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AN ANALYSIS OF THE EDUCATIONAL IMPACT OF THE 1987 IOWA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION SCHOOL STANDARDS UPON SCHOOLS AS VIEWED BY PUBLIC SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENTS OF NORTHEAST IOWA.

The purpose of this study was to analyze the educational impact of the 1987 state standards upon the elementary and secondary public school districts of northeast Iowa. In addition the study gathered information on the standards with regard to: 1) the anticipated and proposed changes in school programs and policy; 2) the short and long-term effects on cooperative and shared programs (with other districts), and on school district reorganization; and 3) the degree of difficulty for districts in meeting each of the new standards. The twenty new standards become effective July 1, 1989.

Involved in the study were 114 public school superintendents from the northeast and north-central quarter of the state of Iowa. The study examined the responses of the superintendents from districts of small, medium, and, large student populations. A questionnaire was mailed to survey the superintendents. Interviews were also conducted with ten percent of the respondents.
Among the major conclusions were the following:

1. The every-day kindergarten standard, which becomes effective in 1992, was selected by superintendents as having the greatest impacts on the existing school programs. This standard was viewed as especially difficult for the large and medium-sized school districts.

2. A majority of the superintendents indicated that it would not be a hardship to meet the requirements of the new educational standards.

3. There was a significant difference between the small, medium, and large-school superintendents on the degree of difficulty in meeting nearly one-half of the standards. In nearly every new standard, the small school districts reported more difficulty than the other two superintendent groups. The medium-school superintendents also reported more difficulty than the large-school superintendents on nearly all of the standards.

4. Nearly one-half of the superintendents indicated that there would be long-range effects on their school district with regard to reorganization, consolidation, or cooperative and shared programs as a result of the new standards.

5. The major concern of superintendents regarding the new standards was the added financial costs resulting from implementation of the standards.
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank everyone who helped to make this investigation possible. Without considerable help this study would have been even more of a challenge.

A special word of thanks is extended to the writer's major advisor and chairman of the dissertation committee, Dr. Mel Heller. His help and encouragement these past several years of graduate study has been invaluable.

Dr. Max Bailey and Dr. Phil Carlin, members of the writer's dissertation committee, have been extremely helpful in completing the study. They have been very supportive throughout my doctoral program.

A special thanks goes to Dr. Sandy Moore and Dr. Gene Potts for their encouragement and support, to two very helpful people Linda Digman and Debbie Rhodes, to many of the Western Dubuque teachers and administrators who have helped through their assistance, support, and understanding.

My deepest gratitude goes to my family for their on-going support and encouragement. To my sister, Jeanne, for her efforts on the word processor; to my other sisters and brother, Helen, Rosemary, and Jay for their ever-present love and support in all my educational endeavors; to my daughters and sons, Lynn, Sally, Jay, T.J., Andy, and Luke for their patience and understanding throughout this effort; and especially Matthew and John for their first-hand help. Most of all, my gratitude is unending to my wife, Brenda, for her understanding, patience, and extraordinary support even while pursuing her own college degree. Without her, this goal might never have been fulfilled.
The author, Thomas Joseph Wickham, is the son of James W. Wickham and Roseline (Delaney) Wickham. He was born July 21, 1939, in Waterloo, Iowa. His elementary education was obtained in parochial schools in Waterloo and Dubuque, Iowa. His secondary education was completed in 1957 at Loras Academy, Dubuque, Iowa.

Mr. Wickham received the degree of Bachelor of Arts in history in May, 1961, at Loras College, Dubuque, Iowa. In 1961, while attending Loras College, he was vice-president of the University History Club and Phi Alpha Theta, the history honor society. In 1966, he received the Master of Arts degree in elementary school administration from Loras College. In 1971, Mr. Wickham received the degree of Educational Specialist in educational administration from the University of Iowa.

In 1973, Mr. Wickham and three fellow educators formed an educational publishing company which is involved in the manufacture and sale of supplemental reading and mathematics materials. His involvement in this endeavor has resulted in his authorship of five books of games and activities.

Mr. Wickham in 1986 became a trained assessor and in March, 1987, was one of six trained administrators to participate in the first Iowa Principals Assessment Center. In late 1987 and early 1988, he was a participant in the initial Iowa Leadership in Educational Administration Development (I-LEAD) train-the-trainer program. Since that time he has been actively training fellow administrators in teacher performance evaluation.
TABLE OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS</td>
<td>ii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VITA</td>
<td>iii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIST OF TABLES</td>
<td>viii</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chapter

I. INTRODUCTION | 1

Steps and Implementation Dates of the New Standards | 2
Major Changes of the New Standards | 3
   Board Policies | 4
   Student Needs | 4
   Curriculum | 4
Local District Concerns Due to the New Standards | 5
Statement of the Problem | 6
Purposes of the Study | 7
Need for the Study | 10
Limitations of the Study | 11
Design of the Study/Procedures | 14
   Selection of the Subjects | 15
   Development of the Survey Form | 16
   Format of the Questionnaire | 17
   Information Requested on the Questionnaire | 18
The Interview Process | 20
Collection of the Data | 20
Questionnaire Return | 21
Treatment of the Data | 21

II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE | 24

Introduction | 24
National Overview of the Reform Movement and Changing Educational Standards | 24
   Arkansas Educational Reforms | 29
   Specific Reforms - Nationally | 31
Minimum Educational Standards in Iowa | 36
   Recent Legislative Action | 41
   Educational Excellence Act of 1987 | 43
   Future Educational Changes in Iowa | 44
   Reorganization in Iowa Schools-An Overview | 47
   1985 Legislative Action | 50
School Districts Which Anticipate Entering into Cooperative or Shared Programs with Another District Prior to the Implementation of the New Standards ... 150

School Districts Which Anticipate Long Range Effects with regard to Reorganization or Consolidation as a Result of the New Standards ... 152

Additional Comments of School Superintendents Regarding the Effects of the New Standards on Their School District ... 154

Interview Information of Superintendents from Small, Medium, and Large School Districts ... 158

IV. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY. ... 167

Summary of the Study ... 167

Summary of the Findings ... 168

The Positive and Negative Impact of the New Standards on Existing School Programs ... 168

New Educational Standards Which Superintendents Indicate as Having a Great Impact or the Greatest Impact on Their District ... 169

Degree of Difficulty for School Districts in Meeting the New Standards Requiring Additional School Board Policies ... 170

Degree of Difficulty for School Districts in Meeting the New Standards Requiring Programs to Meet Student Needs ... 171

Degree of Difficulty for School Districts in Meeting the New Standards for Curriculum Program Requirements ... 172

Degree of Difficulty in Meeting the Data Collecting and On-site Review Procedures of the New Standards ... 174

Recent District Program Changes, Planned Action, and Specific District Timetables for Meeting the New Standards ... 175
# LIST OF TABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Public School Superintendents of Northeast Iowa Who Completed and Returned the Survey Instrument, by Number and Percent</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Extent of Agreement Among Public School Superintendents Concerning the New Educational Standards Having a Great Positive Impact on the Existing School Program in Their District</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Extent of Agreement Among Public School Superintendents Concerning the New Educational Standards Having a Great Negative Impact on the Existing School Program in Their District</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>New Educational Standards Requiring School Board Policies and Student Needs Programs Which Superintendents Indicate as Having a Great Impact on Their District</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>New Educational Standards for Curriculum Program Requirements Which Superintendents Indicate as Having a Great Impact on Their District</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>New Educational Standards Requiring Additional School Board Policies and Student Needs Programs Which Superintendents Indicate as Having the Greatest Impact on Their District</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>New Educational Standards for Curriculum Program Requirements Which Superintendents Indicate as Having a Great Impact on Their District</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Degree of Difficulty for School Districts in Meeting the New Standards Requiring Additional School Board Policies</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Degree of Difficulty for School Districts in Meeting the New Standards Requiring Additional School Board Policies</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Degree of Difficulty for School Districts in Meeting the New Standards Requiring Additional School Board Policies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>102</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>103</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>105</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>108</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>110</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>112</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>116</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>118</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>121</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>123</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>127</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Degree of Difficulty for School Districts in Meeting the New Standards for Curriculum Program Requirements</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Degree of Difficulty for School Districts in Meeting the New Standards for Curriculum Program Requirements</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Degree of Difficulty for School Districts in Meeting the New Standards for Curriculum Program Requirements</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Degree of Difficulty for School Districts in Meeting the New Standards for Curriculum Program Requirements</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Recent District Changes in School Programs to Meet the Requirements of the New Standards</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Actions Planned by School Districts to Meet the Requirements of the New Standards</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Specific School District Plans or Time Tables for Meeting the Requirements of the New Standards</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>School Districts Which Anticipate Reorganizing with Another District Prior to the Implementation of the New Standards</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>School Districts Which Anticipate Entering into Cooperative or Shared Programs with Another District Prior to the Implementation of the New Standards</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>School Districts Which Anticipate Long Range Effects with Regard to Reorganization or Consolidation as a Result of the New Standards</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

In 1983, the National Commission on Excellence in Education stated "Our Nation is at risk. If an unfriendly foreign power had attempted to impose on America the mediocre educational performance that exists today, we might well have viewed it as an act of war. As it stands, we have allowed this to happen to ourselves."

Since that time education has been a high priority in the nation. Thirty governors have named school reform commissions, numerous state legislatures have enacted programs, and the public's attitude towards education, in general, has changed. As a result, more constructive action on behalf of public education has taken place than during any comparable period in our recent history.

In the state of Iowa, the impact was not as immediate. Educators reacted confidently that the state's high ranking in achievement test scores, graduation rates, and literacy rates proved that excellence in education still existed in Iowa. Despite that reaction by many educators, the Iowa legislature responded by establishing a task force that released a 1984 report entitled, First in the Nation in Education
(FINE). The FINE report stated that the present educational system was good, but by implementing a considerable number of changes it could become excellent.

When the report was released, fifty-four percent of Iowa's 436 public school districts had fewer than 600 students and three-fourths of the districts had less than one thousand students. In response to that report, the Iowa legislature mandated the development of new educational standards for approved schools in the state.

Steps and Implementation Dates of the New Standards

It was the responsibility of the State Board of Education to update the current school standards, which have been in effect since 1967. The former state director of the Department of Education, Robert Benton, established a committee which worked for 18 months to develop the new standards. Included in the group were: representatives of the Iowa Association of School Administrators, the Educational Administrators of Iowa, the Iowa Association of School Boards, the Iowa State Education Association, Iowa Congress of Parents and Teachers, the Iowa Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, the Iowa Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, and non-public schools in Iowa.
Iowa legislators and State Board members also worked with the committee.

After completion, the new standards were explained at sixteen informational meetings held around the state in the month of April, 1987. The State Board of Education accepted written comments on the proposal through the month of May and officially adopted the standards in June. The standards were then discussed by a legislative rules committee and the subject of five public hearings in July and August, 1987.

Iowa schools must meet the new standards by July 1, 1989, or risk losing accreditation. A new accreditation process will enforce the standards. The procedures, which are still being developed, will focus on data collection and on-site review. Public schools that do not meet the standards will be given time to adjust their programs, but could then be attached to a neighboring district. In addition to the 1989 requirements, all public school districts must establish every-day kindergarten programs by July 1, 1992.

**Major Changes of the New Standards**

The new standards can be classified into three distinct categories. First, those concerning school board requirements; second, those dealing with specific
curriculum changes; and third, those requirements that specify programs concerned with student needs.

Board Policies

Several of the standards are designed to ensure that local school boards take a hard look at the purposes, goals, and results of their educational system. Boards would be required to conduct needs assessments, develop short and long-range plans and goals for their schools, and write philosophy statements. Each board would be required to evolve procedures for developing, implementing, and evaluating its total curriculum, including methods of monitoring student progress. Policies on student responsibility and discipline, and on the use of instructional time for students would also be required.

Student Needs

Several of the new standards focus on meeting student needs in new ways. The standards would require each school to have a program for gifted and talented students; a properly staffed K-12 guidance program; and programs to meet the needs of "at-risk" students.

Curriculum

Approved schools would be required to offer and teach a minimum of 41 units, or yearlong courses, in
grades 9-12, as compared to the 27 units required under current standards. A specific number of units for each subject area would be required. Physics and chemistry would have to be taught annually, as well as four units in one foreign language. Kindergarten would be required to operate a minimum of 180 days during the school year. The school calendar would be a minimum of 200 days - 180 days of classroom instruction and 20 days for staff in-service and other activities. The standards also set the minimum length of the school day at five and one-half hours of instructional time.

Local District Concerns Due to the New Standards

The implementation of the new educational standards in Iowa schools has been a major area of concern for local school administrators and board members. Financial concerns have been numerous. The cost of employing additional personnel to meet the more stringent requirements for administration, elementary guidance, and media programs have been major concerns. Additional transportation and staff costs for new kindergarten program changes, as well as new course and staff requirements, were also sources of future budget increases.
Job security was also a factor as the new standards may well have far-reaching effects on the very existence of non-public schools, public school systems, and rural Iowa communities. Opponents, such as the Rural Schools of Iowa organization indicated that many long-lasting educational traditions and organizations are threatened by the new educational standards.

Statement of the Problem

The problem in this study was to determine and assess the views of the public school superintendents of northeast Iowa regarding the new school standards. While assessing the views, it also assessed what actions have already started, what was planned, and which standards presented the most difficulty for local educators.

The study focused on these questions:

1. How do the public school superintendents view the new educational standards? Do they perceive the new educational standards as having a great positive or negative impact on the existing school program in the district?

2. Which of the new standards will have the greatest impact on the overall existing school program in the subject's district?
3. How much difficulty will the districts have in meeting the new standards?

4. What school district actions are anticipated or planned, and what has already taken place to meet the requirements of the new standards dealing with school board requirements? Student needs requirements? Curriculum requirements?

5. What specific plan of action and time table have been established by the subjects to meet the requirements of the new standards?

6. Do the subjects perceive their district a) reorganizing with another district, or b) entering into a cooperative or shared program with another district, prior to the implementation of the new standards?

7. What long-range effects on school district reorganization will take place due to the new standards?

8. To what extent will differences exist with respect to the above dimensions of new standards from districts with populations of fewer than 500 students? Of districts with populations of 500-999 students? Of districts with populations of 1000 or more students?

**Purposes of the Study**
Chapter three of the Iowa Administrative Code outlines the school standards, which are the minimum requirements that must be met by the Iowa public school districts to be accredited and remain in operation. The general purposes of this study are to determine and assess: a) the impact of the new standards on local districts; b) the anticipated and proposed changes in school programs and policy; and c) the short and long-term implications of the new standards to the 114 public school districts in northeast Iowa.

The specific purposes of this study are:

1. To determine if the superintendents perceive the new educational standards as having a great positive or negative impact on the existing school program in their district.

2. To determine which of the new standards will have the greatest impact on the overall existing school programs in the subjects' district.

3. To determine the degree of difficulty the subjects perceive their district will have in meeting each of the new educational standards.

4. To determine what changes have already taken place in local districts in order to meet the requirements of the new standards with regard to:
a. School board requirements.
b. Student needs requirements.
c. Curriculum requirements.

5. To determine what actions are anticipated or planned by school districts in order to meet the requirements of the new standards with regard to:
   a. School board requirements.
   b. Student needs requirements.
   c. Curriculum requirements.

6. To determine the specific plan of action and time table which the subjects have established to meet the requirements of the new educational standards.

7. To determine if the subjects perceive their district as taking action prior to the implementation of the new standards to:
   a. Reorganize with another district.
   b. Participate in a cooperative or shared program with another district(s).

8. To determine what long-range effects on school district reorganization will take place due to the new educational standards as viewed by the subjects.
9. To determine with respect to all of the above dimensions of the new standards, the extent of differences between the respondents from:
   a. Public school districts with populations of fewer than 500 students.
   b. Public school districts with populations of 500-999 students.
   c. Public school districts with populations of 1000 or more students.

**Need for the Study**

Since public school superintendents are ultimately responsible for the education of all students in their respective school districts, the short and long-range effects of the new school standards are major concerns to them. The need exists for an in-depth study to determine the current thinking of educators towards the changing school standards. How the local superintendents view these changes and what future actions they take will have a major effect on the shape of Iowa's education in the 1990's. As key educational leaders, the direction they take to meet the challenges and implications is critical. The overall impact of the new standards on their school district is equally important. These changing standards may have a major influence on future school district reorganization and
consolidation and the possible elimination of some existing public school systems.

Limitations of the Study

The following limitations of the study are to be noted:

1. This study involved the analysis of the educational impact of the 1987 Iowa Department of Education school standards as viewed by the public school superintendents of northeast Iowa. A survey instrument was designed and mailed to the 114 public school superintendents. The restriction of the population of the study to this public was clearly a limiting factor. The inclusion of the entire state of Iowa in the study would have provided additional pertinent information. However, the public school districts located in the northeast and north-central quarter of Iowa do represent an adequate cross-section of the entire state. The inclusion of the presidents of boards of education, principals, teachers, and parents would have furnished additional pertinent information. However, according to the stated purposes of the study, the superintendents could best supply the specific information desired.

2. The fact that the instrument pre-supposes a certain familiarity with a given terminology regarding the
nature of the study was also a limitation of the study. By using a mailed survey to secure the views of superintendents, the survey results were dependent upon the perceptivity of the respondents and the willingness of the respondents to complete the questionnaire. The validity of the items included in the instrument and the over-all construction of the instrument were also factors. The personal interview technique, conducted with more than 10 percent of the respondents, did reduce the effects of this limitation as this allowed for a more in-depth investigation of the subject. The superintendent were knowledgeable of the subject of the study but the recent revisions and adaptations by the state legislature may have resulted in some confusion. A pilot study of twenty superintendents, central office administrators, area education agency personnel, and educators from school districts in Iowa was conducted to test the validity of the survey instrument prior to the main study. The suggestions received from this group of educators were extremely helpful in the addition, revision, and deletion of a number of specific questionnaire items.

3. A third limitation of the study was that the survey nature of the study made it necessary to limit the scope of the investigation to a given number of alternatives. The necessity of constructing a survey
instrument which would not require an excessive amount of time for the respondents to complete, while still adequately securing the needed information, was a limiting consideration. "Forced choice" responses to all of the items were also a practical requirement with the large population involved. To partially alleviate this criticism, space was provided on the survey form for respondents to comment on the effects of the new educational standards mentioned in the questionnaire as well as any other alternatives which were not mentioned in the questionnaire.

4. In this survey of the views of superintendents regarding the educational impact of the new school standards, the respondents were not specifically asked whether they favored or opposed all of the new educational standards. In some respects, the omission of these fundamental questions could be considered a limitation of the study. The rationale for excluding questions as "Do you favor or oppose the new educational standards?" was as follows. Many public school superintendents appeared to have strong opinions concerning the new educational standards. These respondents could reply rather easily with a "Yes" or "No" answer, but the same number of respondents would object to such questions which contained no qualifying elements. Many of the superintendents might oppose or
favor some of the new standards but not all of the standards. Therefore, since such direct questions might be difficult for many of the respondents to answer and their response subject to interpretation, questions of such a direct nature were not included in the questionnaire. The respondents were asked to indicate their agreement or disagreement to two general statements. "The new educational standards will have a great positive impact on the existing school program in your district" and "The new educational standards will have a great negative impact on the existing school program in your district." Further, such direct questions might be threatening to superintendents who were promised in the cover letter of the questionnaire that their answers would be held in strict confidence and that no attempt would be made to identify them. Such direct questions might suggest to the respondents that obtaining such information might be the real purpose of the entire study. It was decided that ample evidence of what impact the new educational standards might have on the respondents and school districts could be obtained in a less threatening manner.

Design of the Study

Procedures
Selection of the Subjects

The subjects in this study are from the 114 public school districts in northeast and north-central Iowa. This geographic area comprises that part of the State of Iowa which is bounded on the east by the Mississippi River; on the north by the State of Minnesota; on the west by the western boundaries of the counties of Winnebago, Hancock, Wright, Hamilton, and Story; and on the south by the southern boundaries of the counties of Story, Marshall, Tama, Benton, Linn, Jones, and Jackson. These 114 districts represent a total of 26 percent of the 436 public school districts in the state of Iowa. The subjects included the superintendents of these 114 school districts. For the purposes of this study the subjects were divided into three general subgroups:

1. Superintendents from districts with student populations of fewer than 500 students (Group A).
2. Superintendents from districts with student populations of 500-999 students (Group B).
3. Superintendents from districts with student populations of 1000 or more students (Group C).

A listing of the public school districts located in the thirty county area of northeast and
north-central Iowa, with the enrollment for the 1987-1988 school year can be found in Table A-1, A-2, and A-3 in Appendix A. These 114 school districts include rural and urban school systems with student populations ranging from 132 in the Steamboat Rock Community School District to 17,348 in the Cedar Rapids Community School District. The source for obtaining the enrollments and names of the public school superintendents involved in this study was the *Iowa Educational Directory, 1987-1988 School Year*.

**Development of the Survey Form**

The information for this study was collected by use of a questionnaire developed by the writer and the interview process. The survey technique was used in order to collect information from a large number of public school superintendents. The items for the questionnaire were developed by the writer after extensive study of the proposed new educational standards, which were adopted by the Iowa Department of Education on May 8, 1987. Further study of current literature on this subject and recent research projects dealing with new standards and educational reforms throughout the nation, were also helpful in developing the items of the questionnaire.
The questionnaire was field tested by a group of twenty public school educators. This group consisted of three superintendents, five area education agency staff members, four representatives of educational interest groups, two Department of Education staff members, and six school administrators. This group reviewed and criticized the questionnaire for its length, format, clarity, and content validity, and offered suggestions as to the readability of the individual items and the advisability of adding, changing, or eliminating items.

Format of the Questionnaire
The first page of the questionnaire was a cover letter which described the purpose of the study and asked for the cooperation of the recipients in promptly completing the questionnaire. The letter emphasized that all answers would be held in strict confidence and that no attempt would be made to identify any of the respondents. The importance of the study was also stressed to the recipients since the results would provide insight into the overall effects of the new standards on existing school programs in Iowa. A page with two letters was enclosed, the first from the Executive Director of the School Administrators of Iowa (SAI), the second from the Northeast Iowa Chairman of
the Rural Schools of Iowa (RSI). Both letters encouraged the superintendents to cooperate with the study and to consider responding to the questionnaire.

The main part of the questionnaire contained two sections. The first section requested information as to the population of the district, the superintendent’s total number of years of experience as a superintendent, and the number of years as superintendent in the present district. A question was also asked as to whether the superintendent served in the role of a principal as this was directly affected by one of the new educational standards. The second section of the questionnaire sought information as to the respondents’ views as to the overall impact, the plans or changes anticipated by their district, and the degree of difficulty involved for their district in complying to each specific new educational standard.

**Information Requested on the Questionnaire.**

Part A of the questionnaire asked the respondents to provide the following information: (1) enrollment of the school district; (2) number of years as superintendent; (3) number of years as superintendent in the present district; (4) whether the respondent also serves as a principal in addition to the role of
superintendent: (5) if the answer to question number 4 was yes, what level of principal.

The next section, Part B, contained questions specifically aimed at measuring the overall impact of the new standards; the degree of difficulty in meeting the standards; and the changes, plans, and anticipated shared programs or reorganizations for the respective districts.

The Likert-type scale was used for a majority of the questions with respondents having a choice of answers on a five point scale varying from "No difficulty" to "Great hardship" and from "Strongly agree" to "Strongly disagree." The respondents were asked to identify which of the new standards would have a great impact on the existing educational program in their district and to identify the three standards which would have the greatest impact. The respondents were also encouraged to attach any plan; list any changes already made; and to answer questions concerning long-range effects with regard to reorganization, consolidation, or cooperative and shared programs. A space was provided to add any additional comments regarding the effects of the new educational standards on their school district.

A copy of the questionnaire used in this study can be found in Appendix B.
The Interview Process

The interview provided a more in-depth, comprehensive look at the overall impact of the new standards as viewed by the sample group. In addition to verifying the results of the survey, the interview provided the opportunity to probe more deeply into what was the major impact of the new standards. The interview also allowed for a more detailed analysis of the impact and more specific information as to future plans, programs, and directions.

The interview process involved approximately ten percent of the respondents. A total of twelve respondents were interviewed, four from each of the three subgroups. The superintendents who were interviewed represented a cross-section of the respondents with regard to administrative experience and the length of years as superintendent at their present district, as well as the size of their district. A table of random numbers was used to select the two more-experienced and the two lesser-experienced superintendents to interview from each subgroup. Charles Hopkins' Understanding Educational Research was the source used for that selection.

Collection of the Data
The questionnaires were mailed on April 11, 1988. A stamped reply envelope addressed to the investigator was sent with each questionnaire. Respondents were asked to return the completed questionnaire as soon as possible. On April 28, 1988, a follow-up post card was sent to all superintendents who had not responded, urging them to complete and return the questionnaire.

**Questionnaire Returns**

Questionnaires were sent to the 114 public school superintendents of northeast and north-central Iowa. Questionnaires returned by superintendents numbered 86 or 75 percent response. The number of questionnaires that were mailed, and the number and percent of questionnaires that were returned from the superintendents are shown by population groups in Table 1.

Interviews were conducted by telephone between May 23 and May 31, 1988. The length of the interviews varied from ten to twenty minutes.

**Treatment of the Data**

As the returns were received from the superintendents, the information on the survey forms was recorded. Frequencies for every response were then tabulated. Percentages of selected responses were also computed. To compare the results of the responses to
Table 1

Public School Superintendents of Northeast Iowa Who Completed and Returned the Survey Instrument, by Number and Per Cent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PUBLIC SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group A: Small Districts (N=28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Questionnaires Mailed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Questionnaires Completed and Returned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the questionnaire, the frequencies of the responses were changed to percentages. The analyses involved the comparison of the responses for the three subgroups of respondents, which were determined by the student population of the school district. A group mean was calculated for the responses on the survey. An analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to determine relationship between the three subgroups with regard to the following factors:

1. The overall positive and negative impact of the new educational standards on the existing school program.

2. The degree of difficulty involved by the districts in meeting each of the new educational standards.

The other analyses in this study are basically descriptive in nature indicating how the superintendents responded to each questionnaire item. Responses to the questionnaire items are reported by number and percent.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

This chapter presents a national overview of the reform movement with regard to changing educational standards. It examines national trends and the recent reforms of the state of Arkansas, since these changes are somewhat similar to those of the state of Iowa. In addition, for the state of Iowa, it traces the recent history of educational reform, the newly mandated educational standards, school district reorganization and sharing trends, and reactions to the new standards by a variety of interest groups. Summaries of two previous studies on the new Iowa educational standards pertinent to this investigation are also included.

A National Overview of the Reform Movement andChanging Educational Standards

The National Commission on Excellence reports and the other recent national educational reports have brought "excellence" to a point where it could rival Sputnik as a goal for United States education.1 By

1984, 250 state task forces had been established to review present educational practices.\(^2\) The majority of the responsibility for educational change fell upon the state government. In the United States in 1984, there were forty million public school students and 15,000 school districts. These districts were directed by 80,000 school trustees and employed 2.1 million teachers at the cost of $120 billion each year. As a result, it became critical for the fifty governors, the fifty chief state heads (directors of education), and the 7,000 state legislators to focus their interest towards education.\(^3\) The "New Federalism" of Ronald Reagan also forced the states into an educational policy of self-reliance.

As a result, a flurry of educational activity has taken place at the state legislative level mandating higher educational standards and requirements. Many of the earlier changes were focused at the high school as the initial reform reports emphasized the need for improvements at that level. Since 1980, 45 states and


the District of Columbia have altered their high school graduation requirements, and more than 40 states also have increased the total number of units required for graduation. The average number of units required for graduation has been raised from 17 to nearly 20, with the states of Florida and Missouri requiring 24. At the same time there has been an increase in the number of states that provided for a dual-track diploma, that is, a college-bound or vocational-technical diploma in addition to a standard diploma. Only New York and the District of Columbia had this requirement in 1980. Now 15 states have such requirements. 4

The increased state control of education is also reflected in the myriad of rules and laws that have an impact on the high school curriculum, students, and teachers. Twenty-one states now mandate the passing of minimum competency tests in the basic-skill areas prior to graduation. Another nine states have implemented "No Pass, No Play" rules for extra curricular participation to force students to take academic work seriously. Since 1980, math requirements have been increased in 42 states; science in 36 states; social studies in 29 states; language arts/English in 18 states; and computer literacy in 10 states. "In

---

general, it appears that all states are adding more specificity to high school curricular mandates." 5

In a 1986 report Rex Hagens and Leslie Crohn followed up on an earlier Education Commission of the States (ECS) fifty-state study on educational reforms. They found that one of the most prominent approaches to school improvement was state policy actions. States tended to use three types of actions: 1) the establishment of new or revised state standards; 2) a re-emphasis on modification of required accreditation procedures; and 3) special school improvement projects.

State standards and regulations are one of the broad strategies employed to improve the quality of education. This study by ECS has been interested in curriculum improvement. It also targeted the content of curriculum and the assessment of results at both the district and state levels. This requires establishing state standards and regulations for a curriculum that provides "common learning" for all standards in an area of inquiry. "The center of attention here will be state standards for what is to be taught as a state strategy for school improvement... Research would suggest that the tighter the connection between state, district, and building curriculum standards, the higher

5Ibid., p. 27.
the likelihood that positive student outcomes will be achieved.\textsuperscript{6}

This report also addressed the unresolved issues of the negative effects of raised standards. Will implementing raised curriculum standards in response to recent reform commissions and studies result in increased drop-out rates and more problems with discipline, violence, and vandalism?\textsuperscript{7}

A 1984 ECS study entitled \textit{Education Finance in the States} examined eight states where major educational reform programs had been adopted. Although much of the early reform action began in the southeast states, Arkansas, California, Florida, Illinois, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Utah were the focus of this study. The areas of study included: 1) longer school days; 2) longer school years; 3) stiffer high school graduation requirements; 4) testing requirements; 5) pre-school kindergarten for the disadvantaged child; and 6) programs for at-risk students. Who pays for the reforms was a major focus of this report. The authors concluded that the overall strength of the reforms was based on the state's fiscal health, which for the eight states in question was


\textsuperscript{7}Ibid., p. 32.
Arkansas Educational Reforms

The reform movement that began in 1983 in Arkansas is similar to action that has taken place in Iowa. In late 1983 a special legislative session in Arkansas passed a major educational reform package funded mainly by a one percent sales tax increase. At the time, Arkansas ranked forty-sixth in the nation in per pupil expenditures and forty-eighth in average teacher salaries.

The previous year the Arkansas Supreme Court had declared the state school finance plan unconstitutional. The Quality Education Act created a State Standards Commission to set new standards for the Arkansas public schools. Governor Bill Clinton appointed his wife as chairperson of the commission. In early 1984, the Standards Commission made final recommendation for new standards. The major elements included:

1. High school graduation requirements were increased from 16 to 20 courses.

---

2. The maximum elementary class size was to be 23.

3. The school year for students was extended from 175 to 180 days.

4. The length of the school day was extended from five to five and one-half instructional hours.

5. The teacher contract year was extended from 180 to 190 days.

6. A minimum competency test was implemented in the 3rd, 6th, and 8th grade with a passing grade as a requirement to be promoted to high school.

7. Testing of teachers was implemented.

8. All school districts were required to develop six-year school improvement plans.

9. School finance reform was initiated.

10. Additional funding was provided for extensive in-service for instructional effectiveness.9

In addition, requirements for district policies on discipline and homework, elementary guidance staff, mandatory kindergarten, and increased high school offerings (from 24 to 38 units) were mandated to be in place by 1987.10 The 122 separate measures in the reform legislation included a requirement that if less than 85 percent of a district's students did not meet the state minimum standard, that district must initiate


10Odden and Dougherty, p. 41.
a state-administered school improvement program. Such measures also were intended to force consolidation of districts who failed to meet the minimums.

Seventy percent of the funding increase by the Arkansas legislation was earmarked for teacher salaries. In the first two years, state aid increased 41 percent while local district revenues also increased in more than one-third of the state school districts.11

Specific Reforms – Nationally

The issue of time was the major focus for educational reforms in nearly all of the states. Forty-nine states addressed the issue of the length of the school year. Nearly two-thirds now require approximately 180 days for students, the other one-third have increased the length to 175 days or less.12 A corresponding increase in the number of days for teachers resulted in Arkansas teachers receiving ten more contract days and a number of other states increasing as many as five more days. Forty-five states also increased the length of the school day.

11 Goertz, p. 141.
12 Ibid., p. 22.
The most prevalent length was a five to five and one-half hour day, and the second most prevalent was six hours or more. Seven of the eight states in the 1984 ECS study (including Arkansas, California, Texas, and Florida) have lengthened their school day and school year, but none have had a 20 percent increase as recommended in some of the national reports. Texas attempted to add two hours to the school day, but that was defeated partially because the additional costs would have exceeded $300 million. Florida required all high schools to add a seventh period to their day but many already had that extra time.

More pay for more work has been the common practice in adding school time. As a result, extensions of time have been modest because longer extensions are costly. Instead, many states have "begun to prescribe the objective and content of a core curriculum to be taught in the school."

Special needs students have also received considerable attention by the nation's lawmakers. Nearly all states have addressed the needs of the talented and gifted student. Thirty-four states had set up enrichment programs and summer institutes, and

---

13Odden and Dougherty, p. 23.
14Ibid., p. 25.
15Goertz, p. 24.
eighteen others were considering similar programs. The potential "at risk" student was also a major concern. One of Ohio's major recommendations cited the need to serve students who were "unserved or underserved" and also mentioned "dropout and truant prevention initiatives." Alternative education type programs were frequently required. Pre-school type programs similar to Texas' pre-kindergarten for the disadvantaged child were mandated in nearly every state.

The January, 1986, Fifty State Survey pointed out how prevalent testing standards were across the nation. In 1975, no state had a minimum competency requirement. Forty-two states had implemented student testing requirements or some type of minimum competency by the 1984-85 school year, and two more were starting in the fall of 1985.

The same study showed seventeen states were testing new teachers, and by 1987 that had increased to twenty-seven. Three states at the present time (Arkansas, Georgia, and Texas) also test veteran teachers. The substance and structure of these

---

16 Doyle and Hartle, p. 33.
17 Action in the States: Progress towards Education Renewal, p. 43.
18 Education Week, Dec. 9, 1987, p. 16.
requirements vary widely across the country.

Increased state control is an automatic by-product of the many new state reforms. "Excellence plans", "outcome statements," "on-site evaluations,"
"performance expectations," and "common curricular goals" are all key phrases in much of the reform legislation. Kentucky passed the "academic bankruptcy" bill, which provided state technical assistance to districts failing to meet state standards. Districts that refuse to cooperate were subject to state intervention and possible removal of local school officials. The district was also required to publish annual performance reports and develop improvement plans to correct deficiencies.19

Vermont has required assessment of performance and reports the results to the public. West Virginia has established 12 standards and 145 indicators of educational excellence. Each district must submit "excellence plans" annually, and "on-site evaluations" are required every four years. In Wyoming, testing was not required, but the legislature has funded state-wide assessment by the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) at grades 3, 7, and 11.20

The many state reforms have resulted in a change

19Action in the States: Progress towards Education Renewal p. 41.

20Goertz, p. 137.
of power to the state from the local school districts. Much more state control has resulted as the reforms "envision more student homogenization and regulation of public school norms, standards, and procedures." 21

A major concern of local school administrators was the lack of funds to implement the many reforms. Many times, the strength of the reform was based on the state's fiscal health. Of equal concern was the notion that mandating changes, such as passing a certain test for graduation or requiring three years of high school math and science, would result in legitimate educational reforms. Forest W. Parkay, a noted University of Florida professor, stated, "We must avoid the error of seeking simplistic changes in standards at the expense of genuine excellence. On the other hand, neither must we forget that high educational standards, intelligently developed and sensitively applied, are the best investments in our future." 22

Hagens and Crohn, in their 1986 review of the fifty-state ECS study, referred to the new revised state standards and regulations as one of three broad state strategies that are used to improve the quality of education. Curriculum improvement was a major area

21 Doyle and Hartle, p. 51.

of interest in this study. The targeting of the content of the curriculum and the assessment of results at both the district and school levels was critical. The establishing of state standards and regulations for a curriculum that provides "common learning" for all standards was a special area of need.\textsuperscript{23}

The authors also addressed, as problems yet to be resolved, the possible negative effects of raising standards. The implementation of higher curriculum standards in response to the recent reform commissions and studies could easily result in increasing drop-out rates and related problems such as discipline, violence, and vandalism. As a result, the question of whether new state standards will have positive effect for all students, including those generally described as at-risk, still needs to be answered.

Minimum Educational Standards in Iowa

The state of Iowa also reacted to the call of the "Nation at Risk" and the other educational reform reports. In July, 1983, the Iowa Legislative Council, an executive committee of the Iowa Legislature, created the Excellence in Education Task Force. This body conducted an in-depth study of the state's education system and set an agenda for Iowa education for the next decade. On July 28, 1983, the first meeting was

\textsuperscript{23}Hagans and Crohn, p. 9-11.
held, with members setting up six subcommittees to work in six different areas. Fifty-four individuals served on the Task Force and after fourteen months the final report, entitled First in the Nation in Education (FINE), was published in October, 1984.

The findings of the Task Force stated that Iowa had a "comparatively good kindergarten through grade 12 education system." They did not recommend casting out the present system and starting anew. Rather they observed that a base existed from which excellence could be constructed if a considerable number of changes, some of these significant, would be implemented. The introduction of the FINE report stated clearly that the present decentralized public and non-public educational structure was sound and should be retained, but it should be supplemented at the state level by more extensive and clearly defined standards.

The report further emphasized the strength of Iowa's teacher corps, but also stated a need for stronger teacher preparation programs, stricter certification requirements, longer contracts, effective evaluation systems, and substantial pay increases. A rigorous general academic education that stressed

---

intellectual skills and competencies was given the top priority.

The Task Force report did not recommend competency tests, nor a merit-pay plan, nor a school reorganization plan. Instead it issued 162 recommendations that it believed would bring about needed improvements in the Iowa educational system.25

The 1985 session of the Iowa General Assembly passed House File 686. Section four of that statute dealt with the question of "standards for approved schools." This statute reads as follows:

Commencing July 1, 1985, the state board shall review the standards contained in section 257.25, shall review current literature relating to effective schools and learning environments, and shall consult with representatives from the higher education institutions, area education agencies, school board members, school administrators, teachers, parents, students, members of business, industry and labor, other governmental agencies, associations interested in education, and representatives of communities of various sizes to develop standards for approved schools and school districts that encompass, but are not limited to the following areas:

1. Objectives and assessment procedures for teaching specific competencies related to higher order thinking skills, learning skills, and communication skills.

2. Integration of the applications of current technologies into the general curriculum.

3. Procedures for curriculum development and refinement.

4. Staff development processes.

5. A performance evaluation process for personnel.

25Ibid., p. 59.
6. Use of support staff.

7. A specific number of hours per year for students to be engaged in formal academic instruction.

8. Learning opportunities for students whose needs are not met in the conventional classroom.

9. Career exploration activities and specific vocational education programs.

10. Curriculum standards that include the coordination of extracurricular and academic education goals.

11. Student responsibility and discipline policies.

12. Needs assessments and development of long-range plans as provided for in section 280.12.

13. Community and parent involvement in the education process.

14. Communication with business, industry, labor, and higher education regarding their expectations for adequate student preparation.26

The law further stated that the state board should adopt new standards for approved schools not later than July 1, 1987. School districts were then required to meet those standards by July 1, 1989. Following the adoption, the Department of Public Instruction was to assist schools and school districts to comply with the standards. The state board, in consultation with the board of directors, was to determine not later than July 1, 1989, on the basis of evidence submitted by the school districts, that school districts meet the standards.

approval standards.

Thereafter, the state board shall require that once every three years schools and school districts submit evidence that they meet the approval standards. A procedure that focuses on data collection and on-site review was to be used. Schools that do not meet the standards will be given time to adjust their programs. Failure to do so could result in school districts being attached to a neighboring district.

In response to the mandate, the State Board appointed a task force composed of presidents and state organizations representing school administrators, teachers, boards, non-public schools, higher education, and parents. In addition, three state board members and an administrator from the state department also served.

Since the current school standards had been in effect since 1967, numerous meetings of the Task Force were necessary to come up with new accreditation standards for Iowa schools. A Department of Education in-house committee and the director also made suggestions for items to be included.

In April, 1987, the State Board of Education presented its final draft for discussion purposes at sixteen informational meetings scheduled throughout the state.
After explaining the standards and receiving input from teachers, administrators, school board members, and the general public, the state board then reviewed the issues and questions raised. They then prepared a draft for final consideration to meet the mandated legislative requirement to revise the education standards for approved schools of the state, "not later than July 1, 1987."27

A notice of intended action was then filed by the state board to adopt the Accreditation Standards for Iowa Schools as Administrative Rules. This process took nearly 120 days and involved official publication, public hearings, review by the administrative rules committee of the General Assembly, and review and approval by the Governor.

Recent Legislative Action

The 1988 Iowa state legislative session brought about considerable discussion as to the final shape of the new educational standards. The conference committee of the Iowa House and Senate and the Iowa Board of Education worked together for four months to modify the standards into a more acceptable final form. Attempts were made by opposing forces to delay their implementation for a year, but the Iowa House rejected

27Ibid., p. 111.
that effort by a 52-43 vote.28

The Iowa Board of Education had earlier abandoned the standard which would have required each school district to provide pre-kindergarten programs with the start of the 1992 school year. They also pushed back the every-day kindergarten mandate three years, requiring it for the 1992 school year.

The legislative conference committee recommended modifications to three of the most objectionable standards, and following that compromise both houses of the legislature voted with only one dissenting vote to adopt the standards to become effective July 1, 1989.

The standards which were modified were:

1. The implementation of the increase in vocational education units from 5 to 10 was delayed until an interim committee studies the issue and reports to the General Assembly. Legislative action is then required to make any changes in the current requirements.

2. Three standards were delayed for one year, until 1990, and then given a one year waiver period in which the individual schools may apply to the Department of Education to request a one year exemption until 1991. Those standards were: 1) The prohibition of a superintendent from serving as a principal;

2) establishment of a media center; and 3) requirement of a certified media specialist.

3. The requirement of a certified elementary guidance counselor will go into effect in 1989, but individual school districts may apply for a waiver for the first year and may have that waiver renewed one more year.

4. The total number of curricular units was increased from 27 to 36, rather than the original 41 units.

The every-day kindergarten standard remains effective in 1992, but will be studied extensively for the 1989, 1990, and 1991 legislature to take further action. The Legislative Fiscal Bureau will study the availability of space, staff, materials, and transportation needs involved. The interim committee will explore the issue of the needs of young children for every-day kindergarten.29

Educational Excellence Act of 1987

A major educational impetus for Iowa's schools and teachers was the result of action taken by the 1987 Iowa General Assembly. Iowa Governor Terry Branstad in his State of the State address outlined the plan, which he called A Commitment to Excellence in Iowa's

29School Administrators of Iowa, Bulletin Board, April, 1988, p. 2.
He insisted on adequate funding for making education a top priority in Iowa. The Education Excellence Act provided $90 million to increase salaries for the teachers of Iowa. This action was prompted by the recommendations of the Educational Excellence Task Force and the FINE report of 1984. This action established a three phase program. Phase One allocated nearly $10 million to allow each school district to bring the minimum salary for teachers to $18,000. Phase Two provided $39 million for teacher's salaries allocated to each district on the basis of actual head count. These funds were equally divided among all teachers. Phase Three emphasized performance. Fifty million dollars was allocated to school districts to be distributed to teachers on the basis of locally developed supplemental or performance-based pay plans.30

Future Educational Changes in Iowa

The question of new educational standards and school district reorganization are very closely related. There may be a cause and effect relationship in that the inability of some school districts to meet the standards could force them into cooperative or sharing arrangements with neighboring districts. Such

30Terry Branstad, A Commitment to Excellence in Iowa's Schools, Iowa Department of Education (Des Moines, Ia.: January, 1987).
arrangements could as a result lead to future reorganization or consolidation.

The State Board of Education report, entitled "Shapes for the Future, Plans for Restructuring Iowa’s Educational Delivery System", outlined four alternatives for future school reorganization. The four alternatives included:

1. A minimum enrollment plan with 1,000 students.

2. A county-like school system plan where there would be 99 districts.

3. A managed change plan including a process of natural progression.

4. A restructuring commission plan where the authority would rest with the State Board of Education.31

No action was taken by the 1988 Iowa General Assembly on the issue of school district reorganization. It appears likely this will be a major topic for next year’s legislative calendar. At the present time, 77 percent of Iowa’s public school districts have fewer than 1,000 students, while more than one-half have fewer than 600 students. Fifty-two of these districts serve fewer than 250 students. Any of the State Board plans previously outlined would be

extremely controversial.

Another factor that should have a major effect on the school districts of Iowa in the future is a new school funding formula. The Legislative Council has authorized the expenditure of $40,000 to fund an initial study by the School Finance Study Committee to develop a Request for Proposal (RFP) for a full scale study on school funding in Iowa. The Committee is currently working with the Education Commission of the States (ECS) and education consultants. The Legislative Council has also authorized the expenditure of $100,000 for the full scale study. The present mandated state funding formula has been repealed effective June 30, 1991, so a new plan must be in effect by that date. The Rural Schools of Iowa Inc. organization has expressed concern as to the direction and format that the new formula develops. "It is obvious that the new school standards and the new funding formula will have to go hand in hand. Unless additional funding is directed towards many small districts, they will find it very difficult to comply with the new standards and will be forced to consolidate or reorganize in order to retain their accreditation." 32

The Iowa Association of School Boards (IASB) also

32Ibid., p.5.
has expressed concern with regard to school reorganization. At their January, 1988, Delegate Assembly they passed a resolution to establish a committee of school officials from various-sized school districts to make recommendations to the Legislature on school reorganization. IASB also stated it supported legislation that would provide incentives for the restructuring of Iowa's schools through sharing or reorganization.

Reorganization of Iowa's Public Schools - An Overview

During Iowa's early history, one-room rural schools dotted the state's prairies. They were located on an acre of land in the middle of every four square miles. In the early 1900's township consolidations began to replace one-room schools. The first consolidation law was passed in 1906 and was followed in 1913 by a law that provided for standards and inspections of consolidated districts as a provision for receiving state aid. In the 1950's and 1960's, consolidations gave way to reorganizations into larger units. Most one-room schools had been closed by that time. From 1955-56 to 1960-61, Department of Education figures indicate that the number of districts was reduced from 4,142 to 1,575.33

Finally, legislation was passed in 1965 which mandated that all districts must be in high school districts by July 1, 1966, or be attached to one by the county board of education. Since then several reorganizations have taken place until presently there are only 436 school districts in existence.

Iowa's 436 school districts enrolled nearly one-half million students in kindergarten through grade 12 during the 1987-88 school year. Lineville-Clio, the smallest school district, enrolled 95 students, while Des Moines, the largest school district, enrolled 30,309. The 32 largest school districts in the state enrolled about 45 percent of the total enrollment. Included in the enrollment figures were nearly 43,000 students who were enrolled in special education programs. In addition, nearly 50,000 students (approximately ten percent of the total) attended the 226 approved non-public schools of the state.

The 1986-87 school year was the 17th consecutive year the Iowa schools had experienced enrollment declines. The peak enrollment year in Iowa's public schools was 659,989 in the 1969-70 school year. Enrollment declines since then have ranged annually from one to three and one-half percent. The overall decline of more than 175,000 students represents nearly a 27 percent loss.34

34Ibid., pp. 4-5.
The Seventy-First Iowa General Assembly in 1985 addressed the issue of school district reorganization and other critical educational issues for the state. The legislature passed Senate File 78 and Governor Terry Branstad signed it into law. In essence, the law amended the educational section of the code of Iowa by stating that the "State Board of Education shall develop and adopt a five-year plan for the achievement of common and significant educational goals in Iowa and shall update the plan annually and issue an annual report of progress...."35

In response to this statute's provisions, the state board members invited representatives of thirteen educational and lay constituencies to join them in forming "The Five-Year State Plan Task Force." This group met monthly and developed a draft document for review by members of the educational community and the general public. After a comprehensive review, including nine public hearings, a final document entitled "Renewing the Commitment: A Plan for Quality Education in Iowa" was adopted.

This plan outlined seven major goals for the Iowa educational system. To meet these goals, the task force set up specific activities which needed to be implemented to achieve each specific goal. Two of

these activities addressed the question of state standards for approved schools and a procedure for the accreditation of public and non-public schools. The first goal sought to increase student learning and achievement regardless of sex, race, religion ... or geographic location. Activity 1.11 stated that by July 1, 1987, the State Board should adopt new standards for approved schools, and by July 1, 1989 school districts must meet those standards. Activity 1.12 stated that by July 1, 1989, the State Board of Education will develop and adopt a procedure for the accreditation of public and non-public elementary-secondary school districts.36

1985 Legislative Action

The sixth goal of the task force was to develop more productive and effective use of both financial and human resources in the state's educational system. In the background statement for this goal, the task force mentioned the increased interest in school district improvement by enlarging districts in the early 1940's. It stated that the Department of Education continued to receive inquiries during the war years as to how school districts might be combined. The report indicated that forty years later the situation remained

36Ibid., p. 5.
essentially the same. The Department continued to receive inquiries on ways of enlarging school districts to provide more pupils, fewer schools, better educational opportunities, and lower school costs. Department staff have encouraged school districts to study various options, such as sharing staff and programs, as well as reorganizing, to provide quality instructional programs.

The activities outlined by this goal of "more productive and effective use of financial and human resources" mandated that local districts establish economy task forces and conduct management audits. They also encouraged districts to conduct studies to determine the amount of classroom time spent on non-instructional activities and to develop school improvement exchange practices. Another activity required the State Board, by July 1, 1987, to develop plans relating to the restructuring of local school districts. These plans were to be reported to the General Assembly by October 1, 1987.

School Sharing Plans in Iowa

Declining enrollments in Iowa's public schools have made it necessary for the Department of Education to encourage school districts to study various options. Reorganizing is one option, but a more popular approach in recent years has been the sharing of staffs and programs by two or more districts. A total of 127
districts in 1984-85 and 164 districts in 1985-86 were involved in program or staff sharing. By the 1987-88 school year that number had increased to 272 districts. In addition, 166 school districts were involved in cooperative student participation programs in nine different sports, and another twenty districts were involved in whole grade sharing agreements at the high school level.

To encourage participation in cooperative and sharing programs for teachers, administrators, and curricular offerings, the state has added a supplementary weighting plan to provide additional funds to districts. This was initiated by the General Assembly for the 1981-82 school year. Since the initial year, when the supplemental weighting was 91.2, it has increased to a 1987-88 total of 1,409.1.

The supplementary weighting plan provides .1 weighting times the percent of time a student spends in a shared time program. Pupils attending classes in another school district, attending classes taught by a teacher jointly employed, or attending classes taught by a teacher who is employed by another school.

37Ibid., p. 16.

district, are all eligible for shared time weighting. This weighting increases to .5 if the School Budget Committee determines that sharing would not be implemented without the additional weighting. The 1986 General Assembly has placed a five year limitation on the number of years a school district can receive the extra weighting. Supplemental weightings of .05 per student for shared administrators, but not principals, were established in 1986 for the 1987-88 school year. The maximum individual school district weight is fifteen. If more than two districts are involved, the maximum cumulative weight is 25 for a single administrative position.39

The shared administrators program involved 33 superintendents and 67 school districts in the 1987-88 school year. In addition, there were a variety of cooperative administrative arrangements in 89 Iowa districts involving administrative assistants, curriculum directors, personnel directors, athletic and activities directors, business managers, and assistant superintendents. The subjects that are involved range from basic math, social studies, English, and science courses to every foreign language (including Japanese), advanced calculus, cosmetology, geriatric aide training, 

advanced computing, and principles of industrial
technology. Whole grade sharing programs, some
involving one way and others two way arrangements, are
presently working in 42 Iowa school districts. The
sharing arrangements for the 1987-88 have involved 62
percent of Iowa districts (272 of 436). The total
supplemental full-time equivalency (FTE) weighting was
2407.8. In the short span of seven years, the
cooperative sharing program between districts has grown
to be a very active method for increasing productivity
and providing more extensive educational services for
the young people of Iowa.

Recent Reactions to the Educational Standards

The extensive overhaul of the Iowa educational
standards was not accepted wholeheartedly by all
educators nor the public they serve. At the public
hearings held in the spring of 1987, there was
considerable opposition from parents to some of the
proposed standards. Some parents and many school
officials believed the rules were designed to force
consolidation. One standard, requiring all school
districts to establish a health program to promote
social, physical, and emotional well-being of students,
was met with considerable opposition by parents.

40Iowa Legislative Interim Committee,
Non-public school officials also voiced concern about this standard because they felt the proposed health programs would dispense contraceptives to students and advocate abortion. 41

Critics contend that the standards intrude on local authority and control and are a backdoor way to force small districts to merge. "Iowa has been known for years for having one of the best public education systems in the country," stated one superintendent of schools from a small school district. "Now it seems that everybody wants to get into the act and they are going to tinker with the thing until they break it." 42

The cost of implementing the new standards was also a major concern. Boyd Boehlje, president of the Iowa Association of School Boards (IASB) asked for the standards to be re-examined due to the high cost and the concern that the General Assembly would not provide additional revenue to pay for the costs. Des Moines school board president, Betty Grundberg, estimated that the changes would cost her school district more than $18 million. Bill Behan of the Iowa Farm Bureau Federation expressed concern that it would

---


be too costly to implement the new standards and the end result would then be wholesale school reorganization. He stated, "The implications of these changes are far-reaching ... and have the potential to dramatically impact the structure and make-up of Iowa's school districts." 43

AIEA Survey on the Standards

The Association of Iowa Educational Administrators (AIEA) in their February, 1986, newsletter sent out a survey in an effort to get direct feedback from their members with regard to the new Iowa educational standards. This association includes superintendents, principals and assistant principals, curriculum directors, and other central office administrators. The 822 administrators who responded to the survey were divided as follows: superintendents - 28.5 percent; junior-senior high school principals - 34.4 percent; elementary and middle school principals -27.7 percent; others- less than 10 percent. These responses represented a cross-section of every different size public school district in Iowa.

The largest response came from districts of 1000-2499 students - 25.1 percent, followed by districts of 600-999 students - 20.3 percent, 400-599 students - 15.4 percent, 2500-3499 students - 14.9

43 Bullard, p. 5.
percent, 250-399 students - 10.4 percent, others - 13.9 percent. Slightly more than two percent of the responses were from non-public school administrators. The respondents were asked to read statements regarding the development of new state standards in Iowa. They were then asked to respond, using a five-choice scale of strongly agree, agree, disagree, strongly disagree, and I do not have enough information to give an opinion.

The AIEA survey did not probe as to specific standards, but rather questioned administrators as to what criteria and ingredients should determine the direction of the standards. Among the questions which received the greatest amount of agreement were general philosophical types of statements. On a four-point scale, the following statements scored the highest:

1. Standards should be developed which recognize teachers and learners as the center of the educational process. (3.58)

2. Standards should specify a core that all should acquire, but within this core, there should be allowances for diversity. (3.46)

3. Encouragement should be given for schools to demonstrate their uniqueness while meeting new standards. (3.43)

4. Educational standards should require a program for effective school level leadership development. (3.29)

5. There should be autonomy for school or district staff to develop their own standards within state standard guidelines. (3.29)
6. A three-phase standard which would allow districts to move toward improvement over time should be considered. (3.14)

Only one statement received a composite score lower than 2.0, which indicated an average response between "disagree" = 2, and "strongly disagree" = 1. "New standards should mandate state-wide student competency testing" scored 1.80, the lowest of the 21 inquiries. Other low scores which averaged in the middle of the "agree" to "disagree" scale were:

1. Current school standards are adequate to promote educational excellence in our state. (2.44)
2. Current school standards are adequate to meet the needs of students in our state. (2.50)
3. Measurable student performance standards should be specified. (2.50)
4. New standards should reflect a requirement for minimum district size in terms of student enrollment. (2.63)
5. Measurable system performance standards should be specified. (2.64)

The statement, "State action regarding standards should encourage rather than mandate district improvement." scored 2.97 or near at the 3.0 scale of "agree." 44

P.U.R.E.-Iowa Farm Bureau Survey

An April, 1987, survey sponsored by the People United for Rural Education (P.U.R.E.) and the Iowa Farm

44 Tom Budnik, "Iowa School Standards Revision Survey Results, "AIEA Newsletter, April, 1986, p. 4.
Bureau asked Iowa superintendents to respond to three questions on each of the 21 proposed standards and to consider each as though it was to be implemented in the 1987-88 school year. The three questions were:

1. Is your school district already in compliance?

2. What is the estimated additional cost of complying with this proposed standard in your district?

3. In your opinion, how important is the proposed change to the goal of improving educational quality? (1 = very important; 2 = somewhat important; 3 = not important; or 4 undecided.)

Over one-half (51 percent) of the state's 436 school districts responded to the survey.

Responses

Superintendents indicated that one of the most important proposed standards required school boards to adopt a performance evaluation process for school personnel. Other proposed standards rated important included one requiring an on-going needs assessment for establishing short and long-range plans and goals, and another requiring adoption of discipline policies.

The majority of the respondents indicated that the proposal to require the establishment of a pre-kindergarten program for four-year-olds was not important. Only 34 percent of the administrators responding indicated this the pre-kindergarten standard was important. Fifty-four percent said it was not important and twelve percent were undecided. (The
Department of Education dropped this standard as of January, 1988.

Other proposed standards rated as less significant to the value of improving educational quality included:
1) elimination of the substitution of athletic participation for physical education credit, 2) additional units of vocational education, and 3) an audit of the availability of instructional time for students. In each of these cases, however, a majority of the administrators viewed these standards to be at least somewhat important.

Costs

Not all administrators who responded placed an estimate on the cost of implementing the standards with which they are not currently in compliance. The 223 districts did estimate the total cost at $62 million or more than $275,000 per district. The superintendents indicated the most costly standards to implement would be every-day kindergarten and pre-kindergarten programs. There were 137 administrators who estimated the cost of every-day kindergarten programs at an average cost per district of more than $86,000. Seventy-one administrators indicated their districts were already in compliance with this standard. The average cost of complying with the pre-kindergarten standard was estimated at nearly $89,000 and only 16
many districts indicated there would be additional expenses, not included in their estimates, for facilities and other start-up costs.

Another costly standard to implement, according to the survey, would be the addition of 20 school calendar days for the purpose of staff training. Administrators in 186 districts said they were not in compliance with this standard. The average cost of compliance was estimated at $118,000 per district in those 160 districts for which administrators gave an estimate.

The survey indicated the implementation of the proposed standards would hit hardest at the small school district level. Districts with fewer than 500 pupils were less likely to be in compliance with the proposed standards than were larger districts, and the estimated cost of complying was a higher percentage of their budget. The average estimated cost of complying as a percentage of the budget was almost 8 percent for districts responding with an enrollment above 500 pupils. For the 100 districts responding with fewer than 500 pupils, the estimated cost of complying averaged nearly 11 percent of their budget. Although the cost represented a higher portion of the small district's budget, all districts expressed concern over funding. The five districts with more than 5,000
pupils who responded to the survey indicated the total dollar cost would be over $23 million to implement the standards.

Additional Concerns

Dennis Wood, State Advisor for P.U.R.E. and Superintendent of the Alden Community School District, expressed concerns of the P.U.R.E. members at a public hearing on the proposed changes of the educational standards at Calmar, Iowa on November 4, 1987. He indicated that the standards dictate how the school districts will structure their systems and report to the Department of Education, thus allowing little opportunity to work on the goals of the community. He also expressed concern as to the inconsistency of the state legislature's recent position on administrative expenditures. The recent administration cost controls seemed in contradiction with the new standard which mandates that superintendents cannot also serve as principals. In regard to curriculum, Superintendent Wood indicated school districts were receiving a mixed signal on the standard which increased high school offerings from 27 to 41 units of credit. He stated that the legislature has not been receptive to small schools having small class sizes. The 41 units and a structured gifted and talented program, he stated, would lower class sizes. In concluding his remarks, he stated "Many of our schools face extinction if the
standards are implemented... if we add facilities to comply, we will face a deficit which will cause us to be reorganized, unless the state is willing to pick up the costs of the changes that are implemented. If we do not reach compliance, we face reorganization." 45

Rural Schools of Iowa

The smaller school districts of Iowa in an attempt to protect their interests, organized the Rural Schools of Iowa organization in October, 1987. Membership was open to schools of 1000 students or less and included more than 100 Iowa school districts. The organization officially adopted a purpose statement at its December 28, 1987, meeting which concluded with the intent "to oppose forced reorganization of schools by the imposition of artificially established mandates which do not recognize the established tradition of local control of education." 46 The Board of Directors stated at their December, 1987, meeting that the new standards were being put into effect "less to improve education than to force reorganization and


consolidation by making it economically impossible for small rural school districts to survive." 47 They stated that they also doubted that the Legislature would actually fund the implementation of the new standards. For that reason, they hired two lobbyists to closely monitor legislative action concerning the school standards and the new school funding formula. Their rationale was based on the need for additional funding for small districts or else "small districts will find it very difficult to comply with the new standards and will be forced to consolidate or reorganize in order to retain their accreditation." 48

The Rural Schools of Iowa organization has taken a two-faceted position with regard to the new standards. First, they insist that it is absolutely imperative that the new requirements be funded. Second, the standards should be seen, not so much as an effort to improve the quality of education in Iowa, but as a means to force small school districts to reorganize and consolidate without the legislature having to actually vote on the issue. They further stated that the new mandates, which they say do not recognize "the established tradition of local control," will

47Ibid., p. 3.

themselves force reorganization.\textsuperscript{49} Their lobbying strategy focused on the position that the new standards would increase costs, but would not improve educational quality. In fact, they stated that some provisions of the standards would be educationally and economically harmful to Iowa’s small school districts.

The governing body of the Rural Schools organization, in addition to its wide-spread lobbying efforts at the legislative level, has also considered the courts as a method of resisting the changes in the educational standards. The question is being considered as to whether the broad authority delegated by the Legislature might be viewed as an unconstitutional delegation of legislative power. This power granted to the Department of Education to develop new standards could be questioned as a violation of Article 3, Section 1 of the Iowa Constitution. This action appeared to be a last resort move as the Rural Schools December 23, 1987, memorandum stated, "Such a challenge should only be considered if we cannot make any headway on the rules and if the rules are considered to be so bad that the Rural Schools find they cannot live with them."

Economic Impact Report

On August 19, 1987, the Administrative Rules

\textsuperscript{49}Art Small, \textit{Memorandum regarding Rural Schools of Iowa, Inc.}, December 30, 1987, p. 3.
Review Committee requested the Department of Education to prepare an economic impact statement. It was based on the order requiring the State Board of Education to review standards in Iowa Code Section 256.11 and to adopt rules establishing new standards for accredited schools and school districts. The proposed standards outlined in the new Chapter 4 of the Iowa Code are the minimum requirements that must be met by an Iowa public school district to be accredited and remain in operation. A non-public school must meet the standards if it wishes to be designated as accredited for operation in Iowa. The report was completed and released on January 8, 1988. It was only an estimate and it was based strictly on the school districts of Iowa meeting the minimum requirements. The total annual cost of implementing the standards was estimated to be $78.6 million starting in 1992, when the kindergarten and pre-kindergarten programs were slated to be started. The annual cost in 1989 would be $53 million.

Two proposed standards -- one that sets a minimum school calendar of 180 class days plus 20 more days for other educational purposes, and another that calls for 5 1/2 hours of instruction each day -- would account for annual increases of $29.9 million. The two standards, which were to be in effect July 1, 1992, were estimated to cost $25.6 million ($18.8 - every-day
kindergarten; $6.8 million - pre-kindergarten.) The other major financial increases were the result of the following standards:

* $9.6 million - New curricular requirements. (Additional high school units, four units of a foreign language, ten units of vocational education.)

* $4.3 million - New media center personnel.

* $3.6 million - Certified elementary guidance personnel.

* $3.0 million - Providing programs for at-risk students.

* $2.6 million - To implement the standard requiring that superintendents not serve as principals.

The cost figures were the best assumption of fiscal impact and did not consider the time and opportunity of staff spending time on new required district policies instead of other educational duties. Nor did the figures take into consideration any cost estimate regarding the need for additional facilities.50

REVISIONS IN THE STANDARDS

Financial and educational considerations, as well as the efforts of P.U.R.E. and the Rural Schools of Iowa, resulted in the modification and delaying of some of the more controversial of the new standards. In January, 1988 the Iowa Board of Education rejected the standard requiring that pre-kindergarten classes be offered to four-year-olds. Instead, pilot pre-school programs and financial incentives for districts starting such programs were encouraged. The bulk of the other changes were made by the Iowa General Assembly in the final weeks of the session in April, 1988. The every-day kindergarten standard remained effective in 1992, but would be studied extensively in time for the 1989, 1990, and 1991 legislature to take further action. The Legislative Fiscal Bureau will study the availability of space, staff, materials, and transportation needs involved. An interim committee will explore the issue of needs of young children for every-day, all-day kindergarten.

Delays

The implementation of the increase of vocational education units from 5 to 10 was delayed until an interim committee studies the issue and reports to the General Assembly in 1989. Legislative action will then be required to make any changes in the current requirement. Three standards were delayed for one year.
(1990) and then given a one year waiver period in which individual schools may apply to the Department of Education to request a one year exemption until 1991. These standards are: 1) the prohibition of a superintendent from serving as a principal; 2) establishment of a media center; and 3) requirement of a certified media specialist.

The requirement of having a certified elementary guidance counselor will go into effect in 1989, but individual superintendents may apply for a waiver the first year and may have that waiver renewed one more year. The total number of curricular units will increase from 27 to 36, rather than the originally proposed 41 units. All other standards were adopted by the State Board of Education to become effective on July 1, 1989. The Senate by a 41-0 vote and the House by an 84-1 vote adopted this action on the standards as they were recommended by the conference committee. An earlier attempt to delay all standards for a year was rejected by the House 52-43.

SUMMARY

Considerable information on the status of the educational standards over the last year was provided by Janet Kinney, the governmental relations director

for P.U.R.E., and James Pasut, the Northeast Iowa chairperson for Rural Schools of Iowa. David Bechtel, the chairman of the Steering Committee for Development and Adoption of Standards, and Leland Tack, Chief of the Bureau of Planning, Research, and Development of the Department of Education, both were equally helpful in providing current information about the new educational standards.

The tremors from the "Nation at Risk" report of the President's Commission on Excellence were felt in Iowa as well as across our nation. Education has become a national concern. In the five years since that report, a flurry of action has brought about significant educational changes which should have a lasting effect on education in the 1990's. Iowa, where educational excellence had been taken for granted, was no exception. This study should provide insight into the educational impact of one of the significant changes on the Iowa scene—the new state mandated minimum educational standards. How these changes affect the future of the public school districts of Northeast Iowa will be a major part of this study.
CHAPTER III

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

Introduction

Effective July 1, 1989, new minimum educational standards are required for all public school districts in the state of Iowa. Chapter three of the Iowa Administrative Code outlines the school standards which are the minimum requirements that must be met by the Iowa public school districts to be accredited and remain in operation. The general purposes of this study are to determine and assess: a) the impact of the new standards on local districts; b) the anticipated and proposed changes in school programs and policy; and c) the short and long-term implications of the new standards for the 114 public school districts in northeast Iowa. The specific purposes of this study are:

1. To determine if the subjects perceive the new educational standards as having a great positive or negative impact on the existing school program in their district.
2. To determine which of the new standards will have the greatest impact on the overall existing school program in the subject's district.

3. To determine the degree of difficulty the subjects perceive their district will have in meeting each of the new educational standards.

4. To determine what changes have already taken place in local districts in order to meet the requirements of the new standards with regard to:
   a. School board requirements.
   b. Student-needs requirements.
   c. Curriculum requirements.

5. To determine what actions are anticipated or planned by school districts in order to meet the requirements of the new standards with regard to:
   a. School board requirements.
   b. Student-needs requirements.
   c. Curriculum requirements.

6. To determine the specific plan of action and time table which the subjects have established to meet the requirements of the new educational standards.

7. To determine if the subjects perceive their district as taking action prior to the implementation of the new standards to:
   a. Reorganize with another district.
b. Participate in a cooperative or shared program with another district(s).

8. To determine what long range effects on school district reorganization will take place due to the new educational standards as viewed by the subjects.

9. To determine with respect to all of the above dimensions of the new standards, the extent of differences between the respondents from:

a. Public school districts with populations of fewer than 500 students.

b. Public school districts with populations of 500-999 students.

c. Public school districts with populations of 1000 or more students.

The subjects in this study were the 114 public school superintendents from districts in northeast and north-central Iowa. These 114 superintendents represent a total of 26 percent of the 436 public school superintendents in the state of Iowa. For the purposes of this study the subjects were divided into three general subgroups:

1. Superintendents from districts with student populations of fewer than 500 students (Group A).

2. Superintendents from districts with student populations of 500-999 students (Group B).
3. Superintendents from districts with student populations of 1000 or more students (Group C).

The data were secured through use of a questionnaire developed by the writer and the interview process. The questionnaire was used to collect information from the 114 superintendents. The interview of twelve superintendents, four from each of the three subgroups, provided a more in-depth, comprehensive look at the overall impact of the new standards as viewed by the sample group. In addition to verifying the results of the survey, the interview provided the writer with the opportunity for a more detailed analysis. More specific information as to future plans, programs, directions, and the overall effects were gained by being able to probe more deeply through the personal interview. The interview process involved fourteen percent of the respondents.

The personal and district data received from Part A of the survey were used for the purpose of selecting an adequate cross-section of respondents for the interview process.

This study compares the results as reported by the three subgroups of superintendents (small, medium, and large-sized school districts) with regard to the following factors:

1. The overall positive and negative impact of
the new educational standards on the existing school programs.

2. The degree of difficulty involved by the districts in meeting the new educational standards.

The other analyses in this study are descriptive and indicate how the superintendents responded to each questionnaire item. These results are reported by number and percent and are described in a narrative report. The respondents were also given the opportunity to attach any plan or ideas used by their district rather than or in addition to answering the following four open-ended questions:

1. List below any changes that your district has made since the new educational standards were proposed in order to meet the requirements of the new educational standards.

2. List below the action(s) your district plans to take to meet the requirements of the new educational standards.

3. List below any specific plan or timetable your district has established to meet the requirements of the educational standards.

4. List the changes you anticipate.

Three "yes" or "no" type questions were asked of the respondents to determine future plans for reorganization or cooperative programs prior to
implementation of the standards, and to determine their projections as to the long-range effects of the standards on reorganization or consolidation of their district. The following three questions required "Yes" or "No" answers:

1. Do you anticipate your district reorganizing with another district(s) prior to the implementation of the new educational standards?

2. Do you anticipate your district entering into a cooperative or shared program with another district(s) prior to the implementation of the new educational standards?

3. Do you anticipate any long-range effects on your district with regard to reorganization or consolidation as a result of the new educational standards?

The respondents, if they answered "yes" to any of the above three questions, were also given the opportunity to list the district and the program they planned to share and the changes they anticipated. The results of the information received from the interview process will be described in a narrative report. In general, the sequence of reporting follows the purposes of the study as stated in Chapter 1.
Positive Impact of the New Standards on Existing School Programs

In this section, the responses are reported and analyzed for the questionnaire item specifically designed to indicate the extent of agreement by superintendents to the statement that the new education standards will have a great positive impact on their existing school program. The data are subdivided for analysis into four groups: (1) Group A, which includes superintendents from smaller districts with enrollments fewer than 500 students; (2) Group B, which includes superintendents from medium districts with enrollments of 500-999 students; (3) Group C, which includes superintendents from large districts with enrollments of 1000 or more students; and (4) the total of all three subgroups of superintendents.

Superintendents included in the study were asked to indicate on a five-point scale, their extent of agreement with the statement. It is to be noted that for the purpose of reporting these opinions, the percentages of "Strongly agree" and "Agree" responses were combined, as were the percentages of "Strongly disagree" and "Disagree" responses.

As shown in Table 2, there was a significant difference between the responses of the small, medium,
### Table 2

**Extent of Agreement Among Public School Superintendents Concerning the New Educational Standards Having a Great Positive Impact on the Existing School Program in Their District**

**Issue:** The new educational standards will have a great positive impact on the existing school program in your district.

(Questionnaire item #1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group A: Small Districts (N=28)</th>
<th>Group B: Medium-sized Districts (N=34)</th>
<th>Group C: Large Districts (N=24)</th>
<th>Total (N=86)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1--Strongly agree</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2--Agree</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>45.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3--Undecided</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4--Disagree</td>
<td>59.3</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5--Strongly disagree</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Number of Responses 96.4 100.0 100.0 100.0

Did Not Answer 3.6 .0 .0 .0

Mean 3.11 3.12 2.46

S.D. 1.17 1.09 0.93

**F-Ratio=*/3.20

Significance =0.0445

*p<=.05

Note--Because of rounding, percentages may not equal 100.
and large-sized school districts on the question of the new standards having a great positive impact on their district. Nearly one-third of the small and medium-school superintendents (33.3 and 35.4 percent, respectively), agreed with the statement while 58.3 percent of the large-school superintendents agreed. On the converse side, only 16.7 percent of the large-school superintendents disagreed with the statement while almost one-half (47.1 percent) of the medium-school superintendents and 59.3 percent of the small-school superintendents, respectively, disagreed.

The total responses of all superintendents were nearly equal with a little more than forty percent in agreement and disagreement (41.2 and 42.4 percent, respectively) and a substantial number undecided (16.5 percent). In summary, the data indicate that a majority of the large-school superintendents believed the standards have a great positive impact on their district while a majority of the small and medium-school superintendents disagreed with the statement. The large-school superintendents view the new standards much more positively with regard to improving their educational programs, whereas the small and medium-school superintendents disagree with those positive impacts on their school programs.
Negative Impact of the New Standards on Existing School Programs

A significant difference existed with regard to the statement which indicates that the new standards will have a great negative impact on the existing school program. Although all three groups of superintendents indicated disagreement with this statement, the superintendents of the large school districts marked the highest percentage of "Strongly disagree" and "Disagree" responses (87.5 percent) compared to 64.7 percent and 55.5 percent for the medium and small-school superintendents, respectively. The results of Table 3 point out that none of the large-school superintendents indicated agreement with the statement, whereas 18.5 percent of the small-school superintendents and 14.7 percent of the medium-school superintendents indicated they "agreed" with the negative impact of the standards. Again, as in the previous analysis of the "positive impact," 20 percent of the total superintendents were undecided on the statement. More than two-thirds of the total superintendents (68.2 percent) indicated disagreement with the issue.

A much larger percentage of the total superintendents disagreed with the issue of the
Table 3

Extent of Agreement Among Public School Superintendents Concerning the New Educational Standards Having a Great Negative Impact on the Existing School Programs in their District

Issue: The new educational standards will have a great negative impact on the existing school programs in your district. (Questionnaire item #2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Group A: Small Districts (N=28)</th>
<th>Group B: Medium-sized Districts (N=34)</th>
<th>Group C: Large Districts (N=24)</th>
<th>Total (N=86)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>50.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Number of Responses 96.4 100.0 100.0 98.8

Did Not Answer 3.6 .0 .0 1.2

Mean 3.32 4.17 3.68

S.D. 1.09 0.64 0.94

F-Ratio=5.42 Significance=0.0064

*p<=.05

Note--Because of rounding, percentages may not equal 100.
standards having a great negative impact compared to the statement that the standards will have a great positive impact. From the data it can be seen that while many of the superintendents disagreed that the standards had a great positive impact, a smaller percentage of the subjects indicated that they thought the standards had a great negative impact. In other words, a majority of the superintendents agreed the standards would not have a negative impact but they would not agree that the standards had a great positive impact.

In conclusion, the data indicate that the small and medium-school superintendents believed that the changes that are necessary to meet the new standards are going to have much more of a negative impact on their existing school program than a positive impact. The changes that the large schools must make are not nearly as extensive. As a result the large-school superintendents thought the impact on their district to be much more positive. The results indicate that the small-school superintendents, for example, would not say that adding an "at-risk" program would have a negative impact on their school program. At the same time the small-school superintendents would not say adding that program or another program would have a positive impact. It is believed from the responses
that the small-school superintendents view the addition of the new standards requirements to be more of a burden to their school district and therefore view the standard as having a negative impact rather than a positive one.

**New Standards Which Superintendents Have Indicated as Having Great Impact on Their School District**

In this section, superintendents were asked to select the standards which they believed would have a great impact on the existing educational program in their district. There was no limit as to how many of the standards could be chosen.

**Section No. 1: Standards Which Require Additional School Board Policies.** As shown in Table 4, more than one-half of the superintendents (53 percent) thought that the standard requiring curriculum development, implementation and evaluation of the curriculum, and monitoring of the school program would have a great impact. All three groups of superintendents agreed and chose this standard most frequently as having a great impact. The standards concerning 1) adoption of a performance evaluation process and 2) adoption of instructional time-on-task auditing were marked by more
Table 4

New Educational Standards Requiring Additional School Board Policies and Student Needs Programs Which Superintendents Indicate as Having a Great Impact on Their District

Issue: Indicate which of the new educational standards will have a great impact on the existing educational program in your district. (Questionnaire item #3a)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standards</th>
<th>Group A: Small Districts (N=28)</th>
<th>Group B: Medium-sized Districts (N=34)</th>
<th>Group C: Large Districts (N=24)</th>
<th>Total (N=86)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-Curriculum Development</td>
<td>53.6</td>
<td>65.6</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>53.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-K-12 guidance program</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>47.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-&quot;At-risk&quot; program</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>43.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Evaluation process</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>36.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Time-on-task auditing</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>36.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Number of Responses: 100.0, 94.1, 95.8, 96.5

Did Not Answer: .0, 5.9, 4.2, 3.5
than one-third of the superintendents (36.1 percent). More than one-third of the small and one-third of the large-school superintendents (35.7 and 34.8 percent, respectively), chose the standard requiring establishment and operation of a school health services program as having a great impact.

Section No. 2: Standards Which Require Programs to Meet Student Needs. The results shown in Table 4 revealed that slightly less than one-half of all superintendents (47 percent) indicated that the standard requiring a K-12 guidance program had a great impact on their existing school program. The standard requiring a program for "at-risk" students was selected by 43.4 percent of the superintendents as having a great impact.

Section No. 3: Standards Which Require New Curriculum Programs. As shown in Table 5 the standard, which the highest percentage of superintendents indicated would have a great impact, was the every-day kindergarten requirement beginning in 1992. More than one-half (56.7 percent) of all the superintendents marked that standard. This was chosen by more superintendents than any other standard. The
### Table 5

**New Educational Standards for Curriculum Program Requirements Which Superintendents Indicate as Having a Great Impact on Their District**

**Issue:** Indicate which of the new educational standards will have a great impact on the existing educational program in your district.  
(Questionnaire item #3a)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standards</th>
<th>Group A: Small Districts (N=28)</th>
<th>Group B: Medium-sized Districts (N=34)</th>
<th>Group C: Large Districts (N=24)</th>
<th>Total (N=86)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-Every-day Kindergarten</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>91.3</td>
<td>56.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-200 day calendar</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>38.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Technologies program</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-5 1/2 hour day</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Four year foreign lang.</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total Number of Responses                      | 100.0                            | 94.1                                   | 95.8                            | 96.5         |
| Did Not Answer                                 | 0.0                              | 5.9                                    | 4.2                             | 3.5          |
large-school superintendents especially expressed concern about the kindergarten issue as more than ninety percent (91.3 percent) marked it as having a great impact on their existing school program. Only 21.4 percent of the small-school superintendents listed the kindergarten standard as having a great impact. The 200-day school calendar was more of a concern for the small-school superintendents as 46.4 percent marked it as having a great impact while 38.6 percent of all the superintendents reported it had a great impact on their school program. Two other curriculum standards were also believed to have a great impact by one group of superintendents. Nearly forty percent (39.3 percent) of the small-school superintendents marked the standard (which states that a superintendent may not serve as a building principal) as having a great impact. Nearly thirty percent (28.1 percent) of the medium-school superintendents thought that the standard requiring instructional programs of current technologies would have a great impact on their school program.

In summary, the every-day kindergarten requirement was selected to have a great impact by the highest percentage of the superintendents. This was especially
true of the large-school superintendents and to a somewhat lesser degree, the medium-school superintendents. The standards which require 1) curriculum development, implementation and evaluation of the curriculum, and monitoring of the school program; 2) a K-12 guidance program; and 3) a program for at-risk students were thought to also have a great impact.

The data indicate that the large school districts would be affected significantly by the every-day kindergarten requirement. The doubling of the number of kindergarten staff and kindergarten facilities in large districts will present a major financial burden for these districts. To a lesser degree this can also be seen for the medium school district. This standard has a minimal effect on the small school district.

The other standards which were viewed by the subjects as having a great impact—curriculum development, K-12 guidance, and an at-risk program, would involve additional costs because of the need for more staff. These standards would also establish new programs and policies that would require more administrative time and direction.
The responses to this question seem to indicate that the respondents thought the standards which have a great impact would probably help students. In many cases those same standards would also be a burden to implement.

New Standards Which Superintendents Have Indicated as Having the Greatest Impact on Their Existing Educational Program

In this section, superintendents were asked to select the three educational standards which they believed would have the greatest impact on their existing educational program. In contrast to the previous question where the superintendents could select as many of the standards as they wanted, this question asked the superintendents to select only the three standards they believed would have the greatest impact on their district.

Section No. 1: Standards Which Require Additional School Board Policies. The results shown in Table 6 revealed less than one-third of all superintendents (28.9 percent) reported the standard concerning curriculum development, implementation and evaluation of the curriculum, and monitoring of the school program as having the greatest impact on their program. More than one-third (37.5 percent) of the medium-school
Table 6

New Educational Standards Which Require Additional School Board Policies and Student Needs Programs Which Superintendents Indicate as Having the Greatest Impact on Their District

Issue: Place an x next to the three educational standards that you feel will have a greatest impact on the existing educational program in your district. Mark 3 total not 3 per category. (Questionnaire item #3b)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standards:</th>
<th>Group A: Per Cent</th>
<th>Group B: Per Cent</th>
<th>Group C: Per Cent</th>
<th>Total Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-K-12 guidance program</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>32.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-&quot;At-risk&quot; program</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Curriculum development</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>28.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Evaluation process</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Time-on-task auditing</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Number of Responses: 100.0 94.1 95.8 96.5

Did Not Answer: 0.0 5.9 4.2 3.5
as having the greatest impact on their program. More than one-third (37.5 percent) of the medium-school superintendents also marked that same standard as having the greatest impact. The standard which requires adoption of a performance evaluation process ranked second with 27.7 percent of all superintendents marking it as one of the three standards with the greatest impact. Slightly less than one-fourth of the superintendents (22.9 percent) selected the standard requiring adoption of instructional time-on-task auditing. More than one-third (35.7 percent) of the small-school superintendents ranked the standard on adoption of a performance evaluation process as having the greatest impact.

Section No. 2: Standards Which Require Programs to Meet Student Needs. As shown in Table 6, more than one-third of all superintendents (33.7 percent) indicated the standard to establish a K-12 guidance program, had the greatest impact on their district. This ranked second overall of all the standards as having the greatest impact. The standard which would establish a program for "at-risk" students ranked third of all the standards. It was selected by 30.1 percent of all the superintendents as having the greatest impact on their district. More than one-third (39.1 percent) of the large-school superintendents also chose the "at-risk" standard as having the greatest impact.
The large-school superintendents also thought the "K-12 guidance" requirement would have a significant effect as 39.1 percent of that group marked it as having the greatest impact. Nearly one-third (32.1 percent) of the small-school superintendents indicated the K-12 guidance standard would have the greatest impact.

Section No. 3: Standards Which Require New Curriculum Programs. The every-day kindergarten requirement beginning in 1992 was marked by more than one-half of all superintendents (56.7 percent) as having the greatest impact on their district. This standard was chosen by 47 of 83 superintendents who responded to this question. This was 19 more responses than the next most selected standard. As shown in Table 7, more than three-fourths of the large-school superintendents (78.3 percent) believed the kindergarten standard would have the greatest impact. The medium-school superintendents also agreed, 65.6 percent of that group selected the kindergarten standard as having the greatest impact. These results show that although there were a number of standards which have a significant impact on school districts, the every-day kindergarten requirement does not have the impact on the small schools as it does on the medium and large-school districts. As seen earlier, the data indicate that the small school districts can absorb the additional burden of twice the equivalent
Table 7

New Educational Standards for Curriculum Program Requirements Which Superintendents Indicate as Having the Greatest Impact on Their District

**Issue:** Place an x next to the three educational standards that you feel will have the greatest impact on the existing educational program in your district. Mark 3 total not 3 per category. (Questionnaire item #3b)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group A: Small Districts (N=28)</th>
<th>Group B: Medium-sized Districts (N=34)</th>
<th>Group C: Large Districts (N=24)</th>
<th>Total (N=86)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standards:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Every-day Kindergarten</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Four years foreign lang.</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-200 day calendar</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Ten units vocational</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Supt. not serve as principal</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Number of Responses</strong></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>94.1</td>
<td>95.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Did Not Answer</strong></td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
number of kindergarten students, whereas it will present a heavy financial burden for the medium and large school districts.

The standard requiring four years of a foreign language was seen as having the greatest impact by almost two-thirds of the medium-school superintendents (65.6 percent). Also, 28.9 percent of all superintendents chose it as one of the three standards having the greatest impact on their school program. More than one-third of the small-school superintendents (35.7 percent) marked the standard which stated that a superintendent may not serve as a building principal as having the greatest impact. This standard is a concern to the small school districts because it is probable that their districts are the only ones with superintendents that also have principal responsibilities. Nearly one-fourth of all the superintendents (22.9 percent) indicated that the 200-day school calendar would have the greatest impact. All of the standards which the superintendents indicated as having the greatest impact either require additional monitoring by the superintendent or would be costly to implement. The data seem to indicate that the above-mentioned standards would have a substantial effect on educational programs, in addition to being a burden on the school district and the superintendent who must implement the new standards. The subjects
were not asked to respond as to whether the impact of each standard would be positive or negative, but only select the standards which would have the greatest impact.

Degree of Difficulty for School Districts in Meeting the New Standards Requiring Additional School Board Policies

Six educational standards to require school boards to adopt policies were among the newly mandated requirements of the state. Superintendents included in the study were asked to indicate on a five-point scale the degree of difficulty involved for their district in meeting each standard. Superintendents were asked to answer on a scale which included five responses: "No difficulty," "Little difficulty," "Difficult," "A hardship," and "Great hardship." For the purpose of reporting these opinions of superintendents, the percentages of "No difficulty" and "Little difficulty" were combined, as were the percentages of "A hardship" and "Great hardship" responses. The six standards which are concerned with school board policy requirements are:

1. Adoption of a performance evaluation process.
2. Adoption of needs assessment policy, plans and goals.
3. Adoption of instructional time-on-task
4. Adoption of student responsibility and discipline procedures.

5. Curriculum development, implementation and evaluation of the curriculum, and monitoring of the school program.

6. Establishment and operation of a school health services program.

Standard No. 1: Adoption of a performance evaluation process. As shown in Table 8, there was no significant difference between the small, medium, and large-school superintendents on the degree of difficulty in meeting this standard. More than sixty percent of the medium and large-school superintendents (61.8 and 66.7 percent, respectively), thought there would be little or no difficulty in meeting this standard. The small-school superintendents were not as convinced as 42.9 percent responded that there would be little or no difficulty. Almost one-half (46.4 percent) of the small-school respondents indicated it would be "Difficult" to meet this standard. A small number of the superintendents from each group indicated meeting this standard would be a "Hardship" or "Great hardship." The highest percentage was 10.7 for the small-school superintendents and the lowest was 8.4 for the large-school superintendents.
Table 8

Degree of Difficulty for School Districts in Meeting the New Standards Requiring Additional School Board Policies

Issue: The new educational standards may be a challenge for your district or some districts. How much difficulty do you feel your district will have in meeting these standards?
(Questionnaire item #4a--Adoption of a performance evaluation process.)

PUBLIC SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Group A:</th>
<th>Group B:</th>
<th>Group C:</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Medium-sized</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(N=28)</td>
<td>(N=34)</td>
<td>(N=24)</td>
<td>(N=86)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1--No Difficulty</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2--Little Difficulty</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>30.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3--Difficult</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>33.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4--A hardship</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5--Great Hardship</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.1</td>
<td>99.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Number of Responses | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0
Did Not Answer | .0 | .0 | .0 | .0
Mean | 2.50 | 2.21 | 2.08 |
S.D. | 0.92 | 0.95 | 1.10 |
F-Ratio=1.27
*P<=.05

Note--Because of rounding, percentages may not equal 100.
Standard No. 2: Adoption of needs assessment policy and goals. There was considerable similarity in the responses of the three groups of superintendents to this standard. More than four-fifths of each group stated they would have little or no difficulty in meeting this standard (87.5 percent to 82.3 percent). As shown in Table 9, there was no significant difference between the small, medium, and large-school superintendents on the degree of difficulty in meeting this standard. Only two superintendents (2.3 percent of the total respondents) indicated meeting this standard would be a hardship and 86 percent indicated it would be met with little or no difficulty.

Standard No. 3: Adoption of instructional time-on-task auditing. There was no significant difference between the small, medium, and large-school superintendents on the degree of difficulty in meeting this standard. The results shown in Table 10 revealed that more than one-half of the total superintendents reported little or no difficulty in meeting this standard (54.7 percent). Large-school superintendents indicated the least concern, registering 62.5 percent "Little difficulty" and "No difficulty" responses. Small-school superintendents registered the lowest percentage of "Little difficulty" and "No difficulty" responses (46.4 percent). Less than fourteen percent of the total respondents (13.9 percent) indicated
Table 9

Degree of Difficulty for School Districts in Meeting the New Standards Requiring Additional School Board Policies

Issue: The new educational standards may be a challenge for your district or some districts. How much difficulty do you feel your district will have in meeting these standards? (Questionnaire item #4b--Adoption of needs assessment policy, plans and goals.)

PUBLIC SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group A:</th>
<th>Group B:</th>
<th>Group C:</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small Districts (N=28)</td>
<td>Medium-sized Districts (N=34)</td>
<td>Large Districts (N=24)</td>
<td>Total (N=86)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1--No Difficulty</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2--Little Difficulty</td>
<td>60.7</td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3--Difficult</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4--A hardship</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5--Great Hardship</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Number of Responses: 100.0 100.0 100.0 100.0

Did Not Answer: 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0

Mean: 1.82 1.85 1.63
S.D.: 0.61 0.86 0.71
F-Ratio=0.73
*p<=.05

Note--Because of rounding, percentages may not equal 100.
Table 10

Degree of Difficulty for School Districts in Meeting the New Standards Requiring Additional School Board Policies

Issue: The new educational standards may be a challenge for your district or some districts. How much difficulty do you feel your district will have in meeting these standards? (Questionnaire item #4c--Adoption of instructional time-on-task auditing.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Group A: Small Districts (N=28)</th>
<th>Group B: Medium-sized Districts (N=34)</th>
<th>Group C: Large Districts (N=24)</th>
<th>Total (N=86)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1--No Difficulty</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2--Little Difficulty</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>40.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3--Difficult</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>31.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4--A hardship</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5--Great Hardship</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Number of Responses 100.0 100.0 100.0 100.0

Did Not Answer .0 .0 .0 .0

Mean 2.54 2.41 2.50
S.D. 0.92 0.99 0.98

F-Ratio=0.14
*p<=.05

Note--Because of rounding, percentages may not equal 100.
meeting this standard would be a hardship. More than thirty percent (31.4 percent) of the respondents reported that meeting this standard would be "Difficult."

**Standard No. 4: Adoption of student responsibility and discipline procedures.** As evidenced by the data reported in Table 11, a large majority of the superintendents believed they could easily meet this standard. For all the superintendents, the percentage of "No difficulty" and "Little difficulty" responses was over 80 percent. Specifically by groups, the percentages were: Small, 82.1 percent; Medium, 79.4 percent; Large, 91.6 percent. There was no significant difference between the three groups of superintendents on the degree of difficulty in meeting this standard. There were no superintendents who indicated that meeting this standard would be a hardship and only 16.3 percent indicated it would be difficult.

**Standard No. 5: Curriculum development, implementation and evaluation of the curriculum, and monitoring of the school program.** As shown in Table 12, nearly two-thirds (64.7 percent) of the superintendents indicated there would be little or no difficulty in meeting this standard. The percentages of "No difficulty" and "Little difficulty" responses indicated much the same opinion with 66.6 percent by
Table 11

Degree of Difficulty for School Districts in Meeting the New Standards Requiring Additional School Board Policies

Issue: The new educational standards may be a challenge for your district or some districts. How much difficulty do you feel your district will have in meeting these standards? (Questionnaire item #4d--Adoption of student responsibility and discipline procedures.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PUBLIC SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group A: Small Districts (N=28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1--No Difficulty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2--Little Difficulty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3--Difficult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4--A hardship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5--Great Hardship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Number of Responses | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |

Did Not Answer | .0 | .0 | .0 | .0 |

Mean | 1.86 | 1.85 | 1.63 |
S.D. | 0.71 | 0.74 | 0.65 |
F-Ratio=0.92
*p<=.05

Note--Because of rounding, percentages may not equal 100.
### Table 12

Degree of Difficulty for School Districts in Meeting the New Standards Requiring Additional School Board Policies

**Issue:** The new educational standards may be a challenge for your district or some districts. How much difficulty do you feel your district will have in meeting these standards? (Questionnaire item #4e--Curriculum development, implementation and evaluation of the curriculum, and monitoring of the school program).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PUBLIC SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENTS</th>
<th>Group A: Small Districts (N=28)</th>
<th>Group B: Medium-sized Districts (N=34)</th>
<th>Group C: Large Districts (N=24)</th>
<th>Total (N=86)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1--No Difficulty</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>24.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2--Little Difficulty</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3--Difficult</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>31.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4--A hardship</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5--Great Hardship</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>100.1</td>
<td>100.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Number of Responses:**
- 98.8
- 100.0
- 100.0
- 100.0

**Did Not Answer:** 1.2

**Mean:**
- 2.04
- 2.24
- 2.08

**S.D.:**
- 0.92
- 0.82
- 0.97

**F-Ratio:** 0.42

* *p<=.05

**Note:** Because of rounding, percentages may not equal 100.
small-school superintendents, 58.8 percent by medium-school superintendents, and 70.9 percent by large-school superintendents. There was no significant difference between the three groups of superintendents on the degree of difficulty in meeting this standard. Only three superintendents or 3.6 percent of the respondents indicated that meeting this standard would be a hardship. More than 30 percent (31.8 percent) indicated it would be difficult.

Standard No. 6: Establishment and operation of a school health services program. Results shown in Table 13 revealed that there was a significant difference between the three groups of superintendents on the degree of difficulty in meeting this standard. Only 28.6 percent of the small-school superintendents believed that meeting this standard would require little or no difficulty compared to 64.8 percent of the medium-school superintendents and 75 percent of the large-school superintendents. One-fourth (25 percent) of the small-school superintendents indicated meeting this standard would be a hardship compared to 8.8 percent of the medium-school superintendents and none of the large-school superintendents. Nearly one-half (46.4 percent) of the small-school superintendents indicated meeting this standard would be difficult while 26.5 percent of the medium and 25 percent of the
Table 13

Degree of Difficulty for School Districts in Meeting the New Standards Requiring Additional School Board Policies

Issue: The new educational standards may be a challenge for your district or some districts. How much difficulty do you feel your district will have in meeting these standards?
(Questionnaire item #4f—Establishment and operation of a school health services program.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Group A: Small Districts (N=28)</th>
<th>Group B: Medium-sized Districts (N=34)</th>
<th>Group C: Large Districts (N=24)</th>
<th>Total (N=86)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1—No Difficulty</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2—Little Difficulty</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>32.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3—Difficult</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>32.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4—A hardship</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5—Great Hardship</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Number of Responses: 100.0 100.0 100.0 100.0

Did Not Answer: .0 .0 .0 .0

Mean: 2.86 2.12 2.00

S.D.: 0.93 0.98 0.72

F-Ratio = 7.39*

*p <= .05

Note—Because of rounding, percentages may not equal 100.
large-school superintendents responded it would be difficult.

In summary, a majority of the respondents indicated meeting the six standards requiring new school board policies would not be difficult. The small and medium-school superintendents reported more difficulty than the large-school superintendents on five of the six standards. For those five standards, which should result in more specific school board policies and procedures in areas such as discipline, needs assessment, time-on-task, curriculum development, and evaluation; their implementation should result in more definitive instructional programs. The small-school superintendent, who many times is the only administrator in the district, views this task as being difficult or a hardship.

The small-school superintendents were particularly concerned about meeting the requirements of establishing and operating a school health services program. Three of every four superintendents from the small-school group reported that meeting those requirements would be difficult or a hardship. The lack of health staff as well as administrative staff would explain the great concern by the small-school superintendents regarding the health services program requirement. This area with the advent of AIDS and the many other health questions that go with it, is
difficult for small districts with minimal health staff. The small-school superintendents, who many times are without the necessary health support staff, are not isolated from controversial subjects in this subject area. Parental concerns and questions usually land squarely on the superintendent's desk.

**Degree of Difficulty for School Districts in Meeting the New Standards Requiring Programs to Meet Student Needs**

Three educational standards to require new programs to meet the needs of students were mandated by the state. The three standards are:

1. Gifted and talented program.
2. Program for "at-risk" students.
3. Guidance program with certificated staff for grades K-12.

**Standard No. 1: Gifted and Talented Program.**

There was considerable agreement among superintendents of the three groups concerning the degree of difficulty in meeting this standard. As shown in Table 14, more than three-fourths of all respondents (75.3 percent) indicated little or no difficulty in meeting this standard. The subgroup scores ranged from 81.5 percent for the small-school superintendents to 70.6 percent for the medium-school superintendents. There was no significant difference between the small, medium, and large-school superintendents on the degree of
### Table 14

Degree of Difficulty for School Districts in Meeting the New Standards Requiring Programs to Meet Student Needs

**Issue:** The new educational standards may be a challenge for your district or some districts. How much difficulty do you feel your district will have in meeting these standards? (Questionnaire item #4g--Gifted and talented program.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PUBLIC SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENTS</th>
<th>Group A: Small Districts (N=28)</th>
<th>Group B: Medium-sized Districts (N=34)</th>
<th>Group C: Large Districts (N=24)</th>
<th>Total (N=86)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>51.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key:</td>
<td>No Difficulty</td>
<td>Little Difficulty</td>
<td>Difficult</td>
<td>A hardship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Number of Responses:**

- 98.8
- 100.0
- 100.0
- 100.0

**Did Not Answer:**

- 1.2
- 1.0
- 1.0
- 1.0

**Mean:**

- 1.63
- 1.91
- 1.71

**F-Ratio=0.72**

*N*=0.05

**Note:** Because of rounding, percentages may not equal 100.
difficulty in meeting this standard. Only 7.1 percent of the respondents indicated meeting this standard would be a hardship, while 17.6 percent stated it would be difficult.

**Standard No. 2: Program for "at-risk" students.**

As shown in Table 15, there was no significant difference between the three groups of superintendents on the degree of difficulty in meeting this standard. The responses of the superintendents to this question indicate considerable concern as to meeting this standard. Nearly forty percent (39.5 percent) of the respondents indicated it would be difficult to meet this standard and 16.3 percent answered with "Hardship" or "Great hardship" responses. Less than one-half (44.2 percent) of the superintendents indicated meeting this standard would require little or no difficulty.

The totals of the data revealed much more difficulty for the small-school superintendents in meeting this standard than the large-school superintendents. One-half of the small-school superintendents indicated meeting this standard would be difficult and almost one-fourth (21.5 percent) believed it would be a hardship. The percentage of "No difficulty" or "Little difficulty" responses for the large-school superintendents was more than double that of the small-school superintendents (62.5 percent
Table 15

Degree of Difficulty for School Districts in Meeting the New Standards Requiring Programs to Meet Student Needs

Issue: The new educational standards may be a challenge for your district or some districts. How much difficulty do you feel your district will have in meeting these standards? (Questionnaire item #4h--Program for "at-risk" students.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PUBLIC SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENTS</th>
<th>Group A: Small Districts (N=28)</th>
<th>Group B: Medium-sized Districts (N=34)</th>
<th>Group C: Large Districts (N=24)</th>
<th>Total (N=86)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1--No Difficulty</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2--Little Difficulty</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>34.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3--Difficult</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>39.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4--A hardship</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5--Great Hardship</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Number of Responses: 100.0 100.0 100.0 100.0

Did Not Answer: .0 .0 .0 .0

Mean: 2.89 2.79 2.38
S.D.: 0.92 0.69 0.88
F-Ratio=2.88
*p<.05

Note--Because of rounding, percentages may not equal 100.
the data indicate that setting up an "at risk" program was viewed as a much more difficult task for the small-school superintendents.

Standard No. 3: Guidance program with certificated staff for grades K-12. As evidenced by the data reported in Table 16, a majority of all superintendents (64.3 percent) thought that this standard could be met with little or no difficulty. The large-school superintendents again expressed less concern with 79.1 percent marking "No difficulty" or "Little difficulty" responses in contrast to 55.5 percent for the small-school superintendents and 60.6 percent for the medium-school superintendents. The small and medium-school superintendents also had a higher percentage of "Difficult," "A hardship," and "Great hardship" responses than did the large-school superintendents. Only 4.2 percent of the large-school superintendents marked "difficult" compared to 18.5 and 18.2 percent for the small and medium-school superintendents, respectively. Likewise, a higher percentage of hardship responses were marked by the small and medium-school superintendents (25.9 and 21.2 percent) compared to the large-school superintendents (16.7 percent). There was no significant difference between the groups of superintendents on the degree of difficulty in meeting this standard. Establishing a K-12 guidance program would not appear to be a major
Table 16

Degree of Difficulty for School Districts in Meeting the New Standards Requiring Programs to Meet Student Needs

Issue: The new educational standards may be a challenge for your district or some districts. How much difficulty do you feel your district will have in meeting these standards? (Questionnaire item #4i--Guidance program with certificated staff for grades K-12.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PUBLIC SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group A:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Districts (N=28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium-sized Districts (N=34)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key:</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1--No Difficulty</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2--Little Difficulty</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3--Difficult</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4--A hardship</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5--Great Hardship</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>100.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Number of Responses: 97.7 100.0 100.0 100.0

Did Not Answer: 2.3 0 0 0
Mean: 2.52 2.39 1.92 1.10
S.D.: 1.37 1.22 1.10
F-Ratio=1.66
*p<=.05
Note--Because of rounding, percentages may not equal 100.
burden for the large schools but it would be more difficult for the small and medium-school districts.

In conclusion, the data indicate that meeting the standards, which require programs to meet the needs of students, was not difficult for a majority of the districts. Again, the establishment of new programs was much more of a hardship for the small-school districts and less difficult for the large-school districts. All three of the above-mentioned standards would require new staff or the assignment of staff to additional new responsibilities. As a result, this would be more difficult for the small-school superintendents who have fewer teachers. For example, meeting the elementary guidance standard would require a present high school guidance counselor to return to school to obtain elementary endorsement or the district to hire a new staff member. With declining enrollments this would be an added burden for the small-school superintendents. In the interview of one of the small-school superintendents, he voiced concern as to who was included in an "at risk" program. Did it include elementary students or high school students only? The burden of answering this question and the others regarding each standard, is the responsibility of the superintendent in the small school district, in contrast to the other districts where the
superintendent usually has additional administrators and teaching staff.

**Degree of Difficulty for School Districts in Meeting the New Standards for Curriculum Program Requirements**

Eleven educational standards were mandated by the state with regard to new curriculum program requirements. The eleven standards are:

1. Every-day kindergarten (begins in 1992).
2. 200-day school calendar.
3. A 5 1/2 hour instructional day.
4. A district media services program with certificated media specialists in each attendance center.
5. Instructional programs for current technologies.
6. A minimum of 41 high school units of study.
7. Four years of a foreign language.
8. Ten units of vocational education.
9. Health, physical education, and fine arts.
10. Global education program.
11. Superintendent may not serve as a building principal.

**Standard No. 1: Every-day kindergarten beginning in 1992.** There was considerable concern among all superintendents as to implementation of this standard. Nearly one-half (44.7 percent) of all the respondents
indicated that meeting this standard would be a hardship. As shown in Table 17, a significant difference existed between the three groups of superintendents on the degree of difficulty in meeting this standard. In contrast to many of the other standards, this standard was more of a hardship for the large and medium-schools and less for the small schools. More than one-half of the large and medium-school superintendents (58.3 and 50.1 percent, respectively) responded that this standard would be "A hardship" or "Great hardship," while only one-fourth (25.9 percent) of the small-school superintendents viewed it as a hardship. Nearly sixty percent (59.2 percent) of the small-school superintendents indicated there would be little or no difficulty in meeting this standard while 32.4 and 16.6 percent of the medium and large-school superintendents, respectively, responded in that manner.

As in the earlier analysis which reported on the standards with the greatest impact, the medium and large-school superintendents indicated that meeting this standard would be extremely difficult. The small schools with limited student enrollment did not anticipate much if any difficulty in adding every-day kindergarten.
Table 17

Degree of Difficulty for School Districts in Meeting the New Standards for Curriculum Program Requirements

**Issue:** The new educational standards may be a challenge for your district or some districts. How much difficulty do you feel your district will have in meeting these standards.

(Questionnaire item #4j—Every day kindergarten (begins in 1992).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PUBLIC SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENTS</th>
<th>Group A: Small Districts (N=28)</th>
<th>Group B: Medium-sized Districts (N=34)</th>
<th>Group C: Large Districts (N=24)</th>
<th>Total (N=86)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1--No Difficulty</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>24.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2--Little Difficulty</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3--Difficult</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4--A hardship</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5--Great Hardship</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 99.9 100.2 99.9 100.0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Number of Responses</th>
<th>98.8</th>
<th>98.8</th>
<th>98.8</th>
<th>98.8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did Not Answer</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F-Ratio=5.39*  
*p<.05

Note—Because of rounding, percentages may not equal 100.
Standard No. 2: 200 day school calendar. As shown in Table 18, there was no significant difference between the small, medium, and large-school superintendents on the degree of difficulty in meeting this standard. Although more than one-half of the superintendents (52.9 percent) indicated little or no difficulty in meeting this standard, the percentage for superintendents from small and large schools was considerably higher (67.1 and 73.8 percent, respectively) in contrast with the medium-school superintendents (36.4 percent). More than thirty percent (30.3 percent of the medium-school superintendents reported this standard was either a hardship or a great hardship in contrast with 17.8 percent of the small-school superintendents and 8.3 percent of the large-school superintendents. A higher percentage of the medium-school superintendents (33.3 percent) marked "Difficult" for this question. Twenty-five percent of the small-school superintendents and 20.8 percent of the large-school superintendents indicated meeting this standard would be difficult. The 200-day calendar was viewed to be a difficult standard to meet by the medium-school superintendents but not by the other two groups.

Standard No 3: A 5 1/2 hour instructional day. There was considerable agreement among all three superintendent groups that meeting this standard would
Table 18

Degree of Difficulty for School Districts in Meeting the New Standards for Curriculum Program Requirements

Issue: The new educational standards may be a challenge for your district or some districts. How much difficulty do you feel your district will have in meeting these standards. (Questionnaire item #4k--200 day school calendar).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public School Superintendents</th>
<th>Group A: Small Districts (N=28)</th>
<th>Group B: Medium-sized Districts (N=34)</th>
<th>Group C: Large Districts (N=24)</th>
<th>Total (N=86)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1--No Difficulty</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2--Little Difficulty</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3--Difficult</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4--A hardship</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5--Great Hardship</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Number of Responses: 98.8, 98.8, 98.8, 98.8

Did Not Answer: 1.2, 1.2, 1.2, 1.2

Mean: 2.46, 2.82, 2.13

S.D.: 1.26, 1.26, .95

F-Ratio: 2.42

*p<.05

Note--Because of rounding, percentages may not equal 100.
involve little or no difficulty. More than four out of five of the total superintendents (83.6 percent) responded "Little difficulty" or "No difficulty." Less than 6 percent (5.9 percent) indicated meeting this standard would be a hardship and 10.6 percent indicated it would be difficult. As shown in Table 19, there was no significant difference between the three groups of superintendents on the degree of difficulty in meeting this standard. Meeting this standard was of little concern to nearly all superintendents.

Standard No. 4: A district media services program with certificated media specialists in each attendance center. Although nearly 70 percent of the total superintendents (67.9 percent) marked "Little difficulty" or "No difficulty" for this standard, slightly more than one-half (51.8 percent) of the small-school superintendents indicated little or no difficulty. Nearly three-fourths of the other two groups responded that this standard could be met with little or no difficulty (75.8 percent and 75 percent for the medium and large-school superintendents, respectively). Results shown in Table 20 indicated no significant difference between the three superintendent groups on the degree of difficulty in meeting this standard. A higher percentage of the small-school superintendents (22.2 percent) indicated meeting this standard would be a hardship compared to 15.2 and 12.5
Table 19

Degree of Difficulty for School Districts in Meeting the New Standards for Curriculum Program Requirements

Issue: The new educational standards may be a challenge for your district or some districts. How much difficulty do you feel your district will have in meeting these standards. (Questionnaire item #41--A 5 1/2 hour instructional day).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Group A:</th>
<th>Group B:</th>
<th>Group C:</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Medium-sized</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Districts</td>
<td>Districts</td>
<td>Districts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(N=28)</td>
<td>(N=34)</td>
<td>(N=24)</td>
<td>(N=86)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1--No Difficulty</td>
<td>51.9</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>51.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2--Little Difficulty</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>31.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3--Difficult</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4--A hardship</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5--Great Hardship</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.1</td>
<td>100.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Number of Responses 98.8 98.8 98.8 98.8

Did Not Answer 1.2 1.2 1.2 1.2

Mean 1.74 1.79 1.58

S.D. .90 1.04 .78

F-Ratio=0.38

*p<.05

Note--Because of rounding, percentages may not equal 100.
Table 20

Degree of Difficulty for School Districts in Meeting the New Standards for Curriculum Program Requirements

Issue: The new educational standards may be a challenge for your district or some districts. How much difficulty do you feel your district will have in meeting these standards. (Questionnaire item #4m--A district media services program with certificated media specialists in each attendance center).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PUBLIC SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group A: Small Districts (N=28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:

1--No Difficulty

2--Little Difficulty

3--Difficult

4--A hardship

5--Great Hardship

Total

| Total Number of Responses | 96.4 | 97.1 | 100.0 | 97.7 |
| Did Not Answer | 3.6 | 2.9 | .0 | 1.2 |
| Mean | 2.46 | 2.00 | 1.83 |
| S.D. | 1.10 | 1.22 | 1.09 |

F-Ratio=2.18

*p <= .05

Note--Because of rounding, percentages may not equal 100.
percent for the medium and large-school superintendents, respectively. The same was true with regard to superintendents who responded that meeting this standard would be difficult. The percentage of small-school superintendents responding "Difficult" to this standard was 25.9 percent compared to 9.1 percent for the medium-school superintendents and 12.5 percent for the large-school superintendents. Meeting this standard was not a problem for the medium and large-school superintendents, but almost one-half of the small-school superintendents stated it would be difficult.

Standard No. 5: Instructional programs for current technologies. As shown in Table 21, meeting this standard was again more of a hardship for the small-school superintendents than for the other two groups. The percentage of "Difficult" responses was 40.7 percent for the small schools compared to 29.4 and 29.2 percent for the medium and large schools, respectively. More than ten percent (11.1 percent) of the small-school superintendents indicated meeting this standard would be a hardship. There was no significant difference between the three superintendent groups on the degree of difficulty in meeting this standard. Slightly less than 60 percent (58.8 percent) of all the superintendents indicated they would have little or no difficulty in meeting this standard. As in the
# Table 21

Degree of Difficulty for School Districts in Meeting the New Standards for Curriculum Program Requirements

**Issue:** The new educational standards may be a challenge for your district or some districts. How much difficulty do you feel your district will have in meeting these standards? (Questionnaire item #4n—Instructional programs for current technologies.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Group A: Small Districts (N=28)</th>
<th>Group B: Medium-sized Districts (N=34)</th>
<th>Group C: Large Districts (N=24)</th>
<th>Total (N=86)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1--No Difficulty</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>24.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2--Little Difficulty</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>34.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3--Difficult</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>32.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4--A hardship</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5--Great Hardship</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total**

99.9 100.0 100.1 100.0

**Total Number of Responses**

96.4 100.0 100.0 98.8

**Did Not Answer**

.0 .0 .0 .0

**Mean**

2.48 2.18 2.13

**S.D.**

1.01 .97 .85

**F-Ratio**


*Note—Because of rounding, percentages may not equal 100.*
previous standard, only the small-school superintendents viewed meeting this standard to be difficult or a hardship.

**Standard No. 6: A minimum of 41 high school units of study.** The results reported in Table 22 indicated there was a significant difference between the groups of superintendents on the degree of difficulty in meeting this standard. Nearly 15 percent (14.8 percent) of the small-school superintendents marked "A hardship" or "Great hardship" for the standard and another 7.4 percent stated it would be difficult to meet the standard. This was in sharp contrast to the medium and large-school superintendents. None of the superintendents of those two groups reported it would be a hardship and only one medium-school superintendent (2.9 percent of that group) indicated it would be difficult. All 24 of the large-school superintendents (100 percent) responded there would be little or no difficulty meeting this standard and 97.1 percent of the medium-school superintendents indicated the same. Overall, more than 90 percent (91.7 percent) of the total superintendents marked "Little difficulty" or "No difficulty" in meeting this standard. The data show that meeting this standard was not difficult for any of the superintendent groups except the small-school superintendents.
Table 22

Degree of Difficulty for School Districts in Meeting the New Standards for Curriculum Program Requirements

**Issue:** The new educational standards may be a challenge for your district or some districts. How much difficulty do you feel your district will have in meeting these standards? (Questionnaire item #40--A minimum of 41 high school units of study.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PUBLIC SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENTS</th>
<th>Group A: Small Districts (N=28)</th>
<th>Group B: Medium-sized Districts (N=34)</th>
<th>Group C: Large Districts (N=24)</th>
<th>Total (N=86)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Difficulty</td>
<td>59.3</td>
<td>76.5</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>72.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Difficulty</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficult</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A hardship</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Hardship</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Number of Responses**: 100.0 100.0 100.0 100.0

**Did Not Answer**: 0 0 0 0

**Mean**: 1.85 1.26 1.17

**S.D.**: 1.29 .51 .38

**F-Ratio**: *=5.48

*p<=.05

**Note**--Because of rounding, percentages may not equal 100.
Standard No. 7: Four years of a foreign language.

As shown in Table 23, meeting this standard was again much more of a concern for small-school superintendents than for the medium and large-school superintendents. The large-school superintendents indicated little or no difficulty in meeting this standard as all 24 superintendents marked those two responses. Almost 15 percent (14.8 percent) of the small-school superintendents indicated meeting this standard would be a hardship. Another 18.5 percent of this group marked "Difficult" for their response. Although more than 80 percent of all the superintendents (81.2 percent) indicated little or no difficulty in meeting this standard, the percentages of "No difficulty" and "Little difficulty" responses ranged from a high of 100 percent for the large-school superintendents to a low of 66.7 percent for the small-school superintendents. There was a significant difference between the small, medium, and large-school superintendents on the degree of difficulty in meeting this standard. Meeting this standard was much more difficult for the small-school superintendents than it was for the other two groups.

Standard No. 8: Ten units of vocational education. The totals of the data reported in Table 24 confirm there was a significant difference in the three superintendent groups on the degree of difficulty in meeting this standard. As in the two previous
Table 23

Degree of Difficulty for School Districts in Meeting the New Standards for Curriculum Program Requirements

Issue: The new educational standards may be a challenge for your district or some districts. How much difficulty do you feel your district will have in meeting these standards?
(Questionnaire item #4p--Four years of a foreign language.)

PUBLIC SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Group A: Small Districts (N=28)</th>
<th>Group B: Medium-sized Districts (N=34)</th>
<th>Group C: Large Districts (N=24)</th>
<th>Total (N=86)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>1--No Difficulty</td>
<td>2--Little Difficulty</td>
<td>3--Difficult</td>
<td>4--A hardship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>58.8</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 99.9 100.0 100.0 100.0

Total Number of Responses 96.4 100.0 100.0 98.8

Did Not Answer 3.6 .0 .0 1.2

Mean 2.15 1.71 1.25
S.D. 1.06 1.00 .44

F-Ratio=6.28

*p<=.05

Note--Because of rounding, percentages may not equal 100.
Table 24

Degree of Difficulty for School Districts in Meeting the New Standards for Curriculum Program Requirements

Issue: The new educational standards may be a challenge for your district or some districts. How much difficulty do you feel your district will have in meeting these standards?
(Questionnaire item #4q--Ten units of vocational education.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Public School Superintendents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group A: Small Districts (N=28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1--No Difficulty</td>
<td>37.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2--Little Difficulty</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3--Difficult</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4--A hardship</td>
<td>25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5--Great Hardship</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>99.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Number of Responses | 96.4 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 98.8 |

Did Not Answer | .0 | .0 | .0 | .0 |

Mean | 2.56 | 2.06 | 1.54 |

S.D. | 1.50 | 1.32 | .66 |

F-Ratio* | |

*p<=.05
Note--Because of rounding, percentages may not equal 100.
standards, the results indicated that meeting this standard would be much more of a hardship for the small-school superintendents than for the other two groups. Almost forty percent (37 percent) of the small-school superintendents reported meeting this standard would be a hardship in contrast to 17.6 percent of the medium-school superintendents and none of the large-school superintendents. Although nearly three-fourths (73 percent) of all the superintendents marked "Little difficulty" or "No difficulty," the percentage of responses ranged from a high of 91.7 percent for the large-school superintendents to 55.5 percent for the small-school superintendents. The data indicate that this standard would be much more difficult to meet for the small-school superintendents than for the medium and large-school superintendents.

Standard No. 9: Health, physical education, and fine arts. Three-fourths of all the superintendents (75 percent) who responded to the survey believed that there would be little or no difficulty in meeting this standard. Only two medium-school superintendents (2.4 percent of all the respondents) indicated it would be a hardship. One-third of the small-school superintendents (33.3 percent) marked "Difficult" in response to meeting this standard compared to 17.7 and 17.4 percent for the medium and large-school superintendents, respectively. A smaller percentage of
the small-school superintendents indicated little or no difficulty in meeting this standard, (66.7 percent), compared to a high of 82.6 percent for the large-school superintendents. As shown in Table 25, there was no significant difference between the small, medium, and large-school superintendents on the degree of difficulty in meeting this standard. Although the differences between the three groups of superintendents were not as widespread as in many of the previous standards, the small-school superintendents again viewed meeting this standard to be more difficult than the other two groups.

Standard No. 10: Global education program. As shown in Table 26, there was a significant difference between the three superintendent groups on the degree of difficulty in meeting this standard. More than seventy percent (70.6 percent) of all superintendents indicated there would be little or no difficulty in meeting this standard. Only four superintendents, less than 5 percent (4.7 percent), marked "A hardship" or "Great hardship" in responding to this question. Slightly less than one-fourth (24.7 percent) of the superintendents indicated it would be difficult to meet this standard. Again, as in many previous questions, the small-school superintendents reported a greater degree of difficulty. More than forty percent thought meeting this standard would be a hardship or difficult.
Table 25

Degree of Difficulty for School Districts in Meeting the New Standards for Curriculum Program Requirements

Issue: The new educational standards may be a challenge for your district or some districts. How much difficulty do you feel your district will have in meeting these standards?
(Questionnaire item #4r--Health, physical education and fine arts.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group A: Small Districts (N=28)</th>
<th>Group B: Medium-sized Districts (N=34)</th>
<th>Group C: Large Districts (N=24)</th>
<th>Total (N=86)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1--No Difficulty</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>47.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2--Little Difficulty</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>34.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3--Difficult</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4--A hardship</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5--Great Hardship</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>100.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Number of Responses: 96.4, 100.0, 95.8, 97.7

Did Not Answer: 3.6, .0, 4.2, 2.3

Mean: 2.04, 1.79, 1.70

S.D.: .81, .95, .76

F-Ratio=

*p<=.05

Note--Because of rounding, percentages may not equal 100.
Table 26

Degree of Difficulty for School Districts in Meeting the New Standards for Curriculum Program Requirements

Issue: The new educational standards may be a challenge for your district or some districts. How much difficulty do you feel your district will have in meeting these standards? (Questionnaire item #4s--Global education program.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PUBLIC SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group A: Small Districts (N=28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1--No Difficulty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2--Little Difficulty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3--Difficult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4--A hardship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5--Great Hardship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Number of Responses 96.4 100.0 100.0 98.8
Did Not Answer 3.6 .0 .0 1.2
Mean 2.37 2.00 1.75
S.D. 1.01 0.85 0.74
F-Ratio=
*P<=.05
Note--Because of rounding, percentages may not equal 100.
More than ten percent (11.1 percent) marked "A hardship" or "Great hardship" and nearly thirty percent (29.6 percent) marked "Difficult" in response to this standard. Those percentages were considerably less for the other two groups of superintendents.

Standard No. 11: Superintendent may not serve as a building principal. As revealed in Table 27 a large majority of the superintendents (85.9 percent) indicated that meeting this standard would involve little or no difficulty. There was a significant difference between the small, medium, and large-school superintendents on the degree of difficulty in meeting this standard. Again, it was much more of a hardship for the small-school superintendents. Almost thirty percent (28.6 percent) of the small-school superintendents marked "A hardship" or "Great hardship" compared to 3 percent of the medium-school superintendents and none of the large-school superintendents. All of the large-school superintendents (100 percent) and 97 percent of the medium-school superintendents indicated little or no difficulty in meeting this standard in contrast to slightly more than sixty percent (60.7 percent) of the small-school superintendents. Meeting this standard was much more difficult for the small-school superintendents than the other two groups. This finding was not surprising as it is probable that there
Table 27

Degree of Difficulty for School Districts in Meeting the New Standards for Curriculum Program Requirements

Issue: The new educational standards may be a challenge for your district or some districts. How much difficulty do you feel your district will have in meeting these standards? (Questionnaire item #4t--Superintendent may not serve as a building principal.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PUBLIC SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group A: Small Districts (N=28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:

1--No Difficulty

2--Little Difficulty

3--Difficult

4--A hardship

5--Great Hardship

Total

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Number of Responses</th>
<th>100.0</th>
<th>97.1</th>
<th>100.0</th>
<th>100.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did Not Answer</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-Ratio=*11.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
* p<.05

Note--Because of rounding, percentages may not equal 100.
are few if any school superintendents who also serve as principals in the medium and large school districts.

The eleven standards which require new curriculum programs presented considerable difficulty for the superintendents included in the study. As reported above, the small-school superintendents revealed a greater degree of difficulty on nearly all of these standards than did the other two groups of superintendents. The only exception was the every-day kindergarten standard. The most significant educational program changes in Iowa schools resulted from these eleven standards. For example, the increase of high school units from 29 to 41, four years of foreign language instead of two, the increased vocational education units, the need for technology programs, and a global education program; all will bring about more extensive course offerings for Iowa's students. The every-day kindergarten requirement, the elementary guidance requirement, and the certificated media requirement, will all have a significant effect on the number and training of teachers needed in Iowa's schools. All superintendents will be affected by these changes, but the small-school superintendents, and to a lesser degree the medium-school superintendents, will have more difficulty in making the changes required by the new standards.
The delay in the implementation and the time extensions granted by the state legislature were the result of extensive lobbying efforts by the representative groups of the small and medium-school superintendents. The Rural Schools of Iowa (RSI) and the People United for Rural Education (P.U.R.E.) worked diligently to delay the implementation of the standards. These eleven standards also will be a major impetus for more cooperative and sharing arrangements. In many cases it would be nearly financially impossible for many small districts to meet all of the new standards. More and more sharing of superintendents, curriculum directors, teachers, and instructional programs will result from the implementation of these curriculum standards. Longer school years for teachers and fewer early dismissals will also result from the implementation of these standards. With these types of widespread changes it is understandable why the small-school respondents in this study indicated meeting these standards would be difficult or a hardship.

Degree of Difficulty in Meeting the Data Collecting and On-site Review Procedures of the New Standards

In addition to implementing the new educational standards, a new system of data-collecting and annual
on-site review procedures will go into effect on July 1, 1989. There was no significant difference between the three superintendent groups on the degree of difficulty in meeting these requirements. As in many of the new standards, the small-school superintendents showed more concern as to the difficulty in meeting these procedures. As revealed in Table 28, one-half (50 percent) of the small-school superintendents marked "Difficult" with regard to meeting the procedures compared with 28.1 and 17.4 percent of the medium and large-school superintendents, respectively. The medium and large-school superintendents indicated a higher percentage of "No difficulty" and "Little difficulty" responses than did the small-school superintendents, 62.5 and 65.2 percent for the medium and large schools, respectively, compared to 39.3 percent of the small schools. Overall, more than one half of all the superintendents (55.4 percent) indicated little or no difficulty in meeting the procedures, 32.5 percent indicated it would be difficult, and 12 percent reported meeting the procedures would be a hardship. Meeting the data-collecting and on-site review procedures was difficult for the total superintendents group. Only the every-day kindergarten, the 200-day calendar, and the "at risk" program requirements were reported as more difficult. It was specifically viewed
Table 28

Degree of Difficulty for School Districts in Meeting the Data Collecting and On-site Review Procedures of the New Standards

Issue: The data collecting and on-site review procedures of the new educational standards will also be new. How much difficulty do you feel your district will have in meeting these procedures? (Questionnaire item #5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PUBLIC SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENTS</th>
<th>Group A: (N=28)</th>
<th>Group B: (N=34)</th>
<th>Group C: (N=24)</th>
<th>Total (N=86)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1--No Difficulty</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2--Little Difficulty</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>43.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3--Difficult</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4--A hardship</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5--Great Hardship</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>99.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Number of Responses 100.0 94.1 95.8 96.5

Did Not Answer .0 5.9 4.2 3.5

Mean 2.68 2.34 2.35

S.D. 0.72 0.94 0.98

F-Ratio=1.32

*p<=.05

Note—Because of rounding, percentages may not equal 100.
by the small-school superintendents as being difficult and a hardship for their district.

The data indicate that nearly one-half of the respondents and sixty percent of the small school systems thought the data collecting and on-site review procedures would be difficult or a hardship. This new Department of Education requirement appeared to be a serious concern to the superintendents. In the past the follow-up and review of Iowa standards was not performed annually and was not nearly as comprehensive or rigorous. The penalties and consequences were also not as consequential as the July 1, 1989 requirements.

Recent District Changes in School Programs To Meet the Requirements of the New Standards

The new educational standards were officially adopted by the Department of Education in May, 1987, following a series of hearings and open meetings across the state. They were modified by the state legislature in April, 1988, and are to be effective July 1, 1989. During the last two years as this preliminary action was being taken, many districts began to move towards meeting the up-coming requirements. The survey question asked the respondents to identify what changes they had already made in order to meet the requirements of the new educational standards.
As shown in Table 29, the responses are listed in rank order by group and total. The addition of an elementary guidance counselor by 17 districts was the most popular change. Eleven districts indicated they were planning an every-day kindergarten program. Another eleven districts reported developing a comprehensive health curriculum. Ten districts (six small schools) planned to add additional class offerings at the high school level. Seven districts reported planning a talented and gifted program and six districts added high-school units in order to offer four years of a foreign language.

The following less frequent responses of district program changes were reported. They are listed by the number of districts that have made the change:

a. Added vocational courses - 5 districts.

b. Began whole grade sharing - 4 districts.

c. Hired an elementary principal - 4 districts.

d. Adopted Project Measure to monitor the school program - 4 districts.

e. Added a curriculum coordinator - 3 districts.

f. Develop "at-risk" program - 2 districts.

g. Begin a performance evaluation program - 2 districts.

Single responses included increased media specialist time; work on needs assessment, philosophy, and goals; tuition grade 9-12 student to another district;
Table 29

Recent District Changes in School Programs to Meet the Requirements of the New Standards

Issue: List below any changes that your district has made since the new educational standards were proposed in order to meet the requirements of the new educational standards. (Questionnaire item #6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Change</th>
<th>Group A: Small Districts (N=28)</th>
<th>Group B: Medium-sized Districts (N=34)</th>
<th>Group C: Large Districts (N=24)</th>
<th>Total (N=86)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-Began elementary guidance</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Began plans Kindergarten</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Developed health curriculum</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Added classes to high school</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Organized gifted program</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-Added 4 years foreign language</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
develop a media center; expand the school calendar to 180 days; and form a committee to meet curriculum requirements. As was earlier indicated, many districts had begun to hire and retrain staff for elementary guidance positions. They had also begun to plan for the every-day kindergarten changes and to develop the necessary health curriculum programs. A number of small-school superintendents had also added new classes to their high school program to meet the required 41 units of credit. These changes, which districts have already made, reflect the same standards which the superintendents earlier indicated as having a great impact as well as being more difficult to meet—every-day kindergarten, elementary guidance, health curriculum, and added high school classes. The data indicated that the superintendents already had made a considerable number of changes to meet the requirements of the new standards. In many cases districts had initiated the changes to improve their present educational program without the impetus coming from the new state mandates. In other cases superintendents had set out to gradually make the necessary changes so that they would not have to make all the changes at once.

**Action Planned by School Districts to Meet the Requirements of the New Standards**
In this section the superintendents were asked to list the action that their district planned to take to meet the requirements of the new educational standards. The results as shown in Table 30 list in rank order the actions that were indicated most frequently by the superintendents. Two actions were chosen by 13 of the respondents: 1) Study and prepare for implementing the every-day kindergarten; and 2) Study and revise the K-12 health curriculum. Almost thirty percent (29.2 percent) of the large-school superintendents indicated they were taking that action. Remodelling or building facilities for the new kindergarten program was mentioned by ten superintendents. Eight superintendents indicated they were: 1) Hiring an elementary guidance counselor, and 2) Initiating whole grade sharing or other sharing programs with neighboring districts. Three superintendents responded they were: 1) Implementing a talented and gifted program, and 2) Changing their school calendar. Two superintendents stated they would be developing a program for "at-risk" students.

Single responses from superintendents included: Develop plans for compliance, develop performance evaluation process, add vocational courses, revise global education course, begin needs assessment, eliminate short days (less than 5 1/2 hours), add an elementary media center, study curriculum and needs
Table 30

Actions Planned by School Districts to Meet the Requirements of the New Standards

Issue: List below the action(s) your district plans to take to meet the requirements of the new educational standards. (Questionnaire item #7)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Change:</th>
<th>Group A: Small Districts (N=28)</th>
<th>Group B: Medium-sized Districts (N=34)</th>
<th>Group C: Large Districts (N=24)</th>
<th>Total (N=86)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - Prepare for Kindergarten</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - Change K-12 health curriculum</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - New facilities for Kindergarten</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - Hire elementary guidance counselor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - Grade-sharing programs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
assessment, review policies and develop strategic planning process, eliminate early dismissal, add a fourth vocational area, and work with AEA on a two year time-table of compliance.

The every-day kindergarten requirement resulted in a considerable amount of planned action by the superintendents. Many were studying and preparing to implement the programs and a substantial number were planning to remodel or build new kindergarten facilities. A considerable number were studying and planning revision of the K-12 health curriculum. Shared programs and hiring an elementary guidance counselor were also planned by a number of superintendents. These planned actions indicated that many of the superintendents were making early efforts to meet the new state standards by July 1, 1989. Those actions needed to start early because in many cases meeting the standards required advanced planning. For example, rather than hiring a new elementary guidance counselor, many districts were sending current staff members to school to obtain the necessary certification. Likewise, districts were setting up K-12 health curriculum committees to establish a health services program. Even though the every-day kindergarten standard was delayed until 1992, a substantial number of superintendents were taking the necessary planning steps to implement this program.
Specific School District Plans or Time Tables for Meeting the New Standards

As shown in Table 31, most of the respondents appeared to have no written timetable for meeting the requirements. Few districts indicated a specific plan of action. More than sixty percent (63 percent) of the superintendents, who responded to this question, indicated they would meet the requirements by July 1, 1989. Five superintendents responded that they would continue to monitor a timetable for compliance to the new standards. Four superintendents indicated they would add an every-day kindergarten program and additional curriculum to meet the timelines. Three superintendents answered that they were not making plans or writing timetables. Single responses included passage of an enrichment tax, a whole grade sharing program beginning in the 1988-89 school year, and a sharing program beginning with the 1988-89 school year.

A very small number of the superintendents indicated that they had specific plans or had set timetables to meet the new standards. Instead, nearly all of the respondents stated that they would meet the standards by the required July 1, 1989 date.
Table 31

Specific School District Plans or Time Tables for Meeting the Requirements of the New Standards

Issue: List below any specific plan or time table your district has established to meet the requirements of the new educational standards. (Questionnaire item #8)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Change:</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-Monitor plans for compliance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Additional Kindergarten and curriculum</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Meet standards by July 1, 1989</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-No specific plans</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Other responses</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
School Districts Which Anticipate Reorganizing with Another District Prior to the Implementation of the New Standards

This question required a "Yes" or "No" answer from the superintendents as to whether they anticipated their district reorganizing prior to the July 1, 1989, implementation date. As the results in Table 32 indicate, a large majority of the superintendents anticipated no reorganization on their part prior to the implementation of the new standards. Only four superintendents (4.8 percent), three small and one medium-school superintendents, indicated any reorganization changes prior to the implementation of the standards. From this information it is clear that the new standards have not had an immediate effect on school district reorganization in many districts. The data revealed that school district reorganization is not a spur-of-the-moment action. Much planning over an extended period of time was necessary for two or more districts to consolidate programs. This appeared to be evident from the small number of school districts that anticipated reorganization before the July 1, 1989, standards implementation.
Table 32

School Districts Which Anticipate Reorganizing with Another District Prior to the Implementation of the New Standards

Issue: Do you anticipate your district reorganizing with another district(s) prior to the implementation of the new educational standards? (Questionnaire item #9)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PUBLIC SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group A: Small Districts (N=28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:

1--Yes

11.1 3.0 .0 4.8

2--No

98.9 97.0 100.0 95.2

Total

100.0 100.0 100.0 100.0

Total Number of Responses

96.4 97.1 100.0 98.8

Did Not Answer

3.6 2.9 .0 1.2
School Districts Which Anticipate Entering into Cooperative or Shared Programs with Another District Prior to the Implementation of the New Standards

As shown in Table 33, a majority of all the respondents (58.3 percent) indicated they were anticipating entering into cooperative or shared programs with another district prior to the implementation of the new standards. Three-fourths of the small-school superintendents and one-half of the medium and large-school superintendents anticipated entering into cooperative or shared programs with another district prior to implementation of the new standards.

The data indicated that the new standards have had a significant immediate effect on school districts with regard to entering into cooperative or shared programs with neighboring districts. This was especially the case with the small school districts. Although sharing incentives have been increasingly popular since they were initiated by the Iowa Legislature in the 1981-82 school year, the data indicated that the new standards have had a major effect on the number of cooperative and shared programs. Many of the small-school districts and a lesser number of the medium-school districts believed that the only way they could meet all of the requirements of the new standards was through cooperative or shared programs with one or more
Table 33

School Districts Which Anticipate Entering into Cooperative or Shared Programs with Another District Prior to the Implementation of the New Standards

Issue: Do you anticipate your district entering into a cooperative or shared program with another district(s) prior to the implementation of the new educational standards? (Questionnaire item #10)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PUBLIC SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENTS</th>
<th>Group A: Small Districts (N=28)</th>
<th>Group B: Medium-sized Districts (N=34)</th>
<th>Group C: Large Districts (N=24)</th>
<th>Total (N=86)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1--Yes</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>58.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2--No</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>41.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Number of Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Number of Responses</th>
<th>Group A: Small Districts (N=28)</th>
<th>Group B: Medium-sized Districts (N=34)</th>
<th>Group C: Large Districts (N=24)</th>
<th>Total (N=86)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>94.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>97.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Did Not Answer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did Not Answer</th>
<th>Group A: Small Districts (N=28)</th>
<th>Group B: Medium-sized Districts (N=34)</th>
<th>Group C: Large Districts (N=24)</th>
<th>Total (N=86)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of the neighboring districts. Declining enrollment in many of the smaller Iowa school districts and the additional state funding from the supplemental weighting plan are other factors that have influenced the increase of cooperative programming in Iowa.

Districts Which Anticipate Long Range Effects on Their District with regard to Reorganization or Consolidation as a Result of the New Educational Standards

The results shown in Table 34 indicate nearly forty percent (38.5 percent) of all the superintendents thought there would be long-range effects on their district with regard to reorganization and consolidation as a result of the new standards. The small-school superintendents had 61.5 percent answer "yes" to this question. The percentages for the medium and large-school superintendent's responses were considerably lower (30 percent and 22.7 percent, respectively). These responses definitely indicate that the long-range effects of the new standards on school district reorganization are very substantial. These effects are especially true for the small school districts where more than sixty percent of the respondents indicated there would be long-range effects on their district.

From this data it is very clear that future reorganization and consolidation of many school
Table 34

School Districts Which Anticipate Long Range Effects with regard to Reorganization or Consolidation as a result of the New Standards

Issue: Do you anticipate any long range effects on your district with regard to reorganization or consolidation as a result of the new educational standards? (Questionnaire item #13)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUP</th>
<th>SMALL DISTRICTS (N=28)</th>
<th>MEDIUM-SIZED DISTRICTS (N=34)</th>
<th>LARGE DISTRICTS (N=24)</th>
<th>TOTAL (N=86)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1--Yes</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>38.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2--No</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>77.3</td>
<td>61.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Number of Responses: 92.9 | 88.2 | 100.0 | 90.7
Did Not Answer: 7.1 | 11.8 | 0.0 | 9.3
districts of northeast Iowa would take place because of the new Iowa standards. Although less than 5 percent of the subjects indicated they anticipated reorganization before the implementation date of the new standards, July 1, 1989; nearly forty percent believed there would be long-range effects on their district with regard to reorganization and consolidation as a result of the new standards. If this does take place, it will result in the most extensive change in school district reorganization since the early 1960's. The implications of these changes are far-reaching and would have a significant effect on the face of education across northeast Iowa.

Additional Comments of School Superintendents

Regarding the Effects of the New Standards on Their School Districts

The last question on the survey provided the respondents with an opportunity to write down any additional comments on the effects of the new standards. The comments varied considerably depending on the size of the school district. Only 5 of the 28 small-school superintendents (17.9 percent) responded with additional comments. Overall, most of the small-school superintendent's comments appeared negative in tone. One superintendent stated, "Some of the standards will not improve our school, each school
over the state has different needs." Another stated, "The standards force smaller schools to carry classes with small enrollments..." Another described the standards as "A pain, developed by people who are not in the field." Another gave a mixed review stating, "I am sure it is a step forward, but with great costs." Another responded that they needed additional resources to maintain programs and that an enrichment measure was on the ballot for September, 1988.

The medium-school superintendents that responded to this question also appeared to be more negative than positive concerning the new standards. A higher percentage (38.2 percent) of the medium-school superintendents wrote additional comments. A cross section of the comments are as follows:

"The new standards are a joke."

"We don't have the time or manpower to do all this."

"Very costly."

"They will hit our district hard financially."

"Postpone them as long as possible."

"Finding enough time to complete reporting or implementation."

"The 200-day calendar is silly..."

"...a negative effect in instruction and morale...They are going too far in response to national studies just to force reorganization."
The one superintendent whose comments appeared to be more positive stated, "The standards are minimum. Our board members feel they are warranted."

The large-school superintendents appeared overall to be more positive in their comments about the new standards. One-fourth (25 percent) of the superintendents wrote additional comments. The main concern appeared to be with the kindergarten standard and the financial effects of the standards. This was reflected by the comments: "If funding is available, new standards can be beneficial."

"Need funding," and "... don't have the space. Our main concern is kindergarten."

Other positive comments of the large-school superintendents were:

"Too long coming, should have been done sooner."

"Not enough, we need a stronger program for Iowa youth."

"They haven't gone far enough. Reorganization of Iowa schools must take place."

"I believe they will have a very positive effect."

The comments in general appeared to fall into two different categories. The comments of small and medium-school superintendents were negative and represented their concerns about finances and the educational value of the new standards. The large-school superintendents overall were not as
negative but they did express a definite concern for the financial effects of the standards. The comments made by the superintendents were consistent with the responses that were recorded in the survey. The small-school superintendents expressed many more concerns and indicated that meeting most of the standards would be much more of a difficulty or hardship than did the medium and large-school superintendents. The level of concern of the medium-school superintendent was not as great as the small-school superintendents but was greater than that of their large-school colleagues. In conclusion, the large-school superintendents appeared the least concerned in their comments and in their responses on the survey. Other than the every-day kindergarten standard, they indicated that meeting a majority of the standards would not be that difficult. Their concern was very clear as to the cost of additional staff, and the need for more building facilities to house twice as many kindergarten students.

The data from the comments of the respondents consistently indicated a serious concern as to the financial costs of implementing the new standards. An obvious message to the state legislature and the Department of Education would be to fund the changes that will be necessary to meet the new standards. Failure to do so may add to the hostile feelings at the
local school level towards state mandated program changes. The new financial aid plan which is the topic of discussion in the 1989 Iowa legislature will need to seriously consider that topic.

Information from the Interview of Superintendents from Small, Medium, and Large School Districts

A total of twelve respondents were interviewed, four from each of the three subgroups. The superintendents represented a cross-section of the respondents with regard to administrative experience and the length of years as superintendents at their present district. A table of random numbers was used to select the superintendents to interview. In addition to verifying the results of the survey, the interview provided a more in-depth, comprehensive look at the new standards as viewed by the sample group.

Information received from interviews of the small-school superintendents: The comments made by two of the small-school superintendents were positive. They indicated the standards would not have a big effect on their district. Both stated that they met nearly all of the standards already. Neither of the superintendents viewed reorganization as coming to their district; although both were presently involved in sharing programs, one with four other districts, the other in a whole grade sharing arrangement. The
possibility of the second district starting whole grade sharing was mentioned, but the superintendent stated it was not because of the new standards. One superintendent stated his displeasure, "I think we should be able to decide what is most important for our kids."

The other two small-school superintendents who were interviewed stated that the new standards would affect them greatly. They were both very emphatic as they indicated the new standards were in essence closing up their districts. Both of these districts presently have only one administrator. The first superintendent said, "The standards have no positive impact. It is forcing us to close our high school ... We don't have the horses! Staff or kids! We presently have 52 in our high school with 2 or 3 in some classes." He indicated that in 1988 the two high schools would share all sports program and in 1989 their high school would close. He predicted reorganization in 5-10 years, although he stated the community plans to stay in the school business.

The last small-school superintendent who was interviewed stated, "I don't see where it's going to improve things. We're doing a good job now." He described the standards saying, "They have had an effect on sharing. With the numbers, we have to share." After reflecting he mentioned, "It's easy to
blame the standards. It might have been coming anyway because of the numbers." He mentioned that his district will be sending their high school students to another district in 1989. He concluded the interview by stating that his district, a wealthy district, would not give up. He indicated reorganization would not work for his district for a variety of reasons. It would have to dissolve.

From the interviews of the small-school superintendents, the responses appeared to be related to how the new standards were directly affecting their district. Two of the superintendents were positive because the standards were causing no major changes other than additional sharing arrangements, which had already been initiated previous to the new standards. The two superintendents, from districts who were closing in the near future, were very negative about the effects of the new standards. Interviews of the small-school superintendents indicated that the new standards were having a definite effect on the speeding-up of more cooperative and sharing arrangements between districts. In some cases the standards appeared to be one more impetus for some districts with regard to sharing arrangements which would delay the eventual closing of their high schools. The extent of the impact of the new standards depended
to a great degree on what was the present status of the district.

Information received from interviews of the medium-school superintendents: An experienced veteran superintendent of many years stated, "The standards will have an effect. Costs will be going up." He indicated he had no argument with the standards, "I can't dispute any of them." He reported his district would start sharing whole grades with a neighboring district in 1989. He voiced concern over the additional paperwork and the cost, mentioning $40,000 cost and the need for additional space for kindergarten. In concluding, he stated, "Reorganization is the answer overall; cooperative programs are only a band-aid situation."

The second superintendent, a veteran of 10 years as superintendent at his present district, thought the standards would have no effect on districts merging or sharing. He indicated most of the standards were already in force and that standards were merely to "create new jobs." He complained of the standards being too costly and that his district didn't have the resources or personnel to keep up. "We may hire a curriculum person to help and share them with another district," he concluded.

The third and fourth medium-school superintendents, both less-experienced superintendents
with six and three years experience, voiced concern as to the small schools meeting the standards. The third superintendent stated it would, "Have no great effect or real impact on us." His district presently shares a superintendent with a neighboring district. He said the new standards wouldn't force his district to reorganize, but it has forced the neighboring district into cooperative programs that could bring reorganization. In the 1989 school year, he indicated his district would have whole grade sharing with their grade 6-8 students leaving and the neighboring district's high school students coming. He concluded, "The standards were a part of it. It pushed it more to the forefront. It will be very tough on our neighboring district, us too, especially finances."

The final medium-school superintendent indicated that his district wouldn't do anything different and that the standards had no real impact on his district. He described the standards as "Some good, some baloney." He stated that he resented the new policy development calling it a "Paper shuffle." In concluding he characterized the standards as, "A scary thing for small districts," as he described how two smaller neighboring districts had approached his district as to sharing programs. His last comment summed up his feelings for the future, "Reorganization will come when the sharing money runs out."
In summary, the medium-school superintendents indicated that the standards would not have a major effect but would force more sharing and cooperative arrangements. They voiced concern for the effects on the smaller schools and overall were negative with regard to the additional paperwork and costs. The interview information and data from the survey indicate that the standards will not have a major impact on the medium school district, but meeting the new standards would be an economic burden and extra work for administrators who already feel over-burdened with state-dictated programs and policy demands.

Information received from interviews of large school superintendents. In analyzing the interviews of the four large-school superintendents, three could be characterized as being very positive about the new standards. The fourth superintendent viewed the standards as a burden or "One more thing on top of others." The two more-experienced superintendents had been superintendents at their present districts for 17 years and 22 years, respectively. The first of the experienced superintendents indicated the standards would have no great effect on his district, but that they would "Bring about greater equity on school programs in the state." His main concern was the question of funding, especially after a preliminary study of every-day kindergarten reported an increase of
$250-300,000. He stated that he had called four or five of the small neighboring districts offering to share programs, but had received no return response. He concluded his comments stating his observations as to the smaller schools sharing with his district. "They view big as bad; they would rather share with another district their own size."

The second superintendent, a veteran of 15 years, was emphatic about the reasons a neighboring small district was reorganizing with his district. Commenting on the three year program which will lead to eventual reorganization, he said, "Without a doubt the standards caused this. They only have one administrator, a high school of 55, and they are running out of money. It won't hurt us; we can absorb their whole high school and only add a half-time teacher." He concluded by stating that they would profit from the reorganization.

The final two large-school superintendents who were interviewed had two years and six years experience, respectively, at their present district. The superintendent with two years experience stated that he agreed with all of the standards and that the district was "Moving that way anyway." He elaborated on the specific standards he agreed upon and mentioned the need for more sharing arrangements to survive. He concluded by stating, "It will have a positive impact."
Some will give us problems, but it will improve education."

The last superintendent who was interviewed stated that the standards would have virtually no impact. He commented, "The standards, in my opinion, won't affect our school a great deal." His concerns were over cost and the need for more facilities. He described the standards as "Negative. Unless we get additional funds, we're in big trouble." Referring to the loss of 1000 students in the last ten years, huge staff reductions, and high transportation costs due to a large-sized district, he described the standards as, "One more thing on top of others." He concluded the interview by stating, "Sorry, I can't be more upbeat on the standards."

The responses of the large-school superintendents were more positive than those of their colleagues from the other groups. Their interviews indicated that they thought the new standards would have many good effects on education in their district as well as the state. At the same time, there appeared to be a serious concern by a number of the superintendents as to added costs and the need for more facilities. They indicated that additional state funding for implementation of the new standards would lessen that concern. Overall, the concern for the impact of the new standards upon the small schools was evident, not only from the small
district superintendents, but also from the medium and large-school respondents. Some superintendents indicated that for better education in Iowa, the new standards were long overdue. At the same time, they appeared to be aware of the long-range effects these new standards would have on the future existence of many smaller districts in Iowa.
CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

This chapter presents a summary of the study, a summary of the findings, conclusions based on the findings, recommendations, and suggestions for further research.

Summary of the Study

The purposes of this study were to determine and assess: 1) the impact of the new Iowa educational standards on local districts; 2) the anticipated and proposed changes in school programs and policy as a result of the new standards; and 3) the short and long-term implications of the new standards for public school districts.

One hundred fourteen (114) public school superintendents from northeast and north-central Iowa were involved in the study (26 percent of the total superintendents in the state). The subjects were divided into three groups (districts with small, medium, and large student populations) for the purpose of this study. The information for this study was collected by use of a questionnaire and the interview
Summary of the Findings

The Positive and Negative Impact of the New Standards on Existing School Programs

An Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) established that there was a significant difference between the small, medium, and large-school superintendents on both questions which asked about the positive and negative impact of the new standards. As a group, the superintendents were equally divided as to whether the new standards would have a great positive impact. A majority of the large-school superintendents (58.3 percent) indicated they believed the standards would have a positive impact. On the question of the negative impact of the standards, more than two-thirds of all the superintendents (68.2 percent) indicated disagreement with the statement. Nearly ninety percent of the large-school superintendents disagreed (87.5 percent) compared to 64.7 percent of the medium and 62.9 percent of the small-school superintendents. The 68.2 percent disagreement with the great negative
impact statement was considerably higher than the 42.4 percent disagreement of all the superintendents on the positive impact statement. None of the large-school superintendents agreed with the negative impact statement whereas nearly 20 percent of the small and 15 percent of the medium-school superintendents agreed. In conclusion, more superintendents disagreed that the standards had a negative impact but many of the same respondents would not agree that the standards had a positive impact.

New Educational Standards Which Superintendents Indicate as Having a Great Impact or the Greatest Impact on Their District

When asked to select the standards which they believed would have a great impact on the existing educational program in their district, the every-day kindergarten requirement was selected by the largest number of superintendents. The standard requiring curriculum development, implementation and evaluation of the curriculum, and monitoring of the school program was also selected as having a great impact. The kindergarten standard was viewed as having a great impact for nearly all of the large-school superintendents (91.3 percent). The K-12 guidance requirement and the program for "at-risk" students were
also thought to have a great impact by the superintendents.

The superintendents included in the study were also asked to select the three educational standards which they thought would have the greatest impact on their existing educational program. The every-day kindergarten standard was again selected by more superintendents than any other standard. The large and medium-school superintendents again indicated they were much more concerned on this issue. The K-12 guidance requirement and the program for "at-risk" students ranked second and third as having the greatest impact. In conclusion, the kindergarten standard had the greatest impact for the large and medium-school superintendents whereas a large number of the standards had a great impact on the small school districts.

Degree of Difficulty for School Districts in Meeting the New Standards Requiring Additional School Board Policies

A majority of the superintendents in the study indicated they would have little or no difficulty in meeting each of the six standards that require additional school board policies. The range for the six standards varied from a low of 54.7 percent for the time-on-task standard to a high of 86.1 percent for
the adoption of a needs assessment policy, plans, and goals. The small-school superintendents reported more difficulty than the other two superintendent groups on nearly all of these standards. The Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) measured that a significant difference existed among the three groups of superintendents on the degree of difficulty in meeting the school health services requirements. Nearly three-fourths of the small-school superintendents (71.4 percent) indicated meeting this standard would be difficult or a hardship. In conclusion, the superintendents had little difficulty in meeting 5 of the 6 standards concerned with new school board policies. Only the school health services requirement was a hardship and that was for the small-school superintendents.

Degree of Difficulty for School Districts in Meeting the New Standards Requiring Programs to Meet Student Needs

The ANOVA measured no significant difference among the three groups of superintendents on the degree of difficulty in meeting the three standards requiring programs to meet student needs. A majority of the respondents indicated they would have little or no difficulty in meeting the requirements for establishing a gifted and talented program (74.3 percent) and a K-12
guidance program (64.3 percent). More than one-half of the respondents (55.8 percent) reported it would be difficult or a hardship to meet the standard requiring programs for "at-risk" students. The small-school superintendents specifically indicated concern as nearly three-fourths of that group (71.5 percent) indicated it would be difficult or a hardship to meet this standard. The concern of the small-school superintendents was considerably higher than the medium and large-school superintendents. Only the "at-risk" program requirements were difficult and the difficulty was more for the small-school superintendents.

Degree of Difficulty for School Districts in Meeting the New Standards for Curriculum Program Requirements

There was a significant difference on the ANOVA among the small, medium, and large-school superintendents on the degree of difficulty of six of the eleven standards which require curriculum programs. The ANOVA to be critical at the .05 level of probability was 3.15. This was exceeded with the new standards concerning 1) Every-day kindergarten, 2) A minimum of 41 high school units of study, 3) Four years of a foreign language, 4) Ten units of vocational education, 5) Global education program, and 6) A superintendent may not serve as a building principal.
The F values ranged from the low of 3.27 for the standard establishing a global education program to a high of 11.57 for the standard which states a superintendent may not serve as a building principal.

The superintendents included in the study reported the most difficulty in meeting the standard requiring every-day kindergarten. Contrary to the results on nearly all of the other standards, meeting this standard was much more difficult for the large and medium schools and of little or no difficulty for the small schools.

A significant difference did not exist on the ANOVA among the small, medium, and large-school superintendents on the degree of difficulty in meeting the remaining five curriculum program requirements. There was no significant difference on the following standards: 1) A 200-day school calendar, 2) A 5 1/2 hour instructional day, 3) District media services program, 4) Instructional programs of current technologies, and 5) Health, physical education, and fine arts requirements.

These five standards, where a significant difference did not exist on the ANOVA, were considerably more difficult for the small schools to meet. Overall, a majority of all the respondents indicated little or no difficulty in meeting these five
standards. The responses of little or no difficulty ranged from a low of 52.9 percent for the 200-day school calendar to a high of 83.6 percent for the 5 1/2 hour instructional day.

The standard which states that a superintendent may not serve as a building principal was significantly more difficult for the small-school superintendents. Nearly two-fifths of the small-school superintendents (39.3 percent) indicated meeting this standard would be difficult or a hardship compared to less than 2 percent of the other two groups of superintendents. In conclusion, the findings indicate little difficulty overall in meeting these eleven standards except for the medium and large-school superintendents meeting the kindergarten requirement. Meeting the remaining ten standards was more difficult for the small-school superintendents, especially the standard which states that a superintendent may not serve as a building principal.

Degree of Difficulty in Meeting the Data Collecting and On-site Review Procedures of the New Standards

A majority of the superintendents included in the study (55.4 percent) indicated there would be little or no difficulty in meeting the new data collecting and on-site review procedures. Again, as in many of the
findings summarized earlier, the small-school superintendents expressed more concern as to the difficulty of these requirements than did the other two superintendent groups.

Recent District Program Changes, Planned Action, and Specific District Timetables for Meeting the New Standards

The superintendents included in the study were asked to attach any plan or ideas or to answer three questions which requested them to list 1) any changes that the district had made since the standards were proposed, 2) the action the district planned to take to meet the requirements of the standards, and 3) any specific plan or timetable the district had established to meet the requirements of the standards. The hiring of an elementary guidance counselor was listed as the most frequent change. Initiating or planning an every-day kindergarten program; and developing a comprehensive health curriculum were also mentioned frequently.

The superintendents listed a wide variety of actions that their district planned to take to meet the requirements of the new standards. The two actions most frequently mentioned were 1) study and prepare for
implementing the every-day kindergarten program and 2) study and revise the K-12 health curriculum. The remodelling or building of facilities for a new kindergarten program was also listed frequently.

Most of the superintendents who responded to this question did not have a specific plan or timetable for meeting the requirements of the new standards. Of the superintendents that responded to this question, 63 percent stated they would meet the standards by July 1, 1989.

Districts Which Anticipate Reorganization, Cooperative or Shared Programs, or Long Range Effects with regard to Reorganization or Consolidation as a Result of the New Standards

Three questions were asked of the respondents which required a yes or no answer regarding their future projections about school district reorganization and cooperative program changes. Nearly all of the respondents (95.2 percent) indicated they anticipated no reorganization on their part prior to the implementation of the new standards July 1, 1989. Almost three-fifths of the respondents (58.3 percent) indicated they were anticipating entering into cooperative or shared programs with another district prior to the implementation of the new standards.
Three-fourths of the small-school superintendents (75 percent) anticipated taking that action.

Nearly 40 percent of all the respondents (38.5 percent) and nearly 60 percent of the small-school superintendents (61.5 percent) reported that they believed there would be long-range effects on their school district with regard to reorganization or consolidation as a result of the new standards. The percentage of small school districts affected (61.5 percent) was twice as high as the medium and large schools which were 30 and 22.7 percent, respectively.

In conclusion, the findings indicate no immediate school district reorganization was anticipated by the respondents, but considerable cooperative and shared programming was anticipated in the near future. Over the long run the superintendents did anticipate a considerable amount of reorganization and consolidation as a result of the new standards.

Additional Comments Regarding the Effects of the New Standards and Interview Information of School Superintendents

Many of the comments of the small and medium-school superintendents were negative in tone and expressed a concern for additional costs. The comments of the large-school superintendents were more positive
although they expressed concerns about the financial effects of all the new standards and specifically the kindergarten standard.

The comments of the twelve respondents who were interviewed provided more insight into the overall effects of the new standards. In summarizing their comments, it appeared that they followed the same pattern as those made by the respondents on the last question of the survey. The comments of the four small-school superintendents were split. Two superintendents were positive, the other two indicated that the new standards would affect them greatly in that their districts would be closing their high schools in the next two years.

The medium-school superintendents indicated considerable concern with higher costs and the lack of personnel or resources to meet all of the requirements. They were also concerned for the small school districts in Iowa as they had neighboring school districts who were forced to share programs in order to maintain their programs. Three of the four large-school superintendents who were interviewed were positive about the effects of the new standards. In conclusion, the additional comments and interview results correlate with the results obtained in the survey. The large-school superintendents are more positive and less
concerned as to the difficulty of implementing the new standards whereas the small-school superintendents are more negative and express more difficulty in meeting the standards. The medium-school superintendent's views fall somewhere in-between.

Conclusions

On the basis of the findings of this study, the following conclusions indicate:

1. The every-day kindergarten standard will have the greatest impact on the existing school programs. A majority of all the respondents (56.6 percent) selected this standard as having a great impact on the existing educational programs in their district. It was also marked by more of the respondents (55.3 percent) as having the greatest impact on the existing educational program in their district. Nearly all of the large-school superintendents (91.3 percent) and a majority of the medium-school superintendents (62.5 percent) agreed that the kindergarten standard would have a great impact on their district. Only 21.4 percent of the small-school superintendents thought the kindergarten standard would have a great impact.

2. A majority of the superintendents reported that they believed it would not be overly difficult to meet
the requirements of the new educational standards. A majority of all the respondents (ranging from 52.9 percent to 91.7 percent) reported that there would be little or no difficulty in meeting 18 of the 20 new standards. The kindergarten standard was the most difficult standard to meet, especially for the large and medium-school superintendents. Establishing programs for "at-risk" students was either difficult or a hardship for 55.8 percent of all the respondents. The standard which requires a 200-day calendar was difficult or a hardship for 63.6 percent of the medium-school superintendents.

3. Meeting the new standards would be considerably more difficult and in many cases a hardship for the small-school superintendents. The data indicate that there was a significant difference on the ANOVA among the small, medium, and large-school superintendents on the degree of difficulty in meeting a considerable number of the standards. The standard requiring the establishment of a school health services program, as well as six of the eleven new curriculum program standards, all indicated a significant difference with F values exceeding the .05 probability in responses as to the difficulty of meeting the standards. In six of seven of those standards, the small-school superintendents reported more difficulty than did the
other two superintendent groups. In many of the other standards, the small-school superintendents indicated more difficulty in meeting the requirements of the new standards than the other two superintendent groups. The small-school superintendents also reported more difficulty than the other superintendent groups in meeting the data collecting and on-site review procedures of the new standards. The medium-school superintendents reported more difficulty than the large-school superintendents on nearly all of the standards.

4. A majority of all three superintendent groups agreed that the new standards would not have a great negative impact on the existing school programs in their districts. Only a majority of the large-school superintendents agreed that the standards would have a great positive impact. On both of these questions concerning the positive and negative impact of the standards a significant difference existed on the ANOVA among the small, medium, and large-school superintendents.

Nearly sixty percent of the large-school superintendents (58.3 percent) indicated the standards would have a great positive impact, whereas nearly three-fifths of the small-school superintendents (59.3 percent) and nearly one-half (47 percent) of the
medium-school superintendents disagreed. The percentage of large-school superintendents who agreed that the standards would not have a great negative impact was significantly higher than that of the small and medium-school superintendents.

5. The superintendents have already made many program changes to comply with the newly mandated standards. The major changes that they have already made involve 1) hiring of elementary guidance counselors, 2) planning for every-day kindergarten, 3) revising of the total K-12 health curriculum, and 4) addition of class offerings to their high school program. Even though the data indicate that very few of the respondents did have specific plans or timetables, 63 percent of the superintendents stated they would meet the requirements by July 1, 1989. The respondents also listed a variety of actions that they planned to take to meet the requirements of the new standards. In addition to the kindergarten program, the health curriculum, and hiring elementary guidance counselors; the most frequently planned actions were to obtain facilities for the kindergarten program and to initiate whole grade sharing or other sharing programs with neighboring school districts.

6. Superintendents were most concerned about the added financial costs of the new standards. The
superintendents did not view the new standards as negative in themselves but they believed the impact of the standards would have a negative effect on their programs and in some cases their very existence as a district. Many of the small-school superintendents and some of the others appeared to be torn between the good they saw in many of the standards and the devastating effect the changes would have on their district. This concern is multiplied when added to sagging enrollment problems, the additional paperwork envisioned with the many new school board policy requirements, and the fact that many of the small-school superintendents are the only administrator in the district. The comments by colleagues from the medium and large schools also verified the concern of the small-school superintendent. The comments of the large-school superintendents overall were much more positive, although they did voice concern over the need for facilities and the additional cost for every-day kindergarten. State funding to implement the kindergarten standard as well as some of the other standards would soften the financial worries of the local school districts considerably.

7. The new standards were a major factor in encouraging cooperative or shared programs with other districts prior to the implementation of the new standards.
Nearly three of every five respondents (58.3 percent) reported that they anticipated entering into a cooperative or shared programs before July 1, 1989. Three-fourths of the small-school superintendents (75 percent) planned to take that action.

8. The new standards were not a major factor with regard to district reorganization before the implementation date of the new standards. Fewer than five percent of all the respondents (4.8 percent) reported that they anticipated reorganizing with another district prior to July 1, 1989.

9. Many of the respondents (nearly 40 percent) believed that there would be long-range effects on their school district with regard to reorganization or consolidation as a result of the new standards. This finding was especially important for the small-school superintendents as more than sixty percent of that group (61.5 percent) answered "Yes" to that question. Five, ten, or fifteen years from now these long-range effects of the 1987 educational standards will result in considerably fewer public school districts across the state of Iowa. The toll on the small school district will be the heaviest. The new Iowa state funding law and other future legislative action may also play a major role in reducing the total number of Iowa school districts.
Recommendations

Based on the conclusions, the following actions are recommended:

1. Pilot programs for every-day kindergarten programs should be encouraged by the Department of Education and funded by the legislature prior to the July 1, 1992, implementation date.

2. A new physical plant and equipment fund should be created by the legislature to replace the present site levy and schoolhouse levy. Such a fund would allow school districts to levy up to $1 per $1,000 assessed valuation without voter approval. This would grant school districts the necessary funding to provide the additional classrooms to implement the new every-day kindergarten standard.

3. The new educational standards should be implemented by all Iowa school districts without delay by July 1, 1989. The kindergarten standard should also should be implemented by the July 1, 1992, deadline.

4. Additional state aid funding should be provided to school districts to reduce the additional costs of the new standards. Consideration for additional funding for this purpose should be included in the planning of the new Iowa state aid formula.
5. Additional state aid should be earmarked for rural districts with small or thinly-spread enrollments because of higher transportation costs.

6. The state legislature should continue to fund and promote cooperative and shared programs between Iowa school districts. Joint district efforts have proved to be an effective means of district cooperation and will continue to be an impetus for future school district consolidation and reorganization.

7. A variety of approaches should be studied as means to encourage reorganization and consolidation of Iowa's present school districts. Pilot programs and financial incentives to districts who reorganize are two possible approaches to promote future reorganization and consolidation of Iowa's smaller school districts.

**Implications for Further Study**

The findings from this study suggest several areas in which there is a need for concerted research efforts. On the basis of accumulated evidence, the following research priorities are recommended:

1. In view of the increased pressures being exerted upon education, it is recommended that future studies be made concerning the total financial condition of
education in Iowa. Although an economic impact study was prepared by the Department of Education to determine the approximate costs of implementing the new standards; a study to search out alternative approaches to finance the new standards, as well as bring about educational changes and better education, would be valuable.

2. A study should be made to investigate the effects of the cooperative and shared programs upon future school district reorganization and consolidation. This type of study or a similar study which would search out alternatives to facilitate successful school district reorganization in Iowa, would be helpful.

3. It is recommended that the views of public school superintendents be determined and assessed with regard to the same purposes of this study, but including the provision that all of the new standards would be completely implemented and educational changes would be funded by state revenue.

4. The small-school superintendents in this survey indicated much more difficulty in meeting the new standards than the medium and large-school superintendents. In light of this finding, it is recommended that a study search for the specific reasons why such a variance exists.
5. An in-depth study of the long-range effects of the new educational standards on Iowa school districts with regard to reorganization and consolidation is recommended. Since such a large number of the respondents of this study believed there would be long-range effects on their district, such a study would provide valuable information.

6. A replication of major phases of this study on a total state level, including all of the state's public school superintendents or a cross-section of the state's school board members, would provide a more in-depth assessment of the impact and effects of the new educational standards on the school districts of Iowa.
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APPENDIX A
# Table A-1

Name and Enrollment of Public School Districts Located in Northeast and North-central Iowa with Student Populations of fewer than 500 Students, For the 1987-1988 School Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School District</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Alden Community School District</td>
<td>431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Allison-Bristow Community Schools</td>
<td>386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Andrew Community Schools</td>
<td>359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Aplington Community Schools</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Beaman-Conrad-Liscomb Community Schools</td>
<td>495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Cal Community Schools</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Clarksville Community Schools</td>
<td>443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Dumont Community Schools</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Dunkerton Community Schools</td>
<td>488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Dysart-Geneseo Community Schools</td>
<td>429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Fredericksburg Community Schools</td>
<td>368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Garnavillo Community Schools</td>
<td>433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Garwin Community Schools</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Gladbrook Community Schools</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Green Mountain Independent School District</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Greene Community Schools</td>
<td>390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Hubbard Community Schools</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Janesville Consolidated School District</td>
<td>451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Lisbon Community Schools</td>
<td>465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Mar Mac Community Schools</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Meservey-Thornton Community Schools</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Midland Community Schools</td>
<td>458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 New Hartford Community Schools</td>
<td>351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 North Winneshiek Community Schools</td>
<td>384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Norway Community Schools</td>
<td>334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Olin Consolidated School District</td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Oxford Junction Consolidated Schools</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Plainfield Community Schools</td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Preston Community Schools</td>
<td>490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Radcliffe Community Schools</td>
<td>298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Reinbeck Community Schools</td>
<td>415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 Rockwell-Swaledale Community Schools</td>
<td>354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 Semco Community Schools</td>
<td>328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 Sheffield-Chapin Community Schools</td>
<td>380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 Shellsburg Community Schools</td>
<td>351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 Steamboat Rock Community Schools</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 Union Whitten Community Schools</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 Urbana Community Schools</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 Ventura Community Schools</td>
<td>276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 Wellsburg Community Schools</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 West Central Community Schools</td>
<td>469</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table A-2

Name and Enrollment of Public School Districts Located in Northeast and North-Central Iowa with Student Populations of 500-999 Students, For the 1987-1988 School Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School District</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Ackley-Geneva Community Schools</td>
<td>540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Alburnett Community Schools</td>
<td>697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Belle Plaine Community Schools</td>
<td>695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Central Community Schools</td>
<td>830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Central City Community Schools</td>
<td>542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Center Point Consolidated School District</td>
<td>625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Denver Consolidated Schools</td>
<td>746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Dike Community Schools</td>
<td>571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 East Buchanan Community Schools</td>
<td>712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 East Central Community Schools</td>
<td>540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Eastern Allamakee Community Schools</td>
<td>573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Eldora-New Providence Community Schools</td>
<td>850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Garnavillo Community Schools</td>
<td>715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Grundy Center Community Schools</td>
<td>639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Guttenberg Community Schools</td>
<td>636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Hudson Community Schools</td>
<td>621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Jesup Community Schools</td>
<td>897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 L.D.F. Community Schools</td>
<td>557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 La Porte City Community Schools</td>
<td>731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 M.F.L. Community Schools</td>
<td>746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Maquoketa Valley Community Schools</td>
<td>892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Mount Vernon Community Schools</td>
<td>886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Nashua Community Schools</td>
<td>593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 North Central Community Schools</td>
<td>646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 North Linn Community Schools</td>
<td>790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 North Tama Community Schools</td>
<td>583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Northwood-Kensett Community Schools</td>
<td>605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Nora Springs-Rock Falls Community Schools</td>
<td>537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Parkersburg Community Schools</td>
<td>529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Postville Community Schools</td>
<td>627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Riceville Community Schools</td>
<td>620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 Rudd-Rockford-Marble Rock Community Schools</td>
<td>714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 St. Ansgar Community Schools</td>
<td>726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 South Winneshiek Community Schools</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 Springville Community Schools</td>
<td>504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 Starmont Community Schools</td>
<td>947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 Sumner Community Schools</td>
<td>771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 Tripoli Community Schools</td>
<td>545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 Turkey Valley Community Schools</td>
<td>703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 Valley Community Schools</td>
<td>703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 Wapsie Valley Community Schools</td>
<td>832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 West Central Community Schools</td>
<td>677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 West Marshall Community Schools</td>
<td>807</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE A-3

Name and Enrollment of Public School Districts Located in Northeast and North-Central Iowa with Student Populations of 1000 or more Students, For the 1987-1988 School Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School District</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Allamakee Community Schools</td>
<td>1,582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Anamosa Community Schools</td>
<td>1,313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Benton Community Schools</td>
<td>1,191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Cedar Falls Community Schools</td>
<td>4,875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Cedar Rapids Community Schools</td>
<td>17,348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Charles City Community Schools</td>
<td>2,024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Clear Lake Community Schools</td>
<td>1,638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 College Community Schools</td>
<td>2,341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Decorah Community Schools</td>
<td>1,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Dubuque Community Schools</td>
<td>9,495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Hampton Community Schools</td>
<td>1,112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Howard Winneshiek Community Schools</td>
<td>1,425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Independence Community Schools</td>
<td>1,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Iowa Falls Community Schools</td>
<td>1,270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Linn-Mar Community Schools</td>
<td>2,903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Marion Independent Community Schools</td>
<td>1,637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Maquoketa Community Schools</td>
<td>1,665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Marshalltown Community Schools</td>
<td>4,873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Mason City Community Schools</td>
<td>4,890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Monticello Community Schools</td>
<td>1,063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 New Hampton Community Schools</td>
<td>1,485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 North Fayette Community Schools</td>
<td>1,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Oelwein Community Schools</td>
<td>1,605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Osage Community Schools</td>
<td>1,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 South Tama Community Schools</td>
<td>1,835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Vinton Community Schools</td>
<td>1,474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Waterloo Community Schools</td>
<td>12,584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Waiverly-Shellrock Community Schools</td>
<td>2,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 West Delaware Community Schools</td>
<td>1,816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 West Dubuque Community Schools</td>
<td>3,079</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B
Dear Superintendent:

Your assistance is solicited for a research study concerning the educational impact of the new Iowa Department of Education standards upon schools in northeast and north-central Iowa. This study will include all public school superintendents of districts within the twenty-five counties which make up the northeast quarter of the state of Iowa. In addition, approximately ten percent of the respondents will be interviewed as part of the study.

The effects of the new standards on present school programs will be significant and far-reaching. The purpose of this study will be to assess and determine:

1) the impact on local districts.
2) the anticipated and proposed changes in school programs.
3) the short and long term implications of the new standards.

We believe the results of the study will provide insight into the overall effects of the new standards on the existing school programs. Your individual response is extremely important if we are to get an accurate profile of those effects.

Be assured that your individual responses will be held in strictest confidence. We understand that this issue is a serious concern to many of you. The number on the first page is merely for the purpose of sending reminders to those who have not responded in the given time. Upon return of all questionnaires the list of identification numbers will be destroyed. Upon completion of the study, results will be made available to you at your request. Simply fill in the enclosed card and return if you would like to receive the results of the study. The card ensures confidentiality as I will be able to destroy the identification numbers.

This study can be very important to you. It should provide much needed insight into the impact and effects of the new educational standards.

Your willingness to participate in this study and prompt return of the questionnaire will be greatly appreciated. Please return in the enclosed return envelope by April 25.

Sincerely yours,

M. P. Heller, Professor
Educational Administration
Loyola University of Chicago

Thomas J. Wickham, Principal
Western Dubuque Schools
Dyersville, Iowa
April, 1988

Dear Administrator:

There has been considerable debate about the impact of the new minimum standards as proposed by the State Board of Education. While a lot of discussion has taken place on this topic, little effort has been made to actually gather information as to the impact of the new standards.

Enclosed is a survey instrument designed to elicit feedback from some of our Iowa administrators on the educational impact of the new standards. We believe the study is of interest and urge you to consider responding to this questionnaire.

Respectfully,

Gaylord Tryon
Executive Director

GT: pj
April, 1988

Dear Administrator

Rural Schools of Iowa, Inc., an organization of 90 schools with enrollments under 1,000 students have real concerns about the economic impact of the implementation of the minimum standards for the school year beginning July 1, 1989.

The survey instrument enclosed if completed by all school participants would provide an indication of the educational, economical, and social impact of the enactment of the educational standards for the schools of Iowa.

Our organization urges you to cooperate in the study as we feel it would be beneficial to education in Iowa and an interest to educators, board members, legislators, and state officials.

Sincerely

[Signature]

James E. Pasut, Member
Board of Directors-Rural Schools of Iowa
Northeast Iowa Chairman
Part A.
Personal and District Data

1. What is the enrollment of your district? ______________

2. How many years have you been a superintendent? ______

3. How many years have you been a superintendent in your present district? ______________

4. Do you presently serve as a principal in addition to your role as superintendent? Yes_____ No_____ 
   If your answer to question #4 was no, skip question #5.

5. If yes, circle the level of principal you are.
   a. Elementary
   b. Middle or junior high school
   c. High school
   d. Other, please specify ___________________
Part B.

**Directions:** Indicate your agreement or disagreement by responding to the following scale used below:

1. Strongly agree (SA)
2. Agree (A)
3. Undecided (U)
4. Disagree (D)
5. Strongly disagree (SD)

1. Indicate your agreement or disagreement.
The new educational standards will have a great positive impact on the existing school program in your district. 1 2 3 4 5

2. Indicate your agreement or disagreement.
The new educational standards will have a great negative impact on the existing school program in your district. 1 2 3 4 5

3. Indicate which of the new educational standards listed below will have a great impact on the existing educational program in your district.
   a. On the left side, circle the corresponding letter of the standards which you feel will have a great impact on your district.
   b. On the right side, place an x next to the three educational standards that you feel will have the greatest impact on your existing educational program (mark 3 total not 3 per category).

**School board policies concerning:**

a. Adoption of a performance evaluation process

b. Adoption of needs assessment policy, plans and goals

c. Adoption of instructional time-on-task auditing

d. Adoption of student responsibility and discipline procedures

e. Curriculum development, implementation and evaluation of the curriculum, and monitoring of the school program

f. Establishment and operation of a school health services program

**New programs to meet student needs:**

a. Gifted and talented program
b. Program for "at-risk" students
c. Guidance program with certificated staff for grades K-12
New curriculum program requirements:
j. Every day kindergarten (begins in 1992)
k. 200 day school calendar
l. 5 1/2 hour instructional day
m. District media services program with certificated media specialists in each attendance center
n. Instructional programs of current technologies
o. Minimum of 41 high school units of study
p. Four years of a foreign language
q. Ten units of vocational education
r. Health, physical education, and fine arts
s. Global education
t. Superintendent may not serve as a building principal

4. The new educational standards may be a challenge for your district or some districts. How much difficulty do you feel your district will have in meeting these standards.

School board policies concerning:
a. Adoption of a performance evaluation process
b. Adoption of needs assessment policy and goals
c. Adoption of instructional time-on-task auditing
d. Adoption of student responsibility and discipline procedures
e. Curriculum development, implementation and evaluation of the curriculum, and monitoring of the school program
f. Establishment and operation of a school health services program

g. Gifted and talented program
h. Program for "at-risk" students
i. Guidance program with certificated staff for grades K-12

New programs to meet student needs:
g. Gifted and talented program
h. Program for "at-risk" students
i. Guidance program with certificated staff for grades K-12

New curriculum program requirements:
j. Every day kindergarten (begins in 1992)
k. 200 day school calendar
l. 5 1/2 hour instructional day
m. A district media services program with certificated media specialists in each
5. The data collecting and on-site review procedures of the new educational standards will also be new. How much difficulty do you feel your district will have in meeting these procedures.

For any of the following questions, feel free to attach any plan or ideas instead of answering below.

6. List below any changes that your district has made since the new educational standards were proposed in order to meet the requirements of the new educational standards.

7. List below the actions your district plans to take to meet the requirements of the new educational standards.

8. List below any specific plan or timetable your district has established to meet the requirements of the educational standards.

9. Do you anticipate your district reorganizing with another district(s) prior to the implementation of the new educational standards? Yes____ No____

10. Do you anticipate your district entering into a cooperative or shared program with another district(s) prior to the implementation of the new educational standards?
Yes____ No____

If your answer to question #10 was "yes," please answer #11 & #12.

11. List below the district(s) with whom you plan to share programs.

__________________________________________________________________________

12. List the program(s) your district will share with other district(s).

__________________________________________________________________________

13. Do you anticipate any long range effects on your district with regard to reorganization or consolidation as a result of the new educational standards? Yes____ No____

If your answer to question #13 was "yes," please answer #14.

14. List the changes you anticipate.

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

15. Please add any additional comments you might have regarding the effects of the new educational standards on your school district.

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________
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