil accounting, 9, 59, 76, 80, 115
- Pupil needs, 58, 78, 163
- Pupil personnel services, 59, 75
- Pupil, physical examination for, 81, 83, 84
- Pupil responsibility, development of, 98
- Pupil safety, 124
- Pupil transportation, 121, 124, 151
 - administration, 142, 196
 - extended use, 13
 - planning of bus routes, 13, 123
 - school bus driver (See School bus driver)
- Purchasing procedures, 118-21
- Reading, instruction, 6, 59, 67, 74
- Reading clinic, 68
- Reading consultant, 67, 88
- Recreation services, 9, 12, 67, 82
- Reorganization of school districts (See School district reorganization)
- Reorganized school districts, boundaries, 137
 - characteristics, 31, 137, 185
 - limitations, 185
 - size, 19, 137
- Research needed, 15, 16, 18, 177, 192, 195, 197
- Research services, 13, 127
- Rural community (See Community)
- Rural deficiencies, 184
- Rural isolation, 29
- Rural life, changing character, 41
- Safety education, 82, 124
- School building, community use, 34, 36
 - maintenance, 13, 82, 115
 - planning, 13, 115, 127
- School bus driver, training, 13, 123
- School bus maintenance, 16, 122
- School-community interrelationships, 7, 21
- School-community program, 8, 131
- School district, ability to support schools, 53, 149, 150
 - boundaries, 13, 26, 49
 - establishment, 25, 28
 - not operating schools, 18, 138
 - number, 18, 19, 31, 138
 - size, 15, 18, 137
 - tax base, 49, 114, 185
 - types, 19, 32
- School district, small district, advantages, 29
 - limitations, 28, 136, 140, 150, 158
- School district reorganization, 13, 19, 30, 54, 131, 136, 151, 163, 185
 - effects, 41, 132, 144, 151, 154
 - incentives, 151, 193

- planning, 34, 127
- programs, 30, 136, 144
- trends, 20, 136
- School enrollment, increasing, 53, 125
- School lunch program, 74, 82, 99, 114, 120
- School lunch workers, training program, 117
- School nurses (See Nurse-teacher)
- School study council, 173
- Secondary education, 7, 30, 137
- Social workers, 17, 77
- Special education (See Exceptional children)
- Speech correction, 17, 70, 73, 91
- state aid (See State support of schools)
- State support of schools, 69, 115, 132, 148, 151, 200, 205
- State system of schools, 28, 57, 136
- Summer activities, 9
- Supervision of instruction (See Instructional supervision)
- Surplus commodities, 114
- Teacher, certification, 90, 106
 - orientation, 90, 106
 - physical examinations, 82
 - preparation, 53, 108, 155, 162
 - recruitment, 125
 - selection, 12, 112, 125, 127
 - supply, 53, 125, 127
- Teacher-consultant, 88, 89
- Teacher-librarian, 60, 62
- Telephone, school-to-home, use, 70, 73
- Testing program, 67, 75, 80, 90
- Visual education (See Audio-visual services)
- Visiting teacher, 17, 70, 73
- Vocational education, 7, 12, 69, 75, 114, 140, 156
- Vocational opportunities, 78, 153
- Work experience, 156, 157