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Preface

During 1967 and 1968 five supplemental education centers for rural areas in Florida were funded under Title III, ESEA. These centers were to perform various leadership services for the improvement of schools within their regions.

This report emanated from the expectation that these centers would continue to function after federal grants were terminated at the end of a four year period. Yet, of the five centers established, only one survived and is operating at full capacity at this writing. What were the conditions which assisted in the extended life of one of these centers and the death of others? The study reported herein was designed to illuminate those conditions through a comparative study of two of these centers.

This study had the further purpose of producing implications for the establishment of these high-risk regional centers. Hopefully, those who read this report will find information of assistance in initiating and operating regional educational development centers. The results should be of interest to state department of education leaders who have for many years been interested in regionalization.

Finally, the readers of this report should be reminded that the subjects of this study, the Panhandle Area Educational Cooperative (PAEC) and the Indian River Regional Educational Development Council (IRREDC), were cooperative undertakings by several school districts. The failure or success of the two was not entirely based upon what the central staff for these projects did or did not do. The school systems involved also had a responsibility for the success or failure because in reality the
nine counties of PAEC and the six counties of IRREDC were these organi-
izations. If the PAEC staff lives, then the cooperating counties live in
PAEC and vice versa. After all, as the reader will see, the IRREDC
staff had no control over some of the important conditions which resulted
in its demise.

Ralph B. Kimbrough
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

During the latter part of the 1960's five supplemental education centers for rural areas of Florida were funded under the provisions of Title III of ESEA. These centers were established for the avowed purpose of providing viable alternative solutions to persistent educational problems. Each of the centers was expected to function (1) to make assessments of the educational needs of the school districts included, (2) to help the school districts plan, develop, implement, and evaluate innovative educational programs in the areas of needs identified, (3) to conduct in-service programs, (4) to disseminate information to the cooperating school districts, (5) to provide support to cooperating school districts that adopted innovative and exemplary programs.

These centers experienced varying degrees of success in achieving these functions. Moreover, only one of these supplemental education centers continued to function after the four years of ESEA, Title III funds were exhausted. Therein lay the inception of this research report. Why was one of the supplemental education centers more successful in surviving in its environment than the others?

The Problem

The problem undertaken by the authors was to discover why one of the centers was more successful than other centers as a basis for projecting procedural models that could be used by educators who elect to enter into such cooperative arrangements. What were the elements that contributed to
the continuation or discontinuation of the supplemental education centers? Why was one of the centers more successful than its four other counterparts? What can we learn from studying these cooperative experiments that will help in future attempts to establish supplemental centers?

Procedures

A comparative design was used to assist the writers in studying the problem. Two supplemental education centers were selected for intensive study. One of these centers was designated as successful and the other center was designated as unsuccessful. Data were obtained from the following sources: (1) the related research and literature were reviewed; (2) the documents available from the two selected centers were analyzed; (3) the United States census and other reports providing socio-economic summaries of the areas were utilized; (4) questionnaires were sent to selected school principals and teachers; and (5) in-depth personal interviews were held with the officials of the supplemental education centers, state department of education officials, school district administrators, teachers, school board members, and influential citizens.

Selection of Centers for Study

For purposes of this study the major criterion for success was the continuation of the centers after ESEA, Title III funds were exhausted. There was an expectation that authorities in these centers would continue them after federal funds were exhausted. Moreover, the survival of these organizations, to a considerable degree, depended upon how well they functioned. Since only the Panhandle Area Educational Cooperative (PAEC), with
offices in Chipley, Florida was continued, it was described as the "successful" center. With the assistance of leaders who were knowledgeable about the centers, the Indian River Regional Educational Development Council (IRREDC) was selected as the "unsuccessful" center. The two cooperatives were thought to present similar socioeconomic conditions, pupil populations, and educational needs.

Initial concern was expressed by some officials because of the labeling of one of the centers successful and the other unsuccessful. The point was made by one official that one cannot say that the IRREDC was unsuccessful because it was not continued after federal funds were exhausted. The authors readily agree that not all of the IRREDC experiences or that of the other discontinued centers were unsuccessful. Nevertheless, the terms successful and unsuccessful were applicable to the centers for purposes of this study, which was based on whether they survived after federal funds were exhausted. On the other hand, as the data for the study were collected and analyzed, there was much support for the original definitions. In the minds of an overwhelming number of the teachers, administrators, and other persons interviewed, the IRREDC was unsuccessful whereas the success of the PAEC was widely extolled by its clients. This will become obvious to the reader as he continues through the report.

As was stated in the preface for this report, the successful and unsuccessful nature of the organizations studied was not because of one or a few conditions. Unique system mixes of many variables resulted in the success of one and lack of success in the other. Thus this report is in no way to be interpreted as downgrading the abilities of those associated with the IRREDC or as extolling the superior abilities of those associated with PAEC.
Collection of Data

A review of the literature was made to identify those characteristics that contributed to the successful or unsuccessful operation of organizations, such as the supplemental education centers. Documents for both PAEC and IRREDC were studied, including several evaluation reports. From the literature and documentary evidence the research staff projected 66 criteria for identifying successful and unsuccessful supplemental educational centers. These statements served as the basis for preparing questionnaires and interview guides used to collect data. As data collection proceeded, the staff added to the criteria.

A questionnaire was prepared for teachers and for principals in the areas served by PAEC and IRREDC. These questionnaires contained similar statements but were appropriately worded for the persons and the areas in which they were used. An example of the questionnaire used for teachers in the PAEC area is shown in Appendix A. All members of the faculty in nine randomly selected schools in each of the supplemental education centers filled in the teacher questionnaire. The principals of each selected school were called by telephone and their cooperation solicited in distributing and returning the questionnaires. The questionnaires for school principals were mailed to all principals of schools in the IRREDC and PAEC centers who had not been selected previously for personal interviews. Further detailed information about the development and use of the questionnaires and treatment of data is included in Chapter III.

Interview guides were prepared to use in personal interviews with teachers, principals, school superintendents, school board members, community leaders, the administrative staffs for PAEC and IRREDC, and liaison persons.
The interviews with community leaders and school board members were employed to inquire of their knowledge of PAEC and IRREDC and their general impressions of the organizations. The interviews with superintendents, principals, teachers, and others were more in depth. A copy of the interview guide used in interviewing school superintendents, principals, teachers, and others associated with PAEC and IRREDC is shown in Appendix B. The description of the data obtained from the interviews is found in Chapter IV of this report.

With the exception of one newly appointed superintendent and two members of boards of education, all school superintendents and board members were interviewed in each of the cooperating school districts. In-depth interviews were also conducted with persons other than the school superintendents who served in a liaison capacity with the supplemental education centers. Interviews were conducted with two school principals and six teachers in the home school districts of PAEC and IRREDC and in two additional randomly selected school districts in each of the centers. The schools in these three school districts of each supplemental education center were stratified by secondary and elementary and selected randomly. The principal and three teachers (selected randomly) with at least three years experience were interviewed in each of these schools. As indicated previously, interviews were conducted with the central office leaders of PAEC and IRREDC. Prominent leaders in the home counties for PAEC and IRREDC were interviewed. The State Coordinator for Title III of ESEA, State of Florida was interviewed along with three other state department people. About ten prominent community leaders (i.e., bankers, politicians, businessmen, ministers) were interviewed in the home counties of PAEC and IRREDC.
In all, approximately 105 personal interviews were conducted. A total of 345 questionnaires were returned by teachers of which 331 were usable. Forty-seven principals returned questionnaires.
CHAPTER II

AREAS SERVED BY THE SUPPLEMENTAL EDUCATION CENTERS

This section is included to give the reader a brief explanation of the location, population, economy, and levels of educational finance of the school districts served by the Panhandle Area Educational Cooperative (PAEC) and the Indian River Regional Educational Development Council (IRREDC). The areas served by IRREDC and PAEC had some similar characteristics. For example, both areas are essentially rural with considerable dependence upon agriculture. On the other hand, there are some differences. For instance, the area served by IRREDC is experiencing more rapid growth than the area served by PAEC. PAEC serves a rural farm belt area in the northwest Florida Panhandle, whereas IRREDC served a rural area in southern Florida.

The Counties Served by PAEC

The nine northwest Florida counties which make up PAEC are located in the Florida Panhandle. These counties are bordered on the north by Alabama and Georgia and on the south by the Gulf of Mexico. The counties are Bay, Calhoun, Franklin, Gulf, Holmes, Jackson, Liberty, Walton, and Washington.

The following description of this nine-county area was given in the original application for the Title III Grant in 1967 (2, p.8).

The estimated population of the area to be served by this cooperative is 169,334 which represents 3 1/2 percent of the total state population. All counties are sparsely populated, and have in them many widely dispersed rural communities, each having similar characteristics.
In a rural sparsely populated area as is involved in this project, limited educational and cultural facilities and resources are available. The Florida State University, Chipola Junior College, and Gulf Coast Junior College afford the major educational and cultural opportunities for this area.

For many years research and testing have indicated rural Northwest Florida as an area of education deprivation. This is in part due to low per capita income and poor economic conditions which limit the area in resources and its ability to attract competent well-trained educational personnel.

Population of the Area

The population of most of the nine-county area increased some during the years between 1960 and 1970. However, the area has not had the rapid growth experienced in many Florida counties. Bay County shows the most population growth of the nine counties. Its population increased 12.1 percent from 1960 to 1970. The remaining eight counties had a growth of less than 8 percent for the same period. In fact, two counties, Holmes and Jackson, have lost population. In the same period of time the State had a 37.1 percent increase in population. Table 1 shows comparative data for the nine-county area and a projected population for 1978 (1).

By United States Census Bureau definition only Bay County is greater than 50 percent urban (5). Panama City, located in Bay County, is the only city in the nine-county area with a population above 25,000. Three of the counties are classified as 100 percent rural and an additional three are approximately 70 percent or more rural. In comparison, only 19.5 percent of Florida's population was considered rural by the 1970 census. With the exception of Bay County there has been very little shifting of population within the counties from rural to urban during the past decade.
**TABLE 1**

Comparative Population Data for the FAEC Counties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bay</td>
<td>67,131</td>
<td>75,283</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>81,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calhoun</td>
<td>7,422</td>
<td>7,624</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>7,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>6,576</td>
<td>7,065</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>56.1</td>
<td>7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gulf</td>
<td>9,937</td>
<td>10,096</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>57.6</td>
<td>56.4</td>
<td>10,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holmes</td>
<td>10,844</td>
<td>10,720</td>
<td>-1.1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>10,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>36,208</td>
<td>34,434</td>
<td>-4.9</td>
<td>80.1</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>34,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberty</td>
<td>3,138</td>
<td>3,379</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walton</td>
<td>15,576</td>
<td>16,087</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>66.1</td>
<td>69.1</td>
<td>16,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>11,249</td>
<td>11,453</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>71.9</td>
<td>70.8</td>
<td>16,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The distribution of the population of the nine-county area among the major age brackets shows no major deviations from the State of Florida (1). Table 2 shows the comparative data for the counties. Generally among the counties there is a higher percentage of the population in the sixty-five and older bracket when compared to state averages.

Table 3 shows the proportion of non-white population in the nine counties (1). In Jackson, Franklin, Gulf, and Washington the percentage of non-white population was above the state average for both 1960 and 1970. However, the percentage of non-white population decreased in 7 of the counties between 1960 and 1970.

**Economy of the Area**

The Panhandle counties may be divided into two parts so far as the economy is concerned. Panama City in Bay County and to a lesser extent Gulf County depend upon tourism. The chief attraction for tourists are the nearby beaches on the Gulf of Mexico. The livelihood for most of the residents in the nine-county area, however, is based primarily on agriculture, fishing, and paper manufacturing. Much of the area is covered with pulp wood timber, which is an important source of income for the counties.

Table 4 lists the number of tax returns for the nine counties in three selected brackets (4). The percentage of returns in the lowest bracket for most counties is considerably higher than the state figure. Likewise, the percentage of returns in the highest bracket is generally much lower than the state figure.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Under 5</th>
<th>5 to 17</th>
<th>Over 65</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bay</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calhoun</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gulf</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holmes</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberty</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walton</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 3

**Distribution of Non-White Population In the PAEC Counties**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bay</td>
<td>57,080</td>
<td>10,051</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>64,829</td>
<td>10,008</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calhoun</td>
<td>6,232</td>
<td>1,190</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6,458</td>
<td>1,158</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>5,180</td>
<td>1,396</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5,730</td>
<td>1,323</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gulf</td>
<td>7,550</td>
<td>2,387</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7,622</td>
<td>2,458</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holmes</td>
<td>10,390</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>10,370</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>24,966</td>
<td>11,242</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>24,259</td>
<td>10,259</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberty</td>
<td>2,660</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2,887</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walton</td>
<td>13,461</td>
<td>2,115</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>14,165</td>
<td>1,870</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>9,071</td>
<td>2,178</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>9,088</td>
<td>2,355</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 4

Distribution of Tax Returns for the Nine-County Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Under $3000</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Between $3000-10,000</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Over $10,000</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bay</td>
<td>8662</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>11,561</td>
<td>50.7</td>
<td>2568</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calhoun</td>
<td>986</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>891</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>919</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>762</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gulf</td>
<td>879</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>1,545</td>
<td>55.7</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holmes</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td>1,687</td>
<td>47.3</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>3871</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>4,180</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberty</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>50.8</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walton</td>
<td>1323</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>1,539</td>
<td>49.6</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>(data not available)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**School Financing**

Table 5 shows the adjusted gross income by pupil for each of the counties in 1967 and the amount each of the counties spent per pupil in average daily attendance in 1968-69 (4), (1). Although each of the figures in column one is considerably lower than the state figure, the amount spent per pupil is in line with the state expenditure per pupil.
### TABLE 5
Gross Income and School Expenditure Per Pupil

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Adjusted Gross Income per pupil for 1967</th>
<th>Amount Spent per Pupil in ADA for 1968-1969</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bay</td>
<td>6574</td>
<td>613.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calhoun</td>
<td>3905</td>
<td>869.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>4120</td>
<td>659.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gulf</td>
<td>5650</td>
<td>720.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holmes</td>
<td>5461</td>
<td>724.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>4386</td>
<td>665.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberty</td>
<td>3999</td>
<td>883.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walton</td>
<td>4924</td>
<td>635.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td></td>
<td>769.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>9241</td>
<td>673.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Counties Served By IRREDC

The geographic area served by the Indian River Regional Educational Development Council covered six counties. Indian River, St. Lucie, and Martin border on the Atlantic Ocean approximately 150 miles north of Miami. Highlands, Okeechobee and Glades lie directly west of the coastal counties in the center of the state. Martin, Okeechobee and Glades counties are on the banks of Lake Okeechobee.

The following description of this six-county area is contained in the original application for the Title III Grant in 1967 (2, p.8).
The counties in this area do not, at the moment, have the personnel which makes it possible for them to research, construct, nor implement innovative or exemplary programs for their communities. At this time the only outside assistance available to any of the counties is the services of consultants from the State Department of Education who are responsible for all the counties in Florida.

The population of the six-county area uniting to request the operational grant has grown extremely rapidly in the past ten years. It is still essentially rural country, except small areas on the east coast. The education and cultural aspects of the area are sadly lacking. Many students travel twenty miles and more to attend high school. Education beyond high school is limited to two public supported junior colleges, both less than six years old.

The committee preparing this proposal recognizes the need for long range cooperative educational planning and for the leadership in developing federal programs.

Population of the Area

The population of the six-county area increased rapidly during the years between 1960 and 1970. Table 6 shows comparative data for this area and projected population for 1978 (1), (5). Only two counties failed to record a growth rate that bettered the state growth rate of 37.1 percent. Although all of the counties show substantial growth during this ten year period, four of the counties were still classified as more than 50 percent rural by the 1970 census. All of the counties were classified as more than 30 percent rural and Glades County was listed as being 100 percent rural. In contrast to this, only 19.5 percent of the population of the state is classified as living in rural areas.

Table 7 shows a breakdown of the population in the counties by age brackets (1). In looking at the distribution of the population of the six-county area among the major age brackets, Glades and Okeechobee show a higher
TABLE 6
Comparative Population Data for the IRREDC Counties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Glades</td>
<td>2,950</td>
<td>3,669</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highlands</td>
<td>21,338</td>
<td>29,507</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td>36,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian River</td>
<td>25,309</td>
<td>35,992</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>51.2</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>44,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin</td>
<td>16,932</td>
<td>28,035</td>
<td>65.6</td>
<td>71.7</td>
<td>82.8</td>
<td>38,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okeechobee</td>
<td>6,424</td>
<td>11,233</td>
<td>74.9</td>
<td>54.1</td>
<td>66.9</td>
<td>13,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Lucie</td>
<td>39,294</td>
<td>50,834</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>59,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 7
Age Group Comparisons in the IRREDC by Percentage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Under 5</th>
<th>5-17</th>
<th>Over 65</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Glades</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highlands</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian River</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okeechobee</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Lucie</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
percentage of their population in the lower age bracket and a lower percentage in the sixty-five and older bracket. In three of the most populous counties, Martin, Indian River, and Highlands, the percentage of the population in the over sixty-five bracket is considerably higher than the state breakdown of 14.5 percent.

As shown in Table 8, two of the counties in this area show a high proportion of non-whites in its population (1). Glades County shows 31.1 percent non-white, and St. Lucie shows 31.4 percent non-white. Highlands, with 21.8 percent non-white, is also above the non-white figure of 15.3 percent for the state.

**TABLE 8**

**Distribution of Non-White Population In the IRREDIC Counties**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1960</th>
<th>1970</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Non-White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glades</td>
<td>1,727</td>
<td>1,223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highlands</td>
<td>16,820</td>
<td>4,518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian River</td>
<td>19,920</td>
<td>5,389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin</td>
<td>13,513</td>
<td>3,419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okeechobee</td>
<td>5,356</td>
<td>1,068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Lucie</td>
<td>26,523</td>
<td>12,771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Economy of the IRREDC Area

The long sandy beaches and the long warm summers of Indian River County, St. Lucie County, and Martin County are important tourist attractions. In addition to attracting tourists, many people retire each year in the communities that dot the three counties. These counties are also famous for citrus products that bear the name Indian River Citrus.

Glades and Okeechobee county residents depend upon agriculture and ranching for a large part of their livelihood. There are many ranches and dairies in the two counties. In addition, the growing and refining of sugar cane is an important source of income in the two counties.

There is a substantial retirement community in Highlands County. The groves in Highland County are also important sources of income for the residents.

Table 9 shows the number of tax returns for the six counties in three selected brackets (4). Generally, the distribution of returns in the under $3000 bracket shows little deviation from returns throughout the state. The distribution of the returns in the over $10,000 bracket is lower than the state average. The interior counties show a lower distribution of returns in the higher bracket than do the coastal counties.

Level of Educational Finance

Table 10 shows the adjusted gross income by pupil for each of the counties in 1967 and the amount each of the counties spent per pupil in average daily attendance in 1968-1969 (4), (1). At the time of this study, Glades County had the greatest expenditure per pupil in average daily attendance in the state.
### TABLE 9

**Distribution of Tax Returns for the IRREDC Counties**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Under $3000</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Between $3000-$10,000</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Over $10,000</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Glades</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>55.2</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highlands</td>
<td>3,082</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>3,805</td>
<td>50.3</td>
<td>685</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian River</td>
<td>3,767</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>5,578</td>
<td>51.2</td>
<td>1,543</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin</td>
<td>2,790</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>3,556</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>953</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okeechobee</td>
<td>968</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>1,328</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Lucie</td>
<td>5,333</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>6,849</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>1,517</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 10

**Gross Income and School Expenditure Per Pupil**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Adjusted Gross Income per pupil 1967</th>
<th>Amount Spent per pupil in ADA for 1968-1969</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Glades</td>
<td>3264</td>
<td>904.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highlands</td>
<td>6576</td>
<td>706.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian River</td>
<td>8623</td>
<td>707.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin</td>
<td>8923</td>
<td>701.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okeechobee</td>
<td>8934</td>
<td>593.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Lucie</td>
<td>6699</td>
<td>641.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>9241</td>
<td>673.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In this area three of the counties appear to be in line with the state average for adjusted gross income per pupil. Glades County is well below the state figure. Glades, Highlands, Indian River, and Martin compare well with the state expenditure figure. Okeechobee is considerably low in this area.

Summary Comparison of Characteristics

Comparison of the population characteristics, economic base, and educational expenditures of the areas served by PAEC and IRREDC produced more similarities than differences. The two areas were essentially rural with heavy dependence upon agriculture. The total population of IRREDC was 159,270 in 1970 compared to 176,141 in PAEC. There was much diversity in the total population among the school districts of both areas. The non-white population is declining in both areas. The level of financial support for education in both areas was about the same.

The IRREDC area is experiencing a higher rate of population growth than the school districts served by PAEC. The IRREDC counties also showed a higher percentage of residents over 65 years of age which indicates growth as a retirement area. Tourism may be slightly more important in the IRREDC area. The number of persons making less than $3,000 per year is higher in the PAEC area.

The executive head of the public school system of each county in Florida is the Superintendent of Schools, a constitutional office. Many superintendents are elected for four year terms. An amendment to the Florida Constitution provides for appointive superintendents in certain
counties if the electors of the county so vote. In the Panhandle counties all nine of the superintendents are elected. In the IRRED C counties two counties (Indian River and Okeechobee) have appointive superintendents.

In summary, from a purely statistical standpoint, the areas served by the IRRED C and the PAEC are very similar except for the difference in rate of population growth and a few other minor differences. From some theoretical standpoints, the rapid population growth should produce system openness advantageous to the acceptance of the IRRED C by the citizens as a vehicle for educational change. Moreover, one frequently hears the conjecture that the areas of southern Florida are more flexible in acceptance of change and more liberal in social and political values than the northernmost panhandle areas. Since this was not investigated in this study, it remains just an unsupported conjecture.

Finally, there was no evidence in this study to suggest that conditions relating to population, economic base, or financial support for education were important in the survival opportunities of the two centers.
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CHAPTER III

THE OPINIONS OF TEACHERS AND PRINCIPALS
CONCERNING PAEC AND IRREDC

The opinions of teachers and principals working within the service areas of the two supplemental education centers studied were obtained by two means. Initially, a questionnaire was developed and administered to selected representatives of both the teachers and principals in each of the two regions served by the centers. This was followed by personal interviews in the two areas with selected teachers, principals, school superintendents, board members, center staff members, and other persons which are discussed in Chapter IV. The purpose of this chapter is to describe the development, utilization, and results of the questionnaire provided in the initial phase of data gathering within each of the two cooperatives studied. The results obtained through follow-up interviews will be presented in the following chapter of this report.

Development of the Questionnaire

Before an instrument could be developed, criteria pertinent to the success or lack of success of the Title III projects were developed. This was accomplished by two methods. Initially, available literature pertaining to theory, practice, and opinion was reviewed. While this was being accomplished, a computerized search of available research on Title III projects was initiated. Through use of the combined data obtained from both of these sources, an extensive list of 66 criteria possibly pertinent to the success or lack of success of the Title III centers was compiled. To assure that all areas relative to ascertaining the effectiveness of Title III projects
were included in the questionnaire, but in a manner that would not over-
burden those completing the instrument, the initial list of criteria was
categorized under the following major headings: setting goals, educational
change, organization and administration, finance, communication, public
relations and visibility, leadership, meeting educational needs, planning,
evaluation, and miscellaneous. From within each category was selected a
number of variables representative and inclusive of that category that were
considered as probably determinate of the success or lack of success of a
Title III project.

Through this process a twenty item questionnaire was prepared. Since
the questionnaire was to be administered to both principals and teachers,
two forms were prepared. A copy of the form mailed to teachers is shown in
Appendix A. While each contained the same type statements, the wording of
each of the two forms was adjusted to be applicable to the position held by
the respondent and for the supplemental education center serving them.

Sample for the Study

To select the teachers to be provided with the questionnaires, a complete
list of all public schools included in each of the counties served by the
centers was obtained. Each school served by the given center was assigned a
number. At random, ten numbers were drawn for the IRREDC sample and the PAEC
sample. The final teacher sample, then, included a total of twenty schools,
ten from each area served by IRREDC and PAEC.

The principals of these schools were contacted and each agreed to partic-
cipate in the study. To increase the probability that the data received were
valid, the principal in each of these schools was requested to administer the
instrument only to those teachers with at least three years of experience in the system. This was done to assure that those responding to the questionnaire were in a position to have had contact and knowledge of the Title III centers in their area. The principal was also requested to guard the confidentiality of the responses given by the teachers participating in the study.

The sample of principals was obtained by compiling a list of principals working within the counties served by each of the two centers. Excluded from these lists were principals of adult education centers, the principals of those schools to which teacher questionnaires were sent, and the principals previously selected at random to be personally interviewed at a later date (see Chapter IV).

Treatment of Data

To analyze the data obtained from the questionnaires, a chi square test was employed. This means of analysis was used because the samples were considered to be independent and the data of an ordinal nature. In addition, the chi square has been specifically designed to compare the relative frequency of responses placed into given categories by different groups of individuals. Considering the design of the questionnaire, the chi square test provided the best means for analysis.

The responses of the teachers in schools served by PAEC were compared with those responses by teachers in IRREDC. The responses of principals working in systems served by IRREDC were compared with responses by principals in the PAEC area. A chi square test was carried out on each of the forty resultant comparisons.
Twenty-six principals in the IRREDC area returned questionnaires. Two of these questionnaires were not completed and were excluded from the statistical analysis. All twenty-three principal questionnaires returned from the PAEC area were completed and were used in the statistical analysis.

One hundred eighty-four teacher questionnaires were returned from the area served by PAEC. All were substantially complete and used in the statistical analysis. One hundred sixty-one questionnaires were returned by teachers working within the IRREDC service area. Fourteen of these were not completed and were excluded from the statistical analysis.

While the principal questionnaire provided five categories for response, the analysis was computed on three categories. When using a chi square test with this size sample, the expected values computed should equal at least five in eighty percent of the cells. This was not the case in this initial analysis. Therefore, the response categories were collapsed from five to three. Strongly agree responses were combined with agree responses. The "neither agree nor disagree" responses were unaltered.

The teacher questionnaire data were not collapsed. The chi square in this case was computed using a two by five contingency table instead of the two by three table used on the questionnaire data furnished by principals.

The hypotheses under which the tests were performed were:

Principals $H_0$: The principals in the PAEC area as compared to those in the IRREDC cooperative did not differ in their perceptions of the effectiveness of their respective cooperative and therefore did not differ with respect to the relative frequency with which they fell into the given categories of the questionnaire.
**Teachers** $H_0$: The teachers in the PAEC cooperative as compared to those in the IRREDAC area did not differ in their perceptions of the effectiveness of their respective cooperative and therefore did not differ with respect to the relative frequency with which they fell into the given categories of the questionnaire.

**Principals and Teachers** $H_1$: A greater portion of those working in the PAEC cooperative area (principals or teachers) were more positive in their perceptions of the effectiveness of PAEC than were those individuals (teachers or principals) working in the IRREDAC cooperative area as evidenced by the difference in the relative frequency in which they placed themselves in given categories of the questionnaire.

**Analysis of Responses from Principals**

Shown in Table 11 are the responses of the principals from PAEC and IRREDAC to the items included on the questionnaire. The results of the statistical analysis of the significance of the differences between the two groups are also shown in the table. By studying the responses to the statements, the reader can visualize a different pattern of responses between the two groups. The PAEC principals were more positive than were the IRREDAC principals. For example, with one exception all of the principals from PAEC felt that the goals and objectives were clear, whereas only one-half the principals from IRREDAC felt that the IRREDAC goals were clear. Similar patterns of responses were made to many other questionnaire statements. Twenty principals in the area served by PAEC saw it as stimulating constructive educational change,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire Statement</th>
<th>Center</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Chi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The goals and objectives of the IRRED/C/PAEC are clear to me.</td>
<td>PAEC</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IRRED/C</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The IRRED/C/PAEC stimulates constructive educational change in rural areas.</td>
<td>PAEC</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IRRED/C</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. There is a definite need for the IRRED/C/PAEC.</td>
<td>PAEC</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13.16*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IRRED/C</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The IRRED/C/PAEC is properly staffed to carry out its stated objectives.</td>
<td>PAEC</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6.78**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IRRED/C</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The leaders of the IRRED/C/PAEC are motivated by a sincere desire to solve persistent educational problems.</td>
<td>PAEC</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IRRED/C</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Dissemination of information to principals is well organized and effective.</td>
<td>PAEC</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13.16*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IRRED/C</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaire Statement</td>
<td>Center</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Chi Square Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Grass-roots participation in planning is evident, including wide participation of principals.</td>
<td>PAEC</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13.69*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IRREDC</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. IRREDC/PAEC readily adjusts its program to meet the expressed needs of local schools.</td>
<td>PAEC</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IRREDC</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. The IRREDC/PAEC helps participating school districts assess and clarify their educational needs.</td>
<td>PAEC</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>27.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IRREDC</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. The IRREDC/PAEC encourages local school districts to develop imaginative solutions to educational problems.</td>
<td>PAEC</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IRREDC</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Program adjustments are made in accordance with the outside evaluations.</td>
<td>PAEC</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IRREDC</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Principals are aware of the programs and services offered by the IRREDC/PAEC.</td>
<td>PAEC</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10.62*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IRREDC</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaire Statement</td>
<td>Center</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Chi Square Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. The IRREDC/PAEC project staff works harmoniously with principals.</td>
<td>PAEC</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IRREDC</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. A need for the IRREDC/PAEC still exists.</td>
<td>PAEC</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IRREDC</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Community reactions to the IRREDC/PAEC have been favorable.</td>
<td>PAEC</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11.07*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IRREDC</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. The director and IRREDC/PAEC staff provides outstanding leadership.</td>
<td>PAEC</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IRREDC</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. The activities engaged in by the IRREDC/PAEC meet its stated goals and objectives.</td>
<td>PAEC</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IRREDC</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. The county in which the IRREDC/PAEC center is located receives more services than other member counties.</td>
<td>PAEC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5.53**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IRREDC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaire Statement</td>
<td>Center</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Chi Square Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Red tape at the local level does not interfere with the operation of the IRRED/PAEC.</td>
<td>PAEC</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.70**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IRRED</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. The IRRED/PAEC has made a positive contribution to education in this county.</td>
<td>PAEC</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IRRED</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at the .01 level.

** Not significant at .01 or .001 levels.
whereas only five of the principals from IRREDC viewed it as stimulating educational change.

On the other hand, the responses of the two groups were not widely different on some items. These include statements number 4, 18, and 19. This indicates that the staffing, red tape, and inequality of services were not perceived as differently as were all other areas included.

Through using the chi square test, the significance of difference of responses to the statements by the two groups was determined for all questionnaire items displayed in Table 11. There was a significant difference at the .001 level on twelve of the twenty statements. These were items 1, 2, 5, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 16, 17, and 20. As indicated in Table 11, five of the eight statements on which the responses were not significant at the .001 level were significant at the .01 level. The difference in responses of the two principal groups was not statistically significant at either the .01 or the .001 levels for statements numbered 4, 18, and 19.

These data indicate that the principals from PAEC had a much higher positive response to the questionnaire statements than did the principals from IRREDC. Practically all of the PAEC principals felt that the center helped school districts clarify needs and solve problems. The responses indicate that the IRREDC principals did not feel it contributed much in need identification. Likewise, PAEC principals viewed the center as a mechanism for educational change, whereas only five principals from IRREDC concurred in this view. Thus the great differences in responses provide some significant insights into the way in which the centers were perceived to operate by principals. Likewise, some leads concerning variables which might have been unimportant in success or failure to survive can be noted.
PAEC was viewed by the principals as having well-defined goals and objectives and as stimulating educational change. It was perceived as flexible in making program adjustments, in meeting school needs, educational planning, and in helping school districts assess and clarify their needs. PAEC principals felt that the center had achieved grass-roots participation and that dissemination of information was effective. PAEC was also very positively viewed as encouraging local school districts to develop imaginative solutions to educational problems. The harmonious way in which the PAEC staff worked with school principals was highly commended. The principals felt that the PAEC director and his staff provided outstanding leadership. There was a strong feeling of need among the principals to keep PAEC in operation. PAEC was seen as meeting its stated goals and objectives and as making a positive contribution to educational development. Practically all PAEC principals felt that the center was needed.

A much different description was obtained from the data collected from those in the IRREDC. Its goals and objectives were not clearly understood by many principals, and it did not impress many as an agency to stimulate change. There were serious reservations concerning the IRREDC flexibility in adjusting programs and in meeting educational needs of districts. The principals did not perceive it as contributing forcefully to helping schools assess and clarify needs. Many principals did not feel that the IRREDC contributed imaginative solutions to their problems, and there is evidence that many principals were not aware of its programs and services. The principals expressed little enthusiasm for the dissemination of information and for the grass-roots participation in planning. Finally, many of the principals found difficulty in
agreeing that the IRREDC had made a positive contribution to education in their counties.

From the data one might conclude that staffing (see item 4) was not perceived as differently by the two groups of principals as were many other areas. Likewise, responses to item 10 indicate that there were not feelings of jealousy toward the (home) counties in which the center offices were located. Both groups generally agreed that bureaucratic red tape did not interfere with the center with a number neither agreeing nor disagreeing with the statement.

Somewhat obvious throughout the questionnaire responses and the interviews (to be reported in Chapter IV) was the difference in visibility and impact of the two centers. The reader will note in statement number 12 of Table 11 that eleven of the principals from IRREDC expressed themselves as being unaware of its programs and services. In speaking with school principals to arrange for distribution of questionnaires, several expressed somewhat vague recollection that IRREDC had been active. One principal stated that he had been in his position several years but had to seek some help from his central office in recalling the IRREDC functions.

Analysis of Responses from Teachers

The responses of the teachers from PAEC and IRREDC are shown in Table 12. Usable questionnaires were obtained from 147 teachers from the IRREDC. One hundred eighty-four questionnaires were returned from PAEC. As was true of the returns from school principals, the teachers in the PAEC area viewed it much more positively on most items than the IRREDC was viewed by its teachers.
Using a chi square test to analyze the responses of the two teacher
groups, statistically significant differences at the .001 level were found
between the responses of the two samples on eighteen of the twenty state-
ments presented on the questionnaire. The responses of the two groups were
not statistically significant for statements 18 and 19. Table 12 depicts
the number of responses given by both groups in each of the respective
choice categories.

Statistical analysis revealed a significant difference at the .001
level in placement of responses into the given choice categories by the two
teacher groups on statement one of Table 12. This difference was due to the
larger number of positive responses, given by the PAEC teachers as compared
to the IRREDC teachers surveyed, to the statement that the goals and
objectives of the center were clear.

Similarly, analysis of responses to item two revealed a statistically
significant difference at the .001 level. The distribution of PAEC teacher
responses was skewed toward the positive end of the scale, whereas the
responses given by IRREDC teachers centered around the neither agree nor
disagree category in relation to the statement that the cooperative stimu-
lated constructive educational change.

At the .001 level the difference in the categorization of responses by
the two teacher groups was found to be statistically significant for state-
ment three. The PAEC responses were positively skewed, whereas the IRREDC
responses more nearly centered around the neither agree nor disagree category
in response to the statement that a definite need for a cooperative existed.

The PAEC group responded more positively than the IRREDC group to the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire Statement</th>
<th>Center</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Chi Square Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The goals and objectives of the IRREDC/PAEC are clear to me.</td>
<td>PAEC</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>34.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IRREDC</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>146</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The IRREDC/PAEC stimulated constructive educational change in rural areas.</td>
<td>PAEC</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>47.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IRREDC</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>146</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. There was a definite need for the IRREDC/PAEC.</td>
<td>PAEC</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>22.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IRREDC</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>143</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The IRREDC/PAEC was properly staffed to carry out its stated objectives.</td>
<td>PAEC</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>55.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IRREDC</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>144</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The leaders of the IRREDC/PAEC were motivated by a sincere desire to solve persistent educational problems.</td>
<td>PAEC</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>40.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IRREDC</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>146</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Dissemination of information to teachers was well organized and effective.</td>
<td>PAEC</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>61.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IRREDC</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>147</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaire Statement</td>
<td>Center</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Chi Square Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Grass-roots participation in planning was evident, including wide participation of teachers.</td>
<td>PAEC</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>71.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IRREDC</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>146</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The IRREDC/PAEC readily adjusted its programs to meet the expressed needs of local schools.</td>
<td>PAEC</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>59.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IRREDC</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>146</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. The IRREDC/PAEC helped participating school districts assess and clarify their educational needs.</td>
<td>PAEC</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>67.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IRREDC</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>145</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. The IRREDC/PAEC encouraged local school districts to develop imaginative solutions to educational problems.</td>
<td>PAEC</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>50.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IRREDC</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>146</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Program adjustments were made in accordance with the outside evaluations.</td>
<td>PAEC</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>33.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IRREDC</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>146</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Teachers are aware of the problems and services offered by the IRREDC/PAEC.</td>
<td>PAEC</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>87.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IRREDC</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>145</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaire Statement</td>
<td>Center</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Chi Square Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. The IRREDC/PAEC staff worked harmoniously with teachers and administrators.</td>
<td>PAEC</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>85.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IRREDC</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>146</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. A need for the IRREDC/PAEC still exists.</td>
<td>PAEC</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>32.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IRREDC</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>146</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Community relations to the IRREDC/PAEC have been favorable.</td>
<td>PAEC</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>26.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IRREDC</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>146</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. The director and IRREDC/PAEC staff provided outstanding leadership.</td>
<td>PAEC</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>47.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IRREDC</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>146</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. The activities engaged in by the IRREDC/PAEC meet its goals and objectives.</td>
<td>PAEC</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>45.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IRREDC</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>146</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. The county in which the IRREDC/PAEC center was located received more services than other member counties.</td>
<td>PAEC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>183</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IRREDC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>3.91*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaire Statement</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Chi Square Value</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Red tape at the local level did not interfere with the operation of the IRREDC/PAEC.</td>
<td>PAEC 9</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>17.26*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IRREDC 4</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>145</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. The IRREDC/PAEC has made a positive contribution to education in this county.</td>
<td>PAEC 33</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>90.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IRREDC 8</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>147</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Not statistically significant at .001 level.
statement that each center was properly staffed to carry out its stated objectives. Statistical analysis revealed that this observed difference was significant at the .001 level.

A statistically significant difference was also found between the categorization of responses of the two teacher groups to statement five. The IRREDC responses centered around the neither agree nor disagree category, whereas the PAEC teacher responses were skewed toward the agree and strongly agree categories in relation to the statement that the leaders of the respective cooperatives were motivated by a sincere desire to solve educational problems.

Observation of Table 12 indicates that PAEC teachers more often responded positively than negatively to statement six while IRREDC teachers more often responded negatively than positively. Statistical analysis revealed that this difference in responses to the statement that dissemination of information to teachers was well organized and effective was significant at the .001 level.

As with statement six IRREDC teachers were more negative in their responses and PAEC teachers more positive to the statement that grass-roots participation in planning was evident, including wide participation by teachers. The difference was found to be statistically significant at the .001 level.

There was also a statistically significant difference at the .001 level in the manner in which the two groups placed their responses to statement eight. The PAEC teachers were highly positive in their responses to the statement that PAEC readily adjusted its programs to meet the expressed needs
of local schools. In contrast, the IRREDC teachers were more negative in relation to IRREDC.

Table 12 shows that one hundred fifteen PAEC teachers responded positively to the statement that PAEC helped participating school districts assess and clarify their educational needs. Only twenty-nine IRREDC teachers responded positively to this statement. Statistical analysis revealed these observed differences were statistically significant at the .001 level.

Statistical analysis also revealed that the IRREDC teachers and the PAEC teachers differed significantly at the .001 level in their categorization of responses to statement ten. IRREDC teachers scattered their responses among the categories, whereas PAEC teachers were more positive in their responses to the statement that their center encouraged local districts to develop imaginative solutions to educational problems.

Observation of the responses in Table 12 to the statement that program adjustments were made in accordance with outside evaluations reveals that PAEC teachers responded more positively than did IRREDC teachers. This noted difference is substantiated by statistical analysis, which yielded a significant difference at the .001 level.

A statistically significant difference at the .001 level was found between the response patterns of the two groups of teachers to the statement that teachers were aware of the programs and services offered by the respective cooperatives. PAEC teachers more often responded positively, whereas IRREDC teachers were more negative in their responses.

Data presented in Table 12 show that PAEC teacher responses were skewed toward the positive categories, whereas IRREDC teacher responses were more
widely dispersed in reaction to statement thirteen. This difference in response to the statement that the cooperative staff worked harmoniously with teachers was found to be statistically significant at the .001 level.

As shown by item thirteen in Table 12, the statement that a need for the center still exists produced more positive than negative responses from both teacher groups. Statistical analysis revealed that there was still a significant difference at the .001 level in the way the two groups categorized their responses. A greater percentage of the PAEC teachers agreed with the statement than did IRREDC teachers.

Similar results were obtained for the statement that community reactions to the respective centers have been favorable. While both groups responded more positively than negatively to statement fifteen, the PAEC teachers were more positive in their responses at the .001 level than were the IRREDC teachers.

There was a statistically significant difference at the .001 level between the responses of the PAEC and IRREDC teachers to the statement that the director and cooperative staff provided outstanding leadership. The majority of responses by PAEC teachers to item sixteen were in the positive categories, whereas IRREDC teacher responses were more disperse.

PAEC teachers tended to respond positively to statement seventeen, whereas IRREDC teachers tended to have neither positive nor negative feelings or spread their responses between the positive and negative categories. Statistical analysis revealed that the observed differences in the responses to the statement that the activities engaged in by the respective cooperatives met the stated goals and objectives were significant at the .001 level.
No statistically significant differences were found in the categorization of responses by the two teacher groups to statements eighteen and nineteen. Both groups were similarly negative in response to the statement that the counties in which the respective cooperatives were located received more services than other member counties. Both groups also tended to respond positively to the statement that red tape at the local level did not interfere with the operation of the respective cooperatives.

Finally, a statistically significant difference was attained from the analysis of responses by the two teacher groups to item twenty. A large majority of the PAEC teachers surveyed agreed that PAEC had made a positive contribution to education in their respective counties. In contrast it can be seen that many IRREDC teachers had neither positive or negative reactions to this statement while the remainder divided their responses between the positive and negative categories.

Summary

The data obtained by questionnaires indicate substantial difference of opinion among teachers and principals concerning the operational characteristics of the IRREDC and PAEC. The principals and teachers of PAEC responded much more positively than their counterparts in IRREDC concerning the operational effectiveness of the supplemental education centers. The difference in responses was statistically significant at the .001 level for a vast majority of items responded to by teachers and for three-fourths of the items responded to by principals. The sheer weight of these differences in opinions about PAEC and IRREDC provides compelling basis for projecting
differences in the operational effectiveness of the two centers. We shall now turn attention to the data obtained from personal interviews, which are discussed in Chapter IV.
CHAPTER IV

THE OPERATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS
OF PAEC AND IRREDC

As reviewed briefly in Chapter I, over 105 personal interviews were
conducted by the research staff in the areas served by PAEC and IRREDC.
Using the criteria developed originally from the literature, interview
guides were developed for these personal interviews. The interview guide
shown in Appendix B was used with the school administrators, teachers,
and the central office staffs of PAEC and IRREDC. School board members
and community leaders were asked to state what they knew about the organi-
zations and to provide their opinions as to their purposes and operational
effectiveness.

The original interview sample included all superintendents and other
central office personnel of schools cooperating with the two centers, a
randomly selected school board member from each district, six principals and
eighteen teachers randomly selected from each center, and selected community
leaders from the home counties of PAEC and IRREDC. In addition, interviews
were conducted with the leaders and staffs of PAEC and IRREDC and with state
department of education personnel connected with the operation of the two
centers.

The writers did not detect any significant differences in attitudes
among these various groups. With the exception of a small minority, one
could almost anticipate the tenor of responses from those interviewed after
numerous interviews had been conducted in each center.

As a general rule teachers volunteered much less information about the
two centers than principals, and principals volunteered less information than school superintendents and other central office personnel who had worked with the centers. School board members and selected citizens volunteered less information than did all other representatives of groups interviewed.

History of Cooperation
And Initiation of PAEC and IRREDC

Of considerable importance in the success of PAEC was a history of cooperation and comradeship among the school superintendents of the area prior to its establishment. Such a history of cooperation was not found in the area served by the IRREDC. The initiation of the IRREDC was the first attempt of the member counties to enter into formal arrangements of this type.

The Development of PAEC

The Panhandle Area Educational Cooperative grew out of an early recognition by the superintendents in the area of the advantages of cooperation. Long before PAEC came into being, individual counties in the panhandle area were cooperating in areas of mutual interest, such as shared media centers, testing programs, and special education. Jackson and Holmes counties shared a film library as did Washington and Bay. Over the years, superintendents from the area had practiced rooming close together at statewide meetings so that they could discuss common problems.

In 1959, the Chipola Area Educational Project (CAEP) was formed as a result of an NDEA Title V grant. This project was established to improve
testing, evaluation and guidance services among the member counties which included: Calhoun, Gulf, Holmes, Jackson, Liberty, Walton, and Washington. CAEP was given office space at Chipola Junior College and a supervisor from Jackson County was chosen as director of the project. Although CAEP was able to provide many beneficial services to member counties, it was somewhat restricted in the diversity of activities it was able to perform. Because the nature of the Title V grant established the primary functions of the project as improving testing, evaluation and guidance services, CAEP was not always able to meet the critical needs of member counties in other areas.

The research staff feels that the CAEP served the purpose of building a spirit of cooperation. Moreover, it demonstrated to the satisfaction of the seven county leaders that, through such formal cooperation, services could be provided which no one county by itself could purchase.

Early in 1967, one of the school superintendents from the area began talking about further cooperation among the CAEP school systems. He called a meeting of the superintendents from the seven counties that made up CAEP and, in addition, invited representatives from Bay and Franklin counties. At this steak supper meeting, a plan was sketched out for what was to become the Panhandle Area Educational Cooperative. Interested counties were asked to join together and write a proposal for funding under ESEA Title III. Every county was interested and it was decided that a committee would be formed to draft the proposal. The person who was later appointed Director of PAEC was a member of the committee preparing the proposal. In July 1967, the proposal was approved and a grant of $103,000 was awarded under ESEA Title III. The Panhandle Area Educational Cooperative was born.
The choosing of a director for the cooperative required much cooperation among state authorities administering Title III funds and the counties. The State preferred a director from outside the area who would bring to PAEC a fresh viewpoint to stimulate change. After several months' attempt to recruit an outsider, leaders in the school district finally appointed a local person. On January 1, 1968, the present director and his assistant were appointed and a possible barrier to the success of PAEC had been removed.

PAEC was forced to meet several major challenges during the early stages of its development. The statewide teacher walkout in 1968 made it difficult for PAEC to coordinate programs in the schools. A fire destroyed all the materials and equipment of the cooperative and contributed to getting the project off to a bad start. PAEC had to shift its location when the original home county was placed on a probationary status by the Federal Government because of desegregation difficulties. Through all this adversity, the counties worked with each other and the State to continue PAEC. During 1968-69 (fiscal year), programs in teacher in-service, guidance and testing were started and PAEC was on its way to becoming a successful operation.

The Development of IRREDC

As indicated previously, the center school districts of IRREDC did not have a history of cooperation comparable to CAEP in the area served by PAEC. Some of the school districts had cooperated in the establishment of Indian River Community College. However, from the interviews the writers concluded that formal cooperation and leader comradeship of the type found in the PAEC area did not exist in the IRREDC area.

In early 1967 the superintendents of the six school districts in IRREDC
had agreed to cooperate in writing a Title III proposal. The school superintendent of Indian River County and his assistants provided much of the initial leadership in the project. In May, 1967, final approval for initiation of the IRREDC had been realized.

The IRREDC beginning was also complicated by the pressures created by the state-wide teachers' strike. The first director of IRREDC was a county superintendent who was described by one prominent person as being "tired of the superintendent's office." He served in the capacity for one year and returned to a position in one of the school systems as principal of an elementary school. His assistant in IRREDC was then appointed director and served in this capacity throughout the remaining years of the project.

In the opinion of most observers interviewed, the IRREDC got a slow, difficult start, and many of its early organizational and leadership problems plagued it throughout its existence. The first director of the project expressed this somewhat difficult beginning by stating, "I went in with the idea of meeting the goals and objectives. From the beginning, it was too great a task to get the six counties aware of the fact that it (IRREDC) was there. There was an awful lot of work to be done. We got the counties together but could not get going." Throughout our interview with staff members of IRREDC and others, we were impressed with the development from a point of high hopes for the council by school district leaders to its growth in frustration and exchanges of leadership and staff, the developing negative reaction by educational leaders, and its final months of attempts to establish cooperative activities before its inevitable disintegration. Some of the leaders of school districts would gladly have seen its demise prior to its
final year of operation. Instead, these leaders were persuaded to ask for refunding and let it die quietly with the least amount of struggle.

Data from interviews clearly reveal that IRREDC was beset by numerous organization, administrative, and leadership problems during its first two years. There were feelings of jealousy expressed in interviews over the liberal travel allowances of the IRREDC director and staff. Some observers perceived that certain state department of education authorities were opposed to IRREDC programs.

Organization, Administration, and Leadership

Analysis of the descriptions in the initial proposals for the organization and administration of PAEC and IRREDC indicated some similar prescriptions. That is, when organized, both had provisions for an advisory committee (or council) and other similarities. The school systems in which the central offices for the centers were located served as their fiscal agents. The amount of funds requested was about the same for both centers. Both centers met certain guidelines prescribed by federal authorities in making proposals for organization and administration of activities. However, there were also very important difference in the actual organization and administration of the two centers.

Operating Organization for IRREDC

Even in the original proposals significant differences existed. The PAEC proposal specifically prescribed that the school superintendents would make up the advisory committee. The IRREDC proposal was not specific about who
reported as attending were assistant superintendents, supervisors, and other central office personnel. Thus superintendents must have taken the attitude that IRREDC was not too important to them personally. Furthermore, different persons represented the counties from one meeting to another producing high possibility of low carry-over. The meetings of the advisory council for IRREDC, as was true also for PAEC, were quarterly.

Such conditions as these resulted in social distance between leaders of the school districts and the IRREDC staff. The extent of this social distance was expressed by an IRREDC staff member as follows: "The confidence level was down as low as it possibly could be. No one thought we could do anything." During its first two years of operation, the IRREDC became an autonomous organization in which the organizational machinery for cooperation with and among counties was, with possibly one exception, nonexistent. One official of the IRREDC staff stated, "They did not feel they owned us."

Some renewed efforts to revive cooperation during the last year and a half was viewed by many participants positively. A staff member of IRREDC during this period stated, "Now school districts talked to one another. The superintendents would discuss common problems." By this time most of the members of the IRREDC staff had departed.

A new organizational approach during this period helped. The council established several different groups for different administrative levels. For example, there were a council of superintendents, a regional committee, and school district committees. The superintendents group was a decision-making body. The superintendents worked together constructively during this period.
Monthly meetings were held with these groups.

Overall, the intended organization for the IRREDC failed to materialize. Except for the last year, cooperative planning and program development by the various participants failed to materialize. Finally, any visible evidence of cooperation was, as one participant expressed it, "window dressing." The directors of IRREDC and their staffs seem to have made the decisions for the organization for most of its life.

The PAEC Organization

Our findings concerning the organization and control of PAEC were much in contrast to those reported for IRREDC. PAEC is organized for the maximum participation of the superintendents of cooperating school districts in decision making. Each of the superintendents expressed enthusiastically in interviews that "PAEC is our organization."

The programs and activities of PAEC are approved by the advisory committee which is composed of the nine superintendents from the member counties of the cooperative. The advisory committee meets quarterly for purposes of policy-making, and a decision of the committee is considered final.

It would be difficult to overestimate the importance of the control the area superintendents exercise over PAEC. Every superintendent is quick to point out that, "The key to the organization and success of PAEC is that responsibility, for the cooperative is placed directly in the hands of the superintendents." The fact that the superintendents maintain control of the organization assures responsiveness of PAEC staff to requests for help from the superintendents. As one PAEC staff said, "The staff never says no to requests for aid from the counties. The superintendents express their
needs and PAEC meets them. The superintendents are the hands that feed us." Another staff member put it this way, "Nothing comes ahead of a request from a superintendent. If we can't do it, we get someone to do it."

This high degree of responsiveness by PAEC to the requests of superintendents makes it unique from state agencies such as the Department of Education Regional Office (DOER), which also operated in the area with offices in Panama City. The superintendents see the state agencies as mazes of red tape. They feel that these agencies are so tied up in rules and regulations that they cannot respond effectively to the expressed needs of superintendents. This simple statement by a PAEC superintendent expresses the major distinction superintendents see between PAEC and state agencies. "The PAEC function has been service while the State Department function has been regulatory. Ask the State Department for help and they quote you a regulation."

A Steering Committee, composed of educators and lay citizens in the Center area, has been formed as an advisory body. The Steering Committee consists of one educator and one lay citizen from each member county in addition to one representative from each of the following agencies: State Department of Education, Florida State University, Chipola Junior College, and Gulf Coast Junior College. The Steering Committee only has the power to recommend and has not been instrumental in determining the activities of PAEC. It has served primarily as a public relations tool.

Another significant factor in the organization of PAEC is size. Although the PAEC area is rather large geographically, the superintendents feel that the present staff is adequate to meet the needs of the area. The advisory committee has consciously rejected requests to expand PAEC by refusing
to admit additional counties seeking membership in the organization.

Administrative Leadership Response

The writers found much evidence that the PAEC administrative staff had achieved organizational effectiveness to a degree of productivity seldom observed. There were few exceptions to the view of those interviewed that the central staff was highly responsive to local needs and requests and that it was getting the jobs done to the satisfaction of its clients. This view was supported by documentary materials, especially the various evaluation reports available. The staff was organized to provide specific services held by its clients to be of great value in their operation. One example of direct service was in budgeting and finance. Since most of the cooperating counties were very small and without resources to employ well-trained fiscal officers, PAEC offered consultative services to school superintendents in this area. Few of the superintendents felt they could do without this service.

The PAEC programs were administered so that requests from local school districts received prompt attention. The staff met weekly in critique (sensitivity) sessions in attempts to improve upon their programs of assistance to local school districts. Emphasis was placed upon responsiveness, effectiveness of working with people, and getting the job done. In these sessions each staff member was "put in the barrel" by the group and his effectiveness thoroughly critiqued.

The director of PAEC is viewed as providing forceful leadership in molding the staff into a productive organization. He has been successful in stimulating the staff to be productive and prompt in the deliverance of
services. After joining the PAEC, staff members were reported by former colleagues to have grown much in productivity. All of the superintendents expressed faith in the leadership ability of the director and in the ability of the staff to deliver services satisfactorily and promptly upon request.

Study of other documents about PAEC supports these findings. Various evaluation reports and personal reports of visits to the Center extolled the outstanding leadership on the staff and their willingness to work cooperatively. The PAEC staff is described as wide-awake, capable, and very thorough in planning and operation. High morale exists. Above all else, it is a highly responsive group that "gets the job done" and does it to the satisfaction of its clients.

Those interviewed in IRREDC, as reported previously, failed to view it as highly responsive to educational needs. Several leadership problems were mentioned by a large number of those interviewed, including members of the IRREDC staff. First, there was lack of precedent for leaders to follow in initiating such an organization. To one accustomed to traditional types of administrative organizations, IRREDC appeared to be unmanageable. This resulted in some floundering in the initial stages of development. Secondly, numerous persons, including members of the IRREDC staff, cited the rather serious illness of the project director. For a time, this illness and other factors produced an image of leadership frequently expressed by observers as being laissez faire. Thirdly, there were some problems of staff members lacking in ability to work harmoniously with leaders in school systems.
A frequently mentioned condition given as a reason for the discontinuation of IRREDC was leadership of the staff. The leadership was viewed as low-key and lacking aggressive follow-through and enthusiasm.

The growth in detachment of the IRREDC staff from leaders of school districts, as reported previously, seriously affected the leadership image of the staff. One school principal spoke of one director as "an 'egg head', fine man--tried to do a lot of good things." Such expressions are typically made by practicing educators of organizations (i.e., colleges and universities) perceived as somewhat removed from practical everyday orientation, to school operation.

The IRREDC leadership and staff were never able to "put it all together" for many reasons given throughout this report. They also were not seen as responsive to requests, and in some instances their clients felt that they failed to deliver satisfactory services.

Conflicting State Agencies
And Liaison with State Officials

From time to time those interviewed in the IRREDC and PAEC areas mentioned the conflicting interests of state department of education personnel and agencies. In the IRREDC some people believed that the State Department of Education general consultants were opposed to the center. Other persons stated that they did not think there was basis for this view and that it was not a significant factor. The writers agree with this latter position. Whatever was voiced was not a significant factor in the survival of the organization.
The PAEC area presented a somewhat more complicated condition. The Florida State Department of Education established a Department of Education Regional Office (DoER) in Panama City. There was much concern among many persons, particularly school administrators, that DoER and PAEC were in functional conflict and that future funds to support regional centers would be directed away from PAEC to DoER. However, there was little evidence that DoER was functioning effectively in the situation as an educational improvement agency. To many administrators DoER was just another source of rules and regulations, which could have just as effectively been administered from Tallahassee. In any event, the existence of the two centers in the region has the possibility of creating a competitive condition that may or may not be beneficial in educational improvement.

Some persons spoke of a difference between IRREDC and PAEC in communication effectiveness with state department officials. For the first year or so, the leaders in the IRREDC felt somewhat isolated from officials at the State Department of Education. PAEC was thought by some observers to have better liaison with state officials because of its close proximity to Tallahassee and the fact that the state coordinator for ESEA Title III was from the area served by PAEC. After consideration of the few opinions expressed on this factor, the research staff concluded that any difference in liaison was not significant in organizational survival or death.

Staffing Patterns

Of considerable interest to persons attempting to promote desirable educational change is the differences in the central staffs for IRREDC and
PAEC. The first director of IRREDC was a former administrator of one of the cooperating school systems as is the director of PAEC. The second director of IRREDC had served on the staff for one year, but he was originally from outside the region.

The PAEC staff and director were long-time residents of the area served by the center. One of the leaders described the staff as having solid community ties in the area and as sharing the moral codes of their constituents. There has been very little turnover in the PAEC staff. Most of the staff could be classified as generalists with considerable expertise in school administration.

As previously indicated in this discussion, the PAEC staff was perceived to be capable, responsive, prompt in the performance of services, and able to get along well with its clients. Some expressed surprise that some of these persons they had known all their life could be so much more productive than they had been prior to joining PAEC.

During the first year the IRREDC staff and directors were recruited from both inside and outside the cooperating school districts. There was considerable turnover in personnel. After the second director assumed his duties, he had to employ several persons to replace departing staff members. Many of these were recruited from outside the area served. The IRREDC staff was highly educated and considered by most observers as competent in the field of education with training and experience emphasis in curriculum areas. As indicated above the PAEC staff members were locals, whereas enough of the IRREDC staff was from outside the area to be noticeable. One member of the IRREDC staff reported, "We were not home folk." Numerous persons expressed the opinion that the IRREDC recruited generalists not too
different in expertise to the typical county central office staff of the area. Typical of these comments was, "What could they do for us that we could not do for ourselves?"

As indicated previously, staff and leadership turnover in the IRREDC was an important factor in the development and continuation of programs. In the proposal for a continuation of the grant for 1970-71, mention was made of the "diminishing staff" and also the "severe protracted illness" of staff. The director of the center had experienced very serious illness for a long period, which he and others felt slowed development of the center. The report mentioned above stated that these factors prevented the activation of numerous programs planned by the center, including a staff development program for school administrators.

Some central office persons expressed the opinion that the IRREDC staff was inexperienced which may not have been entirely justified. There were inexperienced persons and some of them created problems for IRREDC. This was a disservice to the organization. However, other staff members had years of experience in the field of education. Nevertheless, most observers felt that too many persons were selected who did not possess expertise and experience for county needs. Whether justified or not by the facts, this perception was probably an important factor when the IRREDC was in its death struggle.

Relationship of PAEC Staff to School Districts

The relationship of the PAEC staff to the local school districts it serves might best be described by the phrase "open door policy." "Open door
policy" signifies a free and open climate in which the local school districts and the PAEC staff share a mutual respect for the needs and capabilities of each other. Although the PAEC staff is welcome in every school in the nine county area, they do not go into a school system with action programs until invited. These invitations are frequent and come from all levels in the school hierarchy. By the same token, anyone in the nine county area is free to come to the PAEC center at any time for help on a problem. Persons interviewed report the PAEC staff members are never too busy to listen and help in any way that they can. One teacher's comments express very well how the PAEC staff reacts to these frequent visitors to the PAEC center. "Whenever I go in there, the PAEC people make me feel more like a superintendent than a teacher."

The PAEC staff maintains a helping relationship with the school districts it serves. It never says no to a request for help from the individual counties, and it does not try to tell a local school district what it must do. Instead, PAEC attempts to offer viable alternatives from which the local school districts can choose a solution. The following comments typify the relationship PAEC enjoys with the local school districts.

"PAEC is close to the people. We feel more free to call on them than the State Department and there is no red tape with PAEC."

"The staff is very friendly and willing to help. They are not so preoccupied with the job that they don't have time to help."

"I think of the PAEC staff members as part of my staff. It's not, 'Will you come?'; but, 'Come'."

"Every time we turn around, they are ready to help us. They always ask us what we need and how they can help us."
The relationship between PAEC and the local school districts it serves has matured to the point that PAEC actively seeks criticism of its staff, programs, and activities in order to bring about improvements. Not only does PAEC seek constructive criticism, but it makes changes in order to meet the needs of its constituency as expressed in the criticism.

"We have offered constructive criticism. They were pleased to get it and used it in many ways to be helpful."

"They have accepted evaluative suggestions readily and, to my knowledge, carried out any constructive criticism."

The relationship between PAEC and the local districts borders on the unbelievable. It required a good deal of searching to come up with any person who was not completely complimentary of the PAEC project and its staff. However, there were a few persons who expressed criticism. All negative comments were from teachers. PAEC has been successful in establishing a warm working relationship with the local school districts based on concern for their problems and responsiveness to their needs. One wily leader of PAEC expressed his philosophy this way, "When you go out to do something for a superintendent, you do not create more work for him than he had before you tried to help him."

**Relationship of IRREDC Staff to School Districts**

The authors spent considerable time in interviews learning how the IRREDC staff worked with cooperating school districts. There was no general clear-cut pattern to describe these relationships as was described for PAEC. From the interviews one must conclude that the IRREDC staff never established
the genuinely warm personal commitments from its clients as was enjoyed continuously by the PAEC staff.

There was much evidence that the IRREDC staff made genuine attempts to establish working relationships with cooperating school systems. Many of these attempts seem not to have been followed-through with definite plans and programs. This may have resulted from various conditions. Many respondents surmized that the IRREDC staff procrastinated. On the other hand, there may have also been lack of push and enthusiasm from the school systems. In any event the IRREDC staff must share responsibility for the development of this lethargic image.

The IRREDC staff lost credibility with the school superintendents before the end of the second year of operation. This must have been a very severe problem. One IRREDC staff member commented, "It is bad when you are a fire department but nobody believes you have any water." It took on several images, many of which were negative. First of all, there was the image of lack of productivity. As one superintendent expressed this, "We called on some of the staff to assist--they were not productive." In a couple of much discussed projects undertaken by the IRREDC staff, observers felt that it failed to deliver. One involved the use of the IRREDC in an organizational study in which a final report was never released. Another involved working with a local group in preparing a Title III proposal. A board member reported, "We wanted our board policies reworked. The superintendent said IRREDC would do it. It took them months to do it and it was unsatisfactory." Yet, administrators of this particular school system used IRREDC more frequently than anyone else. The superintendent of another school system reported, "They never developed programs and carried them out."
As reported previously, the IRREDC staff seemed to become somewhat isolated from many of its clients. There were hostile feelings toward IRREDC. This is seen in the following comments by a prominent educator in the area.

I never, at any time, felt that they were contributing anything to the county. It became work to keep them going. They created more work for us to keep them going than we got out of them. They were not able to assemble a cadre of people with real strong experience. You had to teach them. They started by saying, "We are here to help you. What can we do for you?" This is difficult to answer in itself. It ended that way. There came a time when teachers and principals said, "Don't bring them around. We do not want to be bothered."

Although this person expressed himself in somewhat stronger language than others, the negative perception expressed by him was expressed by many others in the interviews. Yet, while this was the predominant view, persons from some counties had different feelings of relationships. In two of the school systems leaders expressed a live-and-let-live attitude in speaking of their relationship with the staff. For the most part, IRREDC was something "over there" unrelated to what school districts felt.

In one school district the educators interviewed were very positive in their comments about IRREDC. These persons felt that IRREDC had assisted their county in several programs and that it should have been continued. However, a member of the board of education in this school system expressed negative feelings toward IRREDC.

Finally, most observers expressed the opinion that the IRREDC did its most productive work during the last year of the project. There was evidence of a new birth in spirit of cooperation among the leaders of the IRREDC school systems. As one superintendent expressed his feeling, "We were
beginning to jell when the money ran out. We did not involve the board enough—could not ask them to continue." Another superintendent expressed, "We did not begin to have regular meetings of the superintendents until the last year."

For much of its existence the IRREDC staff did not establish close ties with the leaders of local school systems. Concerning work of the staff with the advisory board, one former IRREDC staff member stated:

We worked with them when we were worried about money—when we wanted to know if we would be funded next year. Essentially, we would sit and listen, and have them give us their input. That turned out to be window dressing. The superintendents knew what was going on. They are no dummies. Toward the end we started working more with the advisory body.

Political Leadership
And Organizational Visibility

One of the factors for survival which was unanticipated prior to the interviews was the striking difference in political leadership of PAEC and IRREDC. This loomed as a very important consideration as the data were collected.

The organizations were proposed and initiated through the efforts of school superintendents. In each case the main instigators of their development retired from the superintendency soon after initiation and both men worked on a part time consultative basis with their respective organizations. However, the similarity of political leadership ended with these developments. There was some turnover of superintendents in the IRREDC during the three year period; however, the research staff did not find this significant in survival or discontinuance of the Centers.
Political Leadership and Visibility of PAEC

In the first place, the staff for PAEC impressed the interviewers as possessing considerable political astuteness in the panhandle area, particularly in educational circles. One staff member had, for over twenty-five years, been recognized as an educational leader in the area. The staff had obviously thought seriously and planned meticulously for relating its operation to school systems. Their central focus of power was the superintendents of local school districts. First and foremost in their political leadership was to establish working relationships and understandings with the superintendents. Until recently, practically no attention had been given to boards of education. This was left up to each superintendent to handle in his own way.

The leaders of PAEC obviously had excellent knowledge about the educational leadership of member counties and continuously used this information in planning programs. As an example, they knew who was probably in line to succeed the superintendents in cases of retirement or impending political defeat and made special efforts to help the emerging leaders understand and appreciate PAEC. Four of the superintendents from IRREDC and all of the superintendents of PAEC districts were elected by popular vote. They had to derive their power from the leaders of local power structures and from the voters.

The research staff found fundamental differences among the counties concerning the involvement of school board members in PAEC activities. PAEC elected to let the various superintendents handle board support according to existing norms. In some counties the school board members know very little
about the way schools are administered. In other school systems, board
members were informed to a general degree. On the whole, the administra-
tive norm for the area is that the superintendent has a powerful hand in
the formulation of educational policies. He is usually an important power
figure for the school systems. The PAEC operation had very beautifully fit
itself in these various power systems for maximum program effectiveness.
This is in many ways, an important genius of the effectiveness and survival
of PAEC.

The PAEC staff has made it a point to be highly visible to those who
are instrumental to their continued success while not entirely sacrificing
attempts for visibility among the average citizens in the member counties.
It is extremely difficult to find someone in the school business, with the
exception of school board members, who is not aware of PAEC and its activi-
ties. On the other hand, the average citizen in the Panhandle Area knows
very little about PAEC. In an area where the superintendents stand for re-
election every four years, this state of affairs makes good sense. One
superintendent put it this way.

PAEC is known mostly by school people. It is generally
not known by community leaders and other citizens. The
average person in this county would not know what PAEC
was. This is the success of PAEC. They do not take
credit for the work and they do not project themselves
beyond the county.

Put in simple terms, it is more expedient politically for the
superintendents to receive the credit for improvements to local school sys-
tems. The superintendents look out for PAEC and PAEC in turn helps provide
favorable publicity for the superintendents.
PAEC does, however, have an organized program for dissemination of information about the cooperative and its activities. Staff members are frequently speakers at the functions of local civic groups. The cooperative has hired an ex-newspaperman to handle all press releases for PAEC. He serves as a public relations director and disseminates information about PAEC to the media in all the member counties. PAEC activities are frequently the object of local news on TV. PAEC also prints and distributes a quarterly newsletter to all the schools in the member counties. In all this publicity, PAEC is careful to make sure that the local school districts receive their share of the credit for whatever activity is taking place. An article announcing the establishment of a new reading laboratory in a school would likely carry a picture of the local superintendent smiling broadly even though PAEC might have put in the entire program. This is not a cause of friction however, because both parties want it this way.

The steering committee is another instrument that provides visibility to PAEC. The steering committee is composed of two members from each county, one lay citizen and one local educator, in addition to one representative from each of the following agencies: Chipola Junior College, Gulf Coast Junior Colleges, Florida State University, and the State Department of Education. The local members are appointed by the superintendents in the respective counties and serve as very effective public relations tools. One superintendent used the steering committee to silence a local board member who was very vocal in his opposition to PAEC. The superintendent simply appointed the board member to the steering committee and effectively neutralized him.
The interview data show that, while the leaders were careful to work through the educational power structure of each school system, PAEC had strong visibility and binding ties with school principals and many teachers. Some quotations from the teachers and principals interviewed are indicative of general feelings.

"PAEC is highly visible among teachers and principals. They have a LIFT program. (Member of staff) comes here regularly to check on her."

"They are much in evidence. One of the things I like about PAEC is that they are not bogged down in red tape like the state department is."

"I never hear anything about it. Most of the teachers throw their bulletin in the garbage can or on the table in the teachers' room for someone else to throw away."

"We discuss it as a basis for getting certificate extended."

"I used to teach in Gadsden County (not member of PAEC) and when I read of PAEC I wondered why we did not have a service such as PAEC for our teachers."

As indicated by the one negative and four positive comments from four teachers and one principal, PAEC was a visible organization even in the eyes of those who were opposed to it.

Political Leadership and Visibility of IRREDC

As explained for PAEC, IRREDC was proposed and launched through the leadership efforts of influential school superintendents. The person serving as the prime mover for proposing IRREDC was a very popular superinten- dent. He was joined in his efforts by other superintendents who were important
leaders in the area. Therefore, both IRREDC and PAEC appear to have been initiated through the leadership efforts of school superintendents and with one in particular in each instance.

The leaders of IRREDC staff did not emphasize the building of commitments and ties to the superintendents of cooperating school districts. As mentioned previously, the original proposal did not prescribe that superintendents be centrally involved. The IRREDC staff did not demonstrate exceptional interest in the dynamics of leadership existing in the cooperating counties. They failed to build leadership strategies to take advantage of the leadership structures and dynamics of the school districts. Much evidence indicates that, except for the last year, the school superintendents felt ignored by the IRREDC leaders. Thus, the IRREDC leaders played a political game which assisted their organization down the road toward the graveyard. A few direct quotations from superintendents and other leaders gives the reader the flavor of expressions.

"The further the project advanced the less influence it had. One of the reasons for this was unresponsiveness to the requests of superintendents."

"The original advisory council wasn't made up of superintendents. In fact, we (IRREDC leaders) were so autonomous, we were never really closely identified with the structure."

"Toward the end, the council tried to bring the superintendents together. It was too late at this point."

"They had no regular means of communication. It was rather spasmodic. They would just drop in."

There was widespread opinion that the IRREDC leaders were never able to
come up with a coordinated program strategy. During the first year and continuing thereafter the staff was not productive in projecting its stated goals and objectives into initiated programs. Early attempts to involve school leaders in building a needs based program seem to have been frustrated by lack of follow-through, staff turnover, uncontrollable disruptions, and other factors. The first director mentioned the immense task and frustrations of getting IRREDC started. Apparently the staff could not settle upon what one leader described as, "a specific cluster of regional programs unique to a cooperative" and as another expressed as, "There were never any programs which were indispensable to member school systems."

The authors were impressed with the fact that the leaders and staff for IRREDC failed to visualize it as a semi-private organization as differentiated from the typical public school which Carlson categorized as a domesticated organization (1). Under Carlson's typology a wild organization (1) has control over the admission of clients, and (2) the client may control whether he participates in the organization. The wild organization must struggle for its continued existence. Its survival is less assured than its counterpart, the domesticated organization. The domesticated organization, such as the typical public school, (1) does not control who its clients are, and (2) the clients must attend the school to which they are assigned. The domesticated organization does not have to struggle continuously for an existence.
In the case of Title III organizations such as IRREDC and PAEC, they did exercise certain choice of clients they wished to serve and their potential clients (the personnel of school districts) could either accept or reject their services. Thus the leadership in such an organization was vastly different from leadership in the typical line-and-staff organization of a school system. The leaders of the IRREDC were too long in reacting to this new organizational perspective. They failed to realize that the member school systems were only potential clients who could refuse or accept their services. In fact, some of the staff referred to lack of needed authority for administering programs which indicated their tendency to think as a leader in the domesticated organization.

The staff asked those interviewed to indicate their opinions concerning the visibility and possible impact of IRREDC. For example, one question frequently asked, "If I were to ask 25 teachers at random in your school system about IRREDC, how many would be able to talk knowledgeably about what it was and what its programs were?" The results led the authors to conclude that the IRREDC had very low visibility. Many of the teachers interviewed knew very little about it and several said they had never heard of it. Some expressions about its visibility follow.

"I doubt if five teachers out of twenty would be able to explain to you what the project was to do and what contributions it had made."

"I just don't believe I've ever heard of it."

"I've had no contact with IRREDC at all. My sister-in-law got your questionnaire. She didn't know what was going on. She asked around but no one knew what it was all about."
"Our teachers would know about IRREDC and you would get a positive reaction."

"Teachers would not be aware of IRREDC. Librarians might be because of ERIC funds."

The evidence suggests that IRREDC achieved high visibility and program impact in one of the six counties. Of some possible interest is the fact that the person appointed superintendent of this county was a member of the staff for IRREDC. He was able to perceive how the IRREDC could be useful in the educational improvement of his district and he used its services to advantage.

Educational Services and Programs

Through the interviews and documentary evidence the writers attempted to compare the programs of the two centers. Full discussions of all the programs would not be possible. The discussion here will provide illustrations of the kinds of programs developed and implemented.

The research staff faced a difficult problem in comparing the two centers on program activities. The activities of PAEC were very evident and observable by visiting their offices and talking to educators actively involved in them. On the other hand, IRREDC had been terminated prior to this study and direct observation was impossible. The interviews and documents on file had to be used in describing IRREDC. This complicated the task of describing as interested observers how the central office appeared and how much enthusiasm for program activities prevailed.

As will be described presently, persons visiting the PAEC offices got
"the big welcome you are important treatment." The visit of the research staff was no exception. Visitors were made to feel important by everyone. The offices were characterized by a definite air of hustle and bustle of productivity. There were no reports contrary to these characteristics. Numerous persons on the other hand reported the IRREDC offices to be somewhat bland in personality and characterizing inactivity. One state level leader gave the following account of his visit to IRREDC.

The difference in what you saw in the two centers was contrasting. It was PAEC's treatment as compared to the stark store front offices of IRREDC. You would go into the Indian River office and nothing seemed to be going on.

PAEC Programs and Activities

As emphasized previously, PAEC emerged directly from the NDEA funded CAEP which had operated as a service agency for seven of the nine school systems in the areas of educational media, testing, special education, and guidance. Some of these activities were continued under PAEC and service activities were expanded considerably.

A visitor to the Panhandle Area Educational Cooperative headquarters in Chipley, Florida, is immediately impressed by the atmosphere that prevails throughout the office spaces. People are busily going about their tasks, phones are ringing, and materials are being reproduced. Everywhere there is activity. The walls are filled with seemingly countless acronyms; INSTEP, IDEA, VIEW, LIFT, CARR, SEEP, designating projects PAEC is presently coordinating.

Out of this apparent chaos, it is soon evident that order prevails. The people are not disorganized for everyone knows what he is about. The
people at PAEC are simply busy providing a multitude of services and leadership for superintendents, principals, and teachers in the nine county area served by PAEC.

Since its inception in 1967, PAEC has played an increasingly active role in developing new educational programs for the Panhandle Area. In addition, the PAEC staff has continued to provide many ordinary everyday services required to keep any school system functioning normally. The quantity of programs PAEC has been involved in over the last five years is almost overwhelming. The continuation grant application for the third year of the project listed some forty-eight projects the cooperative had been active in during its first two years of existence. Of these, twenty-five were classified as innovative for the area, eight were considered adaptive, and fifteen were termed exemplary.

In carrying out programs, PAEC does not attempt to make the local school districts dependent on them for the continuation of specific projects. It tries to get a program functioning smoothly and then turn it over to the local school people for administration. This frees PAEC to develop new programs in other areas and is a key reason the center has been able to initiate such an impressive spectrum of activities. As one staff member commented, "We don't try to hang on to our programs; we just find a new horse to ride."

The following sections will briefly describe some representative projects PAEC has initiated at the regional and the local levels.

**Regional projects.** Some of the important regional projects of PAEC are identified below:

1. **I-N-S-T-E-P**: Institute for New Studies in Teacher Education
Preparation. The purpose of this program was to train liberal arts graduates to become teachers. It was instigated to help the member counties fill a shortage of teachers.

2. V-I-E-W: Vital Information for Education and Work. This program was established to help fill a gap in vocational training. Information about numerous vocations was supplied on micro-fiche cards along with readers and printers to high schools and vocational schools in the PAEC area.

3. L-I-F-T: Lattice for Improving Future Teaching. The LIFT program was designed to train teacher aides in cooperation with the junior colleges in the area. The teacher aides can receive two years of college credit and go on to become fully certified teachers.

4. I-D-E-A: Institute for Developing Educational Activities. This program helped to implement the writing and use of "Unipacs" for individually prescribed instruction by teachers in all fields in the PAEC area.

5. P-P-B-E-S: A program to assist county officials develop a planning, programming, budgeting system.

School projects. PAEC has helped to develop numerous programs in individual schools in its member counties. In one county, a program in individually prescriptive instruction was developed. In another school system, a PPBES program has been instituted for an elementary school. One of the school systems has a special program for handicapped children as a result of PAEC efforts. PAEC helped to develop the North Florida Gulf Marine Science Center in Franklin County. A workshop for writing, L-A-P-S, was developed at an elementary school. PAEC has been active in assisting school districts move toward new curriculum organizations such as the initiation of middle schools.
These are just a few representative samples of the multitude of school projects PAEC helps to develop in its member counties.

**Something for everyone.** In addition to the many regional and individual projects PAEC sponsors, a special effort has been made to provide some vital service to each level of the school hierarchy. This practice is felt to be highly significant because it has provided PAEC with an important link with school personnel in every level throughout the region. Nearly every person interviewed could identify some service PAEC had provided for him. Some of these various activities for superintendents, principals, and teachers are described in the following paragraphs.

Perhaps the most valuable service PAEC has provided for the superintendents is that it has functioned as an extension of the central office staff and provided the superintendents with expertise in areas of keenly felt need. PAEC has provided consultant services to the superintendents in areas such as budgeting, curriculum planning, desegregation, evaluation, proposal writing for grants, and a host of other important areas. This service is vital because the staffs of superintendents in rural counties are limited in size and expertise and a superintendent would not normally have the resources to purchase consultant services in all of the areas in which he needs help. Because PAEC provides these services for a nominal charge and responds immediately to requests for help, most superintendents in the Panhandle area feel that PAEC is an absolute necessity. The following comments by superintendents show how important they feel these consultant services are.

> The smallness of this county prohibits federal projects. PAEC has obtained them for us. They are not talkers. They are doers. They are willing to appear before the board and explain things to them. The board listens to PAEC.
It feels the members of PAEC are experts in education. If they cannot do the job themselves, they will find someone who can.

The staff has many abilities not available within a given county. For instance, we didn't have people to write proper proposals for EIE funds.....

Our nine counties are "have nots" compared to Dade, Pinellas, etc. Combined, we can get the best in consultants. We need expertise in the minimum foundation program and finance. We have no experts on our staff, so we look to PAEC as our staff.

Within recent months PAEC has started some activities for school board members. Such a program had been recommended by an outside evaluation committee.

PAEC has provided a valuable service to principals by helping them to introduce innovations in their schools. The cooperative has supplied the leadership and know-how to introduce changes such as the following: Open space, team teaching, semester courses, middle schools, differentiated staffing, individually prescribed instruction, and many, many others. The principals comment on how PAEC has helped bring about change.

PAEC has brought about change. Although it is up to the individual administrator to change, most have accepted PAEC as a helping agent to bring about change.

The value of PAEC is the new and different. PAEC is the first to find out about new programs. They helped us plan our school pod. We could not have done it without them. I would not go through a similar program without them. The county supervisors could not help us.
PAEC meets our needs in so many ways. They helped us write educational specifications for our new building and plan an open space curriculum. PAEC has a favorable attitude toward change. They feel there is a better way to do things than a cage for every age.

Interviews with numerous teachers throughout the area served by PAEC indicated that teachers feel the inservice program is the most significant service the cooperative offers them. Although the primary responsibility for inservice remains at the county level, PAEC strengthens and supplements the inservice program by advising and assisting the counties in implementing their programs and by sponsoring four cooperative inservice days during the school year. These cooperative inservice days are especially significant because teachers in special areas such as art, special education, home economics, agriculture, and music can come together in a central location and receive the services of an outstanding consultant that individual counties could not afford to supply. By cooperating through PAEC, excellent consultants can be acquired for all areas of specialization.

Teacher comment on the importance of the inservice program.

If we did not have PAEC, we would drop back to each school doing what they want. PAEC has the inservice ability to cover all the areas of physical education.

The inservice workshops this year have been extremely valuable, especially in math. They have helped me to work in the pod with individualized instruction. The inservice programs are well-planned and we take part in that planning.

Inservice workshops are helpful. As a small county we could not have many of the things we have under PAEC. As long as new things are happening in education we need PAEC. I would hate to lose them.
From a teacher's point-of-view, I feel the inservice is why PAEC was continued. When you are away from campus, it is hard to keep up professionally. PAEC has made it easier for teachers to keep up professionally.

Program Activities of IRREDAC

In comparison to PAEC, IRREDAC appears to have invested much more of its resources in the assessment of needs and discussion of these needs. This was indicated in the various evaluation reports made available to the authors and supported by the observations of those interviewed. This process resulted in the planning of a variety of projects. Some of these projects were initiated by the council and some had to be delayed for various reasons.

From the compilation of a list of seventeen problems needing attention, the council staff condensed the problem areas in to the following topics:
(1) curriculum revision, (2) improving teacher access to opportunities for improving competencies, (3) expanding testing programs, (4) storage and retrieval of data, (5) cost of materials and supplies, (6) processing of library books. From these areas the council staff decided to initiate programs immediately in: (1) developing electronic data processing for storage and retrieval of data, (2) improving reading programs in the area, (3) cooperate in the development of funded projects for exceptional child education projects.

There was considerable emphasis upon the improvement of reading. Several workshops were held for teachers in the area. Other workshops were held such as interaction analysis workshops which were held in all counties. The council staff participated with various groups of educators in the
development and writing of proposals for educational improvement. These were prepared for federal and state funding. Considerable impact was made in activities to facilitate better storage and retrieval of data. A microfiche and ERIC center was initiated. This was the most frequently mentioned project in interviews with educators in the region. This was apparently very well received by most of the counties.

Much of the center activity involved direct consultative services to schools and teacher groups. As indicated already inservice workshops and conferences for teachers were used in the curriculum improvement phase. These one-to-one services seem, for the most part, to have been satisfactory. The leaders of IRREDC felt that they were very good in these situations. At the same time the leaders recognized that these activities promulgated the center as a crisis oriented fire station.

The council undertook administrative studies for school systems. For example, the council staff assisted one school district in a study of school board policies. The council agreed to make an organizational study for a school system.

The council provided leadership in the development of a cooperative bidding program which still functions today. This was one of the few programs cited by top level school administrators as worth while.

As mentioned previously, the members of the council staff made valuable contributions on a consultant basis to local school systems. They assisted in the state sponsored behavioral objectives movement, the EIE program of the state, and in other matters.
Some Comparative Observations

From the standpoint of sheer volume, breadth, and impact, of programs, the writers found that the IRREDC was far below the productivity of the PAEC center. The IRREDC activities also did not contain anything like the volume of pure service activities as PAEC (i.e., testing, printing, finance services). The contractual service approach exploited by PAEC might be frowned upon by some authorities on the change process. On the other hand, these massive services were one important basis of organizational survival and, as we shall see subsequently, they did not detract that heavily from the purpose of the center to promote educational change.

Another difference in the two centers involved the writing of funded programs to be administered by the center. This was and presently is a very important factor in keeping the operation of PAEC at its expected level of program thrust. One IRREDC staff member commented, "We could have survived by concentrating on writing proposals for state and federal funding."

Finally, there was one other important difference. In the eyes of its clients, doing without PAEC was almost unthinkable. The PAEC staff had found some ways to plant strong feelings that it was indispensable. One of the big limitations in IRREDC was that they never found such programs. As one important leader on the IRREDC staff commented, "We were never able to perform the one big service that would have made us indispensable."

Some of the IRREDC leaders expressed rather strong feelings that a factor in their organization's illness was the crises orientation which developed. This probably did prevent their thinking of those big regional programs which would have made them indispensable. On the other hand, one must not overlook the fact that PAEC also had its crises orientation. It was
called in case of fires. But PAEC had more than this. It had those
indispensable programs of service, change, and innovation.

Perceptions of Activities
Leading to Educational Change

An important purpose of the Title III supplemental education centers
was to serve as vehicles for constructive educational change for rural
areas. They were also to provide viable alternative solutions to persistent
educational problems. Therefore, the research staff was specifically
interested in opinions and evidence concerning whether the centers had
served these functions.

The data from interviews concerning these functions was consistent with
the opinions expressed by teachers and principals on the questionnaires dis-
cussed in Chapter III. The reader will recall that there was strong support
to the idea that PAEC had served to stimulate educational change and to help
school systems provide imaginative solutions to educational problems. There
was not this intensity of support on these functions for IRREDC.

Most persons interviewed did not remember IRREDC as an agent for educa-
tional change. The purchase of the ERIC collection by IRREDC for use of
the counties was mentioned. For the most part, those asked specifically
about the IRREDC as a vehicle for educational change and imaginative solutions
to problems felt that it did not distinguish itself in these functions. One
frequently encountered such comments that, "They just didn't promote change," "absolutely none," "I cannot recall an instance in which an innovation was
promoted," and "Didn't push anything new--would help with something you
wanted to do." As has already been mentioned the credibility gap which
developed between the IRREDC staff and many county leaders worked counter to their helping generate imaginative solutions to educational problems.

With a few exceptions, the interviews with representatives of the clients of PAEC produced positive answers concerning the generation of educational change and in providing imaginative solutions to persistent problems. Comments such as the following were made.

"PAEC definitely promotes change. It has pushed new ideas like individualized instruction and helped young teachers change the ways of old teachers."

"PAEC also helped our teachers in designing programs for open spaces. They also helped in budgeting and writing school policies. They helped in writing the educational specs for new classrooms."

"When they had an idea such as the open terrace prescriptive instruction programs, PAEC would supply personnel and service to be helpful in initiating it. (The center has become a demonstration center nation-wide for IPI."

A very small minority of teachers interviewed did not view PAEC as contributing to new ideas and educational change. However, an overwhelming majority of the teachers perceived PAEC as helping make change and as contributing imaginative ideas.

**Funding of the Centers**

PAEC and IRREDC were funded for four years under the provisions of ESEA, Title III. IRREDC was awarded an initial one-year grant of $103,473.
PAEC had an initial one-year grant of $103,000. Each center was given three additional grants to complete the four years of funding. Title III money is considered to be "high risk" in nature to encourage experimentation and innovation. Generally, projects funded under Title III have no provisions for local contributions because it is felt local monies might tend to discourage innovation. PAEC has been somewhat unique in this respect because it has never depended solely on the use of Title III funds.

From the beginning, local funds have been used to supplement the Title III funds for the project. As PAEC developed new programs the counties began to contribute local funds for testing, inservice training for teachers and administrators, monitoring Title I programs, development of teacher aide programs, and printing services. These local contributions have expanded into numerous other areas and there presently exists a contractual arrangement whereby the local school districts contract with PAEC for services that they need. PAEC will provide the school districts with consultants, printed materials, testing, or other services at a cost to the school districts that compares favorably to individually contracted services with other agencies. This contractual arrangement allows the PAEC to keep the basic charge to the local school districts at a nominal level.

During the 1971-72 school year PAEC activities were partially funded under an arrangement that saw participating counties contribute a base amount of $3,000 for each county plus an additional $1.50 per pupil. This provided approximately $91,200 in a budget of $250,000, and from governmental grants for programs administered by PAEC, approximately $100,000. The staff is continually searching for new means to obtain funding for projects. As one
staff member said, "We can smell a little money and we go out and get it."

Under the present arrangement the knowledge of the local school boards of how PAEC is funded depends upon the particular county. In some counties PAEC is not mentioned specifically in the budget but the services it performs are listed. In other counties the board members are fully informed about PAEC and how it is funded. The following comments by superintendents are indicative of the way in which most superintendents approach the topic of funding of PAEC with their boards.

I inform the board. I simply tell the board that we can contract the services with PAEC cheaper than we can provide the services by other means.

I talk to the board in general terms about PAEC. I tell the board that for $5,000 to $10,000 we are getting services. I do not try to explain. Although the board is very supportive of PAEC, we have never encouraged it to get down to the nitty-gritty aspect.

Generally speaking, the superintendents are highly satisfied by the way in which PAEC is funded. The following brief comments reflect this satisfaction.

Our pro rata share is less than $5,000. For that price there is no way we could get the people, goods, and services by ourselves.

Counties now contract with PAEC for services. They provide testing, printing, report cards, etc. We save money by doing business with them.

These comments are in considerable contrast to those made by the former clients of IRREDC. With one exception all of the school districts in the IRREDC area surmised that they could purchase more with their money by spending it in their own districts than they could by supporting the center. Some of their comments are given below:
The Title III grant ran out. For the local school boards to pick it (IRREDC) up they could not pick it up nor could they justify it. We could not see what we would get for our money that we did not already have.

It (IRREDC) lost federal funds and counties wouldn't support it. It would cost more than could be gotten out of it.

The school administrator interviewed in one county stated that they would have invested funds to continue IRREDC if the other five school systems would have agreed. As mentioned previously, this school district used the services of IRREDC and in most respects were satisfied with them.

Assessment of Needs and Planning

Most respondents reported that IRREDC and PAEC were active in making needs assessments of the cooperating districts. A variety of techniques were used in this process. Practically all observers stated that the IRREDC and PAEC made efforts to contact leaders in school districts and explore how the organization could respond to their needs. In practically all cases these discussions appeared to be satisfying to educational leaders.

There did appear to be a difference in the way the centers used the results of needs assessments. Its clients saw PAEC as promptly responsive to the needs of school people. In the eyes of many respondents IRREDC did not follow-through with programs based upon the numerous discussions of needs. One superintendent stated, "We did sit down a couple of times to put something down. The next meeting did not hit any of these things. They (IRREDC staff) were in a different direction. We were right back in the talk stage."

There were attempts at grass-roots planning in both centers. The process seems to have been more productive of program activity in PAEC.
Throughout the interviews, including its staff and school district personnel, the IRREDC was described as becoming crises oriented. It did a lot of good work in the school districts but much of it was not, as one person expressed it, part of a game plan.

Use of Evaluation

Both of the supplemental education centers had the usual formal evaluations as prescribed in the proposal for most federal grants for this period. These should have provided valuable feedback to the leaders and should have been used to correct obvious pitfalls. From the interviews we were told by IRREDC officials that they were warned by one evaluation team that they were too crises oriented in their activities. That is, the center lacked thrust of activities toward regional goals. According to leaders of IRREDC they were never able to remove themselves from this orientation even though there appeared to be some hope of doing so during the final year.

The IRREDC evaluation referred to above was submitted to the staff on March 4, 1968. All this committee did was spend a few hours reacting logically to what the IRREDC staff had presented concerning their objectives and activities. Even in this very limited process devoid of data collected from school systems, the team made some cogent observations. The staff was praised for the excellent public relations work it had done. However, the evaluation report questioned seriously the IRREDC staff's tendency not to work with and through county leaders. The center staff was cautioned that it may dissipate its energies by the tendency to do consultant work directly with teachers.

The staff was further criticized for "moving in many directions simultaneously"
instead of zeroing in on some major problems. The evaluation team noted in its report that one county was not participating. Moreover, reading between the lines the report suggests a staff doing a lot of work gathering lists of needs and internal planning but producing few program activities to deal with these pressing needs.

This raises some interesting questions. Had the evaluation team talked with school leaders in all counties, could a compelling case have been made which would have corrected the web into which the IRREDC was becoming hopelessly entangled? Obviously, the evaluation team put its finger on some critical conditions which later haunted the effectiveness and continuation of IRREDC.

There is no objective evidence except the opinions from interviews that PAEC was more responsive to formal evaluations of its activities than was the IRREDC staff. There is reason to believe that PAEC probably demonstrated considerably greater responsive sensitivity to criticism from its clients. This was obvious in practically all conversations with principals and superintendents. The PAEC staff was pictured as a live-wire group and very responsive to any suggestions given.

How Selected Citizens Viewed the Centers

The research staff selected business and civic leaders from the cities in which PAEC and IRREDC were located and asked their opinions about the centers. In the IRREDC these persons included a banker, two attorneys, a realtor, an insurance agent, and newspaperman. The persons from the PAEC area included a county official, president of chamber of commerce, an
attorney, an insurance agent, an automobile dealer, and a farmer.

Most of these persons had heard of the two centers and knew that their offices were located in town. In the PAEC area two of the six leaders did not recognize the organization by name. One of these knew it by the fact that the director was head of it and he knew him well. The other person expressed no knowledge of it whatsoever. Of the six persons interviewed in the IRREDC hometown, three did not know it by name. As in the PAEC Area, one of these persons knew it existed by knowing a school person who worked there.

In general, the citizens did not know a lot about the centers and why they existed. There were several comments that they were supported by federal funds. Practically all of the PAEC hometown leaders recalled that it was moved there from a neighboring county. The center had to be moved from its original location to Washington County because of that county's difficulty in complying with federal guidelines on racial integration of its schools. There were no negative reactions to PAEC from its leaders. All who knew about it were positive in their support. A newspaperman from the IRREDC area commented, "Yes, I know about it. Do you want an objective or subjective answer." After indicating that we would like both, he stated:

Well, objectively they were here to develop innovative schools and solve educational problems. Subjectively, they were just using up government funds giving some people jobs. Not much was accomplished. We tried on numerous occasions to find out about their accomplishments and went over there (to IRREDC office) but could find none.
Responsiveness of Counties to the Centers

Frequently, those interviewed in the IRREDC area would, after discussing their perceived faults of the center, stop and thoughtfully observe as one person stated, "I guess we were at fault, too. We could have done more than we did to make it successful." Having served as leader of an innovative program for school systems, the senior author of this report readily appreciates the significance of these comments. IRREDC could not compel the member counties to be its clients. They had to be persuaded somehow that it provided attractive programs which they could not provide by remaining isolated. Any reluctance the counties may have had to cooperate made the center's job that much more difficult.

How much was the unresponsiveness of the counties a factor in the eventual death of IRREDC? Apparently, there was considerable consternation during the first year about how to organize and relate to the member counties. When asked pointedly whether observed differences in the interests and needs of the member counties was a significant factor in the discontinuation of IRREDC, most observers felt that this was a minor factor. Most persons believed that cooperation in the six-county area would have been possible despite the problems involved. The generalization appears to be that the school systems were not cooperative and certainly could have been more responsive to IRREDC but that these conditions were not judged to be of high significance in the eventual death of the organization. No Brutus seems to have planned the early death of IRREDC although, as already mentioned, some superintendents would have gladly seen it go earlier than it did.
We have mentioned previously that the IRREDC did much work with resulting positive feelings in one of the school systems. This developed after one of the IRREDC staff members was appointed to the superintendency of that district. One must surmise that his school district benefited from his knowledge of the staff potential for assistance. This also enforces the earlier implication that the superintendents should have been heavily involved in IRREDC from the beginning.

There is, of course, another important consideration. Since school superintendents were instrumental in establishing IRREDC, why did they not want to participate in its development? Why was this typically left to second level administrators? Was IRREDC seen from the beginning as just another curriculum organization to be used or ignored as the case might dictate?

Obviously, the leadership task of the PAEC leaders was reduced in difficulty by the previous experience in cooperative organizations. Also, one could speculate that the educators and the people among the PAEC counties are more compatible than was true in IRREDC. No evidence was obtained to substantiate this speculation and, even if it were true, it probably was not a significant factor in organizational survival.

Geographic Conditions

The research staff was interested in whether geographic conditions influenced the work of the two organizations. Considerable probing into this with PAEC leaders produced no data indicating that their far-flung area was a detriment. Most of the leaders felt that the present size of PAEC was large enough. They believed that the addition of other counties would overload the central staff and begin to make the organization unwieldy. Moreover,
all respondents felt that all school systems could agree on common needs
as a basis of continued cooperation.

The IRREDC leaders' views on this matter were similar to those voiced
in PAEC in so far as size was concerned. However, several persons voiced
the opinion that the counties in IRREDC had widely different educational
problems and needs. For example, leaders in the very small rural counties
did not view themselves as having the same needs as such counties as St. Lucie
(see Chapter II) where they were feeling the press of a growing population.
Footnotes for Chapter IV

CHAPTER V

REFLECTIONS ON A MODEL FOR HIGH-RISK REGIONAL CENTERS

The data from this study show many different developmental and operational characteristics between the two selected high-risk organizations. One can not simply point to one or a few conditions which resulted in the survival of one organization and in the death of the other. These were very complex organizational systems in which many interacting variables were important. Thus simplistic explanations for one or two reasons (i.e., leadership, staff) are not possible.

Moreover, the point must be reiterated that IRREDC and PAEC were more than offices and more than the central office staffs. The member school systems were in reality also PAEC and IRREDC. Thus the success of the centers is, to some important degree, a measure of the successful efforts of the member school systems in cooperating to realize success. To think otherwise would be comparable to holding the minister and his staff solely responsible for the survival of the church when in reality the parishioners themselves are also accountable. Consequently, when an organization such as those studied meets death, we are not just presiding over the funeral of the regional staff. The member counties and their leaders are ghosts at the funeral, some of whom helped when they could and many of whom could have helped but did not, for whatever reason, do so.

Some Illustrative Differences Between the Two Organizations

This study began as an analysis of the significant characteristic differences between IRREDC and PAEC. There is no presumption that all
of the most significant differences were described. Suffice it so say
that the staff did record those differences, which seemed, at the time,
to be important to the problem undertaken. The staff feels that those
recorded differences are sufficient to assist in intelligent speculation
concerning models for organizing and administering such high-risk organi-
izations as PAEC and IRREDC. Before going to this speculative aspect
of the study, some of the observed differences in the two organizations
are explained below. This, by the way, is not an exhaustive listing of
all differences but is felt to be fairly illustrative of major differences.

The PAEC school superintendents had a history of personal comradeship
and school system cooperation through CAEP, the forerunner of PAEC, whereas
there had been very limited formal cooperation among the school districts
of IRREDC.

The member school systems of PAEC reached what appeared to be an
optional stage of cooperation. With the minor exception of cooperative
bidding, the level of cooperation in the IRREDC was changed very little
from the beginning of the center to its demise.

The administrative control and organization of the two centers were
vastly different. In PAEC the school superintendents were members of the
advisory committee and made the basic policy decisions, whereas the
school system representatives on the IRREDC advisory council were central
office assistants and it did not function as a policy directive group.

Except for the last year, IRREDC operated as an autonomous agency
without on-going control or guidance from school superintendents (or
other local school leaders). The school superintendents in the Panhandle
Area felt that PAEC was their organization.
The staff for PAEC was viewed by its clients as highly responsive to their expressed needs, whereas many IRREDC constituents perceived the staff as lethargic and procrastinating in responding to requests for services and suggested programs.

Leaders in the IRREDC office exhibited little knowledge or sensitivity in responding to the educational power structures of cooperating school districts. The PAEC staff leaders exhibited full knowledge of school system leadership structures and used this knowledge in strategies for program implementation.

The area of staff recruitment and relationships was a very critical area of differences in the centers. Some of these differences are stated below.

1. The PAEC staff was very stable and had practically no turnover, whereas there was much turnover of staff in IRREDC.

2. IRREDC had two different directors, whereas PAEC had the same director for the period studied.

3. Practically all of the PAEC staff members were locals (homefolk) with strong community ties, whereas the IRREDC staff had a more cosmopolitan make-up in that numerous persons were recruited from outside the area.

4. A damaging credibility gap developed between the IRREDC staff and its intended clients, whereas the PAEC staff enjoyed much prestige among its clientele concerning its ability to perform.

5. Serious illness was an important factor in the staff performance of IRREDC, whereas no comparable condition was found in the PAEC staff.

6. For the most part, the PAEC staff appeared to have more harmonious and genuine relationships with its clients. The IRREDC relationships
were strained and impersonal with many of its clients near the end of the project.

The staff leadership of IRREDC was perceived as low-key and somewhat deliberative in taking action. The PAEC leadership was seen by its clients as dynamic, forceful, and action oriented.

The programs and program development activities presented some interesting contrasts.

1. From the beginning PAEC seems to have been action oriented, whereas IRREDC spent much of its energy in spinning ideas from its assessment of needs.

2. Routine service activities (i.e., helping school districts prepare budgets) were a volume business in PAEC but of little consequence in IRREDC. Both centers conducted inservice training activities, provided consultant services to schools, and emphasized activities aimed at educational change and innovation.

3. The massive volume of programs developed in PAEC was overwhelming in comparison to the volume of programs generated by IRREDC.

4. PAEC developed programs which made the organization indispensable in the eyes of its clients, whereas IRREDC was never able to make their programs perceived as essential.

An overwhelming majority of the PAEC clients saw it as highly productive and useful in meeting their needs. The majority of the respondents saw IRREDC as unproductive and as contributing little in meeting professional needs.

IRREDC was perceived by few respondents as an agency for educational change and innovation. PAEC was viewed as a dynamic vehicle for change and innovation by its clientele.
Data indicate more grass-roots involvement of school administrators and teachers in PAEC than in IRREDC.

PAEC had considerably higher visibility among professional educators than did the IRREDC in its area. Both organizations had relatively low visibility among the citizens and school board members interviewed. Overall, IRREDC had rather low visibility and impact.

Funds from school districts were provided for PAEC programs from its beginning. Practically all funds for IRREDC were a direct grant from ESEA, Title III.

Implications for a Model State Regional Organization

After the authors began this study, a topic of discussion involved implications of what was being discovered for the future development of regional cooperatives. For years state department of education leaders have talked about regionalization. Yet simply establishing branch offices and calling them regions for the purpose of administering rules and regulations may do a disservice to students. This is where the subject of this report offers an alternative for regionalization. For this, we must be thankful that the IRREDC and PAEC happened. All of us owe a debt of gratitude to the staffs who struggled long and hard in these regions. Without these happenings, we would have had considerably less knowledge of a promising concept of regionalization.

The undomesticated, semi-wild regional centers, such as PAEC and IRREDC, may have an important function in providing state leadership for
educational improvement. The results of this study will provide knowledge useful in making these organizations productive.

In the following sections, the authors are going to discuss what they believe to be some important conditions for the survival and productivity of these high-risk organizations for rural areas. Since the regional centers for this study were in rural areas, these observations may or may not be relevant for urban areas.

The educational needs of the member school districts should provide a basis for cooperation.

Considerable study should be given to the grouping of school districts into regional supplemental education centers on the basis of existing educational needs. Geographic conditions of the school districts in the proposed region should be considered. Do the educational needs and problems of the proposed region provide the basis of profitable cooperation? A few persons interviewed in this study surmised that the educational problems of the coastal school systems of IRREDC were not common to other participating school districts. Although there was no support for this view by a large majority interviewed, the research staff believes such differences could be important in other contemplated regions.

There are many questions when regionalization of the entire state is considered. School superintendents of large urban school systems frequently voice the opinion that their problems are very different from rural school systems and that mixing urban and rural systems in a region might be unproductive for both. This immediately raises the question of how to regionalize school systems where a large urban school system is surrounded by smaller rural districts.
A tradition of cooperation among the proposed members of a regional supplemental education center will enhance chances of success. If such a tradition does not exist, ways should be found to compensate for it before initiating the center.

The study reported herein indicated that a tradition of cooperation was a significant factor in the survival of PAEC; and likewise, a lack of a tradition of cooperation may have contributed to the demise of IRREDC. Although the research staff would be hard pressed to support their position, we believe that the school superintendents of PAEC had much fuller understanding of their responsibilities to PAEC than their counterparts had for IRREDC. Early in its development the business of IRREDC was shuttled off as the "play pretty" of central office assistants, some college professors, and a private school representative. At the same time the staff members and leaders for IRREDC did not respond to the situation with imaginative programs and leadership that would have made cooperation on a regional basis attractive to the school power wielders. These and other factors and conditions severely crippled the IRREDC from the beginning, whereas PAEC was off and running in regional cooperation when its director was finally approved.

In the event such traditions of cooperation do not exist, and this will be true of many areas, there should be substituted procedures and activities to encourage cooperation. Cooperation could begin with programs that provide certain routine services such as the CAEP program, a forerunner of PAEC (see Chapter IV). Such a program will give the suiters a courtship experience to prepare them for the serious proposal of marriage.
Another alternative for a tradition of cooperation is to ask the proposers of a center to specify how they will assume responsibilities for cooperation. In the case of most supplemental education centers, the participants looked upon them as free; and anything free, particularly if it is federally funded, may not mean serious organizational obligation. We believe that this adversity can be overcome by extended periods of bargaining and planning during which each participant is made aware that he must give something, not just masquerade in a few artificial meetings from time to time. For example, the participants from the beginning should be required to commit enough of the resources of their organizations that they feel the pinch. This could be commitment of personnel, funds, or other resources.

Regional centers should be organized as semiautonomous (wild) organizations in which the centers have some choice concerning the control over their activities by the state department of education and local school districts.

Like all other fields of administration, educational administrators tend to follow the bureaucratic model in organizing activities. That is, every function performed within an organization must be thought of as directly answerable to someone in the chain of command. The Title III supported regional centers, such as IRREDC and PAEC, have provided an exciting alternative organization for educational development.

As was discussed previously, IRREDC and PAEC were semiautonomous type organizations. The member school systems were not compelled to accept services of the centers. The centers were accountable, to some extent,
to federal and state officials for the performance of certain functions. However, the centers had freedom from local and state officials in the performance of these functions. Thus the center staffs could exercise choices and not become just another central staff of a school system or another bureau in the state department of education. Although the PAEC staff worked closely with the school superintendents, it was freed from possible tyranny of localism by also being accountable to state personnel for program development. The superintendents felt that they "owned" PAEC, but at the same time they had become addicted to its indispensable services.

In the future development of these regional centers, the state department of education should attempt to maintain within the regional staffs and leaders an effective choice. They should be free to be captured by either the state, the local school systems, by both local and state leaders, or maintain some independence from both depending upon how educational improvement may be better served in the region.

One might question the recommendation of an organizational structure so similar to those Title III supplemental education centers in which only one of five survived. The important consideration is that one survived and was so successful in surviving. The experience with these centers has given us more know-how in projecting productive regional cooperatives in which productivity in educational improvement can be optimized.

The semiautonomous regional centers can be held accountable through several processes. First of all, their leaders and staffs should be held accountable to the advisory committee or advisory council, as the name may be, for realistic planning and the generation of action programs based
upon cooperative, grass-roots participation of educators from all levels in the region. Secondly, the state may require rigorous evaluations of progress by outside persons appointed by state officials. This should be a much more rigorous and in-depth evaluation report than the traditional ten-page draft based on a couple of days work. Both the state and local districts can maintain continuous monitoring services and feedback to the regional center staffs.

The regional organizations should be provided relatively long term contracts unless experience dictates otherwise. A suggestion might be a commitment of five years with possibly some provisions for renegotiating certain aspects annually. If at the end of the five-year period the state does not feel that the region has made sufficient progress, it may exercise its option to withdraw support. Likewise, the cooperating school districts may decide to negotiate very different arrangements.

The superintendents of schools from the cooperating school districts should be members of the advisory boards for the regional center. The staff should work very closely with the advisory board in the development of regional policies and programs.

The active participation of the school superintendents lends prestige and importance to the regional effort. The policies and programs developed through the participation of these top officials are more readily legitimized within the school systems than if developed without their participation. Moreover, the programs developed will have relevance to the educational needs of the region.
In the past, substantial support has been given to the need for keeping change agents somewhat detached from the control of line officers. Yet the logic of this position was not supported in the cases of PAEC and IRREDC. The school superintendents had a strong sense of ownership of PAEC. The advisory committee functioned as a policy making board rather than as a board of advisers. Nevertheless, PAEC had the image of a dynamic agency for change, innovation, service, and educational improvement. The PAEC staff demonstrated no lethargy toward generating imaginative educational changes as a result of strong participation in policy decisions by school superintendents.

On the other hand, the IRREDC experience indicates that concentrating upon the primary aim of complete autonomy in decision making for regional center staffs runs the risk of creating countervailing forces of uncooperativeness, rejection, and even loss of credibility. During the time in which the IRREDC staff operated at almost complete autonomy, it encountered all of these countervailing forces. Most observers felt the IRREDC was very effective during the last year of its operation when the superintendents participated as a decision making group.

The regional center leaders and staff members should be selected for their expertise in meeting local needs, for balance in age and experience, and for potential for leadership. The leaders should be able to identify and work with the most influential persons in local school systems.

If the center is to provide programs that the member school districts can not provide for themselves, the expertise of the staff must not duplicate existing central office staffs of member school systems. In the case of
PAEC and IRREDC, the expertise of the staffs was spelled out in the program in advance of fundamental needs assessment. This procedure runs the risk of having answers for problems which do not exist. Therefore, a core staff for the center should, in cooperation with local school leaders, perform an in-depth needs assessment prior to recruitment of the staff.

The most constantly desirable quality, however, in the semiautonomous type organization, such as PAEC and IRREDC, is leadership ability. A person with expertise but of questionable leadership ability can "get-by" in the typical bureaucracy because those above and below him can compensate for his deficiencies. Moreover, use of persuasion is not as important where one can give commands. The semiautonomous organization is different. The staff member must use persuasive leadership. In the performance of his services he must establish and maintain harmonious personal relationships with his clients or else suffer the consequence of losing them. Thus leadership and ability to establish and maintain warm, human relationships are absolutely essential for the successful operation of the semiautonomous regional center.

Leadership in the development of high morale and productive mindedness in the center staff is essential to its success. Again, we must emphasize that such a regional center as envisioned herein is not a domesticated organization. Much of the success of the regional center depends upon the leadership of the staff.

The leaders of the regional staffs should be able to identify and work with the most influential leaders of local school systems in administering programs.
One of the impressionable differences in PAEC and IRREDC was in the way they related to the power wielders of local school systems. The PAEC leaders demonstrated viable knowledge of the educational power structure of member school districts. They understood the political dynamics of the area, planned with educational leaders in implementing programs, and worked directly with school superintendents. Except for the last year of its existence, the IRREDC staff seems not to have succeeded in establishing a working relationship with educational leaders. In interviews with the staff, the political dynamics of local school systems was not emphasized as a basis for program development and implication. Most persons interviewed expressed the opinion the IRREDC really came to life during its last year when working relationships with top leaders in school systems improved.

As emphasized in other sections of this report, the regional center leaders must possess political astuteness. This is not to say they must be Machiavellian and seek self-aggrandizement for personal gain. They must be statesmen in recognizing that there are leaders in the local school systems and in being able to obtain the cooperation of these leaders in program development and implementation.

The semiautonomous nature of the regional center staff requires a different leadership and service orientation from the domesticated organization. Those who are selected to provide leadership in these regional centers should undergo a period of training prior to assuming their tasks.

As discussed previously in Chapter IV, the supplemental education centers are semiautonomous (wild) organizations. That is, they have a
choice concerning how they will serve their clients, and their clients may accept or reject their services. Most educators are trained to serve in domesticated organizations in which they have no choice over the clients they must serve, and the clients exercise no choice over the school to which they are assigned. In the domesticated organization its survival is assured for the foreseeable future. The semiautonomous organization must struggle for an existence.

The staff of the semiautonomous center cannot command respect for its program as is possible in the typical line-and-staff organization. It must win respect for its programs.

The differences in leadership demands of the traditional school organization and the emerging regional center require differences in orientation. Placing the typical educational administrator or supervisor in the wild organization without preparation for his new task may seriously handicap him. This was probably a factor in IRREDC. PAEC had overcome this handicap through previous experiences in cooperation.

The training program should allow much opportunity for the students to read and think about the differences in leadership needed between the domesticated and the semiautonomous or wild organization. In addition, the students should have opportunities to learn how to perform the following functions:

1. Initiate processes and procedures for working cooperatively with school districts in needs assessment.

2. Create alternative programs for meeting the needs and identification of those programs, which, in turn, will contribute to the needs of member school districts.
3. Identify, describe, and provide leadership with the civic and/or professional power structures of school districts.

4. Design relevant leadership strategies for different typologies of power systems through which the most promising programs might be provided to school districts.

5. Use feedback as a means of organizational survival and viability of programs.

Stability of staff and leadership of the regional centers are essential.

The data from this study show that high turnover of staff and leadership can be detrimental to program development in regional centers. Every effort should be made to maintain stability in the regional staff.

The effects of staff turnover may not be so noticeable within the traditional bureaucratic organization with which most educators are familiar. In fact, many schools have such a high degree of organizational closedness that turnover in staff can produce positive improvements. High staff turnover in the high-risk regional organizations, however, can be disastrous. These regional centers are characteristically open to begin with. What they must struggle for is closedness upon some commonly accepted programs that will make their services appreciated. If they are faced with a change in staff each time they begin to achieve closure on programs, the interruptions experienced may make the staff appear to observers to be lethargic and to possess lack of follow-through on program agreements. If such situation occurs in an elementary school, its survival is assured until the symptoms disappear. However, these symptoms can signal the impending death of high-risk organizations such as PAEC or IRREDC.
The regional center staff must demonstrate high responsiveness to maintain credibility with the leaders of cooperating school systems.

Meeting this condition involves attention to the development of several abilities. First of all, the regional staff simply cannot procrastinate in the delivery of services. Prompt attention to requests must be maintained at all times.

Promise of the delivery of services must be completed within a reasonable period of time. In fact, the director of the regional center must demand this above all others. Moreover, he must see that the way in which services are performed does not create problems for the leaders of local school systems.

The use of feedback in continuously monitoring the delivery of services is essential to success. If local school people complain about the performance of services, for whatever reason voiced, the leadership must do something to correct the source of the complaint. In all instances the staff must demonstrate in its action that it is responsive to its clients.

The staff should be resourceful in the use of outside consultants to compensate for gaps in expertise.

The research staff was impressed by the exceptionally fine way in which the PAEC staff used outside consultants to complement its programs and meet the needs of school systems. This was voiced over and over in the interviews. The typical statement on this subject from educational leaders was, "If they can't do it, they will find someone who can." This came to be an expectation within the region, and the impression was
deduced that expertise from the entire nation could and would be brought to bear on problems.

Many of the respondents to interviews in the IRRED C area said that the last year of their work was the most productive when only a skeleton staff was left and liberal use was made of consultants. This does not mean that the IRRED C was serving as a brokerage agency for paid consultants. During this period, the IRRED C staff was providing effective leadership in cooperative planning and in the development of programs.

The programs of a supplemental education center serve to make the cooperative indispensable to the participating school districts.

The cooperating school systems should feel that they are obtaining more services from the supplemental education center than each of them can provide as effectively for themselves. Otherwise, the creation of a center is self-defeating. In the case of IRRED C, the staff was not able to come up with programs that resulted in a plus for the member school districts. Rather the feeling was frequently expressed that the local school staff could perform needed tasks just as well as the IRRED C staff and with less effort.

Programs for the center should include assistance in implementing statewide programs for educational improvement.

The regional staff should provide useful leadership in important state programs for educational development and improvement. Both IRRED C and PAEC were commended by school personnel for their services in this area. For example, educators mentioned that they could not have functioned in/
meeting certain state programs without outside help, and the PAEC and IRRED C were there to assist them. Some of the areas in which this assistance was mentioned with feelings of greatest appreciation were behavioral objectives, state accreditation standards, and the EIE program. The fact that many educators felt an openness to use the regional staffs for these projects instead of using regular state consultants is important. Thus the pay-off for the state in supporting these semiautonomous centers is that they serve as facilitating agents in making changes implemented through legislative acts or state board regulations. Hopefully, in the long run, the state may also find the services of these center staffs indispensable.

The regional centers are established for leadership and service to member school districts in improving education for children and youth rather than for the administration of state rules and regulations.

The leaders in the PAEC area stated over and over that the genius of PAEC was that, when they called upon its staff, they got help rather than being quoted a rule and regulation. This feeling was so strong that any regional office organized as an arm of the state department of education will be seriously handicapped as a vehicle for imaginative leadership in educational improvement. There is reason to believe that the semiautonomous type of organization, such as IRRED C and PAEC, can move into the realm of educational development. We emphasize, however, that these organizations must not be under the direct control of the state department of education and that they have bargaining choices with the local school districts themselves.
In addition to their responsibilities for assisting in constructive
educational change and innovation and for providing imaginative alter-
natives for solutions to educational problems, these centers should provide
various services not available to the cooperating school districts
individually.

There is nothing that becomes more tiresome than a group of persons
bent upon their own perspective of changing education. Who wants to be
changed for twenty years and by the same people? Moreover, school districts
within a regional cooperative have a right to expect more from the regional
office than proposed imaginative solutions to their problems. The PAEC
experience leads the authors to believe that there is no inherent conflict
between providing routine services and assisting in educational change
and innovation. The intermixing of these two functions was a very
essential element in the survival of PAEC. The services PAEC gave the
schools of their area made it much more profitable for them to stay
in and give resources than to drop out.

The data show rather clearly that this breadth of program in PAEC
did not conflict with its function as a change agent. The research staff
is very sure that the encompassing program made PAEC more effective in
educational change and in providing alternative solutions to regional
and local school problems.

The center should have an effective communication program for maintaining
its visibility and for promoting its programs and services. These programs
should in all instances enhance the visibility of local school systems.
The data from this study indicate that PAEC enjoyed high visibility among school personnel but not at the expense of the maintenance of visibility of the superintendents and central staffs of cooperating school districts. That is, PAEC used its public relations program to build up and support the local school administrations while also extolling the virtues of PAEC as an organization. The staff was always careful in its news releases to provide visibility for local school leaders.

From the interview data this policy for image building and information was successful beyond what one would normally believe possible. One indeed had to dig deep into the teaching staff to find a few negative statements about the PAEC staff. None of the administrative and supervisory personnel made any statements resentful of PAEC.

Member school districts should share in the support of regional centers from the beginning. State and federal funds should provide much of the financial support.

What a school district is willing to commit in resources is a measure of its willingness to cooperate in regional programs such as PAEC and IRREDC. The autonomous nature of the regional center staff makes commitments from the member counties essential. Likewise, this relationship requires that the school systems have certain bargaining leverage with the regional staff. Making commitments of resources and their possible withdrawal from support provides member counties leverage needed to assure attention to their interests. This does not have to be a financial commitment. It could be in the form of staff time or other arrangements.
If state authorities are interested in this approach to regionalization, feasibility studies should be undertaken as a basis of planning. These studies should consider the geographic problems and other general conditions. Much attention should be given to how far to proceed immediately within existing resources. The means of financing the centers is an important consideration. What percentage of the funds for such centers should come from the state and federal governments? Should this percentage vary from area to area?

Practically all of the financial support for the regional centers should be provided by the state and federal governments. The trend in financing education through state sources has made local monies extremely limited. Although the PAEC school districts are to be commended for their local efforts, the possibilities of their continuing this support for the future are always in doubt. The authors feel that such regional efforts should not become the victims of some future financial squeeze on local school systems. Immediate attention should be given to the development of state and federal funding for these regional efforts.
May 9, 1972

Dear Participant:

We have engaged by the Florida Education Research and Development Council and the State Department of Education to conduct a study of the Panhandle Area Educational Cooperative (PAEC).

As a part of this study we want opinions of teachers concerning the PAEC. You will find attached a questionnaire which we would appreciate your filling in and return to the school office. Your answers will remain confidential.

Your cooperation in this matter is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

Ralph B. Kimbrough
Chairman, Department of Educational Administration
College of Education
University of Florida
SURVEY OF THE PANHANDLE AREA
EDUCATIONAL COOPERATIVE
(PAEC)

Following are some statements with which you may agree or disagree. Circle the symbol which best represents your position on each statement as follows:

SA -- Strongly Agree
A -- Agree
N -- Neither Agree nor Disagree
D -- Disagree
SD -- Strongly Disagree

SA A N D SD The goals and objectives of the Panhandle Area Educational Cooperative (PAEC) are clear to me.

SA A N D SD The PAEC stimulated constructive educational change in rural areas.

SA A N D SD There was a definite need for the PAEC.

SA A N D SD The PAEC was properly staffed to carry out its stated objectives.

SA A N D SD The leaders of the PAEC were motivated by a sincere desire to solve persistent educational problems.

SA A N D SD Dissemination of information to teachers was well organized and effective.

SA A N D SD Grass-roots participation in planning was evident, including wide participation of teachers.

SA A N D SD PAEC readily adjusted its programs to meet the expressed needs of local schools.

SA A N D SD The PAEC helped participating school districts assess and clarify their educational needs.

SA A N D SD The PAEC encouraged local school districts to develop imaginative solutions to educational problems.
Program adjustments were made in accordance with the outside evaluations.

Teachers are aware of the programs and services offered by the PAEC.

The PAEC Project staff worked harmoniously with teachers and administrators.

A need for the PAEC still exists.

Community reactions to PAEC have been favorable.

The director and PAEC staff provided outstanding leadership.

The activities engaged in by the PAEC meet its stated goals and objectives.

The county in which the PAEC center was located received more services than other member counties.

Red tape at the local level did not interfere with the operation of PAEC.

The PAEC has made a positive contribution to education in this county.

In the space provided below please make any additional comments you feel might be pertinent to this study.
Appendix B

INTERVIEW GUIDE

Name ________________________________

County ______________________________

Cooperative Staff Position ______________________________

School System Position ______________________________

Cooperative ______________________________

1. What factors have contributed to the (continuation, discontinuation) of your Title III cooperative after the withdrawal of federal funding?

2. What changes (should be made, could have been made) to insure the continuation of the cooperative after withdrawal of federal funding?
I. Change

1. Was the cooperative a vehicle for constructive educational change in rural areas?

2. Were viable alternative solutions provided for solving persistent educational problems?

3. Was the greatest impact of the cooperative in the area of attitude change?

4. Has the cooperative encouraged local school districts to develop imaginative solutions to educational problems?

5. Has the cooperative assisted school programs in more effective utilization of the latest knowledge about learning and teaching?

II. Organization

1. Was the cooperative properly staffed to carry out stated objectives?

2. Were advisory councils involved in the decision making process?

3. Has the county in which the cooperative center is located received more services than other member counties?

4. Has the project staff worked harmoniously with the school administrators?

5. Has the project staff worked harmoniously with teachers?

6. Have personnel problems existed among the cooperative staff members?

7. Were adequate facilities available to carry out the programs of the cooperative?

8. Has red tape at the local, state, or USOE levels interfered with the operation of the cooperative?

9. Was adequate time for planning programs available?

10. Were the programs and activities well planned and coordinated?

11. Did the size of the counties involved have an effect upon the success of the cooperative?
III. Finance

1. Did the members of the cooperative share in funding the project from the beginning?

2. Were funds adequate to implement the programs undertaken by the cooperative?

3. After withdrawal of Title III funds, were local funds available to continue the cooperative?

4. Was expertise evident in the budgeting of funds?

5. Were funding delays a problem?

IV. Communication

1. Were the objectives of the cooperative well understood?

2. Was dissemination of information well organized and effective?

3. Have the leaders of the cooperative communicated effectively with their constituents?

V. Visibility

1. Were community leaders well informed about the cooperative?

2. Have community leaders supported the cooperative?

3. Were cooperative activities seen by constituents as important and productive?

4. Were excellent public relations employed by the cooperative?

5. Was the amount of the activities carried on by the cooperative impressive?

6. At the initiation stage, was the idea of the cooperative widely disseminated?

7. Were teachers aware of the programs and services offered by the cooperative?

VI. Leadership

1. Were the leaders of the cooperative motivated by a sincere desire to solve persistent educational problems?

2. Have the members of the cooperative staff displayed dynamic leadership?
3. Was there much turnover in the leadership of the cooperative?
4. Has leadership in the cooperative tended to be spread too thin?
5. Were staff members carefully selected and trained for their positions?
6. Was the director of the cooperative brought in from outside the system?

VII. Meeting Needs

1. Were educational services provided to cooperating school systems?
2. Has the cooperative helped participating school districts assess and clarify their educational needs?
3. Has the cooperative helped individual schools identify persistent educational problems?
4. Were consultant services provided through the cooperative relevant to the felt needs of the participating schools?
5. Has the cooperative provided programs for improving educational leadership?
6. Was there a definite need for the cooperative?
7. Does a need for the cooperative still exist?
8. Have the activities engaged in by the cooperative met the stated goals and objectives?
9. What are the reasons for the formation of the cooperative?
10. Were some counties large enough to carry out the goals without cooperative involvement?

VIII. Planning

1. Was grass-roots participation in planning evident, including wide participation of teachers, parents, and community leaders?
2. Were the initial activities of the cooperative cooperatively developed?
3. Were the activities of the cooperative carefully planned?
4. Were the project directors and planners aware of the intent of Title III legislation?

5. Have the planners sacrificed quality in programs for quantity?

6. Were the goals as seen by the state and the local units compatible?

IX. Evaluation

1. Has the cooperative staff engaged in self-evaluation of activities carried on by the cooperative?

2. Has the cooperative staff made program revisions based upon self-evaluations?

3. Were outside evaluations of existing programs of the cooperative made periodically?

4. Were program adjustments made in accordance with the outside evaluations?

X. General

1. Did the school agencies receiving these grants intend to continue after the withdrawal of Title III funds?

2. Should federal and state governments exercise greater control with respect to project continuance after withdrawal of Title III funds?

3. Has the cooperative made a positive contribution to education in this county?

4. Has the cooperative met or exceeded the expectations of the superintendents?

5. Has geographical arrangement of the member counties inhibited the operations of the cooperative?

6. Has the state department provided adequate assistance in establishing the cooperative?

7. Has the cooperative served the needs of a sizable number of pupils?

8. Has the cooperative contributed to the creation, design and intelligent use of supplementary centers and services?

9. Has the rate of growth within the given counties had an effect upon the success of the cooperative?

10. How well did the member of the boards of education accept the center?