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CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM AND DEFINITIONS OF TERMS USED

I. THE PROBLEM

Statement of the problem. It was the purpose of this study (1) to get the opinions of a sampling of superintendents in this state concerning the worth of their educational lay advisory committees; (2) to get similar opinions from lay persons serving on educational lay advisory committees; and (3) to compare the end results of these opinions and attempt to determine the worth of lay committees.

Importance of the study. Educational lay advisory committees are relatively new in our system of public education. They can be traced back to 1911 (7:10), but until the end of the Second World War there was really no great interest in them. In 1949, the National Citizen's Commission for the Public Schools was formed (the Commission will be discussed in Chapter II). This gave great support to the movement toward the use of lay committees.

With this short-lived history lay committees are considered to be still in an experimental period. Their function and position in public education has still to be clarified and stabilized (6:592). It is hoped that this study will not only help to determine the worth of lay committees but will help to clarify the function and position of such committees in the Washington educational system.
At the present time there seems to be a tremendous interest in lay committees both by lay persons and professional persons. Nearly every month two or three different periodicals publish works about lay committees. Washington educators should know how the movement is progressing in Washington and just how well the people of this state accept lay committees.

II. SCOPE AND LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

This study was conducted with a questionnaire sent to accredited Washington State high school districts having educational lay advisory committees. Four limitations were placed on the original list of accredited high school districts, (1) the elimination of private schools; (2) the exclusion of districts with special accreditation; (3) the exclusion of districts with a population exceeding twenty-seven thousand; and (4) the elimination of union high school districts. The reasons for these limitations are discussed in Chapter III.

III. DEFINITIONS OF TERMS USED

Educational lay advisory committees. An educational lay advisory committee is a group of lay persons who have formed together as an advisory body to the board of education in their school district. Their job is to advise the school board on what the community is thinking and to act
as a two-way system of communication between the school and the community. From this point on in this paper the term "lay committee" will be used to mean "educational lay advisory committee."

Long-term lay committee. Long-term lay committees are formed as a continuous advisory body to the board of education.

Short-term lay committees. Short-term committees are formed only when a specific need or problem arises. As the need or problem is solved they then go out of existence until another need or problem arises.

IV. HYPOTHESES

The hypotheses for this study were as follows:

1. Lay committees work well when used on such problems as passing a bond issue and community surveys.

2. Short-term committees have been used primarily for the purpose of passing bond issues.

3. Lay committees can be an excellent means of public relations for this purpose.

4. Lay committees do not work well on curriculum problems and other problems that take time to show that progress is being made.

5. Some superintendents feel that long-term committees are inclined to "get in the way" after they have solved their initial problem.
V. ORGANIZATION OF REMAINDER OF THE THESIS

Chapter two contains the review of the literature. Chapter three includes, (1) the development of the mailing list, (2) the development of the questionnaire. Chapter four presents the research data and the final chapter, chapter five, contains the summary, conclusions and implications.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

There is not a copious amount of literature on the topic of educational lay advisory committees. The most abundant supply is that in periodicals. Between May 1950 and February 1959 there were 226 articles written on lay committees and listed in the Education Index.

I. THE HISTORY

Lay participation in American public schools dates back to the colonial days. In the early days in this country nearly everyone participated in the town meetings. In these town meetings people discussed not only civic problems, but also the town school system. It was in these town meetings that Americans assumed the right to establish their own schools. All educational policy was set in the town meetings (18:20).

"As school affairs became more complex, school committees (the precursors of the school board or board of trustees) were appointed to manage schools" (18:20). Even with the formation of the school committees the people still demanded and had a voice in school affairs, at least for a while.

As history progressed our towns and cities grew larger and our society more complex, and other various and numerous agencies began competing with the schools for
public interest and support. More and more people began taking the public schools for granted. By the time of World War II schools had become impersonal agencies where educational services could be had for the payment of taxes (1:3).

This impersonal attitude had reached such an extreme that Hamlin (7:3) has cited one case where parents were actually barred from visiting the schools that their children were attending.

As the result of this Hamlin, in a different article, states:

We cannot revert to the town meetings in which decisions about the public schools were first made. We cannot risk the other extreme in which a small board of education and its superintendent of schools make public policy for all.

Boards of education must adapt to modern conditions and take an active part in working with laymen for better schools (8:57).

The first lay committees. Langseth (12:48) reports that Hull's study showed two lay committees that were formed in 1919, both in California. Hamlin (7:10) states that committees for agricultural education can be traced back as far as 1911. He also shows a lay committee on education in 1919 in South Dakota.

In 1948 Hull (10:12) found that there were only forty-seven lay committees operating in the United States. Of these, 70 per cent had been organized in 1946, 1947, and
1948. Only 11 per cent had been in existence for longer than ten years.

The fact that the majority of the committees that Hull found were formed in the three years previous to his study can be accounted for by such things as the incident Hamlin cited, where parents were actually barred from the schools their children were attending; plus the attacks against the quality of American education, higher taxes, and poor communication between the public and the schools. A combination of all of these have sparked lay persons to a new and growing interest in their schools.

The National Citizens Commission for Public Schools. "In 1949 the National Citizens Commission for Public Schools was organized to alert Americans to the problems of their schools and help convert their interest into intelligent action" (16:8). In 1955 the Commission reported: "The citizens committee movement continued to go forward in 1955 with 34 state-wide groups active and three more in the process of organizing. Some 3000 committees were in close touch with the Commission and it was estimated that the total number of active groups was at least 10,000" (13:48).

The National Citizens Council for Better Schools. In January 1956 a successor to the Commission took over and assumed the name of the National Citizens Council for Better Schools (16:8). This organization set for itself the two following purposes:
1. To help arouse wide-spread interest in education throughout the United States.

2. To provide state and local improvement groups with information helpful to the solution of their local school problems (16:16).

This organization is financed through grants from foundations and industry (16:16). It provides all of the following services to lay committees: (1) **Clearinghouse materials.** Case history of problems that have been solved by lay groups. (2) **Radio programs.** A series of thirteen radio broadcasts called the "Doorway to the Future." These are twenty-five minute programs that deal with the growth of America's schools, teachers, textbooks, citizens committees, goals of our schools, board members, bond issues, school districts, curriculum and school finance. (3) **Working guides for better schools.** A series of sixteen guide booklets to help lay committees organize to solve different types of problems. (4) **A television kit.** The council has put into the hands of every TV station a one-minute and a twenty-second spot film carrying the "Better School" theme. (5) "**Little songs for better schools.**" A series of six songs prepared for the "Better School" theme, has been sent to all radio stations in the country. (6) **Newspaper advertising kits.** These are prepared twice a year with all size ads offered free of charge to daily and weekly newspapers. (7) **Car cards and posters.** Posters carrying the "Better School" theme to be placed in buses, streetcars, and trains. (8) **Better Schools.** A newspaper for "educators and citizens
who want the latest data on school problems plus news of methods for solutions that can be adopted for use in their localities" (16:9-15).

With all of this behind lay committees it is no wonder that in 1958 there were state committees in forty states and over 18,000 committees in communities throughout the nation (16:8).

II. THE PURPOSES

The primary purpose behind lay committees may be the aspect of "Public Relations," but, this primary purpose can and must be broken down into many specific purposes before it can be understood. Before the purposes of lay committees can be thoroughly understood one should have an understanding of the social and economic conditions of our way of life.

Today there are at least eight problems that affect the purposes of lay committees.

1. At the present time many people in our society are faced with the feeling of insecurity and frustration resulting from the depression of the 30's and the failure to achieve world understanding after World War II.

2. The threat of growing social levels in our society and the ever increasing block in communications between various individuals and groups. Related to this are pressure groups and the question of the strength of common socially desirable purposes.

3. The failure of people to understand the proper
relation between the expert and the layman.

4. The tendency to centralize decision-making and control in relatively few hands.

5. The growing power of or dependence upon mass media of communications and as a result, less genuine government of the people.

6. The difficulty of communication resulting from: social levels, divisions of labor, extended professional training, varied backgrounds, large and complex organizations.

7. The defense demands on our tax dollar and the probable effects on the support of education and other social services.

8. The tremendous educational needs of our society that have been complicated by the lack of clearly defined and agreed upon educational purposes (17-71).

With this background it is possible to proceed on into the purposes of lay committees. Reller feels that the purposes of lay committees are:

To facilitate the solution of specific problems confronting the schools through bringing the resources (especially knowledge, experience, and ideas) of the people to bear upon them; to enable more people to develop an understanding of the educational enterprise, its successes and problems in order that they may act intelligently in regard to education; to develop lay leaders who, through their work with laymen and educators, may facilitate communication and mutual respect and understanding; to enrich the lives of citizens (and thus the society) involved, who develop knowledge, understanding and ability to work with
significant social problems; to develop confidence in schools and schoolpeople coupled with an awareness of their strengths and limitations and confidence of schoolpeople in lay citizens; to provide for teachers and administrators more solid encouragement and proper security than exists for them in many communities today; to advance education, recognizing that sound advancement is to be found not in the ideas of a few but in the optimum utilization of the lay and professional (educational) resources available; to demonstrate--as the schools should--democratic practice. This involves participation in policy-making by the people. It provides an opportunity to attain leadership which is not of one man but which builds upon the resources of and is of the group (17:71).

Yeager, not being so specific, feels that the primary purpose of a lay committee is to, (1) learn what the community is thinking; (2) to find what the people would accept; (3) to advise on timing and other factors; (4) to disperse to the community the information that is most needed at the time; and (5) to determine in what ways the community can participate in a better educational program (23:134).

Langseth, in the conclusion in his Master's Thesis, developed the following seven purposes for the creation of a lay committee:

(1) To interpret school conditions and needs to fellow laymen and to secure their support for improvements. (2) To present to the school officials the educational needs of the community. (3) To develop a curriculum better fitted to the needs of today's youth. (4) To create community confidence in the work of the school. (5) To conduct surveys of the school's needs in terms of finance, buildings, sites and
improvements. (6) To increase the community's use of the school facilities. (7) To serve as a clearinghouse for important educational issues (12:49-50).

This list of purposes would not be complete without the consideration of Hamlin. He has written as much or more than anyone else on the subject of lay committees. Although he is primarily concerned with lay committees for agricultural education, his purposes fit well into any lay committee situation. Hamlin, being quite specific, lists nineteen purposes.

(1) Making studies and recommending policies; (2) Providing two-way communication between the school and the public; (3) Determining the impacts of the school upon the community; (4) Discovering community needs which the school is not helping to meet; (5) Developing a school philosophy, a statement of school objectives, and a plan for evaluating progress toward these objectives; (6) Correlating the work of the school with that of the other agencies; (7) Guiding and supporting the board, the administration, and the teaching staff; (8) Initiating and sponsoring new school projects, such as adult classes, special education, and counseling programs; (9) Getting a school up to date, keeping it up to date, and adjusting it to emergencies; (10) Stabilizing a school situation by providing continuity when board members, administrators, and teachers change; (11) Holding good administrators and teachers by giving them support they need and deserve; (12) Maintaining a maximum of local control of public education by crystallizing community sentiment against encroachments by state and federal agencies; (13) Unifying a community through the participation in the citizens' committees of representatives of many community elements; (14) Providing education about education for future members of boards of education and for future community leaders; (15) Providing a balanced view of the entire
school system in its relations to a community as a corrective to the specialized views of most professional workers in education; (16) Introducing new administrators and teachers to a community and aiding them in making contacts with the laymen of the community; (17) Impressing upon professional workers the values which a community holds and the relationships of their work to the community's value system; (18) Making school officials aware of minority groups and their needs; (19) Setting and maintaining standards for the admission of students to particular school programs (7:67-68).

With all of these purposes in mind it should be easy to see that nearly any public school situation should be able to benefit through the use of lay participation in education. These purposes show that there is definitely a potential place for lay committees in our society today.

III. LEGAL STATUS

The function of the committee is recommendatory and advisory only. Its duty is limited to making a report, and it is without power to carry its recommendations into effect. The authority to carry into effect any recommendation which might be made by the committee is by statute, placed in the Superintendent of Public Instruction, the County Board of Education, and finally the electors (5:77).

The above quote is a Supreme Court ruling in the State of Ohio. Although this ruling may not hold true in other states it is quite evident that the court saw the citizens committee in its proper light. It should be an advisory body if it is to be most effective and if it is not to duplicate or to usurp the powers of the board. To
see this in any other light would so complicate the problem of public education that it would become a nearly impossible task. It can only be hoped that this case will be recognized as a precedent and followed in other states, if a similar question should arise.

IV. ORGANIZATION AND ADMINISTRATION

Before organizing a lay committee in any community there must be a real need. When a community experiences a need it is then ready for a committee. A committee can be organized either of two ways; (1) by interested, or in some cases, disgruntled citizens, and (2) formation with the sanction of the board of education. The latter method being the only one considered in this paper.

Initiating lay committees. When the board forms a committee it should first establish a policy covering the following items taken from Hamlin:

1. The field of the committee.
2. Its function.
3. The number of members.
4. The manner in which the members are chosen.
5. The terms of the members.
6. The manner of replacing members whose terms expire and of filling vacancies.
7. The relationship of the committee to other citizens' committees.
8. The procedures to be used in communicating with the board.
9. The relationship of the committee to administrators, teachers, students, and the community (7:77).
After establishing a statement of policy, the board should then publicize the proposed citizens' committee and the statement of policy. By publicizing the coming addition, the people of the community will be made aware of what is happening, what the committee is for, and what it will do. This will also give persons who will later be asked to serve some background for deciding whether they will serve (7:77).

**Selecting members.** The next step is that of choosing members. There are many different methods of selecting members, but the three most popular are:

1. "Selection of the whole committee by the board of education" (1:13).

   There are some objections to this method, one being that the board becomes responsible for its own appointees and tend to appoint members that will back its program rather than contribute advice from different viewpoints. It has been stated that the board appointment technique works best on short term committees, particularly when a cross-section of influential people are wanted to execute a special job. The argument behind this is that it is important to select community leaders and to secure people who can work harmoniously together (1:13).

2. "Selection by various community groups represented on the committee" (1:13).

   This involves asking service clubs, labor groups,
PTA's, fraternal groups, and other representative groups to name members to the committee. Hull (10:14) found that in three-fourths of the committees he studied, this method was used. Long range committees are most often selected in this manner (1:13-14).

One particular group of persons that should be included is that of persons in elementary districts that send their children to a centralized high school district. Until now these people have had no say on school policy regarding the high school education that their children receive. Lay committees can and do give these people some influence (2:76).

3. "Selection by a combination of the other two methods" (1:14).

This third method involves a combination of the first two methods, that is, some lay committee members are appointed by organized groups and the others by the school board. In a variation of this plan, the school board selects a planning committee which has two responsibilities; (1) nominating members of the advisory committee and (2) preparing the general plan for the operation of the advisory committee (1:14).

When selecting members Hamlin suggests that the following factors be taken into consideration:

1. Geographic location.
2. Sex.
3. Age.
4. Race.
5. Nationality.
6. Occupation.
7. Social Class.
8. Political, organizational, and religious affiliations.
9. Years of schooling (7:81).

Beyond considering these factors there must be represented:

1. Parents and non-parents.
2. Town and country people.
3. New and old residents of the community.
4. Large and small tax payers.
5. Veterans and non-veterans.
6. Persons favorable and unfavorable to present school policies (7:81).

All of these groups should be represented in approximately the same proportion as they are represented in the community. It is especially important that lay committees be representative of the entire community because boards of education are often unrepresentative, having been elected by bare majorities of the people of their districts (7:81).

Qualifications for members. Warriner feels that for a lay person to serve successfully on a committee he must possess the following qualifications:

Obviously the primary requirement is concern and responsibility toward the public schools, and it must be an objective concern. If an individual respects factual information and democratic principles, is willing and able to tackle controversial issues, then whether parent or non-parent, rich or poor, formally educated or self-taught, he is well qualified to make an invaluable contribution to the educational welfare of all children (20:62).
The first meetings. After the members have been selected and notified the first meeting can take place. At this meeting the president of the board will most likely preside. There should be short talks by the president of the board, the school superintendent, and by one or more teachers, emphasizing the need for the committee and the desire of the school personnel to work with it (7:85).

The following is a suggested agenda for the first two meetings. It has been taken from the Washington State School Directors' Newsletter.

4. First Meeting
   a. Purpose of advisory committees explained by board president.
   b. Presentation by board of education of suggested areas for study with order of preference or urgency.
   c. Break-up into "buzz sessions" of five to eight members each for discussion as to subject of study.
   d. Vote by members to determine first study subject.
   e. Delegation by moderator of individual or sub-committees for research. (He might be helped on this by volunteers.)
   f. Decide whether committee wants by-laws, appoint by-law committees.

5. Second and Subsequent Meetings
   a. Vote on by-laws and elect officers.
   b. Questions from the audience.
   c. Presentation of results of research by individual or sub-committee.
   d. Questions from audience.
   e. "Buzz Sessions" for discussion.
   f. Report from each session to general assembly.
g. Vote on whether a recommendation should go to the Board of Education or whether the matter should be continued to the next meeting for further study (22:1-2).

There are three specific principles that Tuttle feels are a "must" for lay committee success.

1. Citizens Committees should be representative of the entire community.
2. Citizens Committees should base their discussions and recommendations upon established facts.
3. Citizens Committees should work with and through the duly constituted authorities (19:80).

V. THE WORK AND VALUE OF CITIZENS COMMITTEES

Public relations. Lay committees are integrally tied up with a good public relations program. They are based on the premise that the schools belong to the people (9:148). It must be kept in mind that this premise is not necessarily true because our "public school system" is legally a state school system "with considerable authority over the schools delegated to the local communities or districts" (18:20).

Therefore, each community must become aware of the extent of its school board's authority and the legal limitations under which it must labor. Then the school board, as the official agent of the state and the community, can more truly represent the informed and sympathetic will of the people in the management of the schools. And at the same time citizens can more intelligently cooperate with the board in the support of the school program (18:20).

With these legal limitations in mind it may now be possible to go back to the subject of public relations.
between the school and the community.

The people of the community should help in determining the type of program the schools should have; the people are entitled to know how well the program is being carried out, and they have a right to suggest improvements. If any school is to have full public support for a forward looking educational program they must first acquaint all of the people of the community with their schools and what they teach. A good public relations program will frequently be the stepping stone to educational progress. However good an educational system may be it cannot operate without the confidence of the people (9:148).

Citizen participation furthermore assumes that there are in every community lay people who are outstanding in some particular field of knowledge and who are willing to volunteer their services to the improvement of the school. Service on lay committees is a golden opportunity for the public spirited citizen who wishes to perform a community service. At the same time people develop interest which will result in better support of the public school program (9:149).

Lay committees have given a great many people a voice in the schools of America. There are many small elementary districts in our country that send their children on to high school in a centralized high school district. Until the rise of lay committees these people had no voice or influence, whatsoever, on their children's high school
education.

Not yet prepared for consolidation, rural school districts may send youngsters to nearby city high schools. They pay tuition there, but usually have no say in fixing educational policy (2:76).

In the past few years many of the high school districts have begun to use lay committees that are represented by persons from outlying elementary districts. The results have been good in the following areas:

(1) Improved understanding of the cost of secondary education; (2) increased knowledge of what constitutes an adequate program of secondary education for the rural community; (3) deeper appreciation of the problems of education at all levels; (4) a growing awareness of the coming need for district reorganization (2:76).

The last of these items may in time prove to be the one item of greatest importance to education in our country. Hull gives a series of quotes from superintendents, from all parts of the country, expressing their views on the value of lay committees.

When a committee's work is reduced to its basic function, regardless of the stated goal (and this applies also to short term action variety), analysis will reveal that the results were achieved because improved communications produced a broader base of understanding between schools and community which resulted in more cooperation and acceptance of a common objective (11:48).

Lack of understanding is still the greatest enemy of public education and good face-to-face communications is by far the best friend of public education. Advisory
Committees are not panaceas to cure all ills of school-community relations. But they are one of the techniques of school-community communications that have proved their value. If the word "communications" were a little more dynamic and picturesque expression it might be a little easier to get this basic function of advisory committees understood, and accepted as a major purpose by more groups (11:48).

An advisory committee can be the means of uniting a community, and it can also be the means of dividing a community; fortunately, even those organized with an ax to grind often muddle their way through to a better understanding of schools (11:48).

From all of the above examples one can see definite indications pointing to the fact that lay committees can and do help promote better public-school relations and communications. They are definitely an asset to a better understanding of educational problems in our country.

Specific problems lay committees can and have solved. When looking at specific problems that lay committees have worked on and helped to solve one could make a long list that would cover several pages. However, this will not be done here. Rather an attempt will be made to show only a few of the more common problems that lay committees have faced.

The one problem most often faced by lay committees is that of the building program. Before such a program can be developed a community survey is often desirable. There are several different methods used in making a community
survey but the one used that involves a lay committee is the "cooperative survey" (14:19).

If the cooperative method of making a survey is decided upon, a survey committee should be selected that will represent the entire community. This is particularly true in small communities where this type of study has been popular. Since it is a total community venture, every effort must be made to see that the opinion of a cross-section of the total community population is obtained and carefully considered before a final solution for the problem is reached (14:19).

MacConnell feels that during a survey the lay committee should keep the following "key points:"

Objectives.
Information needed to attain objectives.
Methods to be used in collecting information.
Sources of available help.
Duties to be assigned.
Time schedules.
Method of reporting.
Type of final report.
Distribution of report (14:19-20).

For such a community survey the original lay committee may be split up into many sub-committees. For example:

1. School curriculum.
2. School plant.
4. School population trends.
5. Tax structure.
7. School transportation.
8. Economic development.
9. Community trade area boundaries.
10. Recreation facilities.

To show what would be studied by each sub-committee would take several pages, so here only two of the items will be broken down into specific items.

The sub-committee on the school curriculum would keep in mind the following items:

1. Are the present school plants meeting the curriculum needs?
2. What subjects are being offered that were not available when the school plants were constructed?
3. If rehabilitation were to be decided upon, would the available spaces and their location still be adequate?
4. What additional out-of-school, curricular demands are being cared for, such as adult education classes? (14:22)

Similarly the sub-committee on finance would take into consideration:

1. What portion of the tax dollar is for schools?
2. What choices are available in raising money for additional school plants?
3. Discussion of false economies in school construction.
4. A study of comparative building cost with other school districts (14:22).

Each school district, being unique, will find that its problems will vary from that of any other district, but they can gain good ideas from studying what other districts have done in the same situation. On this particular topic
of community surveys it may be well to look at what Bellevue, Washington did (3:52-59).

Case study of Bellevue, Washington. Until 1940, Bellevue was just a small suburban Seattle community with the population of 1100. It was accessible from Seattle only by ferry across Lake Washington or by a twenty-mile drive around the lake.

When the floating bridge was opened across Lake Washington in 1940, it put Bellevue within twenty minutes of downtown Seattle. This, along with World War II, caused a fast growth period in the small town.

By 1949, when the toll was removed from the bridge, the population of Bellevue had risen to 5400 and within the school district to 9000. The next five years showed a population in the district of 13,000 and two years later 21,000.

In 1950, the Bellevue school board saw that the rapid growth of population was likely to continue and set out to find an answer that would satisfy the situation for the present and the future as well. Determined to do the job right, the school board turned to Dr. Zeno B. Katterle of Washington State College for help in developing a long range plan.

Katterle explained to the board that no plan, regardless of its technical accuracy, could work unless it properly expressed the wishes of the people. With proper help
from trained personnel, the local citizens and educators could develop any plan they wished. At this point Grant Venn, a graduate student at Washington State, assumed the job as full-time coordinator, Katterle and Venn urged that a citizen's council, representative of the entire area, be formed to help push the work along. The school board wholeheartedly agreed.

Three leading citizens were invited to start the movement. They met with the Bellevue school authorities and together they nominated sixty names for consideration for lay participation. After much consideration fifteen of the original sixty were chosen on the basis of geographical location and suitable recognition of all age, income, and social factors. The board then added five more to the list and the teachers nominated one. Now Bellevue's Citizens School Advisory Council was in business.

Their job was to undertake a complete study of the area, to find out everything that could be found out about the area, to substitute "fact for rumor and figures for fancy," but also to plot what the future might hold.

With this tremendous job ahead it was decided that the twenty-one members were not enough. The school administration was brought into the project and the county planning commission made its facilities available. The council divided into five major committees—on building and sites, educational program, elections, finances, and public information—and a call went out for volunteers. Most of the
original sixty volunteered and some personal solicitations were made bringing into the picture qualified persons to offer practical information—engineers, architects, plumbers, electricians, and others.

Another channel was that of persons who had "sounded off" in letters to the local paper about school conditions or school policy. One council member stated, "The easiest way to get on one of the committees was to be against the schools. We converted a lot of folks that way." In all over two hundred citizens joined the council's committee.

High school students were used to take questionnaires to every home in the district to determine who worked where, how long they had lived in the area, how long they planned to remain, what they wanted in their schools, and how they wanted the community to develop. At the same time high school students, with the use of aerial photographs, marked off the precise use of every piece of land in the district.

Using all available information in the files, every new fact, and every expert source that could be contacted, they developed a set of standards for Bellevue's future schools.

Class loads should be kept to a workable size of about twenty-five pupils. Good teachers should be adequately paid. Schools should serve a community-wide function—a meeting place and recreation center for adults as well as an educational plant for children. Elementary schools should house no more than 400 to 600 pupils, junior high schools 600 to 800, and senior
high schools no more than 800 to 1200 students. How many schools of this size would be needed, and where to place them (3:55-56).

All of the figures and findings were published in a document called The Bellevue Story in 1951. When it was published there were seven schools in the district with an enrollment of 1666. If the saturation point were reached it would mean a potential enrollment of 14,190 pupils, requiring twenty-one elementary schools, six junior high schools and four senior highs for a total of 506 classrooms, a nine-fold increase in the number of teachers and an investment of 24 million dollars. Compare this against 1940, 840 students, thirty-one teachers, thirty-two classrooms in six buildings, an investment of 240 thousand dollars.

"The study of Bellevue's school needs had become a long-range plan for Bellevue's over-all community needs" (3:57).

In the somnolent history of Bellevue, now blasted into full wakefulness, never had there been anything like the Bellevue Story. The Citizens School Advisory Council, working closely with the school authorities and the county planning commission made no specific recommendations for actual school sites or other facilities. It proposed instead the idea of basic neighborhoods—twenty-one of them—within which the necessary additional schools would be built in such a way that never would they be encircled by subsequent business or industrial development or located perilously close to major highways (3:57).

At the time the article was written, almost three years after the commission's report, there had been no
public meetings. This of course was disturbing to the citizens of Bellevue. During the same period building firms had come into the district and put up 6100 houses. Where the Bellevue population density study had provided for only one or two houses per acre, they built between three to five houses.

This rapid and unforeseen growth has forced the district to build one of its projected buildings ahead of schedule and to speed up its once-orderly plan for five more.

Considering the long effort Bellevue's citizens put into their deliberate dreaming, the complaints one hears about the planning commission may be regarded as generously moderate. Behind them, fortunately, officials of the Bellevue school district know that they have unshaken citizen support. Nine times in a period of ten years Bellevue school district voters have gone to the polls voluntarily to increase their school taxes with fourteen special levies. Probably there is no more significant indicator of the eagerness with which Bellevue citizens regard their schools (3:58-59).

A school official attests: "It couldn't have happened without the Citizens School Advisory Council keeping the people's interest up" (3:58).

If the people of Bellevue prove to be as stubborn as the county commission, if they refuse to let go of their dream, there is always a possibility, though it grows weaker with each passing year, that somehow they will be able to build their school district and community according to the plan they so carefully put together.
The odds are against them. They may have to resort to more citizen action of a different kind, at the polls rather than on the planning board, to bring it off (3:59).

The example of Bellevue is only one of literally hundreds that are available. It is perhaps more dynamic than most but it shows what citizens can and do accomplish against unending odds. It shows that lay committees certainly do get community backing and are of immeasurable value to the public schools.

Future problems for lay committees. In public education today there is a never-ending number of problems that crop up or have been prevalent for many years. Dopper, who is the Director of Communications for the National Citizens Council for Better Schools, lists seven major areas which need immediate and drastic attention.

(1) We need a definition of the goals of our schools; (2) we must define quality and then go after first rate schools; (3) we must encourage creative thinking to solve our financial problems; (4) we must staff our schools with the best possible teachers; (5) we must increase the efficiency of school management; (6) we must build classrooms that meet the need of the curriculum, and (7) we must develop the kind of will we have to defend ourselves (4:39).

Others may be able to add to this list, but this is the type of thing that the National Citizen's Council for Better Schools is trying to accomplish across the nation.
"Do educators want lay help?" There is still one study that should be considered here. That is: "Do educators want laymen's help?" This study was conducted during the summer session in 1955 on the campus of Colorado State College. It was conducted to "determine the attitudes of educators toward lay participation in curriculum revision. The returns received from 156 students, indicated that the majority were in favor of lay participation in curriculum revision in the public schools" (15:62).

By amount of training--

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount of Training</th>
<th>% Favoring Lay Participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Master's degree</td>
<td>73.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's degree</td>
<td>65.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduates</td>
<td>60.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By position held--

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>% Favoring Lay Participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College teachers</td>
<td>90.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>77.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom teachers</td>
<td>61.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendents</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is interesting to note that superintendents are low on the list for positions held. Is it because superintendents are the ones that have had experience working with lay persons on this type of problem, while others are only assuming that it sounds good to have lay participation?

Of the Colorado group, 15 per cent felt that lay participation had been of great help in contributing to the success of the project; 60 per cent felt that lay men had been of some help; and 25 percent felt that lay participation had been of very little help (15:63).
Respondents on the questionnaires seemed to feel that educators believe that a major cause for ineffectiveness on the part of lay persons was due to "lack of sufficient understanding of the problem." They indicated that great care must be taken in selecting citizens for participation (15:63).

The persons conducting this study drew the following conclusion in regard to lay participation in curriculum planning:

1. The greater the amount of professional training received the more favorable are the attitudes of educators toward lay participation.
2. Professional position has a bearing on the extent to which educators participate with laymen in solving school problems.
3. Laymen who are relatively unbiased in viewpoint, alert to world affairs and sympathetic toward the school should be selected as members of a citizen's advisory council.
4. Laymen should be selected by cooperative efforts of their colleagues and school personnel.
5. Laymen may be effective in suggesting goals for instruction.
6. Laymen may make their most effective contributions to the curriculum through their knowledge of community resources.
7. Laymen are most ineffective in their suggestions for teaching methods and knowledge of research on educational problems.
8. Great care must be taken to prepare laymen adequately for participation in working on school problems.
9. Lay participation in school affairs aids in the promotion of good school community relations (15:65).
How valid this study was cannot be judged here, it must be remembered that it was a small sampling, and within the limits of a small area. The conclusions in this study seem to follow rather closely with that of other writings on lay committees.

VI. CONCLUDING STATEMENT

The two paragraphs that follow seem to summarize this chapter.

The rapid growth of citizens advisory committees during the last ten years has resulted in the forming of stronger bonds between the school and the community and a more realistic approach to the problems involved in planning a good educational program (15:64).

As laymen and educators have cooperatively approached these problems and arrived at acceptable solutions these problems have changes. Educators have become much more willing to accept the fact that the schools are an integral part of the community and as such cannot be isolated from public interest and participation (15:64).

This chapter has not covered all of the literature that has been written regarding lay participation in the public schools. But it has been an attempt to give a background for the study itself. It is felt that the data selected have been representative of all that has been written on the subject.

With this background it is now possible to proceed into the next chapter which is "The Development of the
Mailing List and the Questionnaire. " Though this has no particular bearing on the mailing list, it is the basis for the questionnaire.
CHAPTER III

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE MAILING LIST
AND THE QUESTIONNAIRE

This chapter represents the beginning of the actual study of the worth of lay committees. Although the development of the mailing list is presented first and the development of the questionnaire second, they were developed simultaneously.

I. THE MAILING LIST

The first step taken to develop a mailing list for this study was to contact (1) The Office of the State Board of Education, (2) The Washington Education Association, and (3) The Washington State School Directors Association. The State Board of Education replied with a list of twenty-seven committees, but neither of the other two organizations had such a list. It was obvious that a different means of developing a larger more representative list would have to be devised.

The First Mailing List

It was then decided that a good place to start any educational mailing list is in the Washington Educational Directory. In this case the 1955-1956 Directory was chosen because it was the last complete directory that has been published to this date. From the Directory the list of
Accredited High Schools for the 1955-1956 (20:148-154) school year was used as a mailing list.

The limitations. There were four initial limitations placed on the original list of Accredited High School Districts as basic criteria for developing a mailing list. The first limitation was to consider public schools only. As this study is primarily concerned with public education, this was a "must." The second limitation was to include only districts with regular accreditation. This factor excluded most of the very small school districts, at least those with a high school enrollment of less than thirty-six. The third limitation was to exclude districts exceeding twenty-seven thousand in population. This was done because it was felt that lay committees in these large districts could become more of a political pressure instrument than an advisory group. Also, it is very doubtful that a committee in these large districts would be a true cross-section of the population. The fourth and final limitation was to leave out union high school districts. They were excluded because they do not constitute a complete set of schools; that is, elementary, junior high, and senior high schools.

By using the above criteria, a mailing list of two hundred and fourteen school districts was developed. Each of these districts constituted a complete set of elementary, junior high (in some cases), and senior high schools. The next problem was to separate those districts having lay
committees from those districts that did not, which would be a fifth criteria in developing a final mailing list.

The Second Mailing List

One way to eliminate districts not having lay committees was to contact the superintendent in each district on the first mailing list. A double post card questionnaire seemed to be the logical, and probably the least expensive, way to contact these people.

The development of the post card questionnaire. A facsimile of the post card questionnaire can be found in Appendix A. The first question was "Do you have, or have you had in the past, a lay advisory committee operating in your school district?" A second question was inserted to attempt to insure higher returns on the final instrument: "If your answer to question one was 'yes' would you be willing to complete a short questionnaire concerning lay advisory committees?" The third portion of the post card asked the answering superintendent to fill in the name and address of a lay committee member. This post card questionnaire was used as it was first developed, with no alterations.

The accompanying letter. A facsimile of the letter accompanying the post card questionnaire can be found in Appendix B. The letter, first written in first person singular, was changed at the suggestion of a faculty
committee member to its present form which is "we, my faculty committee and myself." This was done because it was felt that this form would be more influential in securing higher returns on the post card questionnaire.

The results of the post card questionnaire. On January 23, 1959, two-hundred and fourteen double post cards were mailed to the superintendents of the school districts on the first mailing list. By February 6, 1959, one-hundred and seventy-seven post cards had been returned; this is a return of 82.7 percent.

The data in Table I show the tabulated results of the one hundred seventy-seven returns for the post card questionnaire. Of the districts sampled, 46.9 per cent had lay advisory committees while 53.1 per cent did not. Of those districts with lay advisory committees, 81.9 per cent of the superintendents stated "yes" they would be willing to complete an additional questionnaire concerning lay advisory committees. Only 2.4 per cent stated "no" and 15.7 per cent did not answer the question. Of the cards returned showing lay committees within the district, 81.9 per cent of the superintendents gave the name and address of a lay committee member whom they felt would be willing to complete a questionnaire concerning lay advisory committees. At this point 18.1 per cent of the cards were not completed.

---

1By coincidence "81.9 per cent" occurred in two different items, and should not be construed to be the same group.
TABLE I

RESULTS OF THE POST CARD QUESTIONNAIRE SENT TO SUPERINTENDENTS IN ONE HUNDRED SEVENTY-SEVEN ACCREDITED HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Do you have, or have you had in the past, a lay advisory committee operating in your school district?</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>46.9%</td>
<td>53.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. If your answer to question one was &quot;yes&quot; would you be willing to complete a short questionnaire concerning lay advisory committees?</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>81.9%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Please fill in the name and address of a lay committee member whom you feel would be willing to complete a short questionnaire concerning lay advisory committees.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>81.9%</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This short post card questionnaire established a mailing list, which appears in Appendix C, of seventy-five superintendents and sixty-three lay advisory committee members for a total of one hundred thirty-eight persons. This is the mailing list to which the initial instrument used in this study was sent. The post card also helped eliminate some of the persons who would not ordinarily return a questionnaire even if it were sent to them.  

II. THE QUESTIONNAIRE

The first thing considered when developing the questionnaire was the fact that it must be suitable for both lay committee members and superintendents.

The First Attempt

The first questionnaire developed was based primarily on check lists and rating scales. The following two questions are illustrative of the first attempt to develop an instrument.

4. What types of problems has your committee worked on?

1The post card questionnaire returns also revealed the following information that was not asked for but is still pertinent to this study: Eleven districts have had short term committees in the past, four districts have used local service clubs as study groups but did not consider them advisory committees, and at the time this study was being conducted two districts were forming lay advisory committees.
(please indicate)

A. Bond Levy Campaign
B. School Surveys
C. District Finance Resources
D. Curriculum Problems
E. Others (Please Indicate)

11. Was there a need for your committee at the time it was organized?

After conferring with faculty members it was decided that since this study is concerned with the worth of lay committees and the feelings of lay persons and superintendents toward lay committees, that perhaps open-end questions would be a better way to approach the situation than just the "yes" and "no" type.

The Second Attempt

Because most of the dimensions that were felt to be pertinent had been brought out in the first draft, it was not difficult to reconstruct items into open-end questions. The two following questions have been extracted from the second attempt:

5. Was there a real educational need at the time your committee was formed? Yes___. No___. ___________________________

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________
9. On what type of problem has your committee worked best?

Drafting these questions was only the beginning. In this form they were shown to four different faculty members for criticism and improvement. It was felt that in this form there would not be enough control over the responses of different persons answering the same questions. Therefore, further refinement seemed warranted.

The Final Instrument

The questionnaire was reworked and again submitted to the same four faculty members for their opinions. Further criticisms were considered, many improvements were made, and the final instrument, which is located in Appendix D, at last took form. The following questions are taken from the final questionnaire:

5. Was there a serious school problem at the time your committee was formed? Yes__. No__ Questionable__. If so, what was it? 

1The questionnaire as it appears in the Appendix is on three standard (8½X11) pieces of paper. The instrument as it was used in the study was on two pages of legal size paper (8½X14). Psychologically two pages are better than three.
9. With what type of problem listed in Item 8 has your committee had most success? Why?

The Accompanying Letters

Facsimiles of the letters to the superintendents and the lay committee members appear in Appendixes E and F respectively. The only change between the letters as they were used and the first draft is the addition of the third paragraph, which is the same in both letters, and is a definition of the terms "long-term" and "short-term" committee. These were stated so that all persons concerned would have the same concepts when answering the first question of the questionnaire.

The Mailing Details

The instrument and the letters were mailed in a standard (4x9½) business envelope. There was also included a stamped, self-addressed envelope for the return of the completed questionnaire.

As simple as the process of developing the mailing list and the questionnaire may seem to be in this chapter, it took several weeks to complete this task. At this point, with all of the preliminaries behind, the data could now be gathered. The next chapter is the presentation of the data derived from the returns of the questionnaires.
CHAPTER IV

THE RESULTS OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

Perhaps the simplest and the most logical way to present the data of this study would be to follow the form of the questionnaire. Each question shall be treated individually with one or more formal or informal tables used to present the data. Before presentation of the data proper, the returns for the questionnaire are shown.

I. THE RETURNS

On February 6, 1959, one hundred and thirty-eight questionnaires were mailed to seventy-five superintendents and sixty-three lay persons. The last returns to be included in this study arrived on March 4, 1959.

NUMBER AND PERCENTAGES OF QUESTIONNAIRES RETURNED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire</th>
<th>Superintendents</th>
<th>Lay Persons</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number sent</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number returned</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage returned</td>
<td>85.3</td>
<td>68.2</td>
<td>77.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the seventy-five questionnaires sent to superintendents 85.3 per cent were returned. From lay persons a return of 68.2 per cent was obtained. The percentage for the combination of both groups was 77.8. This is considered
to be a high percentage of returns and can be accounted for. The superintendents no doubt made the highest overall return because of the use of the post card questionnaire which eliminated most of the persons who would not ordinarily return a questionnaire. The fact that the return for lay persons was fairly high can probably be accounted for by the keen interest that lay persons have in their committees and in the work that their committees are doing.

II. RESULT OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

The number of committees represented by the sampling. When tallying the returns for the questionnaire it was found that there were seventy different committees represented by the sampling. These seventy committees were classified in the following manner:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committees represented by:</th>
<th>Number of long term committees</th>
<th>Number of short term committees</th>
<th>Total represented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supt. and Lay Persons</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supt. only</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lay persons only</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Of the seventy committees represented, 52.9 per cent were represented by questionnaires from both superintendents and lay persons. A single questionnaire from superintendents only represented 38.6 per cent of the committees, and 8.6 per cent of the seventy committees were represented by questionnaires from lay persons only. Of the seventy committees, 57.1 per cent were long-term and 42.9 per cent were short-term.

**Length of Time Committees Have Been Used**

Since the time that committees have become popular there seems to have been a trend away from long-term committees toward the use of short-term committees. Although it was shown above that there are more long-term committees in existence the data from the questionnaire show that in recent years there have been more short-term committees formed than long-term. The oldest long-term committee had been in existence sixteen years at the time this study was being conducted. The oldest short-term committee in the sampling had been in use at various times for eleven years. For both types of committees the most recent formed was six months. The mean age shows very significantly the trend toward short-term committees. For long-term the mean was six and one-fourth years and for short-term it was three and eight-tenths years.

**Methods of Financing Committees**

In the seventy different committees represented,
there were five different methods of financing found to be used. Although there were five methods of finance found, the most significant figure in the table below represents those committees that found no finances necessary in their operation. In this category there were 32.9 per cent of all lay committees.

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF COMMITTEE FINANCE METHODS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ways of Financing</th>
<th>Long-term</th>
<th>Short-term</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None required</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School district</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsoring organizations</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member's dues</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Supt. budget</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table shows that 22.7 per cent of all committees were financed by the school districts they represent. Sponsoring organizations, which were civic clubs, community groups, and PTA's that send members to the committees, were responsible for the financing of 18.5 per cent. Another 17.4 per cent were financed by contributions from interested individuals and organizations. Only 8.5 per cent were financed by the dues of committee members and one committee, or 1.4 per cent, was financed by the County Superintendent's budget. This committee was formed for the
purpose of reorganization.

Though it was not asked for, several persons listed what their expense items were, they are as follows: (1) publicity, for bond and levy elections, (2) postage and paper for notices and other correspondence, and (3) refreshments for meetings.

Organizations that Initiated the Committees

Only three different groups were found that had initiated the committees in this sampling. These were (1) the school boards, (2) Parent-Teacher's Association, and (3) interested or "disgruntled citizens" as was referred to in one questionnaire. In the following table a fourth category is noted and that is "Don't know." In this category are three long-term committees. The respondents for these committees did not know what group had organized them.

The table shows that the school boards initiated 85.7 per cent of all committees. If this figure is broken down into long and short-term committees it shows that 80 per cent of all long-term committees were initiated by the board while 93.3 per cent of the short-term committees were organized by this group.
FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION SHOWING
WHAT ORGANIZATIONS INITIATED
THE COMMITTEES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Long-term</th>
<th>Short-term</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School board</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interested citizens</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>40</strong></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
<td><strong>70</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parent-Teacher's Associations are responsible for 5.7 per cent of the committees and interested citizens for only 4.3 per cent.

The Problems that Committees Were Formed to Solve

Before it can be shown what type of problem committees were formed to solve, it must be shown how many committees were actually formed to solve a specific problem. The following table is a tally of the answers for the question "Was there a serious school problem at the time your committee was formed?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Long-term</th>
<th>Short-term</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questionable</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>40</strong></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
<td><strong>70</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The above table shows that 74.3 per cent of all committees formed had a specific problem to solve. There were 18.5 per cent formed that did not have a specific problem and 7.2 per cent of the committees represented felt that it was questionable whether there was truly a problem to solve. Perhaps it can be assumed that the last two groups were formed specifically for public relations.

The specific problems. There are five types of problems that prompted the organization of the fifty-two committees that were formed to solve a particular problem. The following table shows these problems and the number of committees that were formed to solve them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>Long-term</th>
<th>Short-term</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building Program and Bond Issue</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Relations</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary Schedule</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consolidation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table shows that 87.7 per cent of the fifty-two committees were formed specifically to work on
building programs and the passing of bond issues. When this is broken down into long and short-term committees it shows that 73.3 per cent of the long-term committees were formed for this purpose and 90.9 per cent of the short-term committees were. In several cases the questionnaires showed that school boards formed committees only after they had attempted to pass a bond issue and failed. In most of these cases it was short-term committees that were formed.

Although the building program was the problem most often named on the questionnaires, other problems are as follows. The problem of public relations or communication between the schools and the communities was named 9.6 per cent of the cases. Teachers salary schedules and administration problems, one of which was the selection of a superintendent, the other was not named, were both named twice or for 7.8 per cent of the committees. Consolidation was named once.

**Representation on Committees**

The following data represents the question "Do you feel that your committee is a reasonable cross-section of your community?" Rather than a break-down of the seventy committees represented, these data are broken down into the answers on the one hundred and seven questionnaires. The following table gives just this.
It shows that 97.6 per cent of the persons completing questionnaires felt that their committees represented a good cross section of their communities. A closer look at the table will show that the short-term committees are felt to be a better representation than are the long-term committees. Per percentage-wise the difference is rather significant, 70.3 per cent of the long-term committees felt their committees had a good representation while 85.8 per cent of the short-term committees did. The explanation of this will come out below.

The rest of this table shows that 9.3 per cent of all persons felt their committees were definitely not a good cross section, while 13.1 per cent felt that it was questionable.

The following quotes are taken from the questionnaires to show why or why not people felt their committees were a good cross section.

From superintendents: Yes:

Definite attempt made to make the committee representative of the community.

15 were chosen by the board--the 15 then chose 15 more and the 30 chose another 15.
Each organization in our district is represented. However, we must remember some people belong to absolutely no group—perhaps this segment is overlooked in our lay committee.

Each organization sends people it feels will adequately represent that group. Since we have 15 organizations represented, we feel we have an adequate cross-section.

Questionable:

At the time of its organization there was represented a good cross-section of the community, but interest has dwindled and now representation isn't so good.

Having difficulty getting enough representatives.

It has been, but is not currently. Membership has fallen off.

No:

Our need is not now so urgent and people do not attend meetings as well as earlier.

I feel there are not enough men on the committee. Not enough members outside of P.T.A. membership.

From lay persons: Yes

Two persons from every organized group in the community were on the citizen's committee. (approximately 120 persons.)

It has been carefully selected by a committee to make it widely representative.

There are delegates on this committee from all phases of community life.
Questionable:

Perhaps too many educators and housewives.

Most of the members represent laborers and farmers. Business and professional people in our community have displayed very little interest in the public meetings held by the group.

No:

Over padded with scientist, engineers, and executives.

It should be noted here that the quotes that state "at one time we had a good cross-section, but now interest and attendance is lagging" appeared not once or twice but eleven times in the one hundred and seven questionnaires. It was mentioned only on questionnaires from long-term committees. It was mentioned by both superintendents and lay persons.

How Well People Respond When Asked to Serve on Committees

These data represent the question: "Do people respond with enthusiasm when asked to serve on your committee?" Again the tally is given in the form representing the one hundred and seven replies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Long-term</th>
<th>Short-term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supt.</td>
<td>Lay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questionable</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This table shows that 63.6 per cent of all persons responding felt that people did respond enthusiastically when asked to serve on committees. Again when this figure is broken down into long and short-term committees it shows that only 50 per cent of the long-term committees responded affirmatively while 81.4 per cent of the short-term committees did. This was explained in the last section by the responses showing that long-term committees tend to lag after a big beginning, while short-term committees go out of existence after "the big push."

The remainder of this table shows that 7.5 per cent of all persons represented felt people definitely did not respond well and 28.8 per cent felt that it was questionable. These answers in many cases were made with some reservations. The following quotes will attempt to clarify this.

From superintendents: Yes:
Yes attendance is very good.
Reasonably so.
Most people feel they are working with a group that accomplishes something.
Questionable:
At one time—yes—but now without a specific problem—no.
There are just not enough problems to keep them at a white heat.
No:
However when non-high districts find they have to vote bonds they become more interested.
Too busy watching TV. (This is not a facetious answer.)

From lay persons: Yes:

I feel because of the success the committee has met, they are enthusiastic about the opportunity to serve on it.

I would pledge that about 75% of them respond with enthusiasm.

Because there is apparently a desirable status placed on those who are asked to serve. However if certain projects were initiated involving a lot of time, I am certain some resistance would be found.

Questionable:

Working on the committee is shunned by many, especially business people. Ours is a small town and business men feel that it hurts their business to become identified with working for better schools and higher taxes.

Pretty near have to have an extreme emergency to interest citizens in this type of community.

No:

They claim they are too busy.

All of the above quotes appeared in similar terms two or more time throughout the responses.

Types of Problems on which Committees Have Worked

The responses from the seventy committees show that there were seventeen different types of problems that had been worked on by committees. When analyzing Table II it can be seen that 84.2 per cent of the committees have worked on building programs and bond issues. When this is broken
TABLE II
FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION SHOWING WHAT PROBLEMS
THE SEVENTY LAY COMMITTEES HAVE WORKED ON

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>Long-term</th>
<th>Short-term</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building Program and Bond Issue</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Levies for M &amp; O</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Relations</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School and Community Survey</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Selection</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reorganization</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Range Planning</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8:4 VS's 6:3:3)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary Schedule</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cafeteria Problems</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifted Child Program</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior College Advisability</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Maintenance</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship Study</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection of an Administrator</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Safety Program</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
down further into long and short-term committees it can be seen that 80 per cent of all long-term committees have worked on this problem while 90 per cent of the short-term committees have. The second most named problem was that of curriculum on which 41.4 per cent of all committees have worked. When breaking this down it can be seen that 60 per cent of the long-term committees have experienced this work while only 16.6 per cent of the short-term committees have. The trend for long-term committees to have taken a greater interest in problems other than building can be seen throughout the rest of the table with the exception of the problem of school and community surveys. On this problem 12.5 per cent of the long-term committees have worked while 20 per cent of the short-term committees have.

The rest of this table shows that 31.4 per cent of all committees have worked on the passing of special levies, 25.7 per cent on specific public relations problems, 15.9 per cent on school and community surveys and other problems as follows: site selection, reorganization, long range planning, educational organization (8:4 VS's 6:3:3), salary schedule, cafeteria programs, gifted child programs, advisability of a junior college, and others.

It can be assumed from this table that long-term committees work on many diversified problems while short-term committees have worked primarily on building programs.

Problems With Which Committees Have Been Most Successful
Through the rest of this chapter all of the data will be presented as individual responses for the one hundred and seven persons represented in this study.

Table III gives the data that show on what type of problems committees have had most success. The problem most often listed by all persons is building programs and bond issues. It was listed by 51.4 per cent of them. Public relations and special levies for maintenance and operations were both listed by 15 per cent of all persons. Listed by all persons 4.6 per cent of the time were curriculum, site selection, and reorganization. Listed on 2.8 per cent of the questionnaires was finance study. Under miscellaneous were 13.1 per cent of all responses; 8.4 per cent of the questionnaires stated that it was too soon to know if there had been any success and 2.8 per cent had felt that there had been no success at all.

The following quotes have been taken from questionnaires explaining why people felt that they had success on specific problems.

From superintendents: Building program:

They are practical problems.

It seems to develop more interest, is concrete.

Apparently many craftsmen in the district and they really "sparked" on this one.

Public relations:

They did well in all areas but were particularly successful in public relations and getting out the vote. Why? An informed public is essential to
TABLE III

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION SHOWING TYPES OF PROBLEMS WITH WHICH LAY COMMITTEES HAVE HAD MOST SUCCESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>Long-term Supt. Lay Person</th>
<th>Long-term Supt. Lay Person</th>
<th>Short-term Supt. Lay Person</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building Program and Bond Issue</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Relations</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Levy for M &amp; O</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Selection</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reorganization</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance Study</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too Soon to Tell</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Success</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the forty-three persons representing the thirty short-term committees, eighteen stated that the building program was the only one attacked.
passage of levies and bond issues. 87% for on the levy and 95% on the bond issue verify this statement.

Census:

Making the "pin" map did not require an attack on "public relations" or selling a new school.

Levies:

Because it was something they could present in the way of actual figures to show what the needs were and what it would cost.

Curriculum:

Curriculum--more interest, more time spent.

None:

Interest was poor, no one "caught fire."

From lay persons:

Building program:

Well organized and led.

Psychological enthusiasm in regard to something new.

Reorganization:

There seems to be more interest in the issue of consolidation.

Public relations:

I think it is difficult to claim "success" on any of these. We believe we have been a factor in the success of all of them. Please note the word "advisory."

I feel that the committee in their general overall
discussions with the school board on problems in general are of the greatest importance.

I feel that the biggest help of the lay advisory committee was in educating people on the problem.

Problems With Which Committees Have Been Least Successful

Table IV shows the frequency distribution of the problem on which lay committees had least success. The most prominent category on this table is "none". This represents those persons who felt that there were no problems on which they had least success. They felt that everything they had done had been very successful. In this category fell 58 per cent of all the persons answering this question. The rest of the table shows that curriculum problems rank first with 16.9 per cent of the persons responding naming this. Second is public relations with 8.4 per cent of all persons listing it. It is interesting to note here that seven lay persons felt this but only two superintendents.

Building problems, consolidation, and special levies are ranked next with very small percentages of the persons responding.

The following quotes are taken from questionnaires in an attempt to explain why people felt they had less success on these problems.

From superintendents: Curriculum:

Curriculum study--lack of proper background makes it difficult for such a group to be more than just listeners.
**TABLE IV**

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION SHOWING WITH WHICH TYPES OF PROBLEMS LAY COMMITTEES HAD LEAST SUCCESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Relations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Program</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consolidation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Levy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too Soon to Tell</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Possibly lack of leadership by the superintendent.

Building planning:

Lack of background, experience and current practices in planning modern school buildings.

Professed lack of knowledge and experience.

Public relations:

Split the community into 4 distinct groups.

From lay persons: Curriculum:

Lack of leadership in this area as to just how to conduct such a study. Where to begin, etc. There seems to me to be a great hesitation on everyone's part to start this—though it is the one "study" most frequently asked for.

To do adequate job with this problem requires a high degree of professional training.

Public relations:

Stimulating favorable interest in school elections. The one on which we have experienced difficulty is due to lack of a well defined plan on the part of the school administration.

Consolidation:

Consolidation has been our most difficult problem. Districts surrounding ours are smaller but want to retain their entity.

Committees As a Means of Communication

This section is concerned with the question, "Has
your committee been a good means of communication between the schools and the community?

The data in the table show that 81.3 per cent of all persons represented in this study felt that their committees were a good means of communication between the schools and the community. Only 2.8 per cent felt that the committees were not a good means of communication and 15.7 per cent felt it was questionable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Long-term</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Short-term</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supt.</td>
<td>Lay</td>
<td>Person</td>
<td>Supt.</td>
<td>Lay</td>
<td>Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questionable</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second part of this question was, "In what ways?"
The following quotes, taken from the questionnaires, explain why the committees had or had not been a good means of communication.

From superintendents: Yes:

They have a sub-committee on publicity which covers all school board meetings. Attempts to keep local citizens informed through newspaper, radio, and short talks to their various groups.

Since the committee has been a cross section of the entire district members have had opportunity to communicate with all sections.

Brought the truths rather than the false assumptions by the uninformed.
Public reacts better when interested lay person explains the school problems.

This is a rural area and most news is by word of mouth.

Questionable:

The committee has not been accepted generally as the sounding board for the community.

In times past yes. Recently, however, attendance has been poor and communications poor also.

From lay persons: Yes:

Primarily because the committee as a whole has become well informed on school problems and can pass this information along as required.

I think that the public felt more free to ask questions at the committee than they did the school board.

It has contributed a little more means. For one thing we have most of our decisions or gathered information printed in the local paper.

Questionable:

The committee has put forth great effort to contact the community but there seems to be a lack of interest on the part of the public. The same people seem to attend the meetings and we need to reach more people.

**Committees and Criticisms**

The following data represents the question "Have the criticisms made by your committee been constructive?"
The data in the table show that 88 per cent of the one hundred and seven persons sampled felt that their committee's criticisms had been constructive. Only .9 per cent answered "no" that their committees had not been constructive with their criticisms and 6.5 per cent felt it was "questionable." The remaining 4.6 per cent did not answer the question.

The following quotes have been used to help explain the ways in which they have been constructive.

From Superintendents: Yes:

Criticisms have been usually accompanied by constructive suggestions and offers to help.

It brings the Supt. and board back on an even keel on some matters that we think are important but the community doesn't.

The committee has pointed out that we have not been close enough to the public. They sometimes are not aware of our problems.

(Usually) Many of the criticisms were due to lack of understanding, or knowing the fact.

Questionable:

Too many times criticisms have been unfounded.
Committee seems to feel at times the Board should completely adopt their programs.

Usually they are petty problems.

From lay persons: Yes:

We have tried to make them so. Sometimes there is a difference of opinion on what's constructive.

School has established honor society, published lunch menu, increased advisory service, and various other suggested improvements.

I think so. From my observation, there is no criticism even offered, but recommendations for doing better.

To our form of study it has not been necessary to criticize, but rather help in building our district.

Cooperation by the Administration

"Has the school administration been cooperative with your committee?" The results of this question were very complimentary to the school administrators.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Long-term Supt.</th>
<th>Lay Persons</th>
<th>Short-term Supt.</th>
<th>Lay Persons</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questionable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table shows that 95.9 per cent of the persons sampled felt that their administrators had been very cooperative. Only one person stated "no," 2.8 per cent
"questionable," and one person did not answer the question.

Although the second part of this question was "If not, why not?" many people responded with affirmative remarks.

From superintendents:

Being an administrator, I feel we cooperate 100% because we need citizen support in operating the schools.

It gives leadership in assisting those on the program by supplying information—Takes part in presenting facts etc.

Yes, Superintendent and three principals have been given membership and attendance of these have been 100%.

We feel this a must.

From lay persons:

We have unquestioned help and cooperation from the school administration. We have had differences of opinion many times, but in the end nothing but the finest relationship has existed.

As far as we have gone as an Advisory Council, we have received the highest cooperation not only in giving us information, but helping in any way they are able.

Cooperation by the Board

"Has your school board been cooperative with your committee?" Again the results are overwhelmingly positive. Of course maybe this is to be expected when one considers that the board was responsible for initiating nearly 86 percent of all of the committees in this sampling.
The data in this table show that 94.4 per cent of the sampling felt that the board has been cooperative. Only six persons answering for long-term committees felt the board had not been, or questioned the cooperativeness of them.

The following quotes will show just how well the board and committee cooperated.

From superintendents:

Worked very closely together and frequently met with the committee.

Without this there is no hope for success. Serious consideration of their studied and informed recommendations must result.

The school board members made themselves available, the chairman of the board attended most of the general committee meetings and the chairman of the citizens committee met periodically with the board. From these contacts a fine rapport existed between the two groups.

The board members in no way dominated this group as they had done previously.

From lay persons:

Made every effort to affect our suggestions and indicated our efforts were helpful and conducive to a better school program.

They accepted our advice, answered our questions and were very fair in treating the issue.
They are present at our meetings, readily answer our questions and accept constructive criticisms graciously.

How Well Boards Follow the Committees Suggestions

The next question follows well with the two previous ones. "Have the school board and the school administration followed the committees suggestions?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Long-term Supt.</th>
<th>Lay</th>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Short-term Supt.</th>
<th>Lay</th>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too soon to tell</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>107</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These data show that 85 per cent of the persons sampled felt that their boards had followed the committees suggestions, while 3.7 per cent felt the board had not. The remaining 11.7 per cent did not answer the question or felt that it "was too soon to tell" if the board had followed their suggestions.

Along with the data from the table go the following reservations made by persons answering the question.

From superintendents:

Possible 75% of the recommendations submitted by the advisory council have been followed by the board.

In an overwhelmingly great majority of instances.

In most cases--90%

Almost 100%.
Only to the extent that suggestions are educationally sound and financially feasible.

Completely--but, many of their suggestions have come about by the board and administration working closely with them.

The school board submitted the budget estimate to the directors association that was suggested by the citizens committee.

Mutual agreements on certain phases regardless of who originated the ideas.

From lay persons:
Where they were considered feasible and were able to be financed.

To a very great extent.

They accepted our recommendations and acknowledged the fact that our council has spent considerable time and study on the problem thus far, with their thanks and appreciation.

If the suggestions were practical and for the betterment of the children's education.

In perhaps 3/4 of the time they have followed our recommendations. The other 1/4 time, facts we were not aware of have affected their decisions.

There were two rather negative comments on this question, one from a superintendent:

We didn't ask for suggestions.

One from a lay person:

They have accepted the ideas but we cannot say they were always followed. And it is possible that we are more of a front than a need to them.

Have Committees Been Advisory Only?

"Has your committee stayed within the realm of being
'advisory only'?" Again most of the answers were affirmative.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Long-term</th>
<th></th>
<th>Short-term</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supt.</td>
<td>Lay</td>
<td>Supt.</td>
<td>Lay</td>
<td>Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questionable</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table shows that 88.7 per cent of the respondents felt that their committees had stayed "advisory only."

Looking at this in terms of long and short-term committees it shows that, 85.9 per cent of the persons answering for long-term committees felt so while, 93.2 per cent of the persons from short-term committees did. The rest of the table shows that 2.8 per cent answered "no" and the remainder "questionable."

The comments regarding this are as follows: From superintendents: Yes:

Policy making has been left in the hands of school board and recommendations are still asked from administrators of the school system.

They make a real point of doing this--some real lay leaders in the group "tell" them when they tend to get off this basis.

This relationship is set out with the orientation of each committee.

Questionable:

Has a tendency to want its own way--becomes a major pressure group.
No:
Not entirely, there have been instances of telling the board.

From lay persons: Yes:
We have no authority whatsoever to be anything but advisory.

I believe we have done this because we are constantly working in cooperation with the board members, not behind their backs.

Definitely--will not work any other way.

No:
The committee has made recommendations, taken definite stands of policy, and actively worked in all school campaigns.

Committees Effects on the Educational Program
"Has your committee really contributed to the educational program of your community?" As one might expect the answers for this question are again very positive.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Long-term</th>
<th>Short-term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supt.</td>
<td>Lay Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questionable</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too soon to tell</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data in the table show that in most cases, 76.6 per cent, the one hundred and seven persons responding felt that their committees had definitely contributed to their
educational programs. Only 15.9 per cent stated "questionable" and the remainder stated "no" and "too soon to tell."

To show "In what ways" the committees had contributed, the following quotes have been chosen from the questionnaire.

From superintendents: Yes:

People have a place to bring their questions. Misunderstandings can be studied--people support things they understand.

By supporting policies established by the school board and helping to sell the needs for a good school building in our community.

My only request is that the group "come alive" again and reauthenticate its former scope of activities. The encouragement has been there, but "it didn't take!"

Questionable:

As an administrator I do not see how it has. A committee should be activated only when there is a problem for study. This group digs around for trouble if there is no problem.

The committee does not have the confidence of the entire community. The community believes in the school board.

From lay persons: Yes:

To the extent that it has focused more attention of the community on school administration.

By promoting a building program before the need became acute and the students suffered.

At this point in our program I would say our only contribution is better communications which is stimulating interest in our schools.

Questionable:

Perhaps only in educating the patrons of the district
with facts they should know. Cost of operating the district, budget, financing, etc.

Are Committees Worth the Effort?

"Has your committee been worth the effort?" Here again the answers were almost unanimous.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Long-term</th>
<th></th>
<th>Short-term</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supt.</td>
<td>Lay Person</td>
<td>Supt.</td>
<td>Lay Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questionable</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table shows that 93.4 per cent of all responses felt that their committees were worth the effort. The only "no" answers here are for the long-term committees.

"In what ways" have these committees been worth the effort is shown here by quotes taken from the questionnaires.

From superintendents: Yes:

Doubt if we could have come to a settled community feeling as rapidly as we have without committee's help.

Progress in program and in community support, I hope.

It really takes an effort but it's worth it.

The best kind of public relations. They let you know what the community and rural areas want and need.

Tremendous help on election. Wish we could get more action in other areas.

Wouldn't be without one.

They take time and effort but pay large dividends. The short-term approach may be more desirable.
The council has made it possible for school board and administration to operate school program in line with community desire.

No:

Without constant prodding by the school administration there would be little done. I do not believe the community is any better informed nor do the people support the schools any better.

From lay members: Yes:

Every member of the community had a part in the effort and have a better understanding of the problems of the school.

We brought to the publics attention that the school has many serious problems and that they only can help help the school board solve them.

Probably the most important contribution we made was to inform ourselves and pass the facts to our friends. To be able to deal and talk in facts always is worth the effort.

More universal recognition of faculty effort over and above the 3 R's. Created sufficient fuel for pro's and con's of education to take a stand and make the effort to get their points across instead of just mumbling in their beards.

Selfishly, every committee member gets a good education in school problems. I think the committee provides a training ground for school board membership.

As committee members we are more informed on school problems.

Concluding Statement

These data have shown that lay committees in Washington State do support the hypotheses that were the basis
of this study.

(1) Lay committees do work well on such problems as passing bond issues and other short-term type problems.

(2) Short-term committees have been used primarily for passing bond issues.

(3) Lay committees are an excellent means of public relations between the schools and the community.

(4) The longer-term type of problem such as curriculum work have not been very successful problems for lay committees.

(5) Some persons seem to feel that the short-term committee approach is better than the long-term committee. This comment did appear on several questionnaires, plus the fact that long-term committees generally seem to have difficulty in keeping members interested and in getting new members.

This study has shown that lay persons do back their school when they have been educated to their school's needs. There definitely seems to be a place for lay committees in the Washington school system.

The following chapter presents the summary and conclusions of this study.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS

The problem of this thesis was to get the opinions of a sampling of superintendents in this state concerning the worth of their educational lay advisory committees; to get similar opinions from lay persons serving on such lay committees; and to compare the end results of these opinions in an attempt to determine the worth of lay committees in Washington State.

I. SUMMARY

This study was conducted with a questionnaire sent to accredited high school districts in Washington that were using lay committees. Limitations placed on this study excluded (1) private schools, (2) schools with special accreditation, (3) districts with a population exceeding twenty-seven thousand, and (4) union high school districts.

Review of the literature. The history of lay participation in public schools dates back to the colonial days. The history of lay committees has been traced to 1911, but general use of lay committees has only become common since the end of World War II.

The rapid growth of lay committees has resulted in a much stronger and more understanding bond between the schools and the community. It had led to a more realistic
approach to solving school problems and in planning for better educational programs.

In this process educators have become more willing to accept the fact that the schools are an integral part of the community and cannot be withdrawn from public interest and participation.

The study. Of the one hundred and thirty-eight questionnaires sent out to superintendents and lay persons, one hundred and seven (77.8 per cent) were returned. There were represented in this study seventy different lay committees.

This study showed that in the past few years there have been a greater number of short-term committees established than long-term. Of the seventy committees represented, twenty-three (32.9 per cent) required no finances for operation, sixteen (22.7 per cent) were financed by the school district, thirteen (18.5 per cent) were financed by sponsoring organizations, the remainder were financed by contributions, dues from members, and the county superintendents budget.

Sixty (85.7 per cent) of the seventy committees were formed by the school board. The remainder were formed by PTA's, interested citizens, and there was no record of how three of them were formed.

Of the seventy committees, fifty-two (74.3 per cent) were formed to solve a specific problem. Thirteen (18.5 per
cent) had no specific problem to work on when initiated and the remaining five committees were not sure they had a problem on which to work.

The types of problems they were formed to solve rank in the following order: Building program and bond issues were first with forty-two (87.7 per cent), included in this group were 73.3 per cent of the long-term committees and 90.9 per cent of the short-term committees. Second in rank was public relations which was named five (9.2 per cent) times; others included administration, salary schedule, and consolidation.

Of the one-hundred and seven persons representing lay committees, eighty-three (97.6 per cent) felt that their committees were a good representation of the community. Persons responding for long-term committees felt that their committees were not as well represented as did those persons responding for short-term committees.

When asked how well people responded when they were asked to serve on a committee, sixty-seven (63.6 per cent) felt they responded very well. Again it shows that persons on short-term committees respond better than those for long-term committees. Thirty-two (28.8 per cent) felt that it was questionable if people responded well when asked to serve on committees.

With reference to the problems on which committees worked, the building problem was most often attacked by lay committees. Fifty-none (84.2 per cent) have worked on this problem. Curriculum was the problem ranking second with
twenty-nine (41.4 per cent) committees having experienced this work. Other problems listed were special levies, public relations, school and community surveys, site selection, reorganization, curriculum, and finance study.

It is interesting to note that 58 per cent of all persons responding felt that there were no problems on which they had little success. Others, 16.9 per cent listed curriculum as a problem with which they had little success. Other problems listed with which committees had little success are, public relations, building programs, special levies and consolidation.

As a means of communication eighty-seven (81.3 per cent) felt their committees had been a good means of communication to the public. Only seventeen (15.7 per cent) felt it was questionable.

Ninety-four (88 per cent) of all persons felt that their committee's criticism had been constructive. It was felt by one hundred and two (95.9 per cent) of the persons that the school administration had been very cooperative with the committee. Similarly, with respect to the school board, one hundred and one (94.4 per cent) of all persons responding felt they had been cooperative. Ninety-one (85 per cent) felt that the board had followed the committees suggestions.

This study showed that ninety-five (88.7 per cent) of all respondents felt their committee had stayed "advisory only". Here again there is a difference between long and
short-term committees, for long-term 85.9 per cent and for short-term committees 93.2 per cent.

The responses indicated that eighty-two (76.6 per cent) of the persons felt their committees had improved their educational systems and seventeen (15.9 per cent) thought it was questionable.

The majority of the persons (93.4 per cent) stated that their committees had definitely been worth the effort put into them.

II. CONCLUSIONS

The hypotheses of this study have been substantiated.
(1) Lay committees do work well on such problems as passing bond issues and other short-term type problems.
(2) Bond elections and building programs are the problems most often attacked by short-term lay committees.
(3) Lay committees are an excellent means of public relations between the schools and the community.
(4) The long-term type of problems, such as curriculum work, have not been problems on which lay committees have been very successful.
(5) Many persons seem to feel that the short-term committee is better than the long-term committee.

The number of returns in this study suggest that there is a tremendous interest in lay committees both by superintendents and lay persons. Both the literature and the questionnaire data give definite indication that lay
persons, superintendents, and the school boards support their lay committees to a great extent.

III. IMPLICATIONS

There are many questions that may come into one's mind when reading this thesis report. There are some indications in the data that could lead one to wonder whether in some cases boards exploit lay committees to their own advantages. Perhaps this is one disadvantage to the short-term committee approach.

Has the lay committee movement been as effective in Washington as it has in other parts of the country? Consider that from the original mailing list of two hundred and fourteen school districts only seventy lay committees were represented in the final. There are committees in less than a third of the districts. If lay committees work as well as had been shown by this study why doesn't every school district use them? Is it because some superintendents prefer not to work with the lay public or do not have the time and patience to work with them?

What has caused this trend from long-term committees toward the use of short-term committees? Is this because administrators do not have the time or perhaps even the ability to keep lay persons interested in long-term committee work?

These are questions that have come into the mind of the writer as he looks back over this study. Perhaps
other readers could add to this list of unanswered questions, or it could even lead to another study of lay committees for someone who is interested in them.

The writer has a feeling of satisfaction as he looks back over the past months through the development of this study. This study has shown that there is a place for lay committees in the Washington educational system. Lay committees are worth the time and effort that is involved in their use. It is sincerely hoped that more Washington communities will "see the light", discover the value of lay committees, and use them to advantage in the attack on the serious school problems facing us all.
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APPENDIX A
APPENDIX A

FACSIMILE OF POST CARD QUESTIONNAIRE

YOUR NAME ________________________________________________
ADDRESS ________________________________________________

PLEASE CHECK THE CORRECT ANSWERS

1. Do you have, or have you had in the past, a lay advisory committee operating in your school district?
   Yes ___ No ___.

2. If your answer to question one was "yes," would you be willing to complete a short questionnaire concerning lay advisory committees? Yes ___ No ___.

3. Please fill in the name and address of a lay committee member whom you feel would be willing to complete a short questionnaire concerning lay advisory committees.
   NAME ________________________________________________
   ADDRESS ________________________________________________

Superintendent of Public Schools
APPENDIX B
Dear Superintendent: January 23, 1959

We need your help. We, my graduate committee at Central Washington College and myself, are attempting (1) to establish the whereabouts of educational lay advisory committees in Washington State, and (2) to establish a mailing list for an additional questionnaire concerning lay advisory committees from which I will write my master's thesis.

If you have a lay advisory committee in your district, two check marks and two addresses will complete the other half of this card. If you have no committee, one check mark and the name of your district are all that is needed.

We sincerely need your help, so regardless of your answers, please return this card as soon as possible.

Very truly yours,
William A. Gallacher

William A. Gallacher
Box 647, CWCE
Ellensburg, Washington
APPENDIX C
APPENDIX C

MAILING LIST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Superintendents</th>
<th>Lay Committee Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Clarence E. Genning</td>
<td>Mr. Ted Reister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17th &amp; J</td>
<td>Route 3 Box 331C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anacortes, Washington</td>
<td>Anacortes, Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Thomas Terjeson</td>
<td>Mrs. Gordon Duskin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Hayes Holman</td>
<td>Mr. Richard Barnard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9420 South 240th Place</td>
<td>35416 - 90th Avenue South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auburn, Washington</td>
<td>Aubrun, Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Harold W. Johnson</td>
<td>Mrs. A. W. Zimmerman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battle Ground, Washington</td>
<td>9504 N. E. 119th Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vancouver, Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Roy Patrick Wahle</td>
<td>Mr. Donald Hagler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102nd &amp; Main Streets</td>
<td>12213 S. E. 27th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellevue, Washington</td>
<td>Bellevue, Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Robert R. Anderson</td>
<td>Mr. Kenneth Peyton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Box 488</td>
<td>Route 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benton City, Washington</td>
<td>Benton, City, Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Verson C. McDonald</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Box 67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blaine, Washington</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Julian Karp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bothell, Washington</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Superintendents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>district</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Armin G. Hahr</td>
<td>Bremerton School District 100-C</td>
<td>Bremerton, WA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. C. P. Rumburg</td>
<td>Burlington-Edison School District</td>
<td>Bridgeport, WA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Robert A. Foster</td>
<td>Burlington-Edison School District</td>
<td>Burlington, WA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Charles Salt</td>
<td>Burlington-Edison School District</td>
<td>Cheney, WA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Myron G. Colburn</td>
<td>Burlington-Edison School District</td>
<td>Colville, WA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. H. O. Edwards</td>
<td>Burlington-Edison School District</td>
<td>Arlington, WA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. William Castles</td>
<td></td>
<td>Edmonds, WA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. John A. Porter</td>
<td></td>
<td>Edmonds, WA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Lay Committee Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Floyd Hamstrom</td>
<td>Burlington, WA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Paul B. Van Horn</td>
<td>Carnation, WA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Eldon Engle</td>
<td>Cheney, WA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Barrking</td>
<td>Colville, WA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Muriel Fleming</td>
<td>Arlington, WA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Superintendents

Mr. Marvin J. Schroeder
Ellensburg, Washington

Mr. Charles J. Smith
Enumclaw, Washington

Mr. Victor R. Cullens
Ephrata, Washington

Mr. Richard Usitalo
Fairfield, Washington

Mr. Everett C. Sanders
Box 596
Ferndale, Washington

Mr. John B. Hitchcock
Box 8
Forks, Washington

Mr. Gunar H. Tranum
Friday Harbor, Washington

Mr. C. H. Howe
Gig Harbor, Washington

Mr. Clarence McClure
Grandview, Washington

Mr. William J. Robinsen
311 Sampson
Hoquiam, Washington

Lay Committee Members

Mr. Jim Skarstad
807 East Washington
Ellensburg, Washington

Mr. C. W. Watson
R.F.D. #3
Enumclaw, Washington

Mr. Ed Douglass
138 "D" Street S. W.
Ephrata, Washington

Mr. Albert Roecks
Fairfield, Washington

Dr. R. V. Tucker
Ferndale, Washington

Dr. M. G. Heath
Friday Harbor, Washington

Mrs. H. Matthaei
Route 1
Gig Harbor, Washington

Mr. Don Bren
Grandview, Washington
### APPENDIX C (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Superintendent</strong></th>
<th><strong>Lay Committee Members</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. T. R. Deering</td>
<td>Mrs. Harriet Fish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issaquah, Washington</td>
<td>Route 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Issaquah, Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. R. G. Dennis</td>
<td>Mr. Clifford R. Maki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelso, Washington</td>
<td>118 Houssler Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kelso, Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Eimer E. Dubes</td>
<td>Mr. John Marty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kettle Falls, Washington</td>
<td>Kettle Falls, Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Robert C. Patrick</td>
<td>Mr. Jack Soreson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Box 1699</td>
<td>Route 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kittitas, Washington</td>
<td>Ellensburg, Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. E. W. Cox</td>
<td>Mr. Walter Chamberlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Washington School District 414</td>
<td>10025 111th Avenue N. E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Box 188</td>
<td>Kirkland, Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkland, Washington</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. D. D. Oates</td>
<td>Mrs. A. Weisenburger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Stevens, Washington</td>
<td>Verson Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lake Stevens, Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Ralph R. Richards</td>
<td>Mrs. Martin Hanson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Box 67</td>
<td>315 Benton Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leavenworth, Washington</td>
<td>Leavenworth, Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. S. Milligan</td>
<td>Dr. Dallas Dedrick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longview, Washington</td>
<td>1515 22nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Longview, Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. M. F. Garred</td>
<td>Mr. Leonard Springer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mabton, Washington</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Superintendents

Mr. Thomas J. Davis  
Box 357  
Manson, Washington

Mr. Clifton A. Hussey  
Mead, Washington

Mr. C. O. Pence  
Millwood, Washington

Mr. Thomas E. Marsden  
Monroe, Washington

Mr. Ned Phillips  
Box 66  
Naches, Washington

Mr. R. A. Grabenhorst  
P. O. Box 29  
Naselle, Washington

Mr. Arnold A. Bowers  
Oakville, Washington

Mr. Rolland H. Upton  
116 North Columbia  
Olympia, Washington

Mr. James Sonstellie  
Omak, Washington

Mr. Paul L. Buhrmester  
Oroville, Washington

Lay Committee Members

Mr. Ivan Morse  
Manson, Washington

Mrs. Mary Engstrom  
East 22nd Hawthorne Road  
Spokane, Washington

Mr. Merlin Orme  
North 2901 Dora  
Spokane, Washington

Mr. Jack Palmquest  
Route 1  
Monroe, Washington

Mrs. Madge Long  
Route 1  
Naches, Washington

Mr. Martin Hillis  
Naselle, Washington

Mr. Russell Doerge  
Oakville, Washington

Mr. Henery Schmidt  
1318 No. Eastside Street  
Olympia, Washington

Mr. Earl Robertson  
Omak, Washington
Superintendents

Mr. Herman F. Jaeger
2600 N. Chase
Pasco, Washington

Mr. Edgar Critchlow
Pateros, Washington

Mr. Norbert Baugh
Box 448
Peshastin, Washington

Mr. J. D. Glann
Port Angeles, Washington

Mr. George M. Esentront
Port Orchard, Washington

Mr. P. B. Hanawalt
605-West Main
Puyallup, Washington

Mr. Mel Lindbloom
Box 7
Quincy, Washington

Mr. Harold G. Best
Raymond, Washington

Mr. Kenneth C. Jones
Redondo, Washington

Lay Committee Members

Mr. James C. Schill, Jr.
Pasco, Washington

Mr. Owen Sawyer
Peshastin, Washington

Mr. Harold Widsteen
133 East First
Port Angeles, Washington

Mr. Jack O'Neil
Route 5 Box 307
Port Orchard, Washington

Mrs. Beatrice Moye
815 - 3rd Street N. E.
Puyallup, Washington

Mr. Willard Hess
Quincy, Washington

Mr. James Kennedy
225 - 14th Street
Raymond, Washington

Mr. Victor Knutzen
2649 So. 304th
Auburn, Washington
Superintendents

Mr. Neal C. McClure
Richland, Washington

Mr. W. Lyndle Moore
Box 759
Ridgefield, Washington

Mr. John H. Stevens
R. O. Box 77
Rochester, Washington

Mr. Richard C. Langton
4640 South 144
Seattle 88, Washington

Mr. Charles A. McNurlen
Selah, Washington

Mr. E. R. Opstad
Snoqualmie, Washington

Mr. C. E. Willard
1621 Main
Sumner, Washington

Mr. Lee A. Colby
Sunnyside, Washington

Mr. Milford Crowley
Tonasket, Washington

Lay Committee Members

Mr. Caisar Branchini
1307 Stevens
Richland, Washington

Mrs. Roger Stine
Box 536 - Route 2
Ridgefield, Washington

Mrs. C. J. Hartsock
12219 - 27 Avenue South
Seattle 88, Washington

Mr. John Snyder
Selah, Washington

Mrs. John McKibber
Route 1
North Bend, Washington

Mr. George Carnahan
1022 Main
Sumner, Washington

Mr. Carl Dunning
539 Franklin Court
Sunnyside, Washington

Mr. Don Verbeels
Tonasket, Washington
Superintendents

Mr. Theodore Johnson
Box 126
Twisp, Washington

Mr. Marvin Schafer
7000 N. E. 117th Avenue
Vancouver, Washington

Mr. Gilbert C. Mills
East 14503 Alki
Veradale, Washington

Mr. Arthur D. Jones
Walla Walla, Washington

Mr. Carl H. Wheeler
Waterville, Washington

Mr. Paul Furgeson
614 King Street
Wenatchee, Washington

Mr. William W. Nickerson
Wilbur School District #200
Wilbur, Washington

Mr. Kent Caldwell
Winlock, Washington

Mr. Ralph W. Plas
Box 168
Winthrop, Washington

Mr. Walter A. Hitchcock
Rt. 1
Yakima, Washington

Lay Committee Members

Mrs. L. A. Dunkin
Twisp, Washington

Mrs. Rose Funk
8914 N. E. Porter Road
Vancouver, Washington

Mr. Wim Albers
East 12815 - 4th
Opportunity, Washington

Mrs. Lean Krapfel
210 Marcus Street
Walla Walla, Washington

Mr. Ross W. Wilkinson
Waterville, Washington

Mr. Glenn Woods
Chamber of Commerce
Wenatchee, Washington

Mr. Zane Cosby
Wilbur, Washington

Mrs. Harold Nichols
Winlock Washington

Mr. Ray Wehmeyer
Winthrop, Washington

Mr. Don Northrop
10 East Walnut Street
Yakima, Washington
APPENDIX D

A QUESTIONNAIRE CONCERNING EDUCATIONAL
LAY ADVISORY COMMITTEES

1. What type of educational lay advisory committee do you have in your community? Short-term__. Long-term__. (Check one).

2. How long has your committee been in existence? ____ Years, ____ Months.

3. How is your committee financially supported? ________________

4. What group or organization initiated your committee? ________________

5. Was there a serious school problem at the time your committee was formed? Yes__. No__. Questionable__. If so, what was it?

6. Do you feel that your committee is a reasonable cross section of your community? (Doctors, laborers, business men, farmers, managers, housewives, etc.) Yes__. No__. Questionable__. Please explain. ________________

7. Do people respond with enthusiasm when asked to serve on your committee? Yes__. No__. Questionable__. If not, why not?

8. What types of problems has your committee worked on? __________

9. With what type of problem listed in Item 8 has your committee had most success? Why? ____________________________________________

___________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________

10. With what type of problem listed in Item 8 has your committee had least success? Why? ____________________________________________

___________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________

11. Has your committee been a good means of communication between the schools and the community? Yes__. No__. Questionable__. In what ways? ____________________________________________

___________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________

12. Have the criticism made by the committee been constructive? Yes__. No__. Questionable__. In what ways?

___________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________

13. Has the school administration been cooperative with your committee? Yes__. No__. Questionable__. If not, why not?

___________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________
APPENDIX D (continued)

14. Has your school board been cooperative with your committee? Yes___. No___. Questionable___. In what ways? _______________________

15. Have the school board and the school administration followed the committees suggestions? Yes___. No___. To what extent? _______________________

16. Has your committee stayed within the realm of being "advisory only"? Yes___. No___. Questionable___. If not, in what ways? _______________________

17. Has your committee really contributed to the educational program of your community? Yes___. No___. Questionable___. In what ways? _______________________

18. Has your committee been worth the effort? Yes___. No___. Questionable___. In what ways? _______________________

Dear

Not long ago you returned to me a post card questionnaire in which you stated that you would complete an additional questionnaire concerning lay advisory committees. The questionnaire is for my master's thesis, "The Worth of Lay Advisory Committees in Washington State." I am attempting to find out if lay advisory committees are really as successful as they are said to be in the many articles that have been written about them.

This questionnaire is relatively short although nearly every question will require some explanation. Please elaborate as much as you need to make your answers clear. Please write on every question so that I will be able to get your opinion about lay committees.

Question one concerns long term and short term committees. By long term is meant a committee that is in continuous existence, always working for a better educational program. By short term is meant a committee that is formed and operates only when there is a specific need or problem to work on; as the problem is solved the committee then goes out of existence. I believe the rest of the questionnaire is self explanatory.

As you well realize the return of this questionnaire means very much to me. I wish to thank you sincerely for your time, effort, and promptness in returning this questionnaire.

Yours truly,

William A. Gallacher
Dear Box 647, CWCE
Ellensburg, Wash.
February 7, 1959

The superintendent of schools in your district advised me that you may be willing to complete a questionnaire concerning your lay advisory committee. This questionnaire is being used to gather information for my master's thesis, from which I am trying to find out if lay advisory committees are as successful as they are said to be in the many articles that have been written about them.

This questionnaire is relatively short although nearly every question will require some explanation. Please elaborate as much as you need, to make your answers clear. Please write on every question so that I will be able to get your opinion about lay committees.

Question one concerns long term and short term committees. By long term is meant a committee that is in continuous existence, always working for a better educational program. By short term is meant a committee that is formed and operates only when there is a specific need or problem to work on; as the problem is solved the committee then goes out of existence. I believe the rest of the questionnaire is self explanatory.

The return of this questionnaire means a great deal to me as an entire year's work is based upon my thesis. I wish to thank you sincerely for your time, effort, and promptness in returning this questionnaire.

Yours truly,

William A. Gallacher