



**DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS & RURAL SOCIOLOGY**  
**The Ohio State University**  
**2120 Fyffe Road**  
**Columbus, Ohio 43210**

LEADER'S GUIDE TO VIDEOTAPE:  
"OHIO'S SCHOOL FINANCE CRISIS"

By

John D. Rohrer  
Fred J. Hitzhusen

ESO 532

January 1979

Department of Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology  
The Ohio State University  
Columbus, Ohio 43210

## FOREWORD

School finance is a topic of increasing public debate in Ohio. Reports of school closings, teacher's strikes, state mandates and defeated local operating levies are daily headlines. Most Ohio politicians running for office in November 1978 found it necessary to take a position on the school finance question.

The problem simply stated is that school spending is increasing more rapidly than public support for the taxes to finance the increased spending. The major factors in the increased spending of schools are: (1) more services to students with special needs, (2) growth in the number of teachers and administrators per 1000 students and (3) inflation. The slow growth in school revenues seems to be a function of legal provisions limiting the growth in revenues from real property taxes and a growing voter resistance to all taxes.

To facilitate better understanding of these issues, Cooperative Extension Service faculty members, Dr. Fred Hitzhusen, resource economist at OSU and Dr. John Rohrer, area CRD agent, Wooster, Ohio, took the initiative to develop a video tape and this leader's guide. The video tape brings together a group of four experts to discuss why Ohio schools are in financial trouble and what can be done about it. The four expert panelists are: Mr. William Harrison, Staff Director, Ohio General Assembly Educational Review Committee, Dr. Carla Edlefson, Staff Associate, Citizen Council for Ohio Schools, Dr. Bruce Gensemer, Professor of Economics at Kenyon College, and Dr. Frederick Stocker, Professor of Economics and Public Administration, The Ohio State University. While no specific recommendations are given, the key issues are outlined and alternatives presented to encourage further study and debate on the issues.

This leader's guide outlines suggestions for organizing a school finance meeting including audio-visual equipment and format. It also supplies biographical data on the video tape participants and a script of their comments. Finally, a list of suggested written materials is supplied to supplement the video tape presentation. Both available sources for developing local school finance data and more general school finance background resources are included.

## ORGANIZING THE MEETING

### Tape and Equipment

The video tape runs approximately 30 minutes and is available in either 3/4 inch color cassette (for the Sony U-matic or a compatible video player) or the more popular 1/2 inch monochrome (black and white) reel to reel tape. If demand warrants, it may be available soon in the newer 1/2 inch color Sony Batemax cassette.

Be certain what type of equipment is available so that the tape you order is compatible. It is advisable to allow at least two days prior to the meeting to have a test run of the tape and equipment.

With one TV monitor the audience size should be restricted to 30-40 people. For larger groups additional monitors or a TV projection system will be needed.

### Meeting Format

More understanding of the complex issues will be gained by audience involvement. There are various ways to structure the meeting to facilitate audience participation. The following are a few examples:

Send some printed material (see list of resources for some possibilities) to participants before the meeting to provide background information.

Provide paper (or cards) and pencils to participants to jot down notes and questions during video presentation.

Select a reaction panel of 3-5 persons. The group can include local school officials, board members or interested citizens. The panel will be more successful if different points of view are represented. Provide the panel a copy of the video-tape transcript before the meeting (see copy in this Leader's Guide).

Supplement general comments of school finance with more specific local data. Several people could be asked to present information including; the County Auditor, Local School Superintendent, School Board members, Representative of Various Civic Groups (such as League of Women Voters), or your Area Extension Agent, Community and Natural Resource Development.

Utilize the telelecture. Each of the resource persons appearing on the tape can be available to speak to groups by amplified telephone. For any given session, one resource person or at the most, two, could respond to audience questions following the video-tape presentation. The local group is responsible for making necessary arrangements and payment of long distance phone costs, if any. For more information on using the telelecture, contact any of the area extension agents listed below.

Other methods of group involvement such as "buzz groups" or small group discussion, questionnaires, oral questions to speaker(s), or written critiques can be used.

Additional help in securing the tapes, equipment and organizing the meeting can be secured by contacting Dr. John Stitzlein, (614) 422-8436, the Associate State Leader, Community Resource Development, The Ohio State University, 2120 Fyffe Road, Columbus, Ohio 43210 or one of the following area community resource development agents:

Dr. Kaye Bartlett (614) 335-2755, 317 S. Fayette St., Wash. C.H., OH 43160  
Mr. Gregory Passewitz (216) 533-3453, 430 Lisbon St., Canfield, OH 44406  
Mr. Charles Reutter (419) 946-8015, 27 W. High St., Mt. Gilead, OH 43338  
Dr. John Rohrer (216) 262-8176, Area Extension Center, Wooster, OH 44691  
Mr. Raymond Schindler (216) 332-1594, 1401 Walter Ave., Fremont, OH 43420  
Mr. William Shaw (614) 732-2381, 16714 State Route #215, Caldwell, OH 43724

RESOURCE PERSONS ON VIDEO TAPE  
(IN ORDER OF APPEARANCE)

Dr. Fredrick J. Hitzhusen, Extension Economist, Community and Natural Resource Development, Cooperative Extension Service, The Ohio State University, 2120 Fyffe Road, Columbus, Ohio 43210. Telephone (614) 422-6731.

Dr. Hitzhusen is an Associate Professor with the Department of Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology and has been with the department since 1971. He recently served as the principal investigator in a departmental research project on Costs and Financing of Community Services in Ohio. In addition to courses on analysis of public expenditures, he serves as a resource person to public finance seminars conducted by the Cooperative Extension Service.

Dr. Hitzhusen earned a B.S. degree from Iowa State University, M.S. from Purdue University and a Ph.D. in Resource Economics from Cornell University.

Mr. William A. Harrison, Jr., Staff Director, Ohio General Assembly Education Review Committee, 16 East Broad Street, Suite 203, Columbus, Ohio 43215. Telephone (614) 466-6148.

Mr. Harrison has been staff director of the Education Review Committee of the Ohio General Assembly since January, 1974.

Prior to working for the Committee, he was a Fellow of the Academy for Contemporary Problems for two years and an Instructor in Political Science at the Ohio State University for four years.

He was a planning consultant for the Fort Hayes Career Center in Columbus, a consultant to the Educational Governance Project at the Ohio State University, and a researcher for the Commission on Public School Personnel Policies in Ohio. He also served as coordinator of an education internship program in Ohio state government sponsored by George Washington University and the Ford Foundation.

Mr. Harrison received a B.A. degree in government and a B.S. degree in secondary education from the University of Texas in 1958 and was elected to Phi Beta Kappa. He received an M.A. degree in political science from the University of California at Berkeley in 1964 and completed the course work for a Ph.D. in political science at Berkeley.

Dr. Carla J. Edlefson, Staff Associate, Citizen's Council for Ohio Schools, 517 The Arcade, Cleveland, Ohio 44114. Telephone (216) 621-5220, or Academy for Contemporary Problems, 1501 Neil Ave., Columbus, OH 43201 Telephone (614) 424-6245.

Dr. Edlefson has served as a Staff Associate of Citizen's Council for Ohio Schools since 1977. She is responsible for organizing a Task Force on School Finance representing various community interests and for developing public information on school finance.

She has served as a Research Assistant with the Department of Sociology, Stanford, 1976-77 and for Project Redesign, Palo Alto Unified School District, Palo Alto, California 1975-76. In 1974-75 she worked with Prof. J.C. March, at

Stanford University on a Ford Foundation study of educational leadership. From 1968-73 she was a classroom teacher in Illinois.

Dr. Edlefson received a B.A. degree in elementary education from Augustana College, and a M.A. degree in sociology from Stanford University. The Ph.D. also from Stanford, was earned in Administration and Policy Analysis in the School of Education.

Dr. Bruce L. Gensemer, Professor Economics, Kenyon College, 203 Ascension Hall, Gambier, Ohio 43022. Telephone (614) 427-2244, Ext. 256 or home phone (614) 427-2046.

Dr. Gensemer joined the Department of Economics at Kenyon College in 1966 and has served as department chairman since 1975. In addition, he has served as a consultant on school finance to the Ohio Department of Education (Project 842) and School Management Institute during 1977-78. He also served as consultant to the Education Review Committee of the Ohio General Assembly in 1975-76 and to the Citizen's Council for Ohio Schools, 1975 and 1977. He has published many papers on Ohio School Finance.

Dr. Gensemer received an A.B. from the Ohio Wesleyan University, an M.A. in philosophy and an M.A. in economics from the University of Michigan. He also received the Ph.D. in economics from the University of Michigan.

Dr. Frederick D. Stocker, Professor of Economics, The Ohio State University, 212C Hagerty Hall, 1775 College Road, Columbus, Ohio 43210. Telephone (614) 422-4106.

Dr. Stocker has been with the Ohio State University since 1964. His present position is Professor of Economics and Public Administration. He currently is also a Fellow at The Academy of Contemporary Problems. In 1970-71, he served as Fiscal Advisor to the Citizen's Task Force on Tax Reform and in 1967 was Study Director of The Ohio Tax Study Commission. He was an Economist with the USDA from 1952 to 1964. He is the author of many articles and monographs on taxation and government finance.

Dr. Stocker is a graduate of Lehigh University. He received an M.A. and Ph.D. in Economics from Cornell University.

TEXT OF VIDEO TAPE

"OHIO'S SCHOOL FINANCE CRISIS"

DR. FRED HITZHUSEN

School finance is a topic of increasing public debate in Ohio. Reports of school closings, teacher's strikes, state mandates, and defeated local bond issues are daily headlines. To gain a better understanding of these issues, we have brought together a group of individuals representing considerable expertise to discuss why Ohio schools are in financial trouble and what we can do about it.

Mr. William Harrison is Staff Director of the Ohio General Assembly Education Review Committee. Bill will be commenting on the evolution of the school finance problem in Ohio.

Dr. Carla Edlefson is Staff Associate of the Citizens' Council for Ohio Schools located in Cleveland. Carla will discuss the possibilities for reducing school expenditures.

Dr. Bruce Gensemer is Professor of Economics at Kenyon College and a consultant on school finance. Dr. Frederick Stocker is Professor of Economics and Public Administration at The Ohio State University and a recognized authority on state and local taxation. Bruce and Fritz will be discussing current and potential sources of revenue for schools in Ohio.

Bill, what are the major factors leading to the current school finance problems in Ohio?

MR. WILLIAM HARRISON

The public schools are in financial trouble for a variety of reasons, but the basic one is that school spending is going up, while public support for more taxes is not. It is a bit like the proverbial irresistible force meeting the



immovable object.

School spending is rising for three main reasons.

One is more services to students with special needs--especially services for handicapped children and for vocational education. Both have grown by 25% in the past five years, and both cost about 40% more per pupil than the regular school program. We have also boosted the number of children who get free public transportation to school and the number of special programs for disadvantaged children, adult literacy, bilingual education, and the like.

Another reason is inflation. The prices of the things school districts buy are rising, just as they are for the things consumers buy. Most school district spending goes for personnel. Salaries for teachers have risen 43% since 1971. Even so, consumer prices have risen 50% during this time, so the purchasing power of teachers' salaries has actually declined. The average teacher salary in Ohio is still below the national average and is dropping further behind. The situation for non-teaching personnel--such as cooks, building custodians, and bus drivers--is similar. And costs for gasoline and building construction have gone up even faster than costs for personnel.

A third reason is growth in the size of school staffs. Whereas Ohio schools were employing fewer than 35 teachers per 1,000 pupils in 1971, today they are employing more than 40--or about one teacher for each 25 pupils. Schools are also employing more administrators of special programs--many through Federally funded programs--and more counselors, librarians, school nurses, and other specialists. Some of this staff growth has been mandated by the state legislature and State Board of Education, and some has been due to local preference.

Thus, of the three reasons for rising school spending, two of them--the expanded programs and larger staff--are intended to improve the quality

of schools. And the third one--inflation--is largely beyond local or state control.

On the other side, there are two basic reasons for slow growth in tax revenues.

First, we have enacted into law provisions to ensure that taxes on real property will not grow substantially without approval of the voters. Second, it appears that voters are more reluctant to approve new levies now than they used to be. Although state aid grew most rapidly from 1972 to 1975 and local revenue has been growing more rapidly since then, the combined effect of increased local, state, and federal revenue in recent years has been just about to keep pace with inflation, but not much more.

It should be pointed out that not all school districts have the same financial problems. Most of the districts which have had to close temporarily are low in property value per pupil, but some are above the state average. Some have low tax rates, and some have rates above average. Some actually have had more state and local money to spend per pupil than some districts which have not had to close. Each district seems to have had its own unique combination of reasons for closing.

All in all, then, the specific reasons for the financial troubles of the public schools differ from place to place, but the bottom line everywhere is a crunch between higher spending for schools and growing resistance to more taxes.

DR. FRED HITHUSEN

If school spending is rising faster than revenues, reduction of expenditures would seem to be an obvious solution to the school finance problem. Carla, what are the possibilities for this alternative?

DR. CARLA EDLEFSON

First, in education, most costs are those of hiring people. Salaries and fringe benefits of employees make up 80 to 90 percent of a school district budget. Districts are not totally free to cut these costs, because a certain number of instructional personnel for the number of students is required in mandates passed by the legislature and in minimum standards set down by the State Board of Education. Of course the legislature and the State Board could reduce these ratios, and in fact this summer the legislature did relax slightly the staffing requirement for those districts that are losing enrollment. But a large reduction in staffing ratios probably would mean a decline in educational quality.

Second, many people ask, couldn't we cut costs by firing a lot of highly-paid administrators? Costs of central office administration average less than four percent of the school budget that is funded from state and local tax money. So even if we fired all administrators, we wouldn't be doing much to help schools out of their financial difficulties.

Critics have noted the growth in the number of central office administrators while the number of students is declining. Administrators have been added to administer federal programs, with their salaries paid from federal funds. Adding those administrators usually means we've also added services that directly benefit kids.

School buildings tend to have only one administrator--the principal--who often must supervise many employees. Recent austerity moves have already eliminated many assistant principal positions. In any given district, of course, there may be administrators that could be fired and not missed, but as a general rule across the state, we don't waste much money on administration.

Third, declining enrollment doesn't mean that costs can always be cut accordingly. If a school district spends \$1200 per pupil it can't automatically

cut \$1200 out of its budget when its enrollment is one less. For example, a school building can't be closed unless the loss of student enrollment reaches a certain point--even then students may have to be transported to another school, and that costs money. Decisions to close schools involve many trade-offs that must be carefully considered, not the least of which is the outcry that occurs in a neighborhood when its school is closed.

That's not to say that consolidating school buildings and consolidating school districts ought not to be considered--they should. But we cannot expect costs to decrease at the same rate as enrollment declines.

Finally, there are quite a few districts that have had financial problems for three or four years, and they have cut their expenditures already. If the question is, can some costs be cut, the answer is probably. But will that solve the school finance problem in Ohio--no.

DR. FRED HITZHUSEN

Opportunities for major reductions in expenditures without significantly affecting educational quality appear limited. Bruce and Fritz are going to discuss the revenue sources available to schools and what potential exists for increasing these alternative sources?

DR. BRUCE GENSEMER

There are three main sources of school revenues: the federal government; local district tax revenue; and the state government. New revenues would come from one or several of these three sources. But what are the prospects for new revenue from each of these sources? Turning first to the federal government, we find only a very modest chance of significant revenue increases.

The federal government has never accepted a basic responsibility for education. In Ohio, only six to seven percent of our school revenues come from federal grants, and these grants are usually earmarked for special programs

designed to help economically disadvantaged pupils. The federal government offers virtually no general purpose aid to school districts.

While the federal role could change in the future, it is unlikely that federal aid to schools will grow significantly in the near future, and it is also unlikely that federal aid will be available as general purpose aid.

Let's turn then to local tax revenue as a possible source of new funds for Ohio schools.

Fritz, would you explain our options for new local tax revenues?

DR. FREDERICK STOCKER

The property tax is of course the traditional source of tax revenue for school districts. In fact, this is the only tax Ohio's school districts can levy. About half of all local school revenue comes from local property taxes, most of the rest coming from state aid.

Many people would like to see less use made of the property tax. But realistically, I doubt that we here in Ohio can or should expect much reduction in property taxes, or any dramatic change in its role.

For one thing the amount of money the property tax generates is massive, even at the fairly modest rates found in most parts of Ohio. Also, despite all the criticism heaped on the property tax, some of it no doubt deserved, the property tax is still a reasonably good source of local tax revenue as long as it is not overworked. Generally speaking the value of the house a family lives in is not too bad an indicator of their share of the cost of local public services. We should also remember that a very substantial share of the property tax revenue comes from business property.

There are several things that can be done to strengthen the property tax, making it less inequitable and at the same time more productive. For one

thing, we could relax the restraints on the growth of revenue that ordinarily comes with rising prices and rising property values. We could protect low income families and those on fixed incomes from excessive property tax burdens, as many other states have, through the device known as a "circuit breaker." We could also do a much better job of assessing property, and of equalizing assessments between counties and between classes of property. Likewise, putting the property tax on a monthly payment basis instead of requiring payment in two large lumps would make it less inconvenient. Reforms of this sort would preserve both the productivity and the equity of the property tax and help to make it more acceptable to taxpayers. They would not necessarily mean an increase in its relative importance in the total fiscal picture, nor an increase in the effective rate of the tax.

Another option that has received some discussion is that of allowing local school districts to enact payroll taxes similar to those levied in most Ohio cities. This proposal rests on the assumption that income related taxes are more acceptable to taxpayers than is the property tax. But there are serious problems with the school district income tax idea. One problem is that such a tax would almost certainly have to be applied at the point of the taxpayer's residence rather than where he or she works. Consequently, it would tend to work to the disadvantage of the fiscally hard-pressed central city school districts. Most of its revenue would go to comparatively well off suburban districts. Another problem that makes this option less attractive politically is that around 90% of the revenue from the local earnings tax would ordinarily come directly from the pockets of individual taxpayers, with business paying only about 10%, whereas with the property tax, in most places the division is more like 50-50.

So I would say that if we are to continue to have a significant local

role in the financing of public schools, the property tax serves us reasonably well. The job is not so much to increase its rate as it is to resist erosion of the tax base, preserve its productivity, and at the same time work toward making it more equitable.

DR. BRUCE GENSEMER

Thank you, Fritz. Let's now consider the state government as a possible source of new funds for our schools in Ohio. We must look very carefully at the options for new revenues are not likely to come from federal aid or local tax revenue. Before discussing the likelihood of new state revenues, it may be useful to review briefly Ohio's current system for distributing state aid to its school districts.

There are two types of state aid: categorical and basic.

Categorical state aid is earmarked for spending on pupil transportation, special education for the handicapped, vocational, education, and so on. These categorical funds are designed to reimburse the districts for all (or most) of the cost of these special, statemandated programs.

Basic state aid, by contrast, is not earmarked. This aid can be used as the local school boards see fit.

Currently about 3/4 of all state aid in Ohio is basic, and the rest is categorical.

Basic aid is distributed to districts by means of a formula known as the Guaranteed Yield (or Equal Yield) Formula.

The purposes of this formula are: to provide the needed general purpose funds; to guarantee a minimum revenue-raising capacity for all districts; and to enable districts to preserve their local autonomy.

Instead of trying to explain how the guaranteed yield formula actually works, I suggest that those who are interested can read about the formula in

one of the supplementary written materials that are available with this program. Basically, the formula is designed to give more state aid to low-wealth districts than to others. This tends to reduce the disparities in revenue-raising capacity among districts.

It is important to understand that the guaranteed yield formula does not equalize revenues per pupil among Ohio's school districts. This is because there are wide variations among the tax rates of 616 districts. The higher a district's tax rate, the higher will be its combined state-local revenue per pupil. In addition, some districts have so much property wealth that they can raise far more than the state guaranteed level even without any state basic aid. For these reasons the guaranteed yield formula acts so as to provide a guaranteed minimum in combined state-local revenues per pupil for each mill of tax, but the formula does not equalize revenues per pupil among Ohio school districts.

There are several serious problems with our current program for distributing state aid. In Cincinnati, the Hamilton County Court has ruled that our state aid plan violates the Ohio constitution. The Court stressed the wide variations in spending per pupil among districts that levy different levels of tax millage. The judge ruled that these variations violate the constitutional guarantee of equal protection for all Ohio school children, and also violate the constitutional requirement that the state provide a system of thorough and efficient education. The Court has ordered the General Assembly to devise a new state aid program for schools.

Another serious problem is the difficulty many districts are having in trying to balance their budgets. Some districts have even been forced to close their schools for lack of funds. The current state aid plan may not be solely responsible for these local district financial problems, but state aid has failed to solve them.



DR. FRED HITZHUSEN

Bruce, are there any reasonable alternatives to our current state aid system?

DR. BRUCE GENSEMER

Yes, there are two state aid systems worth considering as alternatives, since both of them appear to meet the constitutional objections of the Hamilton County Court. One is a system in which local tax revenue is eliminated entirely in favor of increased state financing. This plan would treat all pupils in Ohio in a uniform manner. Additional funds could be devoted to pupils with special needs, but these pupils would have the same access to special programs no matter where in the state they live. Under this plan, local school districts would no longer determine their own spending levels; this decision would be made instead by the General Assembly. It is important to note that local district financial autonomy would be eliminated under this state finance plan. Also, substantial new revenues at the state level would be needed just to replace the local property tax, let alone to finance higher levels of overall spending. The second alternative to our current state aid program would be to increase state aid while also retaining some modest level of local tax revenue. Under this alternative the state aid would be distributed at a level high enough so that all Ohio pupils can receive an adequate education. Those districts that choose to provide superior schooling could do so by levying additional local property taxes to supplement the high level of state aid.

This plan would preserve some degree of district financial autonomy, but it would also allow some continued variation in the quality of school programs across the state. New state government revenues would need to be provided for schools in order to implement this plan.

Fritz, since it appears likely that the state may need to consider devoting new revenues to our schools, would you explain how new state revenues might be raised?

DR. FREDERICK STOCKER

When it comes to possible sources of additional state revenue, Ohio is in a relatively favorable position. There are a number of fairly reasonable options that we can consider.

First, let me deal with two that I think are not realistic solutions. Some people have the idea that the state lottery might somehow become a major source of school revenue. The fact is that, regardless of what you think of the merits of the lottery, it simply is not a major revenue producer. The sixty million dollars it produces annually is just a drop in the bucket in terms of total school revenues.

Nor would raising business taxes offer any painless solution to our fiscal dilemma. For one thing, most of Ohio's business taxes, for example, our corporation franchise tax, apply at rates that are rather heavy compared with other industrial states. There are, to be sure, some gaps and loopholes in some of our business taxes, and these no doubt should be closed, but to do so will not produce significant amounts of revenue. In my opinion, a program relying on business taxes alone offers only a very limited potential for additional revenue.

This leaves the two major producers of state tax revenue--the retail sales tax and the personal income tax. Neither one of these is especially heavy in Ohio as compared with what people pay in other industrial states. The sales tax, with its four percent state rate, is about average for the U.S., but in Ohio the exemption of food and of most services greatly eases the sales tax burden and its regressivity. The sales tax also tends to be relatively painless

since it is paid a few cents at a time instead of in one lump sum. Still, sales taxes do rest most heavily on lower income groups and do not really tap the taxpaying capacity of those who have substantial ability to pay.

The personal income tax which is levied in Ohio at rates that range from 1/2 of one percent at the bottom up to 3-1/2 percent on incomes in excess of \$40,000 is also relatively light compared to the rates found in other states. This is especially true at the higher income levels where Ohio's income tax rates are among the lowest to be found in the nation. The personal income tax is potentially a very productive tax. It also has certain features-- progressive rates, personal exemptions, and other provisions that adapt the tax burden to the personal circumstances of the taxpayer and his family. In terms of the generally held notions of what is a fair tax, the personal income tax rates high and no doubt deserves top consideration as the principal source of whatever additional tax revenue the state might need to enable it to assume a larger share of the school financing load.

DR. FRED HITZHUSEN

We have learned from our panel that:

- (1) School spending in Ohio is rising due to:
  - inflation
  - expanded programs for children with special needs
  - growth in school staffs associated with expanded programs
- (2) School revenues are not rising as fast primarily due to:
  - constraints on growth of real property tax revenues
  - and increased failure rate of local school levies
- (3) Opportunities for major reductions in expenditures without significantly affecting educational quality are limited.
- (4) There are some problems with the current system for distributing state aid.

- (5) If additional school revenue are to be raised, the state income tax appears to be the most promising source.

DISCUSSION QUESTIONS ON VIDEO TAPE

DR. FRED HITZHUSEN

1. In spite of all the concern over Ohio school finance, not all schools are in financial trouble. Bill, why are some schools in trouble and not others?
2. Even though Carla suggests that opportunities for reducing school expenditures are limited, I think many people remain unconvinced. Carla, what about the frills and the costs of desegregation we hear so much about?
3. Bruce, there appears to be some conflict between the desire for local control and the call for more state and Federal revenues, particularly for so-called disadvantaged school districts. Can we devise a system with both local control and equal opportunity for all Ohio pupils?
4. Fritz, is Ohio likely to feel any repercussions from California's much publicized Proposition 13?

SUGGESTED WRITTEN MATERIALS

Sources for Developing Local School Finance Data

First, check with your county or local school district superintendent's office. There may be publications available based on local school data including enrollment, tax levels, and programs offered.

The Ohio Education Association publishes an annual report of financial data for Ohio school districts titled "Basic Financial Data of Ohio School Districts". While the OEA's supply is limited, you may be able to obtain the data from the latest edition by contacting your local school district superintendent.

Another Ohio Education Association (225 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio 43216) publication "Teacher Salary Schedules and Fringe Benefits for Ohio School Districts 1977-78", single copy \$2.50, 20% discount for 10 or more copies.

"Ohio Public Expenditures Council Reports," OPEC, 40 South 3rd Street, Columbus, Ohio 43215 Phone (614) 221-7738.

Approximately 24 reports per year are received with a subscription of \$25.00. The OPEC is a non-partisan privately funded research organization formed to monitor public expenditures. Selected data may be reproduced from copies on file at Area Extension offices. See contact person and addresses given in the first section of this leader's guide. Examples of recent school finance related reports include:

\* "Costs Per Pupil for Current Expenses in Ohio's Public School Districts During the 1976-77 School Year," OPEC, No. 6, 1978.

\* "Average Salaries of Classroom Teachers in Ohio's Public School Districts (1972-73 thru 1975-76)," OPEC, No. 8, 1978 and (1977-78), OPEC, No. 9, 1978.

\* "Estimated Local Property Taxes for Operating Purposes in Ohio's Public School Districts in 1978," OPEC, No. 16, 1978.

\* "Estimated State School Foundation Program Aid, State Reimbursement for 10% Real Property Tax Relief and Local Property Taxes for Operating Purposes for Ohio's Public School Districts," OPEC, No. 18, 1978.

#### Other Background Sources

\* "1978 State Conference on Public Education Jennings Report to the Public," 901 Citizens Building, Cleveland, OH 44114, single copy, \$1.00.

The proceedings of this conference include presentations on a variety of school issues such as competency testing, basic skills, energy use, and other contemporary issues.

\* "School Finance Reform in the States: 1978," 66 pages, June 1978, Report No. F78-1, prepared by Allan Odden, Education Finance Center, Education Commission of the States, Suite 300, 1860 Lincoln Street, Denver, Colorado 80295 (303)861-4917.

"An overview of state actions in 1977, current trends in litigation strategies, the status of policy research of emerging issues and prospects for 1978."

\* "Plain Talk About School Finance," 69 pages, May, 1978, by Margaret E. Goertz, Jay H. Moskowitz, and Judy G. Sinkin. Available from National Institute of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D. C. 20208.

"specifically written to clarify the technical issues involved in school finance policy...that is currently being considered in our state capitols."

\* "School Finance Reform, Ohio," 22 pages, prepared by the School Finance Project, the National Urban Coalition, 1201 Connecticut Ave., N.W., Washington, D. C. 20036 (202)331-2400.

Sections "explore how schools are funded in Ohio, how school districts are affected by the finance plan, and how the state legislature has responded to the financial crises of Ohio schools."

\* "Ohio's Taxes: A Brief Summary of Major State and Local Taxes in Ohio, 1978-1979 Edition," 57 page booklet, September 1978 prepared by The Ohio Department of Taxation, P. O. Box 530, Columbus, OH 43216 or call (614)466-3960 limited quantities available free of charge.

"...contains a brief outline for each of Ohio's major state and local taxes, including tax rates, collection figures, comparisons with other states, and a legislative history."

\* "The Ohio Law For State Support of Public Schools," 16 pages, Ohio Department of Education, Division of School Finance, Ohio Departments Building, Room 811, 65 South Front St., Columbus, OH 43215.

Limited quantities free of charge.

\* "Cost Per Pupil 1977-78," Atten: Harry Wolford, Division of Computer Services, Ohio Department of Education, Ohio Departments Building, 65 South Front St., Columbus, OH 43215.

Limited quantities free of charge.

\* "Extra Pay for Extra Services; Athletics, Women's Athletics 1977-78," OEA, 225 East Broad St., Columbus, OH 43216.

Single copy, \$2.50, 20% discount for 10 or more copies.

\* "Legislative Mandates, Their Cost to Schools," 100 pages, The Ohio School Boards Association, 700 Brooksedge, Westerville, OH 43081, (614)891-6466.

Single copy, \$3.50.

\* "What Every Ohio Citizen Should Know About School Finance," 38 pages. By Robert Stabile, The Ohio Schools Boards Association, 700 Brooksedge, Westerville, OH 43081 (614) 891-6466.

Cost: OSBA Member, single copy \$1.00, 10 or more \$.60 each,

Non-member \$1.50 each. \* ↓

For Sale publications from the Citizen's Council for Ohio Schools;  
517 The Arcade, Cleveland, OH 44114, (216) 621-5220.

\* "School Finance in Ohio: Background Papers," single copy, \$1.50.

\* "School Budgets and Accounting: For Best Use of Tax Dollars," single  
copy, \$.30.

\* "Ohio's New Plan of Aid to Schools: Will It Meet the Challenge?", (1975),  
single copy, \$.50.

Free publications available in quantity from Citizen's Council for Ohio  
Schools.

\* "School Finance Fact Sheet" (periodical).

\* "Ohio's School Finance Lawsuit: Cincinnati V. Walter"

\* "School Finance: Myths and Facts"

Publications available from Mr. William Harrison, Ohio General Assembly  
Education Review Committee, 16 East Broad St., Suite 203, Columbus, OH 43215.  
(614) 466-6148.

Single copies free of charge.

\* "Summary of Findings on Inflation, School Expenditures," ERC Staff  
Memorandum, eight pages.

\* "Selected Statistics on Trends and Sources of Financial Support, for  
Elementary and Secondary Education in Ohio," six pages, November 1978.

\* "Report of Legislative Recommendations for 1979," (available approx.  
March 1, 1979).

\* "The School Finance Crisis in Ohio Schools," a Joint Position Paper by  
The Buckeye Association of School Administrators, The Ohio Association of  
School Business Officials, The Ohio School Boards Association, December  
1977.

Order from Ohio School Boards Association, 700 Brookside, Westerville,  
Ohio, 43081 (614) 891-6466.



\* "School Finance Study: An Analysis of the Equity of Ohio's School Finance Plan," 28 pages. Prepared by the School Management Institute, Inc., 1978 for the Ohio Department of Education, 842 Project, Atten: William Phillis, Assistant Superintendent, Ohio Departments Building, 65 S. Front Street, Columbus, OH 43215 (614) 466-3175.

Limited quantities available free of charge.

