DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 288 087 CE 049 063

AUTHOR Zelle, Ronald K.; Miller, W. Wade
TITLE Jointly Administered Programs: An Alternative for Student Access to Quality Vocational Programs.
PUB DATE 87
NOTE 67p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Access to Education; Comparative Analysis; Cooperative Programs; *Cost Effectiveness; Educational Research; *Institutional Cooperation; *Rural Schools; Secondary Education; Shared Resources and Services; *Small Schools; *Vocational Education

ABSTRACT

The purpose of a study was to determine if offering jointly administered vocational programs shows a significant, positive cost-benefit relationship over not offering vocational courses. Emphasis was on smaller rural school districts that may not otherwise be able to support a total full-time program. Nine factors listed by Thomas and Peterson (1984) were examined. A survey instrument was distributed to superintendents, high school principals, and school board chairpersons in Area Education Agency 7 in Northeast Iowa. Survey findings supported very strongly six of the nine factors of perceived cost-benefit relationship for offering jointly administered vocational programs: low risks, substantial proportion of students served, efficiency of scale and smaller financial burdens, no duplication of services, perceived important, and representation and cost assessment. Three areas appeared several times to show less agreement: low costs, financial arrangements based on exchange, and cost distribution based on equality. Conclusions were that low costs were of less concern to school board presidents than offering high quality vocational programs. Data strongly supported the belief that vocational programs in high schools were important. (Study correspondence and the instrument are appended.) (YLB)

JOINTLY ADMINISTERED PROGRAMS: AN ALTERNATIVE FOR STUDENT ACCESS TO QUALITY VOCATIONAL PROGRAMS

by

Ronald K. Zelle
Agriculture Instructor
Nashua Community High School
Nashua, Iowa

and

W. Wade Miller
Associate Professor
Department of Agricultural Education
Iowa State University
Ames, Iowa

1987

Table of Contents

Chapter I

Introduction

Throughout the state of Iowa secondary students are offered wide and unequal opportunities to enroll in vocational wage earning courses. Few schools presently offer all six vocational wage earning programs and many schools offer three or less of these types of programs. What should the state and local education systems provide for students in the area of vocational education?

This project will examine:

1. What vocational education can do to help our students.
2. How the unequal opportunities for access to vocational education affect our students and their employability upon high school graduation.
3. The Task Force, the Code of Iowa, and Department of Education proposed school standards regarding the providing of vocational education to secondary school students.
4. The possible alternatives available to school districts and students in the state of Iowa to obtain vocational education courses.

The central purpose of this study will be to determine if "jointly administered" vocational programs can show a definite, positive cost-benefit relationship over not offering vocational courses in Area Education Agency 7 schools. It is believed that offering jointly administered vocational programs will show a definite, positive cost-benefit relationship over not offering vocational courses.

Jointly administered vocational programs are usually established in school districts which, due to limited enrollment or funding requirements, cannot offer a program of their own. Therefore the study will be centered on, but not limited to, smaller rural school districts which may not otherwise be able to support a total full-time program.

The study will center around the offering of jointly administered programs versus not offering a program at all and the perceived benefits of such a program. The question to be answered is whether these perceived benefits outweigh the perceived costs of such a program.

Definition of terms used in this report

Cost-Benefit Relationship - "this term is concerned with the degree to which school districts perceive that cooperation "pays off" for them in terms of the benefits they gain for the costs incurred." (Thomas, 1985)

Vocational students - students who are being instructed in approved vocational educational programs or any students who do not complete a 4-year post-secondary degree.

Vocational wage earning courses - state approved courses which address the goals of "student development in: 1) personal skills and attitudes; 2) communication and computational skills, and technological literacy; 3) employability skills; 4) broad and specific occupational skills and knowledge; and 5) foundations for career planning and lifelong learning." (Gibson, 1985)

Jointly administered programs - any vocational program which is delivered by two or more educational agencies to provide training opportunities in vocational education for all students in the agencies.

Area Planning Councils - (APC), a board of business people and community members established for each of the fifteen merged school areas in Iowa.

Area Educational Agency - (AEA), each school district in Iowa is a member of one merged area school district or AEA. These agencies serve as support services centers and planning areas for the member districts.

Chapter II

Review of Literature

The purpose and need for vocational education has been reviewed and discussed by several authors for many years. Research data have been generated to support the stands of these authors who are committed to the importance of vocational education in our school systems.

A major concern for vocational education during the 1980's came after the 1983 National Commission on Excellence in Education report "A Nation at Risk". This report cited a decline in national standardized test scores and reduced student achievement in schools as placing our nation at risk due to the failure of our education system. As a result of the wide publicity received by this report, many states and schools went to work to raise high school requirements in mathematics, science, foreign language, English, social sciences and computer education.

The Nation at Risk report has influenced the American education system and has placed a great deal of stress on the vocational education system by forcing students to take more science, math etc. "Simply put, the situation in U.S. public schools is more complicated than it may appear." (Lotto, 1985) In Iowa schools today many students are forced to decide whether to take additional math and science courses or enroll in vocational programs. Students desiring

to take both academic and vocational courses discover there are not enough periods during the school day to accomplish that goal. A commission was appointed by the National Center for Research in Vocational Education at Ohio State University to study the importance of vocational education in the U.S. public schools. Their report, entitled "The Unfinished Agenda", has further examined the educational system and the needs America's youth.

The study points out many startling facts which serve to reinforce the importance and need of vocational education. Currently about 28% of the youth of high school age never graduate. (Lotto, 1985) The increased requirements of the Nation at Risk report may push this dropout rate even higher. "The Unfinished Agenda" report stresses the need for both academic and vocational offerings for all secondary school students.

While The Nation at Risk and the Unfinished Agenda are recent reports, the issue of the importance of vocational education has been advanced by many authors for years. Vocational education's real strength lies in its ability to motivate students to learn and its emphasis on a "hands-on", "learning by doing" approach to many of the same educational goals being pursued in academic classes. (Silberman, 1984)

The skills learned in vocational education have always required the student to use the applied knowledge of math and science to accomplish the requirements in a vocational

program. "In vocational education learning is promoted by the use of real objects and knowledge is made relevant to the real world. This makes it possible for students to relate what is to be learned to past experiences and to synthesize the new information with the old. Because students are required to apply what they have learned to real-world situations, they find out for themselves if they have learned the content correctly." (Pucel, 1984) This is why we have a need for vocational programs in our secondary schools. They provide "an alternative learning mode for the many students who can not or do not want to learn through typical academic courses. For many students vocational education is the glue that holds their secondary education together." (Pucel, 1984)

Vocational education has always been useful for students who will be entering the employment or business world immediately out of high school, as well as those who obtain advanced degrees. What will be the effect if students reduce the amount of vocational course offerings taken and increase the amount of academic courses taken? The National Center for Research in Vocational Education studied the "effects of curriculum on three indicators of economic productivity - wage rates, earnings, and months of employment. According to the survey, vocational courses have a strong effect on success in the labor market." (Lankard, 1985) "Taking additional courses is strongly

associated with success in the labor market immediately after high school. Non-college-bound students... received an eight percent higher wage rate, earned 47 percent more income, and were 23 percent more likely to be employed." (Lankard, 1985)

The Iowa Vocational Education Task Force and the Iowa Legislature have examined the vocational offerings in the state of Iowa and have made recommendations for the school districts to assist in planning and carrying out quality education for students in Iowa. The public, educators and the local and merged area school districts have worked and analyzed the education systems and developed plans.

The recommendations and legislation which influence vocational education have been a result of the research demonstrating the importance of vocational education in developing academically sound and economically productive students.

Standards have been set forth for vocational programs. Section 257.25 of the Code of Iowa, subsection 6(h) cites the minimum vocational program standards for public secondary schools. These programs must include:

> Five vocational education subject areas, which shall include, but should not be limited to, programs, services and activities which prepare students for employment in office and clerical, trade and industrial, consumer and homemaking, agriculture, distributive and health occupations. (Iowa Council on Voc. Ed., 1977)

During 1987 new standards have been proposed by the Department of Education to rescind the current Chapter 4 and replace with a new Chapter 4 entitled Accredited Schools and School Districts. Division V, 670-4.5(256) Education Program, section 4.5(5) High School Programs- subsection i states:

> Vocational education (ten units). Vocational education shall prepare students for employment upon graduation and for post-high school education. This standard applies only to public school districts. Classroom instruction shall be coordinated with field, laboratory, or work experience. A minimum of one unit shall be offered and taught in four of the following six areas: industrial education; business and office; home economics; agriculture science and technology; health occupations; and marketing education. The remaining six required units may be offered and taught in any of these six areas.

The interpretation is as follows: each school shall offer at least four subject areas of vocational education and at least one unit each of the four areas plus each district must offer six additional units in any of the six vocational areas. All vocational programs should according to the Iowa Council on Vocational Education prepare students for wage earning employment and not just useful skills to be considered to meet these recommendations. (Iowa Council on Voc. Ed., 1977)

The 1983 Vocational Education Advisory Council for the state of Iowa report gives further details as to the unequal vocational opportunities available for secondary school students in Iowa.

"Numerous local boards of education have enacted policies raising high school graduation requirements in the subjects of math, science, English, social studies, and computer literacy. The 1982-83 session of the legislature placed a "bounty" (HF532) on high school students who enrolled in math and science courses and provided loans and grants for currently employed and future math and science teachers. Iowa's "educational house" seems to be in order for the approximate 20% of its students who are preparing for employment by means of a professional degree." (Iowa Council on Voc. Ed., 1983) The 80% of students who do not complete a 4-year degree are being moved aside. The majority of Iowa students are being limited in their educational progress.

Approximately 68% of Iowa's school districts provide one or less of the state approved wage-earning vocational programs. (Iowa Council on Voc. Ed. 1984) "Iowa schools are neglecting job-training programs for students who don't go to college. Clearly, the students of Iowa do not have equal education opportunity in the various vocational subjects," says Jonathan Roos, Des Moines Register Staff Writer. (Iowa Council on Voc. Ed., 1984) The public of Iowa wants vocational programs, business and industry want them, and the students want and need vocational programs.

The equality of access to programs grows even more critical as we discover that only the large schools have

offerings of five or more vocational courses and a very large number of students in medium and small schools have little or no choice of vocational programs. (Des Moines Register, 1984)

To address this problem, several steps have been taken by the state of Iowa. First, each merged area school district (AEA) throughout the state was to establish an Area Planning Council (APC) composed of members of business and industry, the community, and education. The function of this committee was to study the needs of youth and adults in the AEA; develop long range plans for delivery of instructional programs; identify objectives and activities to promote cooperation of business, industry, education etc..

The overriding goal and objective of these Area Planning Councils is that "every student of secondary school age in Iowa will have the opportunity to be prepared with employability skills which will enable the students to experience successful entry and advancement in the world of work." (Department of Public Instruction, 1979)

Within each Area Education Agency the Area Planning Council determined the needs of the youth and the education systems. They also determined what was being provided in the six vocational areas by each local school district.

Proceedings of AEA 7

This review will now center on the proceedings of the AEA 7 which includes the Waterloo-Cedar Falls area, surrounding school districts, and Hawkeye Institute of Technology.

After the assessment of school vocational offerings by each district in AEA 7 was complete, the second phase was to pick one vocational area and further develop plans for delivery of the various vocational programs within AEA 7. The Agriculture Planning Team, consisting of seven vocational agriculture instructors and two AEA 7 staff members, was selected as the committee. Within AEA 7, fourteen school districts offered vocational agriculture and twelve schools did not during the 1983-84 school year. The committee examined many possible delivery systems for schools not presently offering vocational agriculture. These systems included three models of delivery which would utilize "jointly administered programs" and a fourth model detailing a single school full-time comprehensive program.

These plans were then presented to the administrators of AEA 7 as an avenue to offer vocational agriculture as well as other vocational course offerings to the students in their districts. The following year, three schools, two of which did not offer vocational agriculture changed their program and adopted the idea of a jointly administered program. These schools began offering vocational

agriculture at a reduced cost to the district as compared with starting their own full time vocational agriculture program. In the second year following the report, two additional school districts have taken the first steps to add vocational agriculture as a jointly administered program in their schools.

The jointly administered programs allow students to either travel to a school which offers the vocational program or the instructor and program travel to the school wishing to offer the program. AEA's outside of the AEA 7 have also developed jointly administered programs. Some of these include utilizing their local community college.

All programs developed by the local APC must meet the following goals: equal access, quality vocational programming, cost effectiveness, and relevant and broad base course offerings. (Agriculture Planning Team, 1984)

Every school district in the state of Iowa has access to plans to meet the needs of all students in providing equal and accessible vocational programs. Documents and plans may be obtained through the Department of Education, Career Education Division, Grimes State Office Building, Des Moines Iowa.

Chapter III

Methods and Procedures

After reviewing the presentation of literature the hypothesis that offering jointly administered vocational programs shows a significant, positive, cost-benefit relationship over not offering vocational courses needs to be examined. To determine if there is a perceived positive, cost-benefit relationship the nine factors listed by Thomas and Peterson in 1984, will be examined.

The nine factors are: 1) financial arrangements based on an exchange rather than a tax principle; 2) low costs; 3) low risk; 4) substantial proportions of school district students served by the cooperative arrangement; 5) a sufficient number of members to provide efficiency of scale and smaller financial burdens for each district but not so many members that insufficient service is provided to each district; 6) services provided cooperatively that do not duplicate services provided by individual school districts; 7) services provided that school districts perceive to be important, valuable, and desirable for their students; 8) cost distribution methods based on equality rather than equity; and 9) consistency between the basis for school district representation and cost assessments. (Thomas, 1984)

The method that will be used to determine this relationship will be a survey instrument designed to

Chapter III

Methods and Procedures

After reviewing the presentation of literature the hypothesis that offering jointly administered vocational programs shows a significant, positive, cost-benefit relationship over not offering vocational courses needs to be examined. To determine if there is a perceived positive, cost-benefit relationship the nine factors listed by Thomas and Peterson in 1984, will be examined.

The nine factors are: 1) financial arrangements based on an exchange rather than a tax principle; 2) low costs; 3) low risk; 4) substantial proportions of school district students served by the cooperative arrangement; 5) a sufficient number of members to provide efficiency of scale and smaller financial burdens for each district but not so many members that insufficient service is provided to each district; 6) services provided cooperatively that do not duplicate services provided by individual school districts; 7) services provided that school districts perceive to be important, valuable, and desirable for their students; 8) cost distribution methods based on equality rather than equity; and 9) consistency between the basis for school district representation and cost assessments. (Thomas, 1984)

The method that will be used to determine this relationship will be a survey instrument designed to

evaluate the perceived attitudes and benefits versus the perceived costs of establishing jointly administered vocational programs in the state of Iowa. The survey will be distributed to all superintendents, high school principals and school board chairpersons in Area Education Agency 7 in Northeast Iowa.

The survey information will be compiled and analyzed by determining the mean score of the nine factors of perceived positive, cost-benefit relationship in each independent variable category. A determination will be made if a definite positive, cost-benefit relationship exists when offering quality jointly administered vocational programs.

Plan

1. The survey instrument will evaluate the perceived cost-benefit of offering "jointly administered" vocational programs.

2. The table of specifications was developed from the nine factors which the review of literature points out as seeming to have a significant influence on the success of jointly administered programs.

Survey Table of Specifications:

(Survey question numbers listed in parenthesis)

	Perceived Benefits greater than Perceived Costs	Perceived Benefits equal to Perceived Costs	Perceived Benefits less than Perceived Costs
1. Financial arrangements based on exchange rather than a tax principle.	1(2)		1(3)
2. Low costs.	1(4)	1(5)	2(6,7)
3. Low risks.	1(8)	1(9)	1(10)
4. Substantial proportions of the school districts students are served by the cooperative arrangement.	1(11)	1(12)	
5. A sufficient number of members to provide efficiency of scale and smaller financial burden for each district but not so many members that insufficient service is provided to each district.	1(13)	2(14,15)	1(16)
6. Services provided cooperatively that do not duplicate services provided by individual districts.	1(17)		
7. Services provided that districts perceive to be important, valuable and desirable for students.	2(1,18)	1(19)	1(20)
8. Cost distribution based on equality rather than equity.	1(22)	1(21)	
9. Consistency between the basis for school district representation and cost assessment.	1(23)		1(24)

Try-outs

This survey was administered to thirteen (13) students, four (4) teachers, one (1) administrator and five (5) community members on a trial basis. Following the sampling of the first five individuals several of the questions were reworded to clarify ambiguous terms and questions that they did not understand. The survey was then administered to several more potential participants and the final adjustments were made to the instruments. It became very clear that to further increase the validity an introduction and a cover letter defining terms and explaining vocational programs to the survey participants who are not familiar with this type of program was necessary. The development of the cover letter utilized the frequently asked questions by trial survey participants and samples of Department of Public Instruction surveys as guides. (Iowa DPI, October 1985; and Iowa DPI, June 1986)

Collection of Data

After final approval was given by the Nashua school superintendent and school board chairman, and the Iowa State graduate committee; the surveys were printed on gold colored paper. The school district demographic information was printed on blue paper and all letters were printed on Nashua Community Schools letterhead. The surveys were mailed to all 26 superintendents, 26 school board chairpersons and 28

high school principals in Area Education Agency 7. These individuals were selected because superintendents and principals are administrators of the twenty-six schools in AEA 7 and should have direct knowledge of the cost and present offerings of their respective districts. Board chairpersons were selected because they are elected by the community and represent the entire community in policy making and direction of the school district. A school district demographic information survey was also sent with each superintendent's survey to further gather independent variable information. (see Appendix A for letters)

A second and third copy of the survey was sent to all non-respondents. A cut off date of October 15, 1987 was established to terminate collection of data and begin analysis. Complete return results are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Summary of response rate

	Number in original Sample	Number Responding	Percent of original Responding
Superintendents	26	25	96.2% *
High School Principals	28	28	100.0%
School Board Chairpersons	26	24	92.3% **
Total	80	77	96.3%

* Demographic information was obtained from the missing school by telephone but no survey was returned.

** The final two surveys of Board Chairpersons arrived after the October 15 deadline and were not included in the analysis.

Chapter IV

Analysis of Data

The data were coded and entered into a database for sorting and printing out. Each respondents answers were coded and the following demographic information was included in the data base records: 1) Superintendent, principal or School Board Chairperson; 2) School district K-12 enrollment for 1986-87; 3) Units of vocational courses offered by their school; and 4) does the school district obtain or provide any vocational or academic courses from or to any other schools.

Printouts of the data were made to compare results of the survey questions. Questions from the survey were grouped according to the nine perceived cost-benefit areas. Questions which measured perceived benefits equal perceived costs were not utilized in the analysis. Questions which applied to perceived benefits less than perceived costs were inversed and added to the perceived benefits greater than perceived cost numbers. To determine if respondents agreed or disagreed with a particular cost benefit area the frequency of responses that were strongly agree, agree and somewhat agree were grouped and totaled together. The overall results from the surveys are presented in Tables 2, 3 and 4.

Table 2. All Superintendents Responses

Cost Benefit Area	Total: Raw	SA,A & SWA*: Raw	%	Undecided: Raw	%	SD,D & SWD**: Raw	%
1. Financial arrangement based on exchange	50	29	58.0%	9	18.0%	12	24.0%
2. Low Costs	75	32	42.7%	14	18.7%	29	38.7%
3. Low Risks	50	38	76.0%	7	14.0%	5	10.0%
4. Substantial proportion students served	25	18	72.0%	5	20.0%	2	8.0%
5. Efficiency of scale and smaller financial	60	36	60.0%	9	15.0%	15	25.0%
6. Do not duplicate	25	20	80.0%	3	12.0%	2	8.0%
7. Perceived important	75	72	96.0%	3	4.0%	0	0.0%
8. Cost distribution on equality	25	13	52.0%	7	28.0%	5	20.0%
9. Representation and cost assessment	49	41	83.7%	7	14.3%	1	2.0%

* SA = Strongly Agree, A = Agree, and SWA = Some What Agree, with the given cost-benefit area.

** SD = Strongly Disagree, D = Disagree, and SWD Some What Disagree, with the given cost-benefit area.

Superintendents in AEA 7 appear to agree with eight of the nine factors. Only the low cost area is less than 50% agreement which indicates that superintendents of some of the school districts would support increase costs in offering either jointly administered or more vocational courses. It is also indicated that 96% of the responses agree that vocational education is important and needs to be offered in the high school.

Table 3. All Principal Responses

Cost Benefit Area	Total: Raw	SA,A & SWA: Raw	%	Undecided: Raw	%	SD,D & SWD: Raw	%
1. Financial arrangement based on exchange	56	33	58.9%	9	16.1%	14	25.0%
2. Low Costs	84	52	61.9%	6	7.1%	26	31.0%
3. Low Risks	56	47	83.9%	6	10.7%	3	5.4%
4. Substantial proportion students served	28	23	82.1%	5	17.9%	0	0.0%
5. Efficiency of scale and smaller financial	55	38	69.1%	13	23.6%	4	7.3%
6. Do not duplicate	28	19	67.9%	6	21.4%	3	10.7%
7. Perceived important	84	75	89.3%	6	7.1%	3	3.6%
8. Cost distribution on equality	28	18	64.3%	7	25.0%	3	10.7%
9. Representation and cost assessment	56	45	80.4%	9	16.1%	2	3.6%

Principals appear to support all nine areas of perceived cost-benefit relationships. At least 58% of the responses in all nine categories agree with the perceived cost-benefit relationship area and 89% of the responses believe that vocational education is important in each school.

Table 4. All Board Chairperson Responses

Cost Benefit Area	Total: Raw	SA,A & SWA: Raw	%	Undecided: Raw	%	SD,D & SWD: Raw	%
1. Financial arrangement based on exchange	58	40	69.0%	8	13.8%	10	17.2%
2. Low Costs	72	38	52.8%	10	13.9%	24	33.3%
3. Low Risks	48	34	70.8%	9	18.8%	5	10.4%
4. Substantial proportion students served	24	20	83.3%	1	4.2%	3	12.5%
5. Efficiency of scale and smaller financial	47	39	83.0%	7	14.9%	1	2.1%
6. Do not duplicate	23	16	69.6%	4	17.4%	3	13.0%
7. Perceived important	72	60	83.3%	4	5.6%	8	11.1%
8. Cost distribution on equality	24	14	58.3%	3	12.5%	7	29.2%
9. Representation and cost assessment	48	46	95.8%	1	2.1%	1	2.1%

School Board Chairpersons appear to agree with the nine perceived areas of cost-benefit relationships in offering jointly administered vocational education programs. Board Chairpersons appear to be very concerned with the representation in calculation of costs with 95.8% of responses agreeing with statements concerning equal representation in cost assessment.

Table 5. All Superintendent, Principals, and School Board Chairpersons Responses

Cost Benefit Area	Total: Raw	SA,A & SWA: Raw	%	Undecided: Raw	%	SD,D & SWD: Raw	%
1. Financial arrangement based on exchange	144	82	56.9%	26	18.1%	36	25.0%
2. Low Costs	231	122	52.8%	30	13.0%	79	34.2%
3. Low Risks	154	119	77.3%	22	14.3%	13	8.4%
4. Substantial proportion students served	77	61	79.2%	11	14.3%	5	6.5%
5. Efficiency of scale and smaller financial	162	113	69.8%	29	17.9%	20	12.3%
6. Do not duplicate	76	55	72.4%	13	17.1%	8	10.5%
7. Perceived important	231	207	89.6%	13	5.6%	11	4.8%
8. Cost distribution on equality	77	45	58.4%	17	22.1%	15	19.5%
9. Representation and cost assessment	153	132	86.3%	17	11.1%	4	2.6%

Bases on the results presented the overall belief appears to be correct in that most respondents in AEA 7 believe that jointly administered vocational programs show positive cost benefit relationships over not offering vocational courses. If the jointly administered programs meet the nine indicators of benefit and cost then it would appear the school district would benefit more than the perceived costs to the district.

To further analyze the data three areas were selected to further evaluate the results. They were responses based on enrollments in Kindergarten through grade 12 in 1986-87, whether the school district obtained or provided any courses from or to another agency and the number of vocational subject areas presently offered in their school districts.

The evaluation of the data for school district K-12 enrollment was based on three grouping of the district in AEA 7 based on size. The first group was school districts with less than 550 students. This group contains eleven schools with enrollments ranging from a low of 298 to 535 students. The results are presented in Tables 6, 7, 8, and 9.

Table 6. Superintendent Responses; K-12 enrollment less than 550 students

Cost Benefit Area	Total Raw	SA,A & SWA: Raw	%	Undecided: Raw	%	SD,D & SWD: Raw	%
1. Financial arrangement based on exchange	22	13	59.1%	3	13.6%	6	27.3%
2. Low Costs	33	14	42.4%	7	21.2%	12	36.4%
3. Low Risks	22	17	77.3%	3	13.6%	2	9.1%
4. Substantial proportion students served	11	9	81.8%	1	9.1%	1	9.1%
5. Efficiency of scale and smaller financial	22	17	77.3%	2	9.1%	3	13.6%
6. Do not duplicate	11	9	81.8%	2	18.2%	0	0.0%
7. Perceived important	33	32	97.0%	1	3.0%	0	0.0%
8. Cost distribution on equality	11	7	63.6%	2	18.2%	2	18.2%
9. Representation and cost assessment	22	20	90.9%	2	9.1%	0	0.0%

Superintendents in K-12 enrollments of less than 550 strongly agree with all but one area of perceived cost-benefit that being low costs. Low costs appear to be less of a concern than offering the program to superintendents.

Table 7. Principal Responses; K-12 enrollment less than 550 students

Cost Benefit Area	Total: Raw	SA,A & SWA: Raw	%	Undecided: Raw	%	SD,D & SWD: Raw	%
1. Financial arrangement based on exchange	22	14	63.6%	4	18.2%	4	18.2%
2. Low Costs	33	20	60.6%	2	6.1%	11	33.3%
3. Low Risks	22	19	86.4%	3	13.6%	0	0.0%
4. Substantial proportion students served	11	9	81.8%	2	18.2%	0	0.0%
5. Efficiency of scale and smaller financial	22	15	68.2%	5	22.7%	2	9.1%
6. Do not duplicate	11	8	72.7%	3	27.3%	0	0.0%
7. Perceived important	33	31	93.9%	2	6.1%	0	0.0%
8. Cost distribution on equality	11	7	63.6%	3	27.3%	1	9.1%
9. Representation and cost assessment	22	18	81.8%	4	18.2%	0	0.0%

Principals in this grouping appear to strongly support all nine areas of study.

Table 8. Board Chairperson Responses; K-12 enrollment less than 550 students

Cost Benefit Area	Total: Raw	SA,A & SWA: Raw	%	Undecided: Raw	%	SD,D & SWD: Raw	%
1. Financial arrangement based on exchange	18	13	72.2%	1	5.6%	4	22.2%
2. Low Costs	27	15	55.6%	4	14.8%	8	29.6%
3. Low Risks	18	14	77.8%	2	11.1%	2	11.1%
4. Substantial proportion students served	9	9	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
5. Efficiency of scale and smaller financial	17	15	88.2%	2	11.8%	0	0.0%
6. Do not duplicate	9	6	66.7%	3	33.3%	0	0.0%
7. Perceived important	27	20	74.1%	1	3.7%	6	22.2%
8. Cost distribution on equality	9	4	44.4%	0	0.0%	5	55.6%
9. Representation and cost assessment	18	18	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%

Board chairpersons with K-12 enrollments of less than 550 students appear to be split on the area of cost distribution based on equality rather than equity. No conclusion can be drawn on these results.

Table 9. Superintendents, Principals and Board Chairperson Responses; K-12 enrollment less than 550 students

Cost Benefit Area	Total: Raw	SA,A & SWA: Raw	%	Undecided: Raw	%	SD,D & SWD: Raw	%
1. Financial arrangement based on exchange	62	40	64.5%	8	12.9%	14	22.6%
2. Low Costs	93	49	52.7%	13	14.0%	31	33.3%
3. Low Risks	62	50	80.6%	8	12.9%	4	6.5%
4. Substantial proportion students served	31	27	87.1%	3	9.7%	1	3.2%
5. Efficiency of scale and smaller financial	61	47	77.0%	9	14.8%	5	8.2%
6. Do not duplicate	31	23	74.2%	8	25.8%	0	0.0%
7. Perceived important	93	83	89.2%	4	4.3%	6	6.5%
8. Cost distribution on equality	31	18	58.1%	5	16.1%	8	25.8%
9. Representation and cost assessment	62	56	90.3%	6	9.7%	0	0.0%

The combined data of all responses from K-12 less than 550 indicate a strong agreement with all nine factors.

The second category in this comparison is school districts with 550 to 1000 students enrolled in K-12. In this area there are 11 schools with K-12 enrollment ranging from 566 to 852. These results are provided in Tables 10, 11, 12, and 13.

Table 10. Superintendent Responses; K-12 enrollment 550-1000

Cost Benefit Area	Total: Raw	SA,A & SWA: Raw	%	Undecided: Raw	%	SD,D & SWD: Raw	%
1. Financial arrangement based on exchange	20	11	55.0%	5	25.0%	4	20.0%
2. Low Costs	30	12	40.0%	4	13.3%	14	46.7%
3. Low Risks	20	15	75.0%	2	10.0%	3	15.0%
4. Substantial proportion students served	10	7	70.0%	2	20.0%	1	10.0%
5. Efficiency of scale and smaller financial	20	15	75.0%	3	15.0%	2	10.0%
6. Do not duplicate	10	8	80.0%	0	0.0%	2	20.0%
7. Perceived important	30	29	96.7%	1	3.3%	0	0.0%
8. Cost distribution on equality	10	5	50.0%	3	30.0%	2	20.0%
9. Representation and cost assessment	19	16	88.9%	2	11.1%	1	5.6%

Superintendents in K-12 enrollments of 550-1000 appear to be split over the issue of low costs and only 50% agreement with cost distributions based on equality.

Table 11. Principal Responses; K-12 enrollment 550-1000

Cost Benefit Area	Total: Raw	SA,A & SWA: Raw	%	Undecided: Raw	%	SD,D & SWD: Raw	%
1. Financial arrangement based on exchange	22	14	63.6%	4	18.2%	4	18.2%
2. Low Costs	33	20	60.6%	2	6.1%	11	33.3%
3. Low Risks	22	17	77.3%	3	13.6%	2	9.1%
4. Substantial proportion students served	11	9	81.8%	2	18.2%	0	0.0%
5. Efficiency of scale and smaller financial	21	16	76.2%	3	14.3%	2	9.5%
6. Do not duplicate	11	8	72.7%	2	18.2%	1	9.1%
7. Perceived important	33	31	93.9%	1	3.0%	1	3.0%
8. Cost distribution on equality	11	7	63.6%	2	18.2%	2	18.2%
9. Representation and cost assessment	22	19	86.4%	2	9.1%	1	4.5%

Principals in K-12 enrollments of 550-1000 appear to agree with all nine areas of perceived cost-benefit relationship.

Table 12. Board Chairperson Responses; K-12 enrollment 550-1000

Cost Benefit Area	Total: Raw	SA,A & SWA: Raw	%	Undecided: Raw	%	SD,D & SWD: Raw	%
1. Financial arrangement based on exchange	22	13	59.1%	3	13.6%	6	27.3%
2. Low Costs	33	17	51.5%	1	3.0%	15	45.5%
3. Low Risks	22	15	68.2%	5	22.7%	2	9.1%
4. Substantial proportion students served	11	8	72.7%	0	0.0%	3	27.3%
5. Efficiency of scale and smaller financial	22	19	86.4%	2	9.1%	1	4.5%
6. Do not duplicate	10	8	80.0%	0	0.0%	2	20.0%
7. Perceived important	33	28	84.8%	3	9.1%	2	6.1%
8. Cost distribution on equality	11	7	63.6%	1	9.1%	3	27.3%
9. Representation and cost assessment	22	21	95.5%	0	0.0%	1	4.5%

Board Chairpersons appear to support all nine factors, however, low costs have somewhat split responses.

Table 13. Superintendent, Principal and Board Chairpersons Responses; K-12 enrollment 550-1000

Cost Benefit Area	Total: Raw	SA,A & SWA: Raw	%	Undecided: Raw	%	SD,D & SWD: Raw	%
1. Financial arrangement based on exchange	67	41	61.2%	12	17.9%	14	20.9%
2. Low Costs	96	49	51.0%	7	7.3%	40	41.7%
3. Low Risks	64	47	73.4%	10	15.6%	7	10.9%
4. Substantial proportion students served	32	24	75.0%	4	12.5%	4	12.5%
5. Efficiency of scale and smaller financial	63	50	79.4%	8	12.7%	5	7.9%
6. Do not duplicate	31	24	77.4%	2	6.5%	5	16.1%
7. Perceived important	76	68	89.5%	5	6.6%	3	3.9%
8. Cost distribution on equality	32	19	59.4%	6	18.8%	7	21.9%
9. Representation and cost assessment	63	56	88.9%	4	6.3%	3	4.8%

The combination of data for K-12 enrollments of 550-1000 appear to support the nine areas, but low costs show a split response.

The third group in the enrollment category was school over 1000 students in K-12. In this group there are only four schools ranging from 1679 to 12096 students. The results are presented in Tables 14, 15, 16 and 17.

Table 14. Superintendent Responses; K-12 enrollment greater than 1000 students

Cost Benefit Area	Total: Raw	SA,A & SWA: Raw	%	Undecided: Raw	%	SD,D & SWD: Raw	%
1. Financial arrangement based on exchange	8	5	62.5%	1	12.5%	2	25.0%
2. Low Costs	12	6	50.0%	3	25.0%	3	25.0%
3. Low Risks	8	6	75.0%	2	25.0%	0	0.0%
4. Substantial proportion students served	4	2	50.0%	2	50.0%	0	0.0%
5. Efficiency of scale and smaller financial	8	3	37.5%	3	37.5%	2	25.0%
6. Do not duplicate	4	3	75.0%	1	25.0%	0	0.0%
7. Perceived important	12	11	91.7%	1	8.3%	0	0.0%
8. Cost distribution on equality	4	1	25.0%	2	50.0%	1	25.0%
9. Representation and cost assessment	8	5	62.5%	3	37.5%	0	0.0%

Superintendents from K-12 enrollments of greater than 1000 do not agree with the cost distribution based on equality or that less than 10% of students involved in jointly administered programs represents a deterrent to offering jointly administered programs.

Table 15. Principal Responses; K-12 enrollment greater than 1000 students

Cost Benefit Area	Total: Raw	SA,A & SWA: Raw	%	Undecided: Raw	%	SD,D & SWD: Raw	%
1. Financial arrangement based on exchange	12	5	41.7%	1	8.3%	6	50.0%
2. Low Costs	18	12	66.7%	2	11.1%	4	22.2%
3. Low Risks	12	11	91.7%	0	0.0%	1	8.3%
4. Substantial proportion students served	6	5	83.3%	1	16.7%	0	0.0%
5. Efficiency of scale and smaller financial	12	7	58.3%	5	41.7%	0	0.0%
6. Do not duplicate	6	3	50.0%	1	16.7%	2	33.3%
7. Perceived important	18	13	72.2%	3	16.7%	2	11.1%
8. Cost distribution on equality	6	4	66.7%	2	33.3%	0	0.0%
9. Representation and cost assessment	12	7	58.3%	4	33.3%	1	8.3%

Principals are divided on financial arrangements based exchange and not duplicating services.

Table 16. Board Chairperson Responses; K-12 enrollment greater than 1000 students

Cost Benefit Area	Total: Raw	SA,A & SWA: Raw	%	Undecided: Raw	%	SD,D & SWD: Raw	%
1. Financial arrangement based on exchange	8	4	50.0%	4	50.0%	0	0.0%
2. Low Costs	12	6	50.0%	5	41.7%	1	8.3%
3. Low Risks	8	5	62.5%	2	25.0%	1	12.5%
4. Substantial proportion students served	4	3	75.0%	1	25.0%	0	0.0%
5. Efficiency of scale and smaller financial	8	5	62.5%	3	37.5%	0	0.0%
6. Do not duplicate	4	2	50.0%	1	25.0%	1	25.0%
7. Perceived important	12	12	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
8. Cost distribution on equality	4	2	50.0%	2	50.0%	0	0.0%
9. Representation and cost assessment	8	7	87.5%	1	12.5%	0	0.0%

Board Chairpersons appear to support the nine factors of perceived cost-benefit relationships of offering jointly administered vocational programs.

Table 17. Superintendent, Principal and Board Chairperson Responses; K-12 enrollment greater than 1000 students

Cost Benefit Area	Total: Raw	SA,A & SWA: Raw	%	Undecided: Raw	%	SD,D & SWD: Raw	%
1. Financial arrangement based on exchange	28	14	50.0%	6	21.4%	8	28.6%
2. Low Costs	42	24	57.1%	10	23.8%	8	19.0%
3. Low Risks	28	22	78.6%	4	14.3%	2	7.1%
4. Substantial proportion students served	14	10	71.4%	4	28.6%	0	0.0%
5. Efficiency of scale and smaller financial	28	15	53.6%	11	39.3%	2	7.1%
6. Do not duplicate	14	8	57.1%	3	21.4%	3	21.4%
7. Perceived important	42	36	85.7%	4	9.5%	2	4.8%
8. Cost distribution on equality	14	7	50.0%	6	42.9%	1	7.1%
9. Representation and cost assessment	28	17	67.9%	8	28.6%	1	3.6%

To summarize, most of the data supports the belief in the nine factors of perceived cost benefit relationships and only a few comparisons can be noted based on this information. The indications of the results are that financial arrangements based on exchange appear to be more importanc in school districts where the enrollment is less than 550. One can also draw a conclusion that as the school size increase over 1000 students the 10% efficiency in numbers utilizing a program becomes less of a concern than when comparing to smaller sized districts. Duplication of

services also appears to be less important in larger districts when compared to smaller districts.

The second group is whether or not the school district obtains or provides any courses from or to any other school districts. In this area there are 11 schools that obtain or provide courses and 15 schools which do not obtain or provide any courses. The results are provided in Tables 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, and 25.

Table 18. Superintendent Responses; School District obtains or provides courses

Cost Benefit Area	Total Raw	SA,A & SWA: Raw	%	Undecided: Raw	%	SD,D & SWD: Raw	%
1. Financial arrangement based on exchange	20	13	65.0%	3	15.0%	4	20.0%
2. Low Costs	30	15	50.0%	6	20.0%	9	30.0%
3. Low Risks	20	16	80.0%	1	5.0%	3	15.0%
4. Substantial proportion students served	10	9	90.0%	0	0.0%	1	10.0%
5. Efficiency of scale and smaller financial	30	17	56.7%	3	10.0%	10	33.3%
6. Do not duplicate	10	9	90.0%	1	10.0%	0	0.0%
7. Perceived important	30	30	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
8. Cost distribution on equality	10	6	60.0%	1	10.0%	3	30.0%
9. Representation and cost assessment	20	20	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%

Superintendents of schools obtaining or providing courses appear to support then nine factors but some disagreement does appear in offering at low costs, efficiency of scale and smaller financial obligation and cost distribution based on equality.

Table 19. Principal Responses; School District obtains or provides courses

Cost Benefit Area	Total: Raw	SA,A & SWA: Raw	%	Undecided: Raw	%	SD,D & SWD: Raw	%
1. Financial arrangement based on exchange	22	15	68.2%	5	22.7%	2	9.1%
2. Low Costs	33	20	60.6%	1	3.0%	12	36.4%
3. Low Risks	22	17	77.3%	4	18.2%	1	4.5%
4. Substantial proportion students served	11	8	72.7%	3	27.3%	0	0.0%
5. Efficiency of scale and smaller financial	21	17	81.0%	3	14.3%	1	4.8%
6. Do not duplicate	11	7	63.6%	4	36.4%	0	0.0%
7. Perceived important	33	31	93.9%	2	6.1%	0	0.0%
8. Cost distribution on equality	11	5	45.5%	3	27.3%	3	27.3%
9. Representation and cost assessment	22	18	81.8%	3	13.6%	1	4.5%

Principals support the nine areas but low costs and cost distribution based on equality do appear to have some disagreement.

Table 20. Board Chairperson Response; School District obtains or provides courses

Cost Benefit Area	Total: Raw	SA,A & SWA: Raw	%	Undecided: Raw	%	SD,D & SWD: Raw	%
1. Financial arrangement based on exchange	18	11	61.6%	2	11.1%	5	27.8%
2. Low Costs	27	15	55.6%	0	0.0%	12	44.4%
3. Low Risks	18	13	72.2%	3	16.7%	2	11.1%
4. Substantial proportion students served	9	7	77.7%	0	0.0%	2	22.2%
5. Efficiency of scale and smaller financial	17	14	82.4%	3	17.6%	0	0.0%
6. Do not duplicate	8	6	75.0%	1	12.5%	1	12.5%
7. Perceived important	27	21	77.8%	3	11.1%	3	11.1%
8. Cost distribution on equality	9	5	55.6%	0	0.0%	4	44.4%
9. Representation and cost assessment	18	18	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%

Board Chairpersons reflect very closely principals in some disagreement with low costs and cost distribution based on equality.

Table 21. Superintendent, Principal and Board Chairperson Responses; School District obtains or provides courses

Cost Benefit Area	Total: Raw	SA,A & SWA: Raw	%	Undecided: Raw	%	SD,D & SWD: Raw	%
1. Financial arrangement based on exchange	50	29	58.0%	10	20.0%	11	22.0%
2. Low Costs	90	50	55.6%	7	7.8%	33	36.7%
3. Low Risks	60	46	76.7%	8	13.3%	6	10.0%
4. Substantial proportion students served	30	24	80.0%	3	10.0%	3	10.0%
5. Efficiency of scale and smaller financial	68	48	70.6%	9	13.2%	11	16.2%
6. Do not duplicate	29	22	75.9%	6	20.7%	1	3.4%
7. Perceived important	90	82	91.1%	5	5.6%	3	3.3%
8. Cost distribution on equality	30	16	53.3%	4	13.3%	10	33.3%
9. Representation and cost assessment	60	56	93.3%	3	5.0%	1	1.7%

The combination of data for schools that obtain or provide courses only have partial disagreement with the area of financial arrangements, low costs and cost distribution.

Table 22. Superintendent Responses; School District does not obtain or provide courses

Cost Benefit Area	Total: Raw	SA,A & SWA: Raw	%	Undecided: Raw	%	SD,D & SWD: Raw	%
1. Financial arrangement based on exchange	30	16	53.3%	6	20.0%	8	26.7%
2. Low Costs	45	17	37.8%	8	17.8%	20	44.4%
3. Low Risks	30	22	73.3%	6	20.0%	2	6.7%
4. Substantial proportion students served	15	9	60.0%	5	33.3%	1	6.7%
5. Efficiency of scale and smaller financial	30	19	63.3%	6	20.0%	5	16.7%
6. Do not duplicate	15	11	73.3%	2	13.3%	2	13.3%
7. Perceived important	45	42	93.3%	3	6.7%	0	0.0%
8. Cost distribution on equality	15	7	46.7%	6	40.0%	2	13.3%
9. Representation and cost assessment	29	21	72.4%	7	24.1%	1	3.4%

Superintendents of schools that do not obtain or provide courses appear to have some disagreement with low cost and cost distribution based on equality; the other seven areas appears to be strongly supported.

Table 23. Principal Responses; School District does not obtain or provide courses

Cost Benefit Area	Total: Raw	SA,A & SWA: Raw	%	Undecided: Raw	%	SD,D & SWD: Raw	%
1. Financial arrangement based on exchange	34	18	52.9%	4	11.8%	12	35.3%
2. Low Costs	51	32	62.7%	5	9.8%	14	27.5%
3. Low Risks	34	30	88.2%	2	5.9%	2	5.9%
4. Substantial proportion students served	17	15	88.2%	2	11.8%	0	0.0%
5. Efficiency of scale and smaller financial	34	21	61.8%	10	29.4%	3	8.8%
6. Do not duplicate	17	12	70.6%	2	11.8%	3	17.6%
7. Perceived important	51	44	86.3%	4	7.8%	3	5.9%
8. Cost distribution on equality	17	13	76.5%	4	23.5%	0	0.0%
9. Representation and cost assessment	34	27	79.4%	6	17.6%	1	2.9%

Principals appear to agree with the nine areas but financial arrangements and low costs appear to have some disagreement.

Table 24. School Board Chairperson Responses; School District does not obtain or provide courses

Cost Benefit Area	Total: Raw	SA,A & SWA: Raw	%	Undecided: Raw	%	SD,D & SWD: Raw	%
1. Financial arrangement based on exchange	30	19	63.3%	6	20.0%	5	16.7%
2. Low Costs	45	23	51.1%	10	22.2%	12	26.7%
3. Low Risks	30	21	70.0%	6	20.0%	3	10.0%
4. Substantial proportion students served	15	13	86.7%	1	6.7%	1	6.7%
5. Efficiency of scale and smaller financial	30	25	83.3%	4	13.3%	1	3.3%
6. Do not duplicate	15	10	66.7%	3	20.0%	2	13.3%
7. Perceived important	45	39	86.7%	1	2.2%	5	11.1%
8. Cost distribution on equality	15	9	60.0%	3	20.0%	3	20.0%
9. Representation and cost assessment	30	28	93.3%	1	3.3%	1	3.3%

Board chairpersons appear to support the areas but some disagreement appears with low costs.

Table 25. Superintendent, Principal and Board Chairperson Responses; School District does not obtain or provide courses

Cost Benefit Area	Total: Raw	SA,A & SWA: Raw	%	Undecided: Raw	%	SD,D & SWD: Raw	%
1. Financial arrangement based on exchange	94	53	56.4%	16	17.0%	25	26.6%
2. Low Costs	141	72	51.1%	23	16.3%	46	32.6%
3. Low Risks	94	73	77.7%	14	14.9%	7	7.4%
4. Substantial proportion students served	47	37	78.7%	8	17.0%	2	4.3%
5. Efficiency of scale and smaller financial	94	65	69.1%	20	21.3%	9	9.6%
6. Do not duplicate	47	33	70.2%	7	14.9%	7	14.9%
7. Perceived important	141	125	88.7%	8	5.7%	8	5.7%
8. Cost distribution on equality	47	29	61.7%	13	27.7%	5	10.6%
9. Representation and cost assessment	93	76	81.7%	14	15.1%	3	3.2%

The combined data shows strong support for the nine factors but financial arrangements and low costs show some disagreement.

The areas of obtaining and providing versus not obtaining or providing show us that school districts that provide or obtain courses are more concerned with representation and cost assessment than those districts that do not obtain or provide shared programs.

The third area is based on the number of vocational subjects offered in their school district. The data was broken in to three categories. The first is those districts which offer three subject areas. In AEA 7 eight school districts offer three subject areas of vocational education, thirteen school districts offer four subject areas of

vocational education and five school districts offer five subject areas of vocational education. The results of this data are provided in Tables 26 through 37.

Table 26. Superintendent Responses; 3 Subject areas of vocational education offered

Cost Benefit Area	Total Raw	SA,A & SWA: Raw	%	Undecided: Raw	%	SD,D & SWD: Raw	%
1. Financial arrangement based on exchange	16	10	62.5%	1	6.2%	5	31.2%
2. Low Costs	24	6	25.0%	7	29.2%	11	45.8%
3. Low Risks	16	12	75.0%	2	18.8%	1	6.2%
4. Substantial proportion students served	8	6	75.0%	1	12.5%	1	12.5%
5. Efficiency of scale and smaller financial	16	11	68.8%	3	18.8%	2	12.5%
6. Do not duplicate	8	7	87.5%	1	12.5%	0	0.0%
7. Perceived important	24	23	95.8%	1	4.2%	0	0.0%
8. Cost distribution on equality	8	5	50.0%	3	37.5%	1	12.5%
9. Representation and cost assessment	15	15	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%

Superintendents with three subject areas of vocational education appear to disagree with low costs when providing vocational courses.

Table 27. Principal Responses; 3 Subject areas of vocational education offered

Cost Benefit Area	Total: Raw	SA,A & SWA: Raw	%	Undecided: Raw	%	SD,D & SWD: Raw	%
1. Financial arrangement based on exchange	14	7	50.0%	2	14.3%	5	35.7%
2. Low Costs	21	10	47.6%	3	14.3%	8	38.1%
3. Low Risks	14	13	92.9%	1	7.1%	0	0.0%
4. Substantial proportion students served	7	7	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
5. Efficiency of scale and smaller financial	14	9	64.3%	4	28.6%	1	7.1%
6. Do not duplicate	7	6	85.7%	1	14.3%	0	0.0%
7. Perceived important	21	20	95.2%	1	4.8%	0	0.0%
8. Cost distribution on equality	7	5	71.4%	2	28.6%	0	0.0%
9. Representation and cost assessment	14	11	78.6%	3	21.4%	0	0.0%

Principals of schools offering three areas appear to be split on agreement with financial arrangements and low costs.

Table 28. Board Chairperson Responses; 3 Subject areas of vocational education offered

Cost Benefit Area	Total: Raw	SA,A & SWA: Raw	%	Undecided: Raw	%	SD,D & SWD: Raw	%
1. Financial arrangement based on exchange	12	9	75.0%	1	8.3%	2	16.7%
2. ow Costs	18	11	61.1%	2	11.1%	5	27.8%
3. Low Risks	12	10	83.3%	2	16.7%	0	0.0%
4. Substantial proportion students served	6	5	83.3%	0	0.0%	1	16.7%
5. Efficiency of scale and smaller financial	12	12	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
6. Do not duplicate	6	5	83.3%	1	16.7%	0	0.0%
7. Perceived important	18	13	72.2%	5	27.8%	0	0.0%
8. Cost distribution on equality	6	4	66.7%	0	0.0%	2	33.3%
9. Representation and cost assessment	12	12	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%

Board Chairpersons have some disagreement with the area of low costs and cost distribution based on equality.

Table 29. Superintendent, Principal and Board Chairperson Responses; 3 Subject areas of vocational education offered

Cost Benefit Area	Total: Raw	SA,A & SWA: Raw	%	Undecided: Raw	%	SD,D & SWD: Raw	%
1. Financial arrangement based on exchange	42	26	61.9%	4	9.5%	12	28.6%
2. Low Costs	63	27	42.9%	12	19.0%	24	38.1%
3. Low Risks	42	35	83.3%	6	14.3%	1	2.4%
4. Substantial proportion students served	21	18	85.7%	1	4.8%	2	9.5%
5. Efficiency of scale and smaller financial	42	32	76.2%	7	16.7%	3	7.1%
6. Do not duplicate	21	18	85.7%	3	14.3%	0	0.0%
7. Perceived important	63	56	88.9%	7	11.1%	0	0.0%
8. Cost distribution on equality	21	13	61.9%	5	23.8%	3	14.3%
9. Representation and cost assessment	41	38	92.7%	3	7.3%	0	0.0%

With the combined data of schools offering only three subject areas of vocational education two areas which seem to have considerable disagreement is financial arrangements and low costs.

Table 30. Superintendent Responses; 4 Subject areas of vocational education offered

Cost Benefit Area	Total: Raw	SA,A & SWA: Raw	%	Undecided: Raw	%	SD,D & SWD: Raw	%
1. Financial arrangement based on exchange	26	13	50.0%	8	30.8%	5	19.2%
2. Low Costs	39	18	46.2%	8	20.5%	13	33.3%
3. Low Risks	26	20	76.9%	2	7.7%	4	15.4%
4. Substantial proportion students served	13	9	69.2%	3	23.1%	1	7.7%
5. Efficiency of scale and smaller financial	26	22	84.6%	2	7.7%	2	7.7%
6. Do not duplicate	13	9	69.2%	2	15.4%	2	15.4%
7. Perceived important	39	38	97.4%	1	2.6%	0	0.0%
8. Cost distribution on equality	13	7	53.8%	3	23.1%	3	23.1%
9. Representation and cost assessment	26	21	80.8%	4	15.4%	1	3.8%

Superintendents with four offerings appear to have some disagreement with low costs and cost distribution.

Table 31. Principal Responses; 4 Subject areas of vocational education offered

Cost Benefit Area	Total: Raw	SA,A & SWA: Raw	%	Undecided: Raw	%	SD,D & SWD: Raw	%
1. Financial arrangement based on exchange	32	19	59.4%	7	21.9%	6	18.8%
2. Low Costs	48	31	64.6%	2	4.2%	15	31.2%
3. Low Risks	32	25	78.1%	4	12.5%	3	9.4%
4. Substantial proportion students served	16	11	68.8%	5	31.2%	0	0.0%
5. Efficiency of scale and smaller financial	31	23	74.2%	5	16.1%	3	9.7%
6. Do not duplicate	16	10	62.5%	5	31.2%	1	6.2%
7. Perceived important	48	43	89.6%	4	8.3%	1	2.1%
8. Cost distribution on equality	16	9	56.2%	5	31.2%	2	12.5%
9. Representation and cost assessment	32	27	84.4%	4	12.5%	1	3.1%

Principals appear to agree with all nine factors of perceived cost-benefit relationship.

Table 32. Board Chairperson Response; 4 Subject areas of vocational education offered

Cost Benefit Area	Total: Raw	SA,A & SWA: Raw	%	Undecided: Raw	%	SD,D & SWD: Raw	%
1. Financial arrangement based on exchange	26	14	53.8%	5	19.2%	7	26.9%
2. Low Costs	39	20	51.3%	4	10.3%	15	38.5%
3. Low Risks	26	16	61.5%	6	23.1%	4	15.4%
4. Substantial proportion students served	13	10	76.9%	1	7.7%	2	15.4%
5. Efficiency of scale and smaller financia.	25	18	72.0%	6	24.0%	1	4.0%
6. Do not duplicate	12	10	83.3%	0	0.0%	2	16.7%
7. Perceived important	39	34	87.2%	4	10.3%	1	2.6%
8. Cost distribution on equality	13	7	53.8%	2	15.4%	4	30.8%
9. Representation and cost assessment	26	24	92.3%	1	3.8%	1	3.8%

Board Chairpersons with four offerings appear to have three of the nine areas with some disagreement, they are financial arrangements, low costs, and cost distribution based on equality.

Table 33. Superintendent, Principal and Board Chairperson Responses; 4 Subject areas of vocational education offered

Cost Benefit Area	Total: Raw	SA,A & SWA: Raw	%	Undecided: Raw	%	SD,D & SWD: Raw	%
1. Financial arrangement based on exchange	84	46	54.8%	20	23.8%	18	21.4%
2. Low Costs	126	69	54.8%	14	11.1%	43	34.1%
3. Low Risks	84	61	72.6%	12	14.3%	11	13.1%
4. Substantial proportion students served	42	30	71.4%	9	21.4%	3	7.1%
5. Efficiency of scale and smaller financial	82	63	76.8%	13	15.9%	6	7.3%
6. Do not duplicate	41	29	70.7%	7	17.1%	5	12.2%
7. Perceived important	126	115	91.3%	9	7.1%	2	1.6%
8. Cost distribution on equality	42	23	54.8%	10	23.8%	9	21.4%
9. Representation and cost assessment	84	72	85.7%	9	10.7%	3	3.6%

Generally schools with four course offerings agree with the nine factors but three areas appear to have some amount of disagreement with financial arrangements based on exchange, low costs and cost distribution based on equality.

Table 34. Superintendent Responses; 5 Subject areas of vocational education offered

Cost Benefit Area	Total: Raw	SA,A & SWA: Raw	%	Undecided: Raw	%	SD,D & SWD: Raw	%
1. Financial arrangement based on exchange	10	8	80.0%	0	0.0%	2	20.0%
2. Low Costs	15	8	53.3%	2	13.3%	5	33.3%
3. Low Risks	10	7	70.0%	3	30.0%	0	0.0%
4. Substantial proportion students served	5	4	80.0%	1	20.0%	0	0.0%
5. Efficiency of scale and smaller financial	10	4	40.0%	3	30.0%	3	30.0%
6. Do not duplicate	5	4	80.0%	1	20.0%	0	0.0%
7. Perceived important	15	14	93.3%	1	6.7%	0	0.0%
8. Cost distribution on equality	5	3	60.0%	1	20.0%	1	20.0%
9. Representation and cost assessment	10	7	70.0%	3	30.0%	0	0.0%

Superintendents with five course offerings disagree somewhat with low costs and efficiency of scale and smaller financial obligations.

Table 35. Principal Responses; 5 Subject areas of vocational education offered

Cost Benefit Area	Total: Raw	SA,A & SWA: Raw	%	Undecided: Raw	%	SD,D & SWD: Raw	%
1. Financial arrangement based on exchange	10	7	70.0%	0	0.0%	3	30.0%
2. Low Costs	15	11	73.3%	1	6.7%	3	20.0%
3. Low Risks	10	9	90.0%	1	10.0%	0	0.0%
4. Substantial proportion students served	5	5	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
5. Efficiency of scale and smaller financial	10	6	60.0%	4	40.0%	0	0.0%
6. Do not duplicate	5	3	60.0%	0	0.0%	2	40.0%
7. Perceived important	15	12	80.0%	0	0.0%	3	20.0%
8. Cost distribution on equality	5	4	80.0%	0	0.0%	1	20.0%
9. Representation and cost assessment	10	6	60.0%	3	30.0%	1	10.0%

Principals of schools with five areas of vocational offerings appear to agree with the nine factors except for not duplicating services.

Table 36. Board Chairperson Responses; 5 Subject areas of vocational education offered

Cost Benefit Area	Total: Raw	SA,A & SWA: Raw	%	Undecided: Raw	%	SD,D & SWD: Raw	%
1. Financial arrangement based on exchange	8	5	62.5%	2	25.0%	1	12.5%
2. Low Costs	12	7	58.3%	1	8.3%	4	33.3%
3. Low Risks	8	7	87.5%	0	0.0%	1	12.5%
4. Substantial proportion students served	4	4	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
5. Efficiency of scale and smaller financial	8	7	87.5%	1	12.5%	0	0.0%
6. Do not duplicate	4	1	25.0%	2	50.0%	1	25.0%
7. Perceived important	12	10	83.3%	0	0.0%	2	16.7%
8. Cost distribution on equality	4	1	25.0%	1	25.0%	2	50.0%
9. Representation and cost assessment	8	8	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%

Board Chairpersons of schools offering five areas appear to be split on agreement with low costs and not duplicating services.

Table 37. Superintendent, Principal and Board Chairperson Responses; 5 Subject areas of vocational education offered

Cost Benefit Area	Total: Raw	SA,A & SWA: Raw	%	Undecided: Raw	%	SD,D & SWD: Raw	%
1. Financial arrangement based on exchange	28	20	71.4%	2	7.1%	6	21.4%
2. Low Costs	42	26	61.9%	4	9.5%	12	28.6%
3. Low Risks	28	23	82.1%	4	14.3%	1	3.6%
4. Substantial proportion students served	14	13	92.9%	1	7.1%	0	0.0%
5. Efficiency of scale and smaller financial	28	17	60.7%	8	28.6%	3	10.7%
6. Do not duplicate	14	8	57.1%	3	21.4%	3	21.4%
7. Perceived important	42	36	85.7%	1	2.4%	5	11.9%
8. Cost distribution on equality	14	8	57.1%	2	14.3%	4	28.6%
9. Representation and cost assessment	28	21	75.0%	6	21.4%	1	3.6%

The combined data shows agreement with the nine factors but the ones of low costs, not duplicating services and cost distributions based on equality appear to have some disagreement.

From this data there are implications that schools that offer three subject areas of vocational education are not as concerned about keeping costs low to increase vocational course offerings. This may indicate that the school would be willing to spend more money to raise their offerings to meet the Department of Education standard of four subject areas as well as explore jointly administered programs. Implications also appear that financial arrangements based on exchange are more important to district offering five vocational subject areas than those offering less. A final implication from this data is that if a school district is offering three subject areas of vocational education there is a greater concern for representation and cost assessment than schools that offer four or five areas of vocational education.

Chapter V

Summary, Conclusions, Implications

Summary

The findings of this survey seem to support very strongly six of the nine factors of perceived cost-benefit relationship for offering jointly administered vocational programs. Three areas however appear several times to show less agreement. They are: low costs, financial arrangements based on exchange, and cost distribution based on equality. In these three areas varying degrees of agreement exist as the data were analyzed. The one area of most disagreement came with the cost-benefit relationship of low costs for participating schools.

Based on the findings of this survey the nine factors of perceived cost-benefit relationships appear to be agreed on by superintendents, principals and school board chairpersons of AEA 7 in northeast Iowa. (see Table 5)

Conclusions

The findings derived from this survey are that low costs are of less concern to school board presidents than offering quality vocational programs, (see Table 5). Based on the enrollment comparisons within AEA 7, we can draw the conclusion that financial arrangements based on exchange appears to be more important in school districts where enrollment is less than 550

students in K-12. It also appears that school districts with greater than 1000 students are not as concerned with at least 10% of students being involved in a jointly administered program to provide efficiency of scale, (see Tables 6-17).

When the data of schools obtaining or providing courses is compared to districts not obtaining or providing courses the data indicates that schools which obtain or provide courses are more concerned with representation and cost assessment than districts which do not obtain or provide courses, (see Tables 17-25)

When comparing the number of vocational course offerings the data indicate schools with three course offering are less concerned about costs of offering jointly administered programs than school offering four or five areas. Implications also appear that financial arrangements based on exchange are more important to districts offering five areas of instruction, (see Tables 26-37).

Another conclusion is that the data strongly support the belief that vocational programs in high schools are important with 89.6% of all responses agreeing with statements of the importance of "hands on" training and support of vocational programs.

Implications

The offering to every student in the state of Iowa the Department of Education standard proposal of at least ten

units of instruction in four different vocational subject areas is a realistic goal, given the plans and resources available to local school districts. The ability to train the 80 out of every 100 students in Iowa who will not be graduates of a four-year institution is possible. As Iowa's economy has slowed, it is important to remember that the better trained our students are, the more economic contributions they will make our communities.

The need for vocational education in our secondary schools is critical. All public high school students must have available to them the opportunities to develop skills in wage-earning occupations. If Iowa continues to export its trained residents, the state will suffer. We must develop our youth and encourage them to stay and build our communities, schools and state economically. We have the potential future employees and business persons of the state in our classrooms right now. Schools should offer these students the opportunities necessary to become successful. When we are faced with declining enrollments and tight budgets it is easy for districts to look for places to cut, but an expansion in vocational offerings of a school may be a better alternative. The key is to increase the earning capacity of our youth.

School administrators, board members, students, and community members must look to expand our existing education systems, for our future lies in our hands. The only problem

with establishing and increasing vocational education in our schools is attitudes! Attitudes must be aimed at improving our educational system. Positive attitudes lead to success and stability.

Bibliography

Adams, William H., "Linking Math, Science, and Vo-Ed," School Shop, October 1984, p17-8.

Agriculture Planning Team, AEA 7, Career and Vocational Educational Plan: Vocational Agriculture, 1984.

Area 7 Planning Council, AEA 7, Career and Vocational Educational Plan: Submitted by Area 7 Planning Council, 1984.

Brown, Kay, "The Vocational Approach to Math and Science," Voc Ed, October 1984, p35-6.

Department of Education, Iowa Administrative Rules Bulletin, ARC 7758, July 1987.

Department of Public Instruction, Career Education Division, Grimes State Office Building, Des Moines, Iowa 50319-0146, Report on Student and Employer Follow-up 1985 Sample Survey, Secondary and Merged Area Schools, Pub. No. CE-85-R3, October, 1985.

Department of Public Instruction, Career Education Division, Grimes State Office Building, Des Moines, Iowa 50319-0146, Report on Student Interest 1985-86 Survey, Pub. No. CE-86-R1, June 1986.

Des Moines Register, Editorial, "Too little voc-ed in Iowa?" May 28, 1984, pA-14.

Dyrenfurth, Michael J., "State Trends in Graduation Requirements," Voc ed, January/February 1985, p43-46.

Final Report of the Study Committee on Equitable Funding Approaches for Vocational Education for Secondary-Age Students, July 1, 1982.

Final Report of the Task Force on Vocational Education, Department of Public Instruction, Grimes State Office Building, Des Moines IA 50319, November 1979.

Gibson, Charles, "Vocational Education: Sharpening the Focus" Thrust April-May 1985, p49-50.

Gronlund, Norman E., Measurement and Evaluation in Teaching Fifth Edition, (Macmillan Publishing Company, New York, New York, 1985).

Guidelines for Area Planning Councils in Iowa, State of Iowa Department of Public Instruction, Grimes State Office Building, Des Moines, Iowa, September 1983.

Iowa State Advisory Council on Vocational Education, "8th Annual Evaluation Report - Secondary Vocational Education: Jointly Administered Programs," 1977.

Iowa State Advisory Council on Vocational Education, "14th Annual Report," 1983.

Iowa State Advisory Council on Vocational Education as quoted by Roos, Jonathan, "Voc Ed Report," Des Moines Register, May 28,1984, pA-14.

Iowa Three-year State Plan for the administration of Vocational Education within Career Education, Fiscal Years 1986-1988, State of Iowa Department of Public Instruction, Career Education Division, Grimes State Office Building, Des Moines, Iowa 50319-0146.

Lankard, Tina; Kang, Suk; and Bishop, John, "Voc Ed Spells Job Success" Voc ed, January/February 1985, p17.

Lotto, Linda S., "The Unfinished Agenda: Report from the National Commission on Secondary Vocational Education," Phi Delta Kappan, April 1985, p568-73.

Pucel, David J., "An Alternative Approach to Learning" Voc ed, October 1984, p42-4.

Silberman, Harry F., "The Unfinished Agenda" Voc ed, October 1984, p42-44.

Thomas, Ruth G.; Peterson, Roland L.; Access to Educational Opportunity in Rural Communities: Alternative Patterns of Delivering Vocational Education in Sparsely Populated Areas. Volume 1: Problem, Study Design and Procedures, Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendations. Report Number AD-SB-2133, Resources Distribution, Room 3 Coffey Hall, University of Minnesota, 1420 Eckles Ave., St. Paul, MN 55108.

Vocational Education Research Report on Student Interest 1983-84 Survey Iowa Department of Public Instruction, Publication No. CE-84-R2, August 1984.

Appendix A

Nashua Community Schools

Nashua, Iowa 50658

Phone (515) 435-4835

Dr. Linda Johanningmeier, Superintendent
T. G. Hannemann, Sec'y-Compt.

Lloyd W. Koob, High School Principal
Ken Erpelding, Elementary Principal

August 24, 1987

Dear AEA 7 Superintendents

Your school district as well as all school districts in AEA 7 are being surveyed. These surveys will be completed by your high school principal, school board chairperson (1986-87 school year) and you. This survey is to determine attitudes toward jointly administered vocational programs.

Please complete the survey plus the additional short questionnaire concerning school demographics and statistics.

This information should be returned in the enclosed self addressed envelope by September 10.

The results of the survey can be obtained by contacting Ronald Zelle, Nashua Agriculture Science and Technology Instructor. (515) 435-4166. Thank you.

Sincerely

Ronald K. Zelle
Agriculture Science and Technology
Nashua Community School
Nashua, Iowa 50658

Dr. Linda Johanningmeier
Superintendent
Nashua Community School
Nashua, Iowa 50658

Ronald McGregor
Chairman, Nashua Community School Board
Nashua Community School
Nashua, Iowa 50658

HOME OF

Nashua Community Schools

Nashua, Iowa 50658

Phone (515) 435-4835

Dr. Linda Johanningmeier, Superintendent
T. G. Hannemann, Sec'y-Compt.

Lloyd W. Koob, High School Principal
Ken Erpelding, Elementary Principal

August 24, 1987

Dear AEA 7 Superintendents, School Board Chairpersons and High School Principals

You have been asked to complete this survey instrument of information regarding jointly administered or shared vocational programs. Your help will determine the needs and directions of vocational education in AEA 7 and throughout the State of Iowa.

Your opinions will be kept in the strictest of confidence. Please read each item carefully and mark your response on the survey form by circling the appropriate letter(s). You may use either a pencil or a pen. Please choose one best response for each question and if you change your mind be sure to completely erase or indicate clearly your preferred answer.

This information will be compiled into a report format and will be available by contacting Ronald Zelle, Nashua Agriculture Science and Technology Instructor. If you have any questions about the survey please contact him at Nashua Community School (515) 435-4166.

Please complete the survey form by September 10, 1987 and return the completed form in the enclosed, self addressed envelope. Thank you.

Sincerely

Ronald K. Zelle
Agriculture Science and Technology
Nashua Community School
Nashua, Iowa 50658

Dr. Linda Johanningmeier
Superintendent
Nashua Community School
Nashua, Iowa 50658

Ronald McGregor
Chairman, Nashua Community School Board
Nashua Community School
Nashua, Iowa 50658

HOME OF

Nashua Community Schools

Nashua, Iowa 50658

Phone (515) 435-4835

Dr. Linda Johanningmeier, Superintendent
T. G. Hannemann, Sec'y-Compt.

Lloyd W. Koob, High School Principal
Ken Erpelding, Elementary Principal

September 14, 1987

Dear AEA 7 School Superintendent

The last week of August you received a survey instrument regarding jointly administered or shared vocational programs and a school district demographic information sheet. As of today your survey has not been returned.

Since we are trying to determine the feels of the Superintendents in AEA 7 it is critical that your survey and demographic sheet be returned. Please take a few moments now and complete the survey. Another copy of the survey has been enclosed for your convenience. Please complete the survey immediately and return it to:

Ronald Zelle, Nashua Agriculture Instructor
Nashua Community Schools
612 Greeley St.
Nashua Iowa 50658

Sincerely

Ronald K. Zelle
Agriculture Science and Technology
Nashua Community School
Nashua, Iowa 50658

Dr. Linda Johanningmeier
Superintendent
Nashua Community School
Nashua, Iowa 50658

Ronald McGregor
Chairman, Nashua Community School Board
Nashua Community School
Nashua, Iowa 50658

HOME OF

Nashua Community Schools

Nashua, Iowa 50658

Phone (515) 435-4835

Dr. Linda Johanningmeier, Superintendent
T. G. Hannemann, Sec'y-Compt.

Lloyd W. Koob, High School Principal
Ken Erpelding, Elementary Principal

September 14, 1987

Dear 1986-87 AEA 7 High School Principal

The last week of August you received a survey instrument regarding jointly administered or shared vocational programs. As of today your survey has not been returned.

Since we are trying to determine the feels of the Principals in AEA 7 it is critical that your survey be returned. Please take a few moments now and complete the survey. Another copy of the survey has been enclosed for your convenience. Please complete the survey immediately and return it to:

Ronald Zelle, Nashua Agriculture Instructor
Nashua Community Schools
612 Greeley St.
Nashua Iowa 50658

Sincerely

Ronald K. Zelle
Agriculture Science and Technology
Nashua Community School
Nashua, Iowa 50658

Dr. Linda Johanningmeier
Superintendent
Nashua Community School
Nashua, Iowa 50658

Ronald McGregor
Chairman, Nashua Community School Board
Nashua Community School
Nashua, Iowa 50658

HOME OF

Nashua Community Schools

Nashua, Iowa 50658

Phone (515) 435-4835

Dr. Linda Johanningmeier, Superintendent
T. G. Hannemann, Sec'y-Compt.

Lloyd W. Koob, High School Principal
Ken Erpelding, Elementary Principal

September 14, 1987

Dear 1986-87 AEA 7 School Board Chairpersons

The last week of August you received a survey instrument regarding jointly administered or shared vocational programs. As of today your survey has not been returned.

Since we are trying to determine the feels of the Chairpersons in AEA 7 it is critical that your survey be returned. Please take a few moments now and complete the survey. Another copy of the survey has been enclosed for your convenience. Please complete the survey immediately and return it to:

Ronald Zelle, Nashua Agriculture Instructor
Nashua Community Schools
612 Greeley St.
Nashua Iowa 50658

Sincerely

Ronald K. Zelle
Agriculture Science and Technology
Nashua Community School
Nashua, Iowa 50658

Dr. Linda Johanningmeier
Superintendent
Nashua Community School
Nashua, Iowa 50658

Ronald McGregor
Chairman, Nashua Community School Board
Nashua Community School
Nashua, Iowa 50658

HOME OF

Nashua Community Schools

Nashua, Iowa 50658

Phone (515) 435-4835

Dr. Linda Johanningmeier, Superintendent
T. G. Hannemann, Sec'y-Compt.

Lloyd W. Koob, High School Principal
Ken Erpelding, Elementary Principal

September 24, 1987

Dear AEA 7 Superintendent, Principal or Board Chairperson

The last week of August and ten days ago you received a survey instrument regarding jointly administered or shared vocational programs. As of today your survey has not been returned!

It is critical that your survey be returned in order to accurately reflect the opinions of AEA 7 personal. Please take a few moments now and complete the survey. Another copy of the survey and another return envelope has been enclosed for your convenience.

The survey will only take a few minutes of your time but will greatly assist in the accuracy of the findings. Superintendents please also complete a school district demographic sheet.

Thank you for your time. Completing this form now will result in the results being available very soon and save time and money of having to contact you again.

Sincerely

Ronald K. Zelle
Agriculture Science and Technology
Nashua Community School
Nashua, Iowa 50658

Dr. Linda Johanningmeier
Superintendent
Nashua Community School
Nashua, Iowa 50658

Ronald McGregor
Chairman, Nashua Community School Board
Nashua Community School
Nashua, Iowa 50658

Background which may be useful to you.

Proposed standards have been set forth by the State Department of Education regarding the minimum vocational program standards for public schools in Iowa. These requirements are that each school would offer at least four of the six subject areas of vocational education (Industrial education, Business and office, Home economics, Agriculture science and technology, Health occupations and Marketing education) and at least ten units (ten full year courses) of instruction in vocational education.

Iowa's public schools offer different opportunities of access to vocational courses. It is estimated that 68% of Iowa's school districts provide one or less of the state approved vocational programs.(Iowa State Advisory Council on Vocational Education, 1984)

Definitions:

Vocational Students- students who are being instructed in approved vocational educational programs or any students who do not complete a 4-year post-secondary degree.

Vocational Course- is a state approved course offered in the areas of: Agriculture/Agribusiness, Health Occupations, Home Economics, Industrial Education, Marketing Education or Office Education.

Jointly Administered Program (Sharing)- any vocational program which is delivered by two or more educational agencies to provide training opportunities in vocational education for all students in the agencies.

Directions: Indicate how much you agree or disagree with each statement by circling the appropriate letter(s). Your responses are very important and will be kept confidential.

KEY

SA Strongly Agree
A Agree
SWA Some What Agree
U Undecided
SWD Some What Disagree
D Disagree
SD Strongly Disagree

Please circle ONE: I am

a. an administrator of the school

b. a school board member

c. a high school principal

School P.O. _____

School Name: _____

School Address: _____

SA A SWA U SWD D SD 1. Vocational agriculture/agribusiness, vocational home economics, health occupations, office education, marketing education and vocational industrial education are valuable programs that should be available to students in our school.

SA A SWA U SWD D SD 2. Our school should offer vocational programs in cooperation with other school(s) provided we share equally the costs of the programs and/or provide services to that school.

SA A SWA U SWD D SD 3. Our school should provide additional money to offer more vocational programs.

SA A SWA U SWD D SD 4. The number of vocational programs offered at our school providing "hands on" learning should be increased without increasing the tax burden on our residents.

SA A SWA U SWD D SD 5. Vocational programs should be offered in the least costly manner within the present budget of our school.

(over please)

SA A SWA U SWD D SD 6. Our school should increase the number of vocational programs we offer.

SA A SWA U SWD D SD 7. Additional materials, services and equipment should be purchased by our school to increase the number of vocational programs offered.

SA A SWA U SWD D SD 8. If our school offers jointly administered vocational programs we should have the option to terminate the program(s) based on yearly evaluations.

SA A SWA U SWD D SD 9. Our school should help purchase materials utilized by our students in a jointly administered program.

SA A SWA U SWD D SD 10. Our school should purchase all necessary equipment and services to offer all six subject areas of vocational programs at our school.

SA A SWA U SWD D SD 11. Jointly administered vocational programs should be offered if a substantial proportion of our students are involved.

SA A SWA U SWD D SD 12. Our school should offer shared programs when less than 10% of the high school students are involved.

SA A SWA U SWD D SD 13. Offering a jointly administered program should reduce the financial obligation of both districts over offering the programs independently.

SA A SWA U SWD D SD 14. Schools should offer jointly administered programs that would increase class size to the point where materials and equipment would be fully utilized.

SA A SWA U SWD D SD 15. Our school should participate in shared programs when the cost equals present school expenses and program offerings are increased.

SA A SWA U SWD D SD 16. We should participate in jointly administered vocational programs that provide reduced services to all students in vocational programs due to high enrollments in the shared programs.

SA A SWA U SWD D SD 17. Vocational programs should be offered in a shared arrangement in programs we do not presently offer at our school.

SA A SWA U SWD D SD 18. Students should have "hands on" experience while in high school.

SA A SWA U SWD D SD 19. Our school should teach all vocational skills in our regular academic classes and not offer any vocational courses.

SA A SWA U SWD D SD 20. Jointly administered vocational programs are non-essential courses that should not be offered in our school.

SA A SWA U SWD D SD 21. Our school should explore and implement shared programs with other schools that can share equally in the costs and resources.

SA A SWA U SWD D SD 22. Payment for jointly administered programs should be based on the number of programs shared.

SA A SWA U SWD D SD 23. Our school should be involved with other districts which will work to develop jointly administered programs provided our school district has representation in calculating costs.

SA A SWA U SWD D SD 24. Our school should enter into an agreement with other schools that insist on limiting our say in setting costs of the shared program(s).

Thank you for your help! Please return this form in the enclosed self-addressed envelope.
Nashua Agriculture Science and Technology Department
Nashua IA 50658.

School District Profile For
Vocational Education Survey

School District Name_____

School District P.O._____

1. What was your School Districts certified K-12 enrollment in September 1986. _____

2. What vocational courses does your district now offer? How many units (a unit equals a class meeting at least 200 minutes per week for 36 weeks) in each vocational area? How many different semesters are offered in each vocational area? Please fill in the appropriate information on this chart.

	Semesters Offered	Units Offered
Industrial Education	_____	_____
Business and Office	_____	_____
Home Economics	_____	_____
Agriculture Science and Technology	_____	_____
Health Occupations	_____	_____
Marketing Education	_____	_____

(circle one)

3. Has your district discussed "sharing" programs with other school districts? Yes No

4. Does your school district in 1987-88 obtain vocational courses from another agency? Yes* No

* If yes please list what courses and how many units and with what school district(s) you are obtaining the services from below.

Course(s) obtained	Number of Units Obtained	Agency obtained from

(over please)

5. Does your school district provide any vocational for other schools in 1987-88? Yes* No

* If yes please list what courses and how many units and with what school district(s) you provide vocational courses.

Course(s) provided	Number of Units provided	Agency provided for

6. Does your school district provide or obtain any academic courses for or from other agencies? Yes* No

* If yes please list all shared academic classes.

Course(s)	Provided or Obtained?	Number of Units provided	Agency provided for or obtained from

7. If you are involved in jointly administered programs, do students travel to the courses or do the program and instructor travel, or are other methods utilized (ex: video, etc.) List courses shared under the appropriate column.

Students Travel	Instructor and Program travels	other arrangements list

8. Does your school have plans to participate in any jointly administered programs in 1988-89 or beyond? Yes* No

* If yes please briefly describe plans.

Thank you for your time and help. The results can be obtained from Ronald Zelle, Agriculture Science and Technology Instructor, Nashua Community School, (515) 435-4166.

Please return this information sheet and your survey in the enclosed self-addressed envelope by September 10, 1987.