

AN ASSESSMENT OF THE COMMUNITY EDUCATION PROGRAMS  
IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS OF OKLAHOMA  
RELATIVE TO SOURCES  
OF FINANCING

By

DONALD EUGENE DECKER

Bachelor of Science in Business Administration  
Oklahoma State University  
Stillwater, Oklahoma  
1955

Master of Science in Education  
Oklahoma State University  
Stillwater, Oklahoma  
1963

Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate College  
of the Oklahoma State University  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the Degree of  
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION  
July, 1985

Thesis  
1985D  
D295a  
cop. 2



AN ASSESSMENT OF THE COMMUNITY EDUCATION PROGRAMS  
IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS OF OKLAHOMA  
RELATIVE TO FINANCING

Thesis Approved:

Wayne B. James  
Thesis Adviser

H. Gene Smith

James H. Davis

Robert L. Duncan

Norman N. Mumham  
Dean of the Graduate College

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The researcher is appreciative of the professional and personal support provided by Dr. Wayne James, committee chairman, and Dr. Deke Johnson for coordinating and guiding this study. To the other committee members, Dr. Jerry Davis and Dr. Gene Smith, he extends his sincere appreciation for assisting in the professional growth accrued through the successful completion of this study.

Appreciation is extended to Dr. Mary Lemmond for encouragement and technical assistance, to Dr. Carla Thompson for research and statistical assistance, to Dr. Jim Baker for supplying materials and encouragement, to Mr. Dwight Watson and his staff--Ms. Karen Miller and Ms. Shirley Ogilvie--for quality printing, and to 15 Oklahoma State University graduate students who assisted in collecting the data.

A special "thank you" to Ms. Beverly Keefe for dozens of writes, rewrites, mailings, second mailings, tabulations, and a reservoir of patience. Appreciation is extended to Mr. Ted Brown for the ability to write a software program on a moment's notice.

Most of all, to the researcher's wife, Danna and daughter, Darci, whose continued encouragement provided the support to endure classes, studying, and in writing this study.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
Statement of the Problem. . . . .	2
Purpose of the Study. . . . .	3
Limitations . . . . .	3
Assumptions . . . . .	4
Definition of Terms . . . . .	4
Organization of the Study . . . . .	5
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE . . . . .	6
An Overview of Community Education. . . . .	6
Financing of Traditional Education. . . . .	12
Financing of Community Education. . . . .	19
Expenditures of Community Education Funds . . . . .	27
Summary . . . . .	28
III. METHODOLOGY. . . . .	29
Description of the Population and Sample. . . . .	29
Development of the Instrument . . . . .	31
Collection of the Data. . . . .	32
Analysis of Data. . . . .	33
IV. PRESENTATION OF DATA . . . . .	35
Introduction. . . . .	35
Response Rate . . . . .	35
Demographic Data. . . . .	37
Sources of Funding. . . . .	39
Percentages of Funding. . . . .	46
Types of Expenditures . . . . .	50
Noncommunity Education School Districts . . . . .	54
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS. . . . .	61
Summary . . . . .	61
Conclusions . . . . .	62
Recommendations . . . . .	64
BIBLIOGRAPHY. . . . .	66

Chapter	Page
APPENDIXES. . . . .	70
APPENDIX A - COMMUNITY EDUCATION QUESTIONNAIRE . . . . .	71
APPENDIX B - NONCOMMUNITY EDUCATION QUESTIONNAIRE. . . . .	74
APPENDIX C - COMMUNITY SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT INDEX PLUS COMMUNITY EDUCATION QUESTIONNAIRE . . . . .	76
APPENDIX D - LETTER FROM STATE SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION. . . . .	81
APPENDIX E - RESEARCHER'S LETTER TO COMMUNITY EDUCATION SCHOOL DISTRICTS. . . . .	83
APPENDIX F - RESEARCHER'S LETTER TO NONCOMMUNITY SCHOOL DISTRICTS. . . . .	85

## LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Sources of Revenue and the Amount Collected from Each Source by the Common Schools of Oklahoma for the Fiscal Year 1982-83 . . . . .	20
II. Demographic Characteristics of Community Education and Noncommunity Education School Districts . . . . .	38
III. Sources of Community Education Funds and Percentages of Budget Obtained from Each Source. . . . .	40
IV. Number of Districts by Category Receiving Funds from Listed Sources . . . . .	41
V. Number of Districts by Amount of Total Income for Community Education Programs by Category. . . . .	43
VI. Number of Districts by Amount of Income from Local Sources by Category . . . . .	44
VII. Number of Districts by Amount of Income from State Grants by Category . . . . .	45
VIII. Number of Districts by Amount of Income from Tuition Fees by Category . . . . .	47
IX. Number of Districts by Amount of Income by Category from Federal, Fund-raising, Donations and Other Sources. . . . .	48
X. Breakdown of the Number of Districts Obtaining Percentage of Total Budget from Local, State, and Tuition Fee Funds by Category . . . . .	49
XI. Breakdown of the Number of Districts Obtaining Percentage of Total Budget from Federal, Fund-raising, Donations, and Others by Category. . . . .	51
XII. Number of Districts Expending Money on Programs and Break-down by Category. . . . .	52
XIII. Portion of Budget Expended by Type of Expenditure . . . . .	53

Table	Page
XIV. Percentage of Local Budgets Expended for Type of Expenditure by Category . . . . .	55
XV. Districts' Responses to Reasons for Not Having a Community Education Program by Frequency and Percentage . .	56
XVI. Correlations Between Demographic Factors and Reasons for Not Having Community Education Programs . . . . .	58
XVII. Responses to Question Concerning Establishment of Community Education Program if Obstacle Removed . . . . .	60



## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

According to Marland (1972), the role of community education is to provide opportunities and activities for learning to each member of the community:

Community education at its best is a center of learning and activity for every member of the family, with many opportunities for career information and support, perhaps through education of the whole family in a model setting (p. 146).

Youth can be served by providing guidance and counseling to assist them in wisely choosing a career to pursue; adults may need retraining for their present occupation or acquisition of new skills for new careers. Older adults may be benefited by recreational or related activities to meet their social needs. Totten (1972) believed that community education should be about the task of helping all citizens, regardless of age, explore careers, acquire skills, and gain knowledge.

Numerous agencies in the community can provide activities and could be the focal point for community education. The local school district, through the community school, may be best qualified to serve in this capacity as evidenced by the success of the nationally recognized Flint, Michigan program (Hiemstra, 1972).

In his discussion of school-based versus community-based community education programs, Weaver (1972) indicated that a good argument can be made by the proponents of the school-based theory, because nearly every individual in the neighborhood can be reached by the school. Minzey (1972) said that schools must accept a three-part challenge:

First, schools need to discharge their presently accepted responsibilities more effectively. Second, they must extend traditional services to all members of the community, not only the traditional student population. Third, the school must expand its activities into an area heretofore regarded as alien (p. 150).

According to Minzey and LeTarte (1972), one major excuse used by communities to not begin community education programs is the lack of adequate financing. When a board of education considers the implementation of community education, it must plan for additional staff, supplies, materials and, in most instances, an extended day for utilities and custodial services. The ultimate decision whether to become involved in community education is contingent on securing adequate initial financing. Conversely, established programs may be terminated, reduced, or not expanded because of a decline in the funding level.

Oklahoma Department of Education (1984) records indicated that Oklahoma had 615 dependent and independent school districts in the 1984-85 school year. Seventy-four of these districts had community education programs and 541 districts did not have programs that school year (Johnson, 1984). If community education can help solve societal problems through involvement of all citizens of the community and improve the quality of life, why did few Oklahoma school districts embrace the concept?

#### Statement of the Problem

An information base that includes sources of financing and categorical expenditures is needed to assist school districts who desire to upgrade or establish community education programs, but no study has been conducted in Oklahoma to gather such data. Therefore, the problem

of this study was the lack of an information base relating to the present status of community education funding in Oklahoma.

#### Purpose of the Study

The primary purpose of the study was to provide an information base relative to the financing of community education programs in the public schools of Oklahoma during the 1984-85 school year. A secondary purpose was to determine why some schools in Oklahoma did not have community education programs. The study sought to answer the following questions:

1. What are the sources of funding for community education programs in Oklahoma.
2. What percentage of funding is derived from Federal, State, Local, and Other sources.
3. For what programs are community education funds expended.
4. Was lack of funding the primary reason for not implementing a community education program in the public schools of Oklahoma.

#### Limitations

The study had the following limitations:

1. Programs studied were limited to those in operation during the 1984-85 school year.
2. Because of the size of the population, the study was limited to a sample of the school districts which did not have community education programs during the 1984-85 school year.
3. Results of the survey were specific to the community education programs of Oklahoma; generalizations about community education programs in other states should be made with caution.

## Assumptions

The study made the following assumptions:

1. School districts utilized for this study responded honestly to the questionnaire.
2. Perceptions reported corresponded with the reality of events and circumstances of the community education programs surveyed.
3. Individuals who completed the questionnaire were qualified to respond.

## Definition of Terms

A list of terms that have relevancy to this study are listed below:

Building fund: monies that can be expended for construction, purchase, or remodeling of public buildings.

Community education: a process by which the educational needs of the individual and of the society are met regardless of age or academic achievement.

Community education program: the organizational unit within a public school district that provides educational activities and opportunities to all citizens of the community.

Community school: the vehicle by which community education is delivered to the community.

General fund: monies that are collected or expended for undesignated reasons.

Public school district: a political subdivision and public corporation, governed by an elected board of education, with statutory authority to provide educational services.

Source of funds: financing from governmental agencies--local, county, state, federal--and assistance from the private sector, including tuition fees.

Traditional education: the education of students from ages 5 to 18 who normally attend school between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m.

### Organization of the Study

The study consists of five chapters. Chapter I introduced the study; stated the problem to be studied; stated the purpose of the study; itemized the limitations of the study; listed assumptions; defined terms; and described the organization of the study.

Chapter II includes a review of the related literature focusing on (1) An Overview of Community Education, (2) Financing of Traditional Education in the public schools, (3) Financing of Community Education in the public schools and the sources that are available at the local, state, and national levels, (4) Expenditures of Community Education Funds, which included a categorical disbursement of community education monies, and (5) Summary.

Chapter III reports the selections of participants in the study, development of the instrument, collection of the data and analysis of the data. Chapter IV includes the presentation and discussion of the findings. Chapter V includes a summary of the study, statement of the conclusions, and recommendations for practice and study.

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The review of literature in this study is divided into five sections:

1. An Overview of Community Education
2. Financing of Traditional Education
3. Financing of Community Education
4. Expenditures of Community Education Funds and
5. Summary

#### An Overview of Community Education

Hiemstra (1972) wrote that the community school movement began in Flint, Michigan in 1935, a city with economic problems that suddenly evolved into social problems. High unemployment and a deteriorating educational program, characterized by minimal services for students, low teacher salaries and no community support for new facilities, created community social problems of juvenile delinquency and discrimination against minorities and poor people. According to Hiemstra (1972), Manley, a physical education and recreation supervisor in the Flint Public Schools, presented some ideas aimed at solving these community problems to Mott, a former mayor of Flint, who contributed \$6,000 for a different approach to utilization of school facilities. The community school concept was born.

Pendell (cited in Weaver, 1972) quoted from a personal interview with Mott:

I see the community education concept spreading all over the United States; yes, even to other parts of the world . . . I see people becoming involved in their local problems, their state, their national problems. They will work together solving their problems, developing new ways of doing things, and as they work together they will develop closer feelings of friendship, cooperation, and understanding which will work toward solving some of the great social problems threatening this nation (p. 154).

A review of literature revealed that many authors have devoted extensive literary efforts to defining community education in terms of programs or processes. Horyna (1979) wrote that some educators have opinions that community education cannot nor should not be defined because the limits of the definition are not important. The importance lies in the context of the community with which you are dealing. He also wrote that the purpose of a definition is to establish a starting point to bring people together for the purpose of a coordinated effort in solving common problems. Totten (1970) wrote:

Through cooperative effort, supported by community school leadership, there is a strong possibility that people will be able to improve their homes and reduce racial and socio-economic barriers, and that the illiterate can acquire needed basic skills. There is also a good chance that safety and health standards will be improved, delinquency and crime will be reduced, the employment rate will be increased, and the causes of poverty will be eliminated (p. 5).

Community education in its earlier stages was described by Minzey (1972) as a program added to the existing curriculum of traditional education and consisted of offerings such as recreation and extra programs for adults and children. He pointed out that even the supporters of the community education concept viewed it as being an extra, not an integral, part of the total educational program of the community.

In justifying the establishment of a community education program, Thomas (1984) indicated that a community education program should have a range of programs that includes academic and special interests offerings such as basketweaving, bridge, physical fitness, sewing clubs, algebra, accounting, drafting, and investing--those programs that would fulfill the needs and desires of community members.

Horyna (1979) believed that many community educators became involved in programming because it was more visible than the process concept. Programming may also be a source of funds and increased in importance if districts were depending on revenues to support the community education endeavor.

Minzey (1972) noted that community education should be examined relative to two prime ingredients of the concept: programs and process. The first ingredient of a community education program deals with the more obvious activities of a community. The course offerings listed above by Thomas are some examples of program activities. The community has particular needs as indicated by surveying the population, and the programs are designed to meet those needs. If the needs assessment indicates a desire for recreation, vocational retraining, or basic education classes, the programs provide the means for fulfilling these requirements. The second ingredient of the community education concept is that of process, which can be defined as an attempt to organize and inspire each community so that it will solve its problems by democratic involvement.

Hiemstra (1972) expressed a definition of community education as:

A philosophy that accompanies the community education process is that learning is a continuous, lifelong experience and need. This implies a process that begins in the home at birth, is continued in the community school, and is



perpetuated in the educative community throughout one's life (p. 33).

Kerensky (1972) declared that community education is not a preconceived package, but is a process and entails all the implications of a process. People who live in a community should have the opportunity for input into the educational system that serves them. Community education is a process that seeks procedures that will allow all community agencies to cooperate in the attainment of common goals.

Totten (1970) wrote:

Community education is the process by which people come to realize the great reservoir of strength they have within themselves to solve their own personal and community problems. Community Education can best be implemented when the schools in the community become multi-purpose schools (p. 7).

Weaver (1972) surveyed the current writers in the field and had the opinion that they favored a definition of community education as a process, lending support to Seay, (cited in Weaver, 1972), who wrote as early as 1953 that the community school involved an educative process that allocated the resources of a community according to the needs and interests of citizens of that community. Carillo and Heaton (1972) noted the importance of following a developmental process so that it is not an experimental program but a way of life. Kerensky (1972) suggested these basic ideas that underpin community education:

1. Community education is not a product. It is not a series of packages. It is a process that attempts to educate and mobilize everyone in the development of educational goals for a community.
2. Community education is a new form that requires new administration and control. It is a process for putting the ideas, wants, and needs of local citizens back into the educational system.
3. Community education is an alternative organizational form to decentralize and "debureaucratize" the American schools. It is based on the philosophical assumption that

if you want people to accept change they must be involved in the process.

4. Community education strives to mobilize the vast array of human and physical resources that are available in each community but work in an independent, self-serving manner.
5. The community education concept seeks the total mobilization of human resources . . . The community education concept mobilizes an entire community as teachers and learners (pp. 159-160).

According to Minzey (1972), the real promise of community education is in the process. He said:

For unlike most current endeavors of social engineering which attack the symptoms of our problems, community education provides a system for involvement of people in the identification and solution of their problems (p. 153).

Weaver (1972) indicated sufficient rationale for program and process definitions of community education exists, especially for the program concept in the beginning stages of community education. Those interested in the development of the community education theory will need to examine both points of view before defining community education.

Whether community education is defined as a process or a program, some ideas and some misconceptions of the concept have emerged.

Kerensky (1972) enumerated some of these mistaken ideas:

One misconception of community education is the view that the enterprise is merely a new slogan, an add on, or a gimmick without real depth of meaning. Community education is not a new way of describing the existing education structure. It is an alternative form of education that provides new dimensions, new alternatives, and new approaches to the education of the entire community.

Some people mistakenly see community education as a neat package of programs. This view perpetuates the myth that the simplistic solutions--a course in ceramics here, a program for the disadvantaged there--can solve society's complex problems.

Another misconception of community education is that by simply lighting the public schools in the late afternoon and evening and by extending the current day we can make something magical happen to the existing educational system. Or that by adding

adult education programs and a few exciting activities we accomplish a revolution that will turn the tide of public opinion.

Community education is not an extra program to be attached to the existing education structure.

Another misconception is that community education is a public relations gimmick. This view holds that the educational establishment will be able to convince the community that past politics are indeed the proper policies, and that previous defeats of bond and millage elections are simply a result of public naivete or ignorance. Rather, community education should establish a process where the clients are given an opportunity to make an impact on the total educational process (p. 158).

Minzey (1972) recommended that the size of the community must be small enough to allow for citizen participation when defining the process aspect of community education. The area that surrounds an elementary school building generally satisfies this requirement. What is the relationship between the community school and community education? Community education is a concept; the community school is the medium or vehicle for delivering services to the involved community. The school is the least threatening of public agencies in the community and the logical agency to deliver services. Parents do not feel threatened because they have had contact with the school through the educational activities of children.

Is the school capable of assuming these additional responsibilities that are being sought through the community education concept?

Cunningham (1971) believed that the schools have not been alert to this increased need and described the school's failure to understand the situation:

Part of the problem stems from a basic fallacy in the school system approaches to school public relations. The preparation programs developed by colleges and universities for administrators in training have been urged to tell people about the schools, bring parents into the schools, sell the

schools to the people. Very few efforts of a continuing type have been mounted which allow parents and students opportunities to share their feelings about the schools with school officials. Information flow has been primarily one way. Legitimate outlets have not been provided for protest or discontent. PTAs and similar organizations have often ruled discussions of local school's weaknesses out of bounds to perpetuate a peaceful, tranquil, and all-is-well type of atmosphere (p. 179).

In summary, according to Thomas (1984, p. 4), "Community education leaders must solve this basic problem: How to make community education an integral part of the regular school program." When this problem is solved, the concept of community education will become integrated into the educational family. With this acceptance will come support by the public, support by the public school administrators, and "will be well understood as the dynamic process that holds all education together" (Thomas, 1984, p. 4).

The benefits of education to an individual are usually evidenced by the ability to obtain employment or to pursue higher levels of education. Also, inherent in all teaching is the opportunity to transmit values. According to Hiemstra (1972), all citizens of a community can be affected by values learned concurrently in education and at home by a reduction in crime, unemployment, delinquency and poverty. The value of education to a community can be measured in economic and social yields.

#### Financing of Traditional Education

Garms, Guthrie, and Pierce (1978) have researched public education from the early nineteenth century through World War II and have found the public to be very supportive of the common schools. During those years, the goals of public education were agreeable to the general

public. If the United States were to grow, prosper, and defend itself, the public education system needed to produce a trained and literate population.

Following World War II, the public schools assumed additional responsibilities besides providing basic skills and citizenship training. Schools were singled out as the appropriate institution for bringing about an integrated society (Garms, Guthrie, and Pierce, 1978, p. 4).

The Phi Delta Kappa Commission on Alternative Designs for Funding Education (1973) wrote that the justification of mass public education is founded on the basic grounds that it is a basis for culture, attempts equality and expands development of the economy. According to the Commission, any one of these reasons was sufficient for financing public education, but taken collectively there was little argument as to the importance of public education.

As a basis for the continued and increased financial support of public education, the Phi Delta Kappa Commission (1973) suggested the following principles by which government should adhere:

First. Perpetuation of a democracy is dependent upon the citizens' ability to make knowledgeable public policy decisions.

Second. Education is desirable not only because it enhances economic development but more importantly because it protects individual freedom and instills the power of effective choice.

Third. All children and youth should be given equal opportunity and encouragement to develop their talents to their greatest potential.

- a. Public schools should be free and fully governmentally financed.
- b. Education should be supported by government at a level which provides an educational program appropriate to the individual needs and differences among children.

- c. Government financing of education should not be dependent upon the wealth of the parent or the fiscal ability of the school district.

Fourth. Government should seek in the allocation of funds to correct educational, social, cultural, and economics imbalance and inequity--to remove barriers between caste and class and promote social mobility.

Fifth. Government should finance education through equitable forms of taxation (p. 7).

Local control of public institutions is one of the fundamental principles of a democratic nation. The early leaders of the United States recognized the importance of this principle and organized schools at the community level under the authority of a school board elected by the citizens of the community. Unless there is evidence of an overriding state interest in financing and controlling schools, the financial support and control of the local public schools lies with the local community.

Total costs of education in the United States have increased dramatically since 1960 in part because of the increasing school population. There have been more school-age children, they have stayed in school longer, and more of them have gone on to college--particularly more blacks and women. Many younger and older people who were traditionally excluded from school are now being provided public educations: mentally and physically handicapped children, children with learning disabilities, preschool children, pregnant girls, and many adults (Garms, Guthrie, and Pierce, 1978, p. 65).

According to Barr (1960), the purpose of public school finance is to employ an administrative staff, secure teaching personnel, and maintain facilities necessary to meet the educational needs of the school district. Garms, Guthrie, and Pierce (1978) have listed raising, distributing, and spending money as the three dimensions of public school finance.

Six principles of public school finance have gained general acceptance (Barr, 1960):

1. Public schools are a primary government responsibility.
2. Adequate financial support of public schools is essential in a democratic state.
3. School funds should be utilized efficiently.
4. Schools fiscal policies should be stable.
5. Flexibility is essential to the development of sound school finance practices.
6. Social justice should be strengthened by school finance policies (p. 50).

The chief source of revenue for education is a system of broad-based taxes (Garms, Guthrie, and Pierce, 1978). The public elementary and secondary schools of all states in the United States are supported primarily by local and state taxation and are open, tuition-free, during the traditional hours to the traditional student. The taxes which have the broadest base and are utilized to a great extent in the financing of education are the income, sales, and property taxes. "There are four bases or criteria for levying a tax: wealth, income, consumption, or privilege" (Garms, Guthrie, and Pierce, 1978, p. 119). In their discussion on taxes, Garms, Guthrie, and Pierce (1978) defined a tax on wealth as one which is based on the ownership of property. The most common example of a tax on wealth is the property tax, with the amount of tax paid based on the value of property owned without considering any mortgage or income-producing potential of the property. An income tax is one based on the income, after deductions, of individuals or corporations. A sales tax is a tax on consumption, unless it applies specifically to the purchase of certain items, then it is called an excise tax. License fees are a tax on privileges, such as driving an automobile, operating a bar, or performing personal services.

Sources of revenue for a public school district can be categorized as local, state, and federal. Benson (1968) stated:

Though local districts have been delegated the major responsibility for operating schools, it does not follow that all taxation for education is local. Grants-in-aid from the state governments are an important source of funds. The term "grants-in-aid" refers to payments by states to local governments, usually derived from appropriations by the state legislature from the general fund. Thus state tax instruments are used to support the schools. Likewise, some money is provided by the federal government (p. 87).

According to Garms, Guthrie, and Pierce (1978, p. 132), "The property tax is a principal support of the public schools in 49 of the 50 states." The property tax has been the major source of financing for the public schools at the local level; sales tax is the primary source at the state level; and the income tax is the largest source of funding for the federal government (Garms, Guthrie, and Pierce, 1978). The Phi Delta Kappa Commission (1973), discussing tax bases, said:

Generally, state governments have reserved the property tax base for local use. The sales and income bases were reserved for state use. A few states have permitted local school boards and other agencies to levy sales and income taxes, and some states levy small statewide property taxes. However, for the most part, the property tax base is still reserved for local agencies. This shared use of the property tax base is cause for some concern in school finance. If the sharing is uneven across a state, some school districts may have greater or less access to the local property tax base than others (p. 34).

Research and practice have resulted in the development of generally accepted principles of state support for the public schools (Barr, 1960):

1. State funds should be distributed in such a manner that every child is guaranteed a reasonably good education.
2. State funds should be distributed to public schools in accordance with objective formulas.



3. State funds should be so distributed that every district is assured some tax leeway for experimentation and adaption.
4. State support should be coordinated with local support.
5. State funds for public schools should be derived from general funds of the state.
6. State funds for public schools should be distributed in such manner that equitable treatment is afforded all taxpayers (p. 56).

Barr explained that the traditional foundation system was funded on the premise that there is a funding level necessary to guarantee every child a reasonably good education and that the foundation programs are designed to bring each school district up to the level. However, most foundation systems do not encourage incentives for the local district, but only require a minimum amount of funding at the local level.

The following explanations of federal funding were offered by Garms, Guthrie, and Pierce (1978) and Benson (1968):

The 1958 National Defense Education Act - The NDEA authorized funds for numerous activities including student (college) loans and funds for the purchase of instructional equipment in the math, science, and foreign language departments. There were incentives for guidance and counseling personnel and encouragement for educational television and other audio-visual materials.

The 1964 Economic Opportunity Act - This act funded unusual programs including Headstart, Upward Bound, and the Job Corps.

The 1965 Elementary and Secondary Education Act - This Act is considered a landmark in federal funding because of the largest appropriation and broadest spectrum of funding for public education. In its original form, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act authorized in excess of \$1.2 billion. By 1977, this amount had nearly doubled, to

\$2 billion. The major thrust of the legislation was to provide funds for the educationally disadvantaged children in the form of remedial and compensatory services. This portion of the Act was known as Title I.

The 1968 Vocational Education Act - This Act provided for amendments to the 1963 Vocational Education Act that encompassed all previously existing federal vocational programs and authorized some new ones.

Two laws, Public Law 874 and Public Law 815, known as impact laws, are designed to provide funds to school districts which have federal installations located within their boundaries. These installations are tax-exempt and the theory behind the laws is that the federal government is a property owner and has the same responsibility for supporting local government as a private individual does. Public Law 874 allows the grants to be used for current operating expenses and Public Law 815 allows for construction of school facilities.

In Oklahoma, the State Constitution (1981) provides for the local school district to raise funds, by presenting a question to the district electors at the annual school election--the fourth Tuesday in January of each year. The question is whether the electors wish to tax the net assessed valuation of district property 15 mills for general fund purposes. These 15 mills, if voted, raise the total millage available for general fund purposes to 35 mills.

Each district has the ability to vote up to five mills for building fund purposes and may present this question to the electors at the annual school election. A district may borrow funds to build or remodel facilities up to a maximum of 10 percent of the net assessed property valuation of the district, with this indebtedness to be repaid by a

sinking fund levy sufficient to pay bonds, interest, and fees. An increase or decrease in the taxable property base affects the annual sinking fund levy.

According to the Finance Division of the State Department of Education (1983), the school districts of Oklahoma received \$1,598,776,000 for school year 1982-83. (Figures were not available for school year 1983-84.) Of this total, local revenues amounted to \$507,484,000 or 31 percent; state revenues amounted to \$959,606,000 or 61 percent; federal revenues amounted to \$131,686,000 or eight percent.

Data in Table I show that the advalorem tax accounted for 55 percent of the local revenues; the state aid or grants-in-aid accounted for 74 percent of the state revenues; and three sources (school lunch, 29 percent; ECIA, 24 percent; P.L. 874/815, 19 percent) accounted for 72 percent of the federal revenues.

#### Financing of Community Education

Funding of community education programs parallels funding of traditional education in many respects, but there are some distinct differences in the methods used to secure funds. The purpose of this section of the review of literature is to identify some sources for initially funding the community education concept or securing additional funds to expand the concept.

According to Fish and Klassen (1977), the successful funding program is preceded by assessing the needs of the program. The first step is to identify the specific needs of the program--for what purposes are monies required. Some common needs are the director's salary, travel, advisory council in-service training, preschool programs, and

TABLE I  
SOURCES OF REVENUE AND THE AMOUNT COLLECTED FROM EACH  
SOURCE BY THE COMMON SCHOOLS OF OKLAHOMA  
FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 1982-83

## LOCAL.

Revenues for General Fund

Ad Valorem Tax	\$ 278,498,000
County 4-Mill Levy	31,795,000
County Apportionment	7,125,000
Miscellaneous	66,396,000

Revenues for Capital Outlay  
and Debt Service

Constitutional Building Fund	43,296,000
Sinking Fund	80,374,000

TOTAL LOCAL REVENUES	\$ 507,484,000
----------------------	----------------

## STATE

Dedicated Revenues

Motor Vehicle Stamps	344,000
Gross Production	51,495,000
Auto License	100,542,000
Boat and Motor License	1,123,000
Mobile Home License	6,709,000
REA Tax	10,639,000
Commercial Vehicle License	565,000
School Land Earnings	23,109,000

Revenues from Appropriations  
by Legislature

Vocational Aid	27,207,000
School Lunch	7,095,000
Special Services	1,560,000
Free Textbooks	10,242,000
Driver Education	2,309,000
State Aid	716,666,000

TOTAL STATE REVENUES	959,606,000
----------------------	-------------

## FEDERAL

Vocational Aid	2,893,000
Johnson-O'Malley	639,000
School Lunch	38,350,000
P.L. 874/815	25,131,000
Chapter 1, ECIA	32,693,000
Chapter 1, ECIA (Migrant)	2,327,000
Chapter 2, ECIA	4,300,000
IV-B, and IV-C, ESEA	706,000
EHA-B, P.L. 94-142	13,604,000
Title IV-A, Indian Education	9,553,000
Adult Basic Education	1,112,000
Career Education	103,000
Transition Program for Refugees	275,000

TOTAL FEDERAL REVENUES	131,686,000
------------------------	-------------

GRAND TOTAL	\$1,598,776,000
-------------	-----------------

Source: Oklahoma State Department of Education  
Finance Division  
1983

senior citizens programs. When the needs have been identified, they should be prioritized and an estimate of the costs should be calculated. "Many people totally neglect the first step, assuming that the school district and/or municipality will provide them a carte blanche" (p. 7).

Step two is an assessment of possible sources of funding for the community program. Specific methods of approaching step two can be developed by the director after researching sources and attitudes of the various institutions and/or individuals from which the support is being sought. Step three is the location of sources and program implementation (Fish and Klassen, 1977).

Most community education programs are financed from a multiplicity of fund sources and financial support. To be successful in securing funds, the community education director must understand where to look for funds, how each of the sources operates, and the methods of successful approaches to secure funds from the sources.

Basically there are four sources of governmental funds--local, county, state, and federal (Fish and Klassen, 1977). At the county, state, and federal levels, there are generally two types of governmental funds--allocated and discretionary. Allocated funds are those which are earmarked for eligible districts and municipalities, usually on a formula basis. A district or municipality needs only to apply for these.

Discretionary funds are different. These are monies for which the school district and municipalities must compete. To receive these, proposals are required since only a small percentage of the requests will be funded. The quality, orientation and scope of the proposal are crucial. The skill of grantsmanship, the identifying and securing of

funds, must be developed if one is going to be successful in obtaining discretionary funds.

An explanation of federal programs is included in the Catalog of Federal Programs Related to Community Education (1976):

Federal programs include two basic types of grants, formula and discretionary. Formula grants include those grants where funds are distributed according to a formula outlined in the law (often apportioned by population or other community characteristics). The formula is specified by the law. Discretionary grants are also called project grants. The law states that the Commissioner of Education distributes these funds at his own discretion (p. iii).

Fish and Klassen (1977) have developed some questions to be answered in the writing of proposals. The questions are concerned with justification, objectives, procedures and design:

Justification for the proposal: Why should it be funded? What specific needs will be met? What are the target populations? How long has the problem existed? What has already been done about it?

Specific objectives: What is to be changed and/or accomplished, over how long a period, and according to what measurement indicators?

Detailed operational procedures: How will the participants be selected? How will the program be conducted and for how long? What kind of supplies and facilities are needed? What are the staffing requirements? Are consultants to be employed?

Adequate evaluation design: Using the objectives as indicators of desired ends, what evaluation techniques are to be used? Who will administer? When? (p.15).

One source of federal funds is the Community Education Act (Stanley, 1977). Congress, through the Community Education Act of 1978, authorized \$500 million to support Community Education programs from 1979 to 1983. At the current time, money is distributed through grants that are applied for through competitive funding proposals. Other sources of federal funds are: the Elementary, Secondary Education Act; Title IV; Community Schools; Metric Education, Gifted and Talented

Education; Career Education; and Consumer Education (Fish and Klassen, 1977).

The 36th Oklahoma Legislature (1978) directed the State Board of Education via a joint resolution by the Senate and House of Representatives to develop an Oklahoma plan to implement community education. The resolution stated:

Whereas, community involvement and more complete utilization of existing educational facilities are goals which may be attained through community education programs; and

Whereas, community education is a concept which calls for an expanded role for public education, encouraging the total community to become a living and learning laboratory for all facets of the community, from the youngest to the most senior citizen, by providing a dynamic approach to individual and community improvement; and

Whereas, community education is a process by which public facilities are used as community centers and operated in conjunction with governmental agencies and community service organizations to provide educational, recreational, cultural, social, health and such other community services which are not already available to persons in the community in accordance with the needs, interests and concerns of the community; and

Whereas, community education will strengthen the bonds connecting the home, school and community through the provision of cultural, educational, recreational and social services for all people in the community; and

Whereas, the use of human resources and community facilities, the coordination and cooperation among individuals and groups, and the development of an ongoing means of identifying present and future wants and needs provides a strong force against crime and deleterious antisocial behavior in the community (Oklahoma Session Laws, 1978, p. 908).

The initial State funds for community education appropriated by the Oklahoma Legislature totaled \$160,000 in 1979 (Oklahoma Session Laws, 1979, p. 806). The appropriations for subsequent years are as follows: \$220,000 in 1980 (1980, p. 1057); \$325,000 in 1981 (1981, p. 1233); \$450,000 in 1982 (1982, p. 711); \$450,000 in 1983 (1983, p. 22); \$399,833 in 1984 (1984), p. 1114). The reduction in the appropriated

funds in 1984 reflected a shortfall in State income rather than a lessening of support for the community education concept.

Probably no groups in the local community have the potential for benefiting more from community education than do business and industry. When seeking assistance from business and industry, according to Fish and Klassen (1977) there are three steps or techniques that can or should be used:

One of the first steps in seeking support from business and industry is to indicate to these people the impact that community education has for them. Nearly every business or industry in every community in the United States is committed to a community role or responsibility; thus, they are logical resources to be approached by community educators for support.

A second way to win business support is to get business and industrial leaders to visit a school or program activity and to observe personally what is going on.

The third technique for publicizing community education is to get business and industrial leaders involved in actual community education programs. This can be done in several ways: serving on advisory councils; ad hoc committees, speakers on special subjects; leadership capacity for fund raising for community education (p. 21).

Although foundations are not a major source of funds for most community education programs, they are an important source of funds for individual programs within the total concept of community education. Foundations are a possible source of financing, because they are required by law to spend six percent of their total assets at the end of the fiscal year (Fish and Klassen, 1977).

According to the Mott Foundation Special Report (1982), the Foundation began funding the community education concept in Flint, Michigan in 1935. Mott believed in making Flint a laboratory for community education practitioners and established the National Center for Community Education in 1963. The purpose of the center was to offer



six-week courses to assist in the training of community education directors. One hundred eighty-eight state community education centers were established to provide services and disseminate information to local communities. Currently, 85 of these community education centers receive funds from the Foundation.

According to Mott Foundation guidelines, total support for community education is measured according to the following criteria:

- (1) Recognized community education director(s)/coordinator(s) charged with relating the affairs of the community with those of the school and serving on at least a half-time basis.
- (2) A council, committee or vehicle that provides for involvement by members of the community--including students, teachers, parents, other citizens--in the affairs of the school.
- (3) The availability of the school for programming during and beyond the traditional school hours and for all in the community.
- (4) Mobilization and utilization of agencies and other resources for addressing needs of the school and the community.
- (5) A Board of Education resolution supporting the concept of community education (Johnson, 1985).

The Oklahoma school districts identified as having community education programs can be divided into three categories depending upon the degree of commitment and participation in the community education concept. The categories are: (A) meets all Mott guidelines, (B) meets all Mott guidelines, but employs less than a half-time director, (C) meets at least three of the Mott guidelines. Forty school districts are classified in Category A; 16 school districts are classified in Category B; 18 school districts are classified in Category C (Johnson, 1985).

There are two steps in obtaining financial support from foundations. The first step is that of planning a proposal and the

second step is the actual writing of the proposal. Community education directors could utilize the services of the Foundation Center located in Washington, D. C. One of the major services of the Foundation Center is the maintenance of branch libraries related to foundations (Stanley, 1980). Foundation Center libraries contain sources of information pertaining to foundations--annual reports, Internal Revenue Service returns, records on microfiche, books, and other data useful to the community education director (Stanley, 1980). Two of these libraries are located in Oklahoma: Oklahoma City Community Foundation and Tulsa City-County Library System. The Foundation Directory lists all major foundations in the United States with assets over \$1 million or which make grants of over \$500,000 annually.

Organizations which have a community service focus, such as Scouts, YMCA, YWCA, the Lions Club, and so on, are quite often interested in contributing to the community education program . . . Community groups such as churches and social service agencies can cooperate with Community Education in providing for community needs.

Community Education, itself, can raise or provide money through its own activities. Fund-raisers are common in many community education programs . . . Finally, a very important source of funds is the fees from individual classes offered by community education. While these fees do not, as a rule, provide money for program expansion, they are designed to cover the major costs of most classes and, thus, are a vital component of the total financial picture (Fish and Klassen, 1977, p. 7).

The review of literature has quoted numerous writers who have listed sources of funds and techniques for procuring them, but Johnson (1984) advocated commencing a community education program with available funds. He quoted George Washington Carver who said, "Start where you are with what you have. Make something of it. Never be satisfied." (Cited in Johnson, 1984, p. 2). Johnson listed nine communities which began community education programs through the cooperation of agencies

within the communities and two of these communities started programs via community college courses offered in the public schools.

#### Expenditures of Community Education Funds

The expenditures of different community programs varies according to the personality of the community, but Fish and Klassen (1977) have developed a budget worksheet representative of the budgets of most community education programs. The main principle here is the necessity of preparing a budget and securing approval from all responsible individuals or groups. The expenditure portion of the budget worksheet is categorized into the following classifications:

- A. Staff Compensation
  - 1. Professional
  - 2. Clerical
  - 3. Other
- B. Fringe Benefits
  - 1. Retirement
  - 2. Social Security
  - 3. Health Benefits
  - 4. Life Insurance
  - 5. Other Benefits
- C. Supplies
  - 1. Office Supplies
  - 2. Program Supplies
  - 3. Telephone
  - 4. Postage
- D. Capital Outlay
  - 1. New Equipment
- E. Local Transportation
  - 1. Mileage Payments (Staff)
  - 2. Mileage (Advisory Council, others)
- F. Professional Development
  - 1. Conference, Meetings
  - 2. Subscriptions and References
  - 3. Dues and Memberships
  - 4. Staff Training

#### G. Program Costs

Each individual program should have its own minibudget. The format would be the same as this work sheet. The total cost of all programs should be reflected in the final budget (p. 13).

### Summary

Most writers defined community education in terms of the process rather than programs. Most agreed that even though this definition was more philosophical than the practical approach through programming that ultimately the survival of community education would depend upon the larger concept of process. Many of the writers expressed a view that community education was indeed the thread that eventually would hold all education together as a cohesive unit.

Funding will continue to be a major factor in the successes or failures of community education programs. Most writers agreed that even the most marvelous and innovative ideas and programs generally required dollars to succeed. The literature written about funding community education is rather limited, but broad enough to give guidance to the beginning community educator.

## CHAPTER III

### METHODOLOGY

The primary purpose of this study was to provide an information base relative to the financing of community education programs in the public schools of Oklahoma. The base of information gathered in this study would assist community educators in upgrading or establishing community education programs. A secondary purpose of the study was to determine why some schools in Oklahoma did not have community education programs. A sample of these schools was surveyed to determine if the absence of funding was the primary reason for not having a community education program.

This chapter is devoted to reporting the methods used to accomplish the purpose of the study and is divided into four sections. The sections are:

1. Description of the population and sample
2. Development of the instrument
3. Collection of the data and
4. Analysis of the data

#### Description of the Population and Sample

Oklahoma Department of Education (1984) records indicated that Oklahoma had 615 dependent and independent school districts in the 1984-85 school year. The data for this study were collected from two

subgroups of these districts. One of the subgroups for this study consisted of the 74 Oklahoma school districts which had community education programs during the 1984-85 school year. The district names, addresses, and persons responsible for community education at the schools were furnished by the Community Education Center, Oklahoma State University (OSU), Stillwater, Oklahoma (Johnson, 1985). These districts were identified from a telephone survey conducted by the OSU Community Education Center to determine the location of existing community education programs, to identify potential contact individuals, and to categorize each district according to Mott Foundation guidelines.

The Oklahoma school districts identified as having community education programs were divided into Mott Foundation's three categories depending upon the degree of commitment and participation in the community education concept. The categories were: (A) meets all Mott guidelines, (B) meets all Mott guidelines, but employs less than a half-time director, and (C) meets at least three of the Mott guidelines. Forty school districts were classified in Category A; 16 school districts were classified in Category B; 18 school districts were classified in Category C.

A sample of the remaining 541 school districts which did not have community education programs during this same time period comprised the second subgroup to be studied. The sample was randomly selected using the following procedures. A listing of districts published by the Oklahoma State Department of Education (1983) was utilized to assign numbers to all districts except those districts which were identified as community education districts. Using a table constructed by Krejcie and Morgan (1970), the number of districts needed to insure the probability

of obtaining a representative sample was 227. After each district was assigned a number, a table of random numbers from Popham and Sirotnik (1973) was utilized to obtain the districts included in the sample.

#### Development of the Instrument

A questionnaire consisting of nine questions was developed by the researcher. The questions resulted from information gathered in reviewing the literature concerning sources of funding. Information necessary to establish the base of knowledge as outlined in the purpose of study dictated the type of questions included on the questionnaire.

The first eight questions were designed to identify the local, state, and national sources of funds as received by the local community education program. The last question was designed to categorize expenditures of local community education funds. Experts in questionnaire development and staff members of the Jenks Public Schools assisted in reviewing and field-testing the instrument. See Appendix A for a copy of the final version of the Community Education Questionnaire (CEQ).

A second questionnaire was constructed to survey the sample school districts. The questionnaire requested the respondents to rank eight items from the most important to the least important reason for not having a community education program for school year 1984-85. In addition, the respondents were asked if they would consider establishing a community education program should their primary obstacle to such a program be removed. See Appendix B for a copy of the Non-Community Education Questionnaire (NCEQ).

### Collection of the Data

In districts with single community schools, the questions used to survey community education school districts about their finances were incorporated in a COMMUNITY SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT INDEX (CSDI) questionnaire. Data collected from the first part of the CSDI were to be used in a study by another researcher. This instrument (see Appendix C) was distributed to 71 community education school districts, addressed to the superintendent or director, as determined by the OSU Center telephone survey. In three districts with multiple community schools, a copy of the CSDI without the CEQ Finance Section was mailed to each community school; a single copy of the CEQ, which was color-coded blue for identification purposes (see Appendix A), was mailed to the central office of the district. All questionnaires to each community school district were accompanied by a letter of support from the Oklahoma State Superintendent of Public Instruction (see Appendix D) and a letter (see Appendix E) from the researcher explaining the study.

The letter from the researcher (Appendix E) assured anonymity to the respondent and informed the districts that a graduate student from Oklahoma State University or the researcher would contact them by telephone. During the telephone call the data would be collected or a personal interview would be scheduled. Each graduate student was scheduled to collect data through four telephone interviews and one personal interview. For those questionnaires which were not completed, the researcher contacted the district to gather the data.

Upon receipt of the completed questionnaire, the researcher added the following demographic information for each school district: (1) district size from average daily membership, (2) wealth from per capita



valuation, and (3) budget from total revenue received. This information was gathered from Annual Report of the Oklahoma State Department of Education (State Department of Education, 1984).

The questionnaires used to survey the noncommunity education school districts (Appendix B) were coded with assigned numbers and mailed to the sample school district during early December, 1984, accompanied by an explanatory letter from the researcher. See Appendix F for a copy of the researcher's letter to the superintendents of the noncommunity education school districts. Coding was performed to identify the subjects who did not respond so that they could be included in a second mailing in January, 1985. Nonrespondents received another copy of the Noncommunity Education Questionnaire (Appendix B) and letter from the researcher (Appendix F).

#### Analysis of Data

The information on funding sources and expenditures was analyzed by using frequency distributions; percentages for all items were also obtained. In addition, means and ranges were calculated for some items where appropriate.

Because of the noninterval level of most of the data obtained by the questionnaires (most items were nominal or ordinal level), nonparametric statistics were employed in the study. To determine relationships between and among questions on the Noncommunity Education Questionnaire and the demographic information, the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences subprogram NONPAR CORR: SPEARMAN AND/OR KENDALL RANK ORDER CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS was utilized for analysis of relationships (Nie, Hull, Jenkins, Steinbrenner, and Bent, 1975).

The Subprogram NONPAR CORR computes Spearman rank-order correlation coefficients that are nonparametric, because neither depends upon a normal distribution of interval scales. The variables must be a least ordinal in scale and numeric in type.

## CHAPTER IV

### PRESENTATION OF DATA

#### Introduction

The primary purpose of this study was to provide an information base relative to the financing of community education programs in the public schools of Oklahoma during the 1984-85 school year. A secondary purpose was to determine why some schools in Oklahoma did not have community education programs. The following questions were examined:

1. What are the sources of funding for community education programs in Oklahoma.
2. What percentage of funding is derived from Federal, State, Local, and Other sources.
3. For what programs are community education funds expended.
4. Was lack of funding the primary reason for not implementing a community education program in the public schools of Oklahoma.

The remainder of this chapter is devoted to the response rate, demographic data, sources of funding, percentages of funding, types of expenditures, and correlation of noncommunity education questionnaire factors. Data are presented in narrative and table formats.

#### Response Rate

Responses from two subgroups of all school districts in Oklahoma were obtained. The first subgroup consisted of school districts with community education programs, while the second group consisted of a

sample of the school districts which did not have community education programs. The community education questionnaire was distributed to 74 Oklahoma school districts which had community education programs. The researcher and 15 graduate students from Oklahoma State University collected the data via telephone and personal interviews. Two districts indicated a cooperative effort with local community/junior colleges to provide services to the community. The school districts provided facilities; all administrative and instructional functions were performed by the colleges. One district reported that all services, including instruction and supplies, were donated. Health circumstances prevented one school district director from participating in the study, and five school districts indicated the absence of a program in their community. Since five of the originally identified programs did not have community education programs and since two programs had cooperative relationships with community colleges and only furnished facilities, 67 of these school districts actually met the guidelines for being classified as a community education program. In the 67 programs, 65 districts (98.5%) provided data included in this study. One of the 67 districts provided no financial data because all services, supplies and equipment were donated with no dollar value being supplied. One district did not participate in the study, reducing the appropriate school districts to 65. These 65 districts were categorized by the Mott standards system according to the following: Category A = 37; Category B = 16; Category C = 12.

The second subgroup consisted of 227 school district randomly drawn from all those school districts which did not have community education programs. After the first mailing, 120 (52.9%) returned their

questionnaires. A second mailing was undertaken to increase the response rate. From the second mailing, 33 (14.5) additional questionnaires were returned. In total, 153 (67.4%) of the questionnaires were returned.

### Demographic Data

Demographic characteristics of community education and non-community education school districts are presented in Table II. The number and percentages of Size, Wealth, and Budget are presented for each subgroup.

The mean of students for the community education schools was 3,377 while the mean for the non-community schools was 538. For comparison purposes, the State mean for district size was 615. Community education schools ranged from 62 to 42,078 students as compared to 28 to 9,749 students for non-community education schools. For comparison purposes, the State district sizes range from 22 to 42,078. Sixty percent of the community education schools have fewer than 1,500 students compared to 96 percent for the non-community education schools in the same size range.

Wealth of a school district was measured by the dollar value of the property tax base supporting each student. The per capita wealth mean for community education schools was \$15,093 compared to a mean of \$17,936 for non-community education schools. For comparison purposes, the State per capita wealth mean was \$15,829. Community education schools ranged from \$2,992 to \$67,271 per capita wealth compared to a range of \$1,979 to \$84,437 for non-community education schools. Sixty-five percent of the community education schools had a per capita wealth

TABLE II  
DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF COMMUNITY EDUCATION  
AND NON-COMMUNITY EDUCATION SCHOOL DISTRICTS

Characteristic	Community Education Schools		Non-Community Schools	
	N	%	N	%
<b>District Size</b>				
4,000 and over	12	18.5	2	1.3
3,500 - 3,999	1	1.5	0	0.0
3,000 - 3,499	1	1.5	0	0.0
2,500 - 2,999	2	3.1	1	0.7
2,000 - 2,499	5	7.7	0	0.0
1,500 - 1,999	5	7.7	3	2.0
1,000 - 1,499	11	16.9	11	7.2
500 - 999	12	18.5	30	19.6
under 500	16	24.7	106	69.2
TOTAL	65	100.*	153	100.*
Mean	3,377		538	
Range	62 - 42,078		28 - 9,749	
<b>Wealth</b>				
\$25,000 and over	7	10.8	33	21.6
20,000 - 24,999	2	3.1	15	9.8
15,000 - 19,999	10	15.4	16	10.4
10,000 - 14,999	22	35.9	30	19.6
5,000 - 9,999	19	29.1	49	32.1
under 5,000	5	7.7	10	6.5
TOTAL	65	100.*	153	100.*
Mean	\$15,093		\$17,936	
Range	\$2,992 - 67,271		\$1,979 - \$84,437	
<b>Budget</b>				
\$5,000,000 and over	18	27.6	5	3.3
4,500,000 - 4,999,999	5	7.7	0	0.0
4,000,000 - 4,499,999	0	0.0	0	0.0
3,500,000 - 3,999,999	4	6.2	3	2.0
3,000,000 - 3,499,999	5	7.7	2	1.3
2,500,000 - 2,999,999	5	7.7	7	4.6
2,000,000 - 2,499,999	6	9.2	6	4.0
1,500,000 - 1,999,999	4	6.2	14	9.2
1,000,000 - 1,499,999	8	12.3	31	20.2
500,000 - 999,999	8	12.3	52	33.8
under 500,000	2	3.1	33	21.6
TOTAL	65	100.*	153	100.*
Mean	\$7,999,911		\$1,302,592	
Range	\$179,470 - 116,588,372		\$93,152 - 9,593,323	

\*May not equal 100 due to rounding

in the \$5,000 to \$15,000 range as compared to 52 percent of non-community education schools in this same range.

The budget for a school district was determined by totaling income from all sources during the 1983-84 school year. The budget mean for community education schools was \$7,999,911 compared to a mean of \$1,302,592 for non-community education schools. For comparison purposes, the State mean for budget income was \$2,285,823. The range for budget income was \$179,470 to \$116,588,372 for community education school districts compared to \$93,152 to \$9,593,323 for non-community education school districts. Twenty-seven percent of the community education school districts had budgets over \$5,000,000 compared to only 3.3 percent for non-community education school districts. Conversely, over 75 percent of the non-community education districts had budgets less than \$1,500,000 compared to only 27 percent of the community education districts in this range.

#### Sources of Funding

The data reported in Table III indicated that 81.6 percent of the community education school districts obtained funds from the local budget; 73.8 percent of these districts received funds from tuition fees and 64.6 percent had obtained State grants. No community education programs reported funding from foundation grants. Community education programs reported funding of \$1,457,423 with \$433,814 (29.7%) from local budgets; \$438,083 (30.1%) from State grants; and \$356,320 (24.5%) from tuition fees.

Sources of funding by Mott Foundation categories are listed in Table IV. The data indicated that 83.7 percent of Category A community

TABLE III  
SOURCES OF COMMUNITY EDUCATION FUNDS AND PERCENTAGES  
OF BUDGET OBTAINED FROM EACH SOURCE

Source of Funds	N*	%	Total Dollar Amount for All Districts	% of Total Amount
Local Funds	53	81.6	\$433,814	29.7
Federal Grants	4	6.2	85,500	5.9
State Grants	42	64.6	438,083	30.1
Tuition Fees	48	73.8	356,320	24.5
Fund-raising Activities	4	6.2	5,350	0.4
Foundation Grants	0	0.0	0	0.0
Donations	8	12.3	10,015	0.7
Other	6	9.2	128,341	8.7
TOTAL			\$1,457,423	100.0

\*Total N = 65



TABLE IV  
NUMBER OF DISTRICTS BY CATEGORY RECEIVING  
FUNDS FROM LISTED SOURCES

Source/Category	N*	% of Category
Local Funds		
Category A (n=37)	31	83.7
Category B (n=16)	14	87.5
Category C (n=12)	8	66.6
Total	53	
State Grants		
Category A (n=37)	34	91.9
Category B (n=16)	7	43.8
Category C (n=12)	1	8.3
Total	42	
Federal Grants		
Category A (n=37)	2	3.0
Category B (n=16)	1	1.5
Category C (n=12)	1	1.5
Total	4	
Tuition Fees		
Category A (n=37)	30	81.0
Category B (n=16)	12	75.0
Category C (n=12)	6	50.0
Total	48	
Fund-raising Activities		
Category A (n=37)	3	8.1
Category B (n=16)	1	6.3
Category C (n=12)	0	0.0
Total	4	
Foundation Grants		
Category A (n=37)	0	0.0
Category B (n=16)	0	0.0
Category C (n=12)	0	0.0
Total	0	
Donations		
Category A (n=37)	6	16.2
Category B (n=16)	1	6.3
Category C (n=12)	1	8.3
Total	8	
Others		
Category A (n=37)	5	13.5
Category B (n=16)	1	16.3
Category C (n=12)	0	0.0
Total	6	

\*Total N = 65

education programs, 87.5 percent of Category B programs and 66.6 percent of Category C programs received funds from the local school district budgets. State grants were awarded to 91.9 percent of Category A schools, but to only 43.8 percent of Category B and 8.3 percent of Category C schools. Eight percent of Category A schools reported fund-raising activities; 6.3 percent of the Category B schools obtained funding from this source; and no Category C schools received funds from fund-raising activities.

The total income by number of districts and category for community education programs is reported in Table V. Six percent of the programs (all in Category A) had income in excess of \$60,000. Over 28 percent of the programs reported less than \$5,000 in total income. Community education programs reported their amounts of income by source and category in Table VI. These data indicated that 16.2 percent of the districts received between \$4,000 and \$5,000 from local sources while another 16.2 percent received less than \$2,000 from the same sources. Nine districts (seven in Category A and two in Category C) or 24.4 percent of the districts received local assistance. Sixteen districts furnished custodial services, utilities, and incidental supplies to their community education program without attaching dollar amounts.

The data in Table VII show the amount of income received by community education programs from State grants by Mott categories. Fourteen and three-tenths percent reported State grants in excess of \$13,000 (Category A programs) and 28.6 percent of the districts were awarded grants in the \$4,000 to \$6,000 range. Only one school district in Category C reported income from a State grant.

TABLE V  
NUMBER OF DISTRICTS BY AMOUNT OF TOTAL INCOME FOR  
COMMUNITY EDUCATION PROGRAMS BY CATEGORY

Total Income	N*	%	A n	Category	
				B n	C n
\$60,000 and over	4	6.3	4	0	0
55,000 - 59,999	1	1.6	1	0	0
50,000 - 54,999	0	0.0	0	0	0
45,000 - 49,999	1	1.6	1	0	0
40,000 - 44,999	1	1.6	1	0	0
35,000 - 39,999	1	1.6	1	0	0
30,000 - 34,999	1	1.6	0	1	0
25,000 - 29,999	1	1.6	1	0	0
20,000 - 24,999	6	9.5	6	0	0
15,000 - 19,999	6	9.5	4	2	0
10,000 - 14,999	11	17.5	8	2	1
5,000 - 9,999	12	19.0	8	4	0
1 - 4,999	18	28.6	2	6	10
TOTAL	63	100.0	37	15	11

\*Total N = 65

TABLE VI

NUMBER OF DISTRICTS BY AMOUNT OF INCOME  
FROM LOCAL SOURCES BY CATEGORY

Amount of Income	N*	%	Category		
			A n	B n	C n
\$26,000 and over	3	6.1	3	0	0
24,000 - 25,999	1	2.7	1	0	0
22,000 - 23,999	0	0.0	0	0	0
20,000 - 21,999	1	2.7	0	1	0
18,000 - 19,999	1	2.7	1	0	0
16,000 - 17,999	0	0.0	0	0	0
14,000 - 15,999	2	5.4	2	0	0
12,000 - 13,999	0	0.0	0	0	0
10,000 - 11,999	3	8.1	3	0	0
8,000 - 9,999	2	5.4	1	1	0
6,000 - 7,999	3	8.1	2	1	0
4,000 - 5,999	6	16.2	5	1	0
2,000 - 3,999	9	24.4	7	0	2
1 - 1,999	6	16.2	0	6	0
TOTAL	37	100.0	25	10	2

\*Total N = 65

Note: Sixteen districts furnished custodial services, utilities, and incidental supplies to their community education programs without attaching dollar amounts: A = 6; B = 4; C = 6.

TABLE VII  
NUMBER OF DISTRICTS BY AMOUNT OF INCOME FROM  
STATE GRANTS BY CATEGORY

Amount of Income	N*	%	Category		
			A n	B n	C n
\$13,000 and over	6	14.3	6	0	0
12,000 - 12,999	3	7.1	2	0	1
11,000 - 11,999	1	2.4	1	0	0
10,000 - 10,999	5	11.9	3	2	0
9,000 - 9,999	5	11.9	5	0	0
8,000 - 8,999	3	7.1	1	2	0
7,000 - 7,999	3	7.1	2	1	0
6,000 - 6,999	3	7.1	3	0	0
5,000 - 5,999	6	14.3	4	2	0
4,000 - 4,999	6	14.3	6	0	0
3,000 - 3,999	1	2.4	1	0	0
2,000 - 2,999	0	0.0	0	0	0
1,000 - 1,999	0	0.0	0	0	0
TOTAL	42	100.**	34	7	1

\*Total N = 65

\*\*Does not equal 100 due to rounding

Approximately 50 percent (45.6%) of the school districts collected less than \$2,000 from community education student tuition fees. Only six Category C schools (n=16) reported collecting tuition fees. These data are reported in Table VIII.

Federal grants, fund-raising activities, donations and other sources of funding for community education programs are listed in Table IX. Only four districts received federal grants; four districts received income from fund-raising activities; eight districts received donations from individuals, companies, corporations, service organizations, and civic clubs; six districts received income from other sources.

Federal grant sources reported were: Chapter 1 and Chapter 2 of the Elementary Secondary Education Act; Bilingual Act; and, Job Training Partnership Act. Fund-raising activities included carnivals, beauty pageants, sports-events gate receipts and raffles. Donations were received from banks, Rotary Club, Lions Club, Chamber of Commerce, Pepsi, Wendy's and United Way. Income from other sources included General Educational Development (GED) test fees and city government. The largest city government grant was via the parks department.

#### Percentages of Funding

The number of districts and percentage of budget from local funds, State grants and tuition fees are presented by Mott category format in Table X. Twenty percent of the districts received more than half of their community education total income from local sources. Forty-three percent of the districts received less than 10 percent of their community education income from local sources--18.6 percent received no

TABLE VIII  
NUMBER OF DISTRICTS BY AMOUNT OF INCOME FROM  
TUITION FEES BY CATEGORY

Amount of Income	N*	%	Category		
			A n	B n	C n
\$11,000 and over	3	6.3	3	0	0
10,000 - 10,999	2	4.2	2	0	0
9,000 - 9,999	1	2.1	1	0	0
8,000 - 8,999	0	0.0	0	0	0
7,000 - 7,999	2	4.2	2	0	0
6,000 - 6,999	3	6.3	3	0	0
5,000 - 5,999	2	4.2	2	0	0
4,000 - 4,999	4	8.3	4	0	0
3,000 - 3,999	6	12.5	3	2	1
2,000 - 2,999	3	6.3	1	2	0
1,000 - 1,999	9	18.5	3	4	2
1 - 999	13	27.1	6	4	3
TOTAL	48	100.0	30	12	6

\*Total N = 65

TABLE IX  
NUMBER OF DISTRICTS BY AMOUNT OF INCOME BY  
CATEGORY FROM FEDERAL, FUND-RAISING,  
DONATIONS AND OTHER SOURCES

Source/Amount of Income	N*	%	Category		
			A n	B n	C n
Federal Grants					
\$53,500	1	1.5	1	0	0
26,000	1	1.5	1	0	0
4,000	1	1.5	0	1	0
3,000	1	1.5	0	0	1
Total	4	6.0	2	1	1
Fund-raising Activities					
\$2,050	1	1.5	1	0	0
2,000	1	1.5	1	0	0
700	1	1.5	1	0	0
600	1	1.5	0	1	0
Total	4	6.0	3	1	0
Donations					
\$3,000	1	1.5	1	0	0
2,000	1	1.5	0	1	0
1,900	1	1.5	0	0	1
1,750	1	1.5	1	0	0
750	1	1.5	1	0	0
300	1	1.5	1	0	0
200	1	1.5	1	0	0
115	1	1.5	1	0	0
Total	8	12.0	6	1	1
Other Sources					
\$111,000	1	1.5	1	0	0
10,000	1	1.5	1	0	0
6,406	1	1.5	1	0	0
675	1	1.5	1	0	0
160	1	1.5	0	1	0
100	1	1.5	1	0	0
Total	6	9.0	5	1	0

Total N = 65



TABLE X  
BREAKDOWN OF THE NUMBER OF DISTRICTS OBTAINING PERCENTAGE  
OF TOTAL BUDGET FROM LOCAL, STATE, AND  
TUITION FEE FUNDS BY CATEGORY

Source/Category.	Percentage of Total Budget										
	over 90	80-89	70-79	60-69	50-59	40-49	30-39	20-29	10-19	1-9	0
Local Funds											
N*	2	1	2	6	2	5	6	8	5	16	12
%	3.0	1.5	3.0	9.2	3.0	7.7	9.2	12.4	7.7	24.7	18.6
Category											
A	1	1	0	3	2	3	6	8	1	6	6
B	0	0	1	2	0	2	0	0	4	5	2
C	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	4
State Grants											
N*	4	2	7	4	2	9	8	2	2	2	23
%	6.2	3.0	10.8	6.2	3.0	13.9	12.3	3.0	3.0	3.0	35.2
Category											
A	3	2	5	2	2	7	7	2	2	2	3
B	0	0	2	2	0	2	1	0	0	0	9
C	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Tuition Fees											
N*	7	1	0	1	2	0	5	14	9	9	17
%	10.8	1.5	0.0	1.5	3.0	0.0	7.7	21.5	13.9	13.9	26.2
Category											
A	0	0	0	1	2	0	4	10	7	6	7
B	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	3	4
C	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	6

\*Total N = 65

income from local sources. Seventy percent of the districts received less than half of their community education income from State grants, while 35.2 percent of the districts received no income from State grants. Tuition fees accounted for over 90 percent of the income for three Category B and four Category C districts.

The number of districts and percentage of individual community education budgets from Federal grants, fund-raising activities, donations and others are presented by category in Table XI. Ninety-four percent of the districts receive no Federal assistance; 93.9 percent of the districts had no fund-raising activities; 87.8 percent of the districts listed no donations; and 90.8 percent had no "other" sources of income.

#### Types of Expenditures

The researcher, through the Community Education Questionnaire (CEQ), requested participants in the study to list dollars expended for specific programs. However, some districts responded in percentages, while others checked programs offered, therefore, the researcher utilized a frequency format and category distribution to report the data in Table XII. Programs offered by districts were distributed almost evenly among adult basic education, education for youth, health and recreation, hobbies and personal development, and business classes. Education for youth was offered by 32.3 percent of the districts while home improvement classes were offered by only 13.9 percent of the districts.

The data in Table XIII show the total amount of funds expended in Oklahoma community education programs for directors' salaries,

TABLE XI

BREAKDOWN OF THE NUMBER OF DISTRICTS OBTAINING PERCENTAGE  
OF TOTAL BUDGET FROM FEDERAL, FUND-RAISING,  
DONATIONS, AND OTHERS BY CATEGORY

Source/Category	Percentage of Total					0
	Over 80	60-79	40-59	20-39	1-19	
Federal Grants						
N*	1	1	1	1	0	61
%	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	0.0	94.0
Category						
A	0	0	1	1	0	35
B	0	1	0	0	0	15
C	1	0	0	0	0	11
Fund-raising Activities						
N*	0	0	0	1	3	61
%	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.5	4.6	93.9
Category						
A	0	0	0	1	2	34
B	0	0	0	0	1	15
C	0	0	0	0	0	12
Donations						
N*	1	0	0	1	6	57
%	1.5	0.0	0.0	1.5	9.2	87.8
Category						
A	0	0	0	0	6	31
B	0	0	0	1	0	15
C	1	0	0	0	0	11
Other						
N*	0	0	0	3	3	59
%	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.6	4.6	90.8
Category						
A	0	0	0	3	3	31
B	0	0	0	0	0	16
C	0	0	0	0	0	12

\*Total N = 65

TABLE XII  
NUMBER OF DISTRICTS EXPENDING MONEY ON PROGRAMS  
AND BREAKDOWN BY CATEGORY

Programs	N*	% of Total	Category		
			A n	B n	C n
Adult Basic Education	14	21.5	7	6	1
Education for Youth	21	32.3	13	6	2
Health and Recreation	16	24.6	9	6	1
Home Improvement	9	13.9	5	3	1
Hobbies and Personal Development	18	27.7	10	5	3
Business Classes	19	29.2	11	7	1
Other:					
Inservice Training	2	3.1	2	0	0
GED	1	1.5	1	0	0
Culture and Arts	1	1.5	1	0	0

\*Total N = 65

TABLE XIII  
PORTION OF BUDGET EXPENDED BY  
TYPE OF EXPENDITURE

Expenditure	Amount of Money	%
Director Salaries	\$627,204	57.4
Instructor Salaries	245,958	22.5
Other Salaries	203,717	18.6
Travel	16,469	1.5
TOTAL	\$1,093,348	100.0

instructors' salaries, other salaries and travel. Each expenditure is also reported as a percentage of total community education expenditures.

Directors' salaries accounted for the largest expenditure (\$627,204) and were 57.4 percent of the total community education expenditures (\$1,093,348). Instructors' salaries were 22.5 percent of the total and other salaries e.g., custodians, secretaries and clerks, accounted for 18.6 percent of total expenditures. Travel costs were 1.5 percent.

Percentages of local budgets expended for salaries are reported in Table XIV. Forty-six percent of the districts indicated that more than 50 percent of the local budget was spent for the director's salary, while 36.9 percent of the districts reported no expenditures for directors' salaries. Forty-two percent of these districts were Category C community education programs. Instructors' salaries were not an expenditure in 53.8 percent of the districts, and 61.8 percent paid no "other" salaries.

#### Non-Community Education School Districts

A sample of Oklahoma school districts was asked to rank reasons for not having a community education program. Their responses are reported in Table XV. Over 63 percent of the respondents indicated that lack of funds was either their first or second reason for not having a community education program. Lack of community interest was chosen by 24.8 percent of the districts as the primary reason for not having a program.

The factor indicated to be the least deterrent to a community education program was administrative interest. Only 0.7 percent of the

TABLE XIV  
PERCENTAGE OF LOCAL BUDGETS EXPENDED FOR  
TYPE OF EXPENDITURE BY CATEGORY

Type of Expenditure	Percentage of Local Budget										
	90-100	80-89	70-79	60-69	50-59	40-49	30-39	20-29	10-19	1-9	0
<b>Director Salaries</b>											
N*	11	4	6	4	5	1	3	3	2	2	24
%	16.9	6.2	9.2	6.2	7.7	1.5	4.6	4.6	3.1	3.1	36.9
Category											
A	10	4	5	3	4	1	2	1	0	1	6
B	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	2	2	0	8
C	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	10
<b>Instructor Salaries</b>											
N*	4	1	1	2	2	3	3	9	3	2	35
%	6.2	1.5	1.5	3.1	3.1	4.6	4.6	13.9	4.6	3.1	53.8
Category											
A	1	0	1	2	0	2	3	6	2	1	19
B	1	1	0	0	2	1	0	3	1	1	6
C	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
<b>Other Salaries</b>											
N*	6	0	0	2	1	1	3	1	7	4	40
%	9.2	0	0	3.1	1.5	1.5	4.6	1.5	10.8	6.2	61.6
Category											
A	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	3	4	25
B	1	0	0	2	1	0	0	1	4	0	7
C	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

\*Total N = 153

TABLE XV

DISTRICTS' RESPONSES TO REASONS FOR NOT HAVING A COMMUNITY  
EDUCATION PROGRAM BY FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE

Reason	Rank Order																No Response	
	1 N*	%	2 N*	%	3 N*	%	4 N*	%	5 N*	%	6 N*	%	7 N*	%	8 N*	%		
Lack of Funds	76	49.7	21	13.7	16	10.5	8	5.2	5	3.3	3	2.0	2	1.3	6	3.9	16	10.5
Lack of Community Interest	38	24.8	21	13.7	18	11.8	23	15.0	16	10.5	6	3.9	3	2.0	7	4.6	21	13.7
Lack of Facilities	6	3.9	16	10.5	21	13.7	23	15.0	11	7.2	19	12.4	13	8.5	18	11.8	26	17.0
Lack of Instructors	7	4.6	23	15.0	30	19.6	25	16.3	17	11.1	14	9.2	7	4.6	6	3.9	24	15.7
Lack of Administrator Interest	1	0.7	9	5.9	6	3.9	15	9.8	34	22.2	27	17.6	18	11.8	15	9.8	28	18.3
Unfamiliarity with Community Education Concept	4	2.6	7	4.6	8	5.2	7	4.6	11	7.2	15	9.8	34	22.2	27	17.6	40	26.1
Other	10	6.5	9	5.9	6	3.9	15	9.8	14	9.2	19	12.4	27	17.6	20	13.1	33	21.6
Unsuccessful Previous Program	12	7.8	7	4.6	1	0.7	3	2.0	0	0.0	3	2.0	8	5.2	26	17.0	93	60.8

\*Total N = 153



respondents stated that lack of administrative interest was the primary reason for not having a program.

Correlations between demographic factors and among reasons for not having community education programs are listed in Table XVI. Demographic factors of size, wealth and budget when correlated to each other indicated a significant relationship at the .05 level of significance. Size correlated with wealth ( $r=-0.3096$ ) indicated that as size increased per capita wealth decreased. This relationship occurs when a constant district valuation is divided by district size--as size increased per capita wealth decreased and vice versa. Size and budget are highly positively correlated ( $r=0.8907$ ). As size of the district increased, budget also increased. Wealth and budget are negatively correlated ( $r=-0.1805$ ). For the school districts in this study, as budget increased per capita wealth decreased.

The correlations between demographic factors and reasons for not having community education programs were not significant in most cases. However, there were three significant values. There was a negative relationship ( $r=-0.1729$ ) between size and lack of administrative interest as a reason for not having a community education program. In other words, as district size increased administrative interest also increased. Wealth and lack of funds as a reason for not having a community education program were positively correlated ( $r=0.2160$ ). As per capita wealth increased, lack of funds becomes more important in the establishment of a community education program.

The correlation between budget and lack of administrative interest as a reason for not having a community education program was negative

TABLE XVI  
CORRELATIONS BETWEEN DEMOGRAPHIC FACTORS AND REASONS FOR  
NOT HAVING COMMUNITY EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Demographic Factors				Reasons for Not Having Community Education Programs							
Factor/Reason	Size	Wealth r	Budget r	Funds r	Community Interest r	Facil. r	Instruc. r	Admin. Interest r	Unfamiliar Concept r	Other r	Unsuccessful Program r
Size	----	-0.3096*	0.8907*	0.0579	0.0323	-0.0689	0.0024	-0.1729*	-0.0972	-0.0455	0.0331
Wealth		----	-0.1805*	0.2160*	-0.0873	0.1233	-0.0620	-0.0633	0.0639	-0.0021	0.1159
Budget			----	0.0478	-0.0240	-0.0852	-0.0589	-0.2267*	-0.1305	-0.0360	-0.0721
Lack of Funds				----	0.0426	0.3771*	0.3073*	0.2423*	0.1878*	0.3967*	0.1876*
Lack of Community Interest					----	0.4154*	0.4529*	0.5333*	0.5070*	0.3967*	0.3967
Lack of Facilities						----	0.6009*	0.3887*	0.3066*	0.3690*	0.0204
Lack of Instructors							----	0.5223*	0.2870*	0.4018*	0.1355
Lack of Administrative Interest								----	0.4038*	0.3818*	0.0663
Unfamiliarity with Community Education									----	0.5218*	0.1268
Other										----	0.2306*
Previous Unsuccessful Program											----

\*Significant at the .05 level

( $r=-0.2267$ ). In other words, as budget increased, administrative interest appeared to increase.

The relationships among reasons for not having community education programs were, in general, significantly correlated. Lack of funds as a reason was significantly correlated with all of the other reasons except lack of community interest ( $r=0.0426$ ).

Lack of facilities as a reason for not having a community education program was significantly correlated with all other reasons except previous unsuccessful program ( $r=0.0204$ ). Lack of instructors as a reason for not having a community education program was also significantly correlated with all other reasons except previous unsuccessful program ( $r=0.1355$ ). Lack of administrative interest as a reason for not having a community education program likewise was correlated with all other reasons except previous unsuccessful program ( $r=0.0663$ ). Previous unsuccessful program as a reason for not having a community education program was correlated only with lack of funds ( $r=0.1876$ ) and other ( $r=0.2306$ ).

A sample of 153 school districts was surveyed to determine their primary reason for not having a community education program. Responses to the question, "If your primary obstacle was removed, would you establish a community education program in your district?" are listed in Table XVII. Sixty percent responded that they would establish a program if their obstacle was removed; 25.5 percent responded "No" and 14.4 percent chose not to respond.

TABLE XVII  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION CONCERNING ESTABLISHMENT  
OF COMMUNITY EDUCATION PROGRAM  
IF OBSTACLE REMOVED

Response	N	%
Yes	92	60.1
No	39	25.5
No Response	22	14.4
TOTAL	153	100.0

## CHAPTER V

### SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The content of this chapter is presented in three sections: summary, conclusions, and recommendations. A brief review of the purpose and methodology of the study is included in the summary. Conclusions are drawn from the data gathered during the study, and recommendations are made for practice and additional study.

#### Summary

The primary purpose of this study was to provide an information base relative to the financing of community education programs in the public schools of Oklahoma during the 1984-85 school year. A secondary purpose was to determine why some schools in Oklahoma did not have community education programs. The following questions were examined:

1. What are the sources of funding for community education programs in Oklahoma.
2. What percentage of funding is derived from Federal, State, Local, and Other sources.
3. For what programs are community education funds expended.
4. Was lack of funding the primary reason for not implementing a community education program in the public schools of Oklahoma.

Relevant literature was reviewed by the researcher. Literature reviewed included the nature of community education process and

programs, sources of funding for traditional education, sources of funding for community education, and principles for budgeting community education funds.

Participants in the study were school districts of Oklahoma, 65 of which had community education programs during the school year 1984-85. One hundred fifty-three school districts responded to a second questionnaire indicating reasons for not having a community education program during the same time frame.

Both instruments used to conduct the research were developed and field tested by the researcher. The Community Education Questionnaire (CEQ) contained eight questions directed at sources of community education funding and one question seeking to determine the areas of expenditures of community education budgets. The noncommunity Education Questionnaire (NCEQ) asked respondents to rank eight reasons for not having community education programs.

Information from the CEQ was analyzed using frequency distribution, percentages, and, in some cases, means. Spearman rank-order correlation coefficients were calculated for all demographic variables and all reasons for not having community education programs.

### Conclusions

The conclusions that resulted from this study were as follows:

1. A review of literature revealed numerous sources that dealt with the community education concept, but few sources dealing with financing community education programs were found. Sources for proposal writing--State, Federal and foundations--were available for the community educator.

2. The mean size of community education school districts was six times larger than the sample school districts' mean. Most of the larger school districts in Oklahoma have community education programs.

3. The per capita wealth was approximately equal for community education school districts and non-community education districts, but the district budget means for community education districts was six times larger than non-community education districts' mean. Total income is positively correlated with district size. Community education school districts had larger budgets because they had more students than the non-community school districts.

4. The primary source of income for a majority of community education programs was the local school district budget. Secondary sources of income, listed in order of importance, were State grants and tuition fees.

5. Federal grants, fund-raising activities and donations were not major sources of income for community education programs in most Oklahoma school districts. Federal grants may not be available, but community educators can plan fund-raising activities or solicit donations to expand programs.

6. The primary reason for not having a community education program was the lack of funding. The secondary reason for not having a program was lack of community interest.

7. Administrators generally did not view their lack of interest as a reason for not having a community education program. However, when asked if a community education program would be established when major obstacles were removed, a majority of superintendents responded "no."

### Recommendations

Based upon the knowledge gained through the collection and analysis of data, the following recommendations for practice are suggested:

1. Conduct a workshop/seminar that emphasizes sources of funding community education programs. Superintendents and/or community education directors and superintendents of non-community education districts are desired participants.

2. Compile a recordkeeping packet, including forms and suggestions, and distribute to all community education programs. Mott Category C programs should find this service extremely helpful.

3. Organize and structure a legislative contact network for the dual purposes of providing information to legislators and lobbying for additional funds for community education. If possible, involve the legislators in community education programs, either as participants, instructors or advisory council members.

4. Attempt to influence Education Departments of all Oklahoma universities who offer administrative certification programs to provide at least one course offering that introduces the community education concept. A major emphasis should be directed toward financing a community education program.

5. Attempt to influence State legislation that would permit citizens to vote taxes specifically for community education programs.

This study answered some questions for the researcher, but created an interest in some possible future studies. Recommendations for further research are:



1. Conduct a study in two or three years using the sample of non-community education school district to determine if programs have been established in those schools. Over 60 percent of the respondents expressed a possible need for a community education program.

2. Conduct a follow-up study in two or three years to determine if the sources of funding and community education expenditure percentages in Oklahoma have changed.

3. Conduct a national study that would compare sources of funding among the states.

4. Conduct a study that could result in the discovery of additional methods of financing community education programs.

5. Conduct a study to determine which foundations are prime sources for financing community education programs. These foundations could be surveyed for procedures that would enhance opportunities for grant proposal acceptance from community education programs.

## SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Annual Report of the Oklahoma State Department of Education. Oklahoma City, Oklahoma: State Department of Education, 1983.
- Annual Report of the Oklahoma State Department of Education. Oklahoma City, Oklahoma: State Department of Education, 1984.
- Barr, W. Monfort. American Public School Finance. New York, New York: American Book Company, 1960.
- Benson, Charles S. The Economics of Public Education. Boston, Massachusetts: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1968.
- Carrillo, Tony S. and Israel C. Heaton. "Organizational and Administrative Problems and Practices." Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. LIV (November, 1972), pp. 168-170.
- Cunningham, Luvern L. Governing Schools; New Approaches to Old Issues. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1971.
- Fish, Thomas L. and James A. Klassen. Financing Community Education. Midland, Michigan: Pendell Publishing Co., 1977.
- Fleischman, Howard, Paul Hopstock, and Malcolm Young. Determining The Costs and Benefits of Community Education Programs: Handbook for Local Practitioners. Arlington, Virginia: Development Associates, Inc., August, 1983.
- Garms, Walter I., James W. Guthrie, and Lawrence C. Pierce. School Finance: The Economics and Politics of Public Education. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1978.
- Grubb, W. Norton and Stephen Michelson. States and Schools. Lexington, Massachusetts: D.C. Heath and Company, 1974.
- Hiemstra, Roger. The Educative Community. Lincoln, Nebraska: Professional Educators Publications, Inc., 1972.
- Horyna, Richard L. "The Process Model: Revisited." The Bulletin. Southwest Center for Community Education Development, Issue No. 3, March-April, 1979.
- Johnson, Deke. "Community Education Programs in the Public Schools of Oklahoma, 1984-85." Stillwater, Oklahoma, Community Education Center, Oklahoma State University, 1984. (Duplicated material.)

- Johnson, Deke. "Is There Really A Dollar Barrier?" Stillwater, Oklahoma, Community Education Center, Oklahoma State University, 1984. (Duplicated article.)
- Johnson, Deke. "Mott Foundation Standards." Community Education Center, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma, 1985. (Duplicated material.)
- Kerensky, V.M. "Correcting Some Misconceptions About Community Education." Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. LIV, (November, 1972), pp. 158-159.
- Key, James P. Research Design in Occupational Education. Stillwater, Oklahoma, Oklahoma State University. (No date.)
- Knight, Philip H. Financing Community Education. St. Louis, Missouri: The Midwest Community Education Development Center, 1978.
- Krejcie, Robert V. and Daryle Morgan. "Determining Sample Size for Research Activities." Educational and Psychological Measurement, Vol. XXX (August, 1970), pp. 607-610.
- Marland, S.P. Jr. "The Federal Role in Community Education." Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. LIV (November, 1972), p. 146.
- Minzey, Jack. "Community Education: An Amalgam of Many Views." Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. LIV, (November, 1972), pp. 150-153.
- Minzey, Jack and Clyde LeTarte. Community Education: From Program to Process. Midland, Michigan: Pendell Publishing Company, 1972.
- Mitiguy, Nancy. The Rich Get Richer and The Poor Write Proposals. Amherst, Massachusetts: University of Massachusetts, 1978.
- Mott Foundation. Community Education: Partnerships for Tomorrow. Flint, Michigan: Mott Foundation, 1982.
- Nie, Norman H., C. Hadlai Hull, Jean G. Jenkins, Karin Steinbrenner and Dale H. Bent. Statistical Package for the Social Sciences. New York, New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1975.
- Oklahoma Session Laws, 1978. "Education--Community Education Program," Senate Joint Resolution No. 49. St. Paul, Minnesota: West Publishing Company, 1978.
- Oklahoma Session Laws, 1979. "Appropriations--Education, State Board." St. Paul, Minnesota: West Publishing Company, 1979.
- Oklahoma Session Laws, 1980. "Appropriations--Education, State Board." St. Paul, Minnesota: West Publishing Company, 1980.
- Oklahoma Session Laws, 1981. "Appropriations--Education, State Board." St. Paul, Minnesota: West Publishing Company, 1981.

- Oklahoma Session Laws, 1982. "Appropriations--Education, State Board." St. Paul, Minnesota: West Publishing Company, 1982.
- Oklahoma Session Laws, 1983. "Appropriations--Education, State Board." St. Paul, Minnesota: West Publishing Company, 1983.
- Oklahoma Session Laws, 1984. "Appropriations--Education, State Board." St. Paul, Minnesota: West Publishing Company, 1984.
- Oklahoma State Department of Education. Oklahoma Educational Directory. Bulletin No. 110A, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma: State Department of Education, 1982.
- Oklahoma State Department of Education. Schools Laws of Oklahoma. Oklahoma City, Oklahoma: State Department of Education, 1984.
- Pappadakis, Nick. "Financing Community Education." Community Education Journal, Vol. I (May, 1971), pp. 37-42.
- Pappadakis, Nick and W. Fred Totten. "Financing the New Dimensions of Community Education." Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. LIV (November, 1972), pp. 192-194.
- Pendell, Richard C. "A Personal Interview with the Founder of Community Education--Mr. C. S. Mott." Community Education Journal, Vol. IX (February, 1972), pp. 32-45.
- Phi Delta Kappa Commission on Alternative Designs for Funding Education. Financing The Public Schools. Bloomington, Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa, 1973.
- Popham, James W. and Kenneth A. Sirotnik. Educational Statistics: Use and Intrepretation. New York, New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, Inc., 1973.
- Sherman, Joel D. "Financing the Future." Community Education Journal, Vol. X (July, 1983), pp. 5-6.
- Shoop, Robert J. Developing Interagency Cooperation. Midland, Michigan: Pendell Publishing Co., 1976.
- Stanley, Martha L. Dealing With Dollars. St. Paul, Minnesota: The Community Education Center, 1980.
- State of Oklahoma Constitution. St. Paul, Minnesota: West Publishing Company, 1981.
- Thomas, Donald M. "It's Time for Community Education to be a Full-Fledged Member of the Education Family." Community Education Journal, Vol. XI (January, 1984), pp. 4-8.
- Toch, Thomas. "E. D. To Seek \$100 Million Increase in 1985 Budget." Education Week, Vol. III (February, 1984), pp. 1-5.

- Totten, W. Fred. The Power of Community Education. Midland, Michigan: Pendell, Publishing Company, 1970.
- Totten, W. Fred. "Community Education: The Feasible Reform." Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. LIV (November, 1972), pp. 154-157
- U. S. Department of Education. Catalog of Federal Programs Related to Community Education. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1976.
- U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Office of Education. Community Education Program. Federal Register. April 3, 1980.
- U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Office of Education. Community Education Program. Federal Register. December 12, 1975.
- Van Voorhees, Curt. "Finding Funds Can Be Fun." Community Education Journal, Vol. I (August, 1971), pp. 20-22.
- Warden, John. "Community Education as a Movement." Community Education Journal, Vol. XI (October, 1983), pp. 4-8.
- Weaver, Donald C. "A Case for Theory Development in Community Education." Phi Delta Kappan, Volume LIV, (November, 1972), pp. 154-157.

## APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

COMMUNITY EDUCATION QUESTIONNAIRE

**FOR SCHOOL YEAR 1984-85:**

## SOURCES OF FUNDS

**Yes      No**

- (1) Was any portion of your Community Education budget funded from local school district monies? ☐ ☐

If yes, what was the approximate amount of funds? \$ \_\_\_\_\_

- (2) Was any portion of your Community Education budget funded from Federal grants? ☐ ☐

If yes, what was the approximate amount of funds and which agency or Act furnished these funds?

Funding Agency \_\_\_\_\_ \$ \_\_\_\_\_

**Purpose** \_\_\_\_\_

Funding Agency \_\_\_\_\_ S \_\_\_\_\_

Purpose \_\_\_\_\_

Revenue Sharing \$\_\_\_\_\_

- (3) Was any portion of your Community Education budget funded from state grants? ☐ ☐

If yes, what was the approximate amount of funds? \$ \_\_\_\_\_

- (4) Did you charge tuition fees for any of your courses? ☐ ☐

If yes, what is the average amount a participant would pay per contact hour? \$\_\_\_\_\_

Approximately how many dollars were collected from tuition fees? \$ \_\_\_\_\_

- (5) Was any portion of your Community Education budget funded from "fund-raising" activities? ☐ ☐

If yes, what was the approximate amount of funds raised? \$ \_\_\_\_\_

**What type of activities were involved?**

### Activity

### Funds Raised

\_\_\_\_\_ S \_\_\_\_\_

[illegible]

© 2006 The Authors  
Journal compilation © 2006 Blackwell Publishing Ltd

- (6) Was any portion of your Community Education budget funded by foundations grants? ☐ ☐

If yes, who were the foundations and amount of grants?

\_\_\_\_\_ \$ \_\_\_\_\_

**S**

- (7) Was any portion of your Community Education budget funded by donations from individuals, companies, corporations, or civic clubs/organizations? ☐ ☐

If yes, please indicate amount (s) by source (s).

Individuals S\_\_\_\_\_

United Way S\_\_\_\_\_

Companies \$

Contributor	Name	\$
Contributions		

Name \_\_\_\_\_

**Please list clubs/organizations and amount (s).**

§



- (8) If you have funding from sources not indicated, please list sources and amounts.

\_\_\_\_\_ \$ \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_ \$ \_\_\_\_\_

**EXPENDITURES:**

- (9) What portion of your budget was expended for:

**Salaries and fringe benefits**

Director \$ \_\_\_\_\_  
 Instructor \$ \_\_\_\_\_  
 Others \$ \_\_\_\_\_  
 Travel \$ \_\_\_\_\_

**Programs**

Adult Basic Education \$ \_\_\_\_\_  
 Education for Youth \$ \_\_\_\_\_  
 Health and Recreation \$ \_\_\_\_\_  
 Home Improvement \$ \_\_\_\_\_  
 Hobbies and Personal Development \$ \_\_\_\_\_  
 Business Classes \$ \_\_\_\_\_

Please list other Categories:

\_\_\_\_\_ \$ \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_ \$ \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_ \$ \_\_\_\_\_

APPENDIX B

NON-COMMUNITY EDUCATION QUESTIONNAIRE

Rank the following reasons from one (1) through eight (8) why your school district does not have a community education program for 1984-85. A rank of one (1) indicates your district's primary reason for not having a program. A rank of eight (8) indicates the least important reason for your district not having a community education program. Your other choices will carry a rank of two (2) through seven (7).

Lack of Funding	_____
Lack of Community Interest	_____
Lack of Facilities	_____
Lack of Instructors	_____
Lack of Administrative Interest	_____
Unsuccessful previous program	_____
Not familiar with community education concept	_____
Other	_____

---

Please list reason, if other.

If your primary obstacle was removed, would you establish a community education program in your school district? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

APPENDIX C

COMMUNITY SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT INDEX PLUS  
COMMUNITY EDUCATION QUESTIONNAIRE

School Name: \_\_\_\_\_

School District: \_\_\_\_\_

City: \_\_\_\_\_ State: \_\_\_\_\_

This form contains a series of questions concerning characteristics of your community school. The questionnaire should be completed separately for each community school, and should not be used to describe a district program using more than one facility. In answering the questions, please use as a frame of reference a twelve-month time period such as the previous calendar year or the previous school year.

Answer each of the questions to the best of your ability, using estimates for those questions for which you do not have precise information. It is important that you attempt to answer all items, because even an estimated answer is preferable to no answer at all.

1. Please indicate which of the following activities were offered at any time during the past year as part of the community school program of this school.

- |   |                          |
|---|--------------------------|
| a. Pre-school or day care activities  | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Organized recreational or sports activities for school-age children apart from the regular school program. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Cultural/crafts activities for school-age children apart from the regular school program                   | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d. Adult education classes for credit (ABE, GED, ESL, etc.)   | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e. Vocational classes for adults  | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| f. Colleges credit courses  | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| g. Non-credit general interest or enrichment classes for adults   | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| h. Recreational or sports programs for adults   | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| i. Cultural/crafts activities for adults  | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| j. Special programs for senior citizens   | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| k. Special programs for minority populations  | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| l. Special programs for handicapped persons   | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| m. Health services (blood pressure screening, nutrition, etc.)  | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| n. Newsletters or other communication forms (not including simple announcements of courses and activities)    | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| o. Special programs on family relations (one parent families, etc.)   | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| p. Special programs on crime, delinquency, violence, or vandalism   | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| q. Community social services (clothing or food collections, etc.)   | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| r. Special programs on neighborhood housing concerns  | <input type="checkbox"/> |

2. Please indicate the average number of hours per week over the past year that school facilities were used for community activities beyond the traditional school program.

(a) Number of school hours per week during which there was community use of school facilities \_\_\_\_\_

(b) Number of non-school hours per week during which there was community use of school facilities \_\_\_\_\_

3. During the past year, how many professional (i.e., paid) hours per week, on the average were devoted to coordinating the community school program at this particular school? (If there was a coordinator or director who served more than one school, please estimate the number of hours devoted to coordinating this school's program.) \_\_\_\_\_

4. Did this particular school have its own citizens' council for at least part of the last year for planning and/or operating the community school program?

No ☐ Yes ☐

5. Was there an area or district-wide council during the last year which was involved in planning and/or operating the community school program for this school?

No ☐ Yes ☐

6. How many times did the council meet during the past year? \_\_\_\_\_

7. Listed below are a number of areas of responsibility concerning the community school program in which the council might or might not have been involved over the past year. Please indicate those areas in which there was at least some council involvement.

- |  |                          |
|--|--------------------------|
| (a) Community needs and resource assessments | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| (b) Program planning and design              | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| (c) Personnel selection and evaluation       | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| (d) Program evaluation                       | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| (e) Budget formulation                       | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| (f) Fundraising                              | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| (g) Public relations                         | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| (h) Interagency cooperation                  | <input type="checkbox"/> |

8. Listed below are areas of responsibility concerning the regular (K-12) school program in which the council might or might not have been involved over the past year. Please indicate those areas in which there was at least some council involvement.

- |  |                          |
|--|--------------------------|
| (a) Curriculum design                  | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| (b) Personnel selection and evaluation | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| (c) Budget formulation                 | <input type="checkbox"/> |

9. Please estimate the number of people who volunteered at least eight hours over the past year to the community school program at this particular school (attended council meetings, conducted needs assessments, taught classes, etc.) \_\_\_\_\_

10. Please estimate the number of community agencies or organizations (city or county departments, universities, service clubs, business and professional groups, private voluntary agencies, etc.) which over the past year provided regular and planned input into design of the community school program of this school \_\_\_\_\_

11. Not including time spent in the planning and design of the community school program, please estimate the number of community agencies or organization which over the past year shared substantive resources (money, staff time, or use of facilities) with the community school program of this school. \_\_\_\_\_

12. Please estimate the number of community agencies or organizations which over the past year sponsored activities or programs using the facilities of this school. \_\_\_\_\_

13. (a) In the past three years, have there been any systematic efforts to assess the needs of the people in the service area of this particular community school? \_\_\_\_\_

No ☐ (Skip to item 14) Yes ☐

- (b) For the most comprehensive needs assessment performed in the past three years, how many individuals provided information for the assessment? \_\_\_\_\_

14. (a) In the past three years, have there been any systematic efforts to assess the human and financial resources of the people and organizations in the service area of this particular community school? \_\_\_\_\_

No ☐ (Skip to item 15) Yes ☐

- (b) For the most comprehensive resource assessment which was performed in the past three years, how many individuals provided information for the assessment? \_\_\_\_\_

15. (a) In the past three years, have there been any systematic efforts to evaluate the effectiveness of community education programs in this school?

No ☐ (Skip to item 16) Yes ☐

- (b) For the broadest scale program evaluation which was performed in the past three years, how many individuals provided information? \_\_\_\_\_

16. (a) Was there a formal school board policy in effect in your district during any part of the past year which supported the community use of schools?

No ☐ (Skip to item 17) Yes ☐

- (b) Did the school board policy specifically name this school to provide community school programs?

No ☐ Yes ☐

17. Do community groups pay the school system for the use of your school's facilities?

No groups pay for facilities ☐  
Some groups pay for facilities ☐  
All groups pay for facilities ☐

18. Of the paid hours devoted to coordinating the community school program at the school (see answer to Item 3), how many were supported by the school system (rather than by other agencies or through fees)?

All paid hours were supported by the school system ☐  
Some paid hours were supported by the school system ☐  
No paid hours were supported by the school system ☐  
Not applicable, there were no paid hours ☐

#### COMMUNITY EDUCATION QUESTIONNAIRE FINANCE SECTION

FOR SCHOOL YEAR 1984-85

##### SOURCES OF FUNDS

- |   | Yes                      | No                       |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| (1) Was any portion of your Community Education budget funded from local school district monies? <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| If yes, what was the approximate amount of funds? \$ _____  |                          |                          |
| (2) Was any portion of your Community Education budget funded from Federal grants? <input type="checkbox"/>               | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| If yes, what was the approximate amount of funds and which agency or Act furnished these funds?                           |                          |                          |
| Funding Agency _____ \$ _____   |                          |                          |
| Purpose _____   |                          |                          |
| Funding Agency _____ \$ _____   |                          |                          |
| Purpose _____   |                          |                          |
| Revenue Sharing _____ \$ _____  |                          |                          |
| (3) Was any portion of your Community Education budget funded from state grants? <input type="checkbox"/>                 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| If yes, what was the approximate amount of funds? \$ _____  |                          |                          |
| (4) Did you charge tuition fees for any of your courses? <input type="checkbox"/>   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| If yes, what is the average amount a participant would pay per contact hour? \$ _____                                     |                          |                          |
| Approximately how many dollars were collected from tuition fees? \$ _____   |                          |                          |

- (5) Was any portion of your Community Education budget funded from "fund-raising" activities? ☐ ☐

If yes, what was the approximate amount of funds raised? \$ \_\_\_\_\_

What type of activities were involved?

Activity	Funds Raised
_____	\$ _____
_____	\$ _____
_____	\$ _____

- (6) Was any portion of your Community Education budget funded by foundations grants? ☐ ☐

If yes, who were the foundations and amount of grants?

_____	\$ _____
_____	\$ _____

- (7) Was any portion of your Community Education budget funded by donations from individuals, companies, corporations, or civic clubs/organizations? ☐ ☐

If yes, please indicate amount (s) by source (s).

Individuals	\$ _____
United Way	\$ _____
Companies	\$ _____
Corporations	\$ _____
	Name _____
	Name _____

Please list clubs/organizations and amount (s).

_____	\$ _____
_____	\$ _____

- (8) If you have funding from sources not indicated, please list sources and amounts

_____	\$ _____
_____	\$ _____

#### EXPENDITURES:

- (9) What portion of your budget was expended for:

Salaries and fringe benefits

Director	\$ _____
Instructor	\$ _____
Others	\$ _____
Travel	\$ _____

Programs

Adult Basic Education	\$ _____
Education for Youth	\$ _____
Health and Recreation	\$ _____
Home Improvement	\$ _____
Hobbies and Personal Development	\$ _____
Business Classes	\$ _____

Please list other Categories

_____	\$ _____
_____	\$ _____
_____	\$ _____



APPENDIX D

LETTER FROM STATE SUPERINTENDENT  
OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION



## Oklahoma State Department of Education

2500 North Lincoln Boulevard • Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73105-4599

JOHN M. FOLKS  
Superintendent  
LLOYD GRAHAM  
Deputy Superintendent

February 21, 1985

Dear Colleague:

This letter is to request your assistance in compiling data for two statewide community education questionnaires that are currently being circulated and in which your participation is needed.

The surveys are being conducted by two community education graduate students at Oklahoma State University—Don Decker of Jenks, and Carol Lackey of Weatherford. Decker's questionnaire seeks data from Oklahoma's community education programs that will allow him to compile a study assessing the sources of funding for these programs. Lackey's will compile and assess data concerning the current development of existing community education programs in Oklahoma.

The analysis of data obtained from the completed questionnaires will be valuable to our statewide community education process. As you complete the questionnaire, I believe you will see how important it is to compile data about existing community education programs so that effective planning may be carried out in the development of new community schools.

I shall greatly appreciate your taking the time to see Don Decker and Carol Lackey and complete the questionnaires.

Sincerely,

John M. Folks  
State Superintendent

APPENDIX E

RESEARCHER'S LETTER TO COMMUNITY EDUCATION  
SCHOOL DISTRICTS

March 4, 1985

Dear Community Educator:

An assessment of the Community Education programs of Oklahoma is being conducted by Ms. Carol Lackey and me to provide an information base to assist in the improvement of the existing programs and extend the community education concept in our State. Each Community Education program is being contacted and your assistance is needed to adequately research this project. The identity of school districts participating in this survey and any data shared will remain confidential.

A graduate student from Oklahoma State University will be contacting you to gather data either by personal interview or via telephone. We are enclosing a copy of the survey instrument so that you may gather information prior to this contact. The period covered is the 1984-85 school year, which may require some estimation of the latter half of the second semester. We will unconditionally accept your judgment.

We are enclosing a letter from Dr. John Folks, State Superintendent of Public Instruction and a verbal assurance from Dr. Deke Johnson, Oklahoma State University, that support the tenet that the project has worth. Ms. Lackey and I hope that you can find time to participate in the survey and please accept our most sincere appreciation of your time and efforts.

Respectfully yours,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Don Decker".

Don Decker

APPENDIX F

RESEARCHER'S LETTER TO NONCOMMUNITY EDUCATION  
SCHOOL DISTRICTS

January 16, 1985

Dear Superintendent:

Enclosed is a questionnaire that will be utilized in assessing the current status of the concept and practice of community education in the public schools of Oklahoma. The data gathered will be used in a doctoral dissertation for Oklahoma State University. Any information supplied will be used in a confidential manner and your district will be identified only as a participant in the survey.

A self-addressed, prepaid return envelope is included for your convenience. A moment of your time will certainly be welcomed and appreciated.

Respectfully yours,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Don Decker".

Don Decker

VITA <sup>2</sup>

Donald Eugene Decker

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Education

Thesis: AN ASSESSMENT OF THE COMMUNITY EDUCATION PROGRAMS IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS OF OKLAHOMA RELATIVE TO SOURCES OF FINANCING

Major Field: Occupational and Adult Education

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Lindsay, Oklahoma, October 7, 1934, the son of Bert V. Decker and Hazel B. Decker; wife Danna, two children Elizabeth D'Ann Decker Hargrove and Darci Beth Decker.

Education: Graduated from Lindsay High School in May, 1951, received Bachelor of Science in Business Administration from Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma, in August, 1955; received Master of Education degree from Oklahoma State University in August, 1963; completed requirements for the Doctor of Education degree at Oklahoma State University, in July, 1985.

Professional Experience: Instructor of Business Education and Distributive Education, Bixby High School, Bixby, Oklahoma, 1955 - 1967; Instructor of Distributive Education, Jenks High School, Jenks, Oklahoma, 1967 - 1972; Administrator, Business and Financial Affairs, 1972 - 1985.

Professional Organizations: Oklahoma Association of School Administrators, American Association of School Administrators, Cooperative Council of Oklahoma School Administrators, Oklahoma School Business Officials, National Association of School Business Officials, National Association of Educational Negotiators, Oklahoma Vocational Association, National Association of Distributive Education Teachers.