

New Jersey, State Federation of District Boards
of Education.

Final Report

Copy 3.

J371.2
N547

New Jersey



State Federation of District Boards of Education

NEW JERSEY STATE LIBRARY
J371.2 N547 c. 3
Final report concerning the Report of th
3 3009 00397 0144

FINAL REPORT

FINAL REPORT

Federation Committee To Study School District Reorganization

Concerning the Report of the State Committee to Study the Next Steps of Regionalization
and Consolidation in the School Districts of New Jersey

Submitted April 2, 1970

**PROPERTY OF
RECEIVED**

MAY 21 1970

Mr. P. Paul Ricci, President
State Federation of District Boards of Education
407 West State Street
Trenton, New Jersey 08605

Division of State Library
Archives and History
Trenton, N. J. D363

Dear Mr. Ricci:

The Committee to Study School District Reorganization presents herewith the report of its members. Our Committee was composed of board members from the various geographic regions of New Jersey. These board members serve on boards of education in elementary, secondary, vocational, K-12 and non-operating school districts. In your charge to our Committee you asked that we "conduct a thorough and intensive analysis of the recommendations of the State Committee to Study the Next Steps of Regionalization and Consolidation in the School Districts of New Jersey and recommend a position on the report to the Federation." This analysis has been conducted and is contained in the attached report.

The concern over reorganization of school districts is not new; neither does it reflect any departure from the continuing concern of the people to provide a quality educational program for all pupils.

The purpose of reorganization transcends the concern that there are many small school districts, administrative problems, and the search for economies. The major purposes of school district reorganization should be to establish the framework which will provide a quality educational program and, as far as possible, quality educational opportunity for all children in the state. Upon looking at

J371.2

N547

copy 3

other states in our nation, we realize that reorganization of school districts into larger, more comprehensive units is a national trend. We gathered research materials from throughout the country while conducting our study and made a conscious effort to locate research data both supporting and refuting reorganization of school districts.¹ We discovered, however, little research disputing reorganization. There is a preponderance of research that claims a significant relationship between the size of a school district and

- program breadth and quality
- pupil achievement
- teacher preparation and certification
- supporting educational services
- educational leadership
- financial efficiency

Since schools exist to serve our children, we are morally obligated to acknowledge this research.

While we see the necessity for some form of school district reorganization in New Jersey, we also recognize that a period of voluntary reorganization with financial incentives is a necessary developmental phase that must be provided. It is during this time that educators and laymen alike can thoroughly explore reorganization together. Case studies in school reorganization should be prepared. Thorough and intensive research studies should be conducted in New Jersey districts to validate the claims made for reorganization. Both these case studies and research should be disseminated throughout the state in an attempt to enable all those concerned to make truly objective decisions. *Therefore, we recommend a five-year period during which time the state should encourage reorganization (without requiring it) through highly attractive financial incentives to local districts which choose to meet state standards for reorganization.* Permissive legislation would be necessary to permit withdrawal from a regional district to form a new district, to permit school districts to cross county lines if the districts concerned so desire, and such other legislation as needed to facilitate orderly transition for those desiring to reorganize. In addition, the Federation's Reorganization Committee, through its study, makes the following major recommendations:

1. The major purpose of reorganization should be to establish the framework which will provide a high quality education and equal educational opportunity for all children in the state.
2. Reorganization by legislative decree would not be appropriate at this time. Realistic incentives, financial and otherwise, must be provided to promote voluntary reorganization. This provision will require permissive legislation.
3. A K-12 form of organization is a desirable goal for all New Jersey school districts.

¹ A bibliography of the resources used by the Federation's Committee to Study Reorganization is available upon request.

4. Size, in and of itself, will not provide quality education. Size must be related to the objectives upon which a state school system is organized. Size becomes significant only when related to the tasks for which numbers are important to meet educational objectives adequately, efficiently and economically.
5. A search for acceptable criteria for a high quality educational program must receive a high priority by all those concerned with improving education. These criteria must be devised so that present programs can be properly assessed.

The Federation's Reorganization Committee, in conclusion, would like to point out that the State Committee to Study the Next Steps of Regionalization and Consolidation in the School Districts of New Jersey did not deal with the pressing problem of urban school district organization. Our Committee feels that study of this facet of New Jersey school district organization has merit.

Respectfully submitted,

George Heller

George Heller, Chairman
Committee to Study School
District Reorganization

The Committee wishes to express its appreciation to Mark W. Hurwitz and Claire C. Edwards, without whose counsel and assistance this report could not have been prepared. We thank you for the opportunity to participate in this endeavor and recommend that this report be received and approved by the State Federation of District Boards of Education.

FEDERATION COMMITTEE REPORT

The Federation's Reorganization Committee has analyzed each of the recommendations of the State Committee to Study the Next Steps of Regionalization and Consolidation in the School Districts of New Jersey. Following each recommendation, the Federation's Reorganization Committee reaction is listed.

SECTION I CRITERIA FOR REORGANIZATION

Commissioner's Committee Recommendation

A. School District

1. All school districts be organized on a K-12 (Nursery-12) basis to provide a comprehensive, quality education for all pupils.

a K-12 (Nursery-12) form of organization is a desirable goal for all non-vocational New Jersey school districts.

Commissioner's Committee Recommendation

2. Constituent districts of regionals or districts with sending-receiving relationships be reorganized in a K-12 district.
 - a. Exception: When such reorganization mitigates against an effective county reorganization plan.

Federation Committee Reaction

The Federation's Reorganization Committee agrees that

Federation Committee Reaction

The Committee feels that this recommendation is too broad. While this recommendation might be desirable in some situations, in others it could create a district that would be too large and unwieldy. We recommend that constituent districts of regionals or districts with sending-receiving relationships be reorganized into K-12 districts only after due consideration is given to such factors as geographic size and total ultimate enrollment of the new district.

Commissioner's Committee Recommendation

3. *Districts which have not maintained nor operated a school for the preceding two years shall become part of a reorganized district.*

Federation Committee Reaction

Our Committee is in agreement with this recommendation.

Commissioner's Committee Recommendation

B. Enrollment

4. *The comprehensive K-12 district enroll a minimum of 3,500 pupils.*
 - a. *Exceptions to the minimum may be allowed when:*
 - (1) *the proposed district is so extensive as to require transportation greater than 45 minutes one way.*
 - (2) *the growth of the proposed district is projected to be sufficient to meet the minimum enrollment by 1973.*

Federation Committee Reaction

The Committee wishes to emphasize that size, in and of itself, will not provide quality education. Size must be related to the objectives upon which a state school system organization is based. Size becomes significant only when related to the tasks for which numbers are important to meet educational objectives adequately, efficiently and economically.

The Reorganization Committee is of the opinion that a minimum of 3,500 pupils is a desirable goal. However, there may be some districts with fewer than 3,500 pupils who are willing to put forth a high degree of financial effort and provide a quality educational program. For this reason, the Committee recommends that a district with an enrollment of less than 3,500 may remain so, provided that (a) the board of education and superintendent feel they are providing a quality education program and (b) the State Department of Education attests to this fact.

The Committee is also concerned that there are no optimum enrollment figures in the report of the State Committee. There is nothing prohibiting districts of 10,000, 15,000 or 20,000 pupils from being formed. Therefore, our Committee recommends that no district may reorganize with a district which already has more than 10,000 pupils in enrollment unless the majority of those voting in each district are in agreement.

Commissioner's Committee Recommendation

C. Boundaries

5. *School district boundaries be primarily within county lines but, when feasible and contributory to effective reorganization, they shall cross county lines.*

Federation Committee Reaction

The Committee is in agreement with this recommendation but requests that the section which reads "shall cross county lines" be changed to read "may cross county lines." This change would not alter the meaning of the recommendation, but would serve to clarify its intent.

Commissioner's Committee Recommendation

6. *Each newly-created district shall respect, as nearly as practicable, a natural geographic, social and economic community providing equalization of opportunity for all students, to avoid the creation or perpetuation of racial imbalance.*

Federation Committee Reaction

We feel that this recommendation seems to contradict itself and therefore recommend that it be changed to read "Each newly-created district shall respect, as nearly as practicable, natural geographic boundaries and shall provide equalization of opportunity for all students."

Commissioner's Committee Recommendation

D. Master Plan

7. *In the development of the county master plan, all school districts be part of the study and included in the final master plan.*

Federation Committee Reaction

Our Committee supports this recommendation and applauds the State Committee for recognizing the importance of all districts being involved in the study.

Commissioner's Committee Recommendation

8. *The master plan for reorganization contain recommendations for the alleviation of concentrations of pupils with educational and learning problems.*

Federation Committee Reaction

The Reorganization Committee interprets this to mean that the master plan will consider all districts in the county rather than just those with a small pupil enrollment. Since this will make for a comprehensive master plan we support this recommendation.

SECTION II

COUNTY REORGANIZATION COMMISSION

Commissioner's Committee Recommendation

A. Commission

1. *The county be the basic unit for planning school district reorganization.*

Federation Committee Reaction

Since an earlier recommendation (Section I, No. 5) recommended that school district boundaries be permitted to cross county lines we recommend that after the words "the county" the words "or combined counties" should be added.

Commissioner's Committee Recommendation

2. *Legislation be enacted to authorize the establishment of a county convention of presidents of boards of education within each county or combined counties for the purpose of selecting a Reorganization Commission which shall develop a comprehensive reorganization plan for the county or combined counties.*

Federation Committee Reaction

Our Committee heartily endorses the idea of involving every local board of education in creating a County Reorganization Commission and applauds the State Committee for their recognition of the importance of such a high degree of involvement. Since board of education membership usually attracts people who serve their communities in many ways, we suggest that this recommendation be changed to permit the president of the board of education to appoint an alternate if he is unable to participate.

Commissioner's Committee Recommendation

3. *The county superintendent of schools convene the convention of presidents of boards of education within the counties or combined counties who shall select the following members of the Reorganization Commission:*
 - a. *Membership*
 - (1) *Three board of education members – who shall be broadly representative of the types of organization of school districts within the county.*
 - (2) *Three chief school administrators – who shall be broadly representative of the types of organization of school districts within the county.*
 - (3) *One freeholder*
 - (4) *One state senator*
 - (5) *One state assemblyman*
 - (6) *The county superintendent of schools, who shall act as a non-voting secretary.*

Federation Committee Reaction

The Committee supports this recommendation but feels

that the county superintendent of schools should be a non-voting member of the Commission and act as a consultant but not as a secretary. A paid secretary should be hired if needed.

Commissioner's Committee Recommendation

3b. Alternates and Vacancies

The convention select an alternate delegate in the same classification for each Commission member, such alternate to fill vacancies which may occur. Further vacancies beyond the alternates selected shall be filled by a majority vote of the members of the Commission.

Federation Committee Reaction

Our Committee respectfully points out that in some counties there is only one senator. Some senators represent more than one county. We recommend that counties should consider the merits of having alternates sit with the Commission but with no voice or vote.

Commissioner's Committee Recommendation

3c. Chairman

- (1) *The Reorganization Commission select its chairman from among the members of boards of education.*
- (2) *The Reorganization Commission select its vice-chairman from among its members.*

Federation Committee Reaction

Since we have recommended that the county superintendent of schools be a non-voting member of the ten-member Commission it will be necessary for the chairman of the Commission to be entitled to a vote. In case of the chairman's resignation, he should be replaced by a board member.

Commissioner's Committee Recommendation

3d. Meetings

- (1) *The Reorganization Commission meet within one month following its selection and continue to meet at regular intervals until its work is completed.*

Federation Committee Reaction

The Committee supports this recommendation.

Commissioner's Committee Recommendation

3e. Expenses

- (1) *The operating expenses of the Commission and the expenses of Commission members incurred while on Commission business shall be funded and reim-*

bursed by the State Department of Education.

Federation Committee Reaction

The Committee supports this recommendation.

Commissioner's Committee Recommendation

4. *The Reorganization Commission develop a comprehensive master plan for the reorganization of school districts in the county or combined counties in accordance with the criteria for reorganization. Such plan shall be completed by January 1, 1971.*

Federation Committee Reaction

Our Committee feels that since this recommendation was made almost one year ago the time limit seems unrealistic at the present time.

Commissioner's Committee Recommendation

5. *The county comprehensive master plan for reorganization be submitted, upon its completion, to the Commissioner of Education for review and approval. If not approved, the Commissioner's recommendations shall be reviewed and an alternate plan or plans shall be submitted to the Commissioner for approval.*

Federation Committee Reaction

The Committee supports this recommendation since it actually represents step number one on a referendum.

Commissioner's Committee Recommendation

6. *Public hearings on the approved master plan for reorganization be held within the proposed reorganized areas of the county or counties.*

Federation Committee Reaction

Our Committee feels that there should be some provision for reflecting the changes in the master plan proposed as a result of the public hearings. Unless these public hearings can have an impact upon the master plan they only serve as public meetings, not hearings.

Commissioner's Committee Recommendation

7. *The Reorganization Commission, after consultation with boards of education in the proposed reorganized districts, set the dates for referenda to be held in the districts. A majority vote in the total proposed reorganized district shall determine approval or disapproval.*

Federation Committee Reaction

Since earlier in our testimony we reported that our Com-

mittee recommends a period of voluntary reorganization, we must oppose this recommendation. We recommend instead that a majority vote in each of the districts that would constitute the proposed reorganized district shall determine approval or disapproval. The State Committee recommendation could cause districts to be reorganized against their will when they are simply outnumbered by voters in the other districts in the proposed reorganized district.

Commissioner's Committee Recommendation

8. *A defeated reorganization proposal be reconsidered by the Commission and the same or an alternate plan which meets the criteria for reorganization and is approved by the Commissioner be submitted to the voters in the same manner as in recommendation 7.*

Federation Committee Reaction

Our Committee supports this recommendation if recommendation 7 is changed to recognize our objections.

Commissioner's Committee Recommendation

9. *The State Commission of School District Reorganization review proposals not approved in the second referendum and recommend a reorganization plan for the affected districts for review and implementation by the Commissioner and the State Board of Education.*

Federation Committee Reaction

The Federation's Reorganization Committee objects to this recommendation since it provides that the Commissioner of Education and the State Board of Education may implement a reorganization plan despite two negative votes in the districts involved. We respectfully recommend that if a reorganization proposal is not approved in the second referendum that a one-year moratorium be declared. During this time the State Commission of School District Reorganization and the County Reorganization Commission, together with the school districts involved, should conduct an in-depth study of the reorganization plan defeated by the voters. Alternate plans should be considered as well as the need for additional incentives, financial and otherwise. At the end of this one-year period the revised reorganization plan may be submitted for voter approval as we have recommended under recommendations 7 and 8.

Commissioner's Committee Recommendation

10. *Reorganization of school districts under the comprehensive county master plan be completed by July 1, 1973. The County Reorganization Commission be dissolved upon such completion.*

Federation Committee Reaction

Our Committee feels that the time limits in this recommendation are unrealistic.

SECTION III STATE COMMISSION ON SCHOOL DISTRICT REORGANIZATION

Commissioner's Committee Recommendation

A. Appointment

1. *The Governor appoint, with the approval of the Senate, seven members broadly representative of the public schools and citizenry to serve for term on the State Commission on School District Reorganization.*

Federation Committee Reaction

The Federation's Reorganization Committee agrees with this recommendation.

Commissioner's Committee Recommendation

2. *The State Commission on School District Reorganization serve within the State Department of Education as an initiating, review and recommending body on reorganizations or decentralizations that may be desirable or advisable after the completion of county reorganizations.*

Federation Committee Reaction

The Committee feels that the words "or decentralizations" should be removed from the recommendation since the study of decentralization was not within the charge presented to the Commissioner's Committee.

Commissioner's Committee Recommendation

3. *The State Commission on School District Reorganization serve as recommending body on reorganization proposals not approved in two referenda.*

Federation Committee Reaction

The Federation Committee approves this recommendation and wishes to stress the word "recommending."

Commissioner's Committee Recommendation

4. *The State Commission on School District Reorganization shall make its recommendations to the Commissioner and the State Board of Education. If approved by the Commissioner and in accord with the forementioned criteria, and after a public hearing, such plan may be implemented by the State Board of Education.*

Federation Committee Reaction

The Federation's Reorganization Committee has already stated that reorganization plans not approved in two referenda should be referred for further study by the communities involved, the County Reorganization Commission and the State Commission on School District Reorganization. New plans should be formulated and resubmitted to the citizens after a one year moratorium. The Federation's Committee is opposed to the State Board of Education ordering the implementation of any reorganization plan.

SECTION IV STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Commissioner's Committee Recommendation

A. Bureau of School District Organization

1. *A Bureau of School District Organization be established within the State Department of Education. The responsibilities of the Bureau shall be:*
 - a. *to provide necessary data, consultants, and specialists to aid County Reorganization Commissions in the development of master plans.*
 - b. *To review and make recommendations on master plans.*
 - c. *to provide a continuing service in advising local school districts on organization of and within school districts.*

Federation Committee Reaction

The Federation's Reorganization Committee approves of these recommendations since they would provide worthwhile and much needed consultative services.

Commissioner's Committee Recommendation

B. State Evaluation Service

1. *Procedures and materials be developed for the co-operative self-study of the total school district; and that evaluation and approval of the total school district be undertaken by the State Department of Education.*

Federation Committee Reaction

The Federation's Committee approves of the intent of this recommendation but feels that it requires further clarification. It should be clearly stated that this service will be

made available only upon the request of the local board of education and that the participation of the total community will be encouraged in the evaluation of the school district.

SECTION V **INTERMEDIATE SERVICE UNITS**

Commissioner's Committee Recommendations

1. *Intermediate Service Units be established on a county or multi-county basis (determined by pupil base necessary to provide desired services) to offer such special services as are needed by local districts and are beyond the capability of the local district to provide.*
2. *The Intermediate Service Unit be operated under a policy board elected by the participating boards of education.*
3. *The Intermediate Service Unit be financed by the State Department of Education and by contract services with local school districts.*

Federation Committee Reactions

"Intermediate service units" would provide special services which are beyond the capability of an individual district to provide. Examples of such special services are: learning disability specialists; teams of psychologists; comprehensive collections of audio-visuals; and training specialists for certain types of handicapped pupils. The Federation's Reorganization Committee fully supports these recommendations concerning intermediate service units, however, they recommend that the State should pay the full administrative costs. The Committee also feels that if services are so highly specialized that they cannot be included in the offerings of reorganized districts, that perhaps the State should assume the full cost of providing these services.

SECTION VI **BOARDS OF** **EDUCATION — REORGANIZED DISTRICTS**

Commissioner's Committee Recommendation

A. Board of Education

1. *The board of education of a reorganized district consist of seven members elected for a period of five years. In the original organization, number and terms shall be varied to provide for an annual election. Such reorganized district shall be a Type III district.*

Federation Committee Reaction

The Federation's Committee recommends that the safeguards of the present law concerning the number of members on a board be retained. The committee supports the principle of a minimum of one member per each municipality involved and the remaining to be elected-at-large, if there are fewer than seven municipalities involved. If there are more than seven municipalities in a reorganized district, the number of members should be increased accordingly so that each municipality may be represented.

The exception to this would be an even number of municipalities, in which case an additional member would be elected-at-large.

The Federation's Committee opposes a period of five years for the term of office. The present three-year term should be maintained.

Commissioner's Committee Recommendations

B. Fiscal Responsibility

1. *The Board of Education of the newly created district shall adopt a budget ordinance after (1) approval as to form by the county superintendent of schools, (2) review with the appropriate combined municipal bodies, and (3) public hearing.*
2. *The board of education in a reorganized district adopt a bond ordinance for needed capital construction after (1) approval of the Commissioner of Education, and (2) public hearing. The extension of credit procedures be followed as present requirements under Type II district statutes.*

Federation Committee Reaction

The Federation is officially on record endorsing complete fiscal independence for all boards of education. Therefore, the Federation's Committee takes no position on these recommendations.

Commissioner's Committee Recommendation

3. *Present Type I and Type II districts which are not affected by reorganization shall have the legal right upon*

petition of the people or action by the board of education and a favorable vote of the people to become a Type III school district.

Federation Committee Reaction

Evidently a Type III district will be one in which there are seven member boards elected for five-year terms. These boards would be fiscally independent. The Federation's Reorganization Committee opposes the seven-member board elected for five years and feels that all boards of education should be fiscally independent.

SECTION VII DISSOLUTION OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS

Commissioner's Committee Recommendation

1. *Legislation be enacted to permit the dissolution of existing regional school districts. (County reorganization master plans may necessitate such dissolution and reorganization for an effective county plan.)*
2. *Legislation be enacted to permit the dissolution of reorganized districts. Such dissolution and reorganization may be advisable because of growth or for a more effective school district.*

Federation Committee Reaction

Both of these recommendations are necessary to provide organizational flexibility. However, proper safeguards must be made to insure that such dissolution will not damage the credit rating of regional districts. Before a district made up of two or more municipalities can dissolve approval should be secured from the Commissioner of Education and the Commissioner of the State Division of Local Finance.

SECTION VIII PERSONNEL

Commissioner's Committee Recommendation

1. *The present New Jersey law covering tenure personnel be applicable in reorganized districts.*

that the recommendations of the Federation's Tenure and Certification Committee be given consideration when they are made public. No position should be taken by the Federation on this recommendation until the Tenure and Certification Committee completes their study.

Federation Committee Reaction

The Federation's Reorganization Committee requests

SECTION IX STATE AID – CURRENT EXPENSE

Commissioner's Committee Recommendations

1. *Equalization Aid – State Aid for current expenses be an equalized program incorporating a guaranteed financial base equal to at least the state average equalized property value per pupil.*
2. *Minimum Aid – All districts receive increased minimum aid, such aid related to equalized property values and quality of program.*

3. *Weighting of Pupils – Pupils be weighted for current expense aid based on grade levels and additional weight assigned for AFDC, public housing, vocational education, and for the educationally disadvantaged. Weighted aid should be provided for approved pre-school and summer school programs.*
4. *Relate to Costs – The equalization program automatically adjust to increased costs and state average equalized value per pupil.*

5. *Pupil Count* – The pupil count for equalization purposes be taken twice a year for current funding.
6. *Special Education* – Chapter 46 aid for handicapped children be 50 per cent in addition to equalization aid. Further study for full funding should be undertaken.
7. *Vocational Education* – Additional state support for vocational education in county or comprehensive high schools be provided on a weighted pupil basis.
8. *Transportation* – Transportation aid be retained at 75 per cent of approved costs. A comprehensive study of pupil transportation regulations be undertaken.

Federation Committee Reaction

The Federation has already gone on record supporting most of the recommendations of the State Aid to School Districts Study Commission (Bateman Commission). The financial recommendations made in the Reorganization Report are similar to these made by the Bateman Commission and are embodied in Senate Bill 575 (1970). For this reason the Federation's Reorganization Committee did not react to the State Aid – Current Expense recommendations.

SECTION X BUILDING AID

Commissioner's Committee Recommendations

1. *Minimum Level* – School building aid be increased to a minimum level of 40 per cent of the school debt service appropriation.
2. *Pupil Count* – The pupil count for building aid be taken twice a year for current funding.
3. *Special Education* – Full funding by the state of construction for special education programs.
4. *Equalization* – Building aid provide for the weighting of pupils on the same basis as current expense aid provisions.
5. *Urban-Suburban Cooperation* – The state fully support locally developed and state approved construction plans which will assist in urban-suburban cooperation in satisfying educational needs.

Federation Committee Reaction

All of these recommendations except number 5 were included in the final report of the State Aid to School Districts Study Commission and are embodied in S-575 (1970). Since the Federation has already gone on record in support of these recommendations the Federation's Reorganization Committee did not react to them. However, recommendation number 5 which concerns urban-suburban cooperation was not included in the Bateman Commission Report, nor is it specifically referred to in S-575. The Federation's Reorganization Committee supports this recommendation since the plans must be locally developed.

SECTION XI INCENTIVE AID

Commissioner's Committee Recommendations

1. *The current expense aid program include a state guaranteed financial base related to educational criteria to support a quality level educational program.*
2. *A reorganized district qualify for placement at the highest guaranteed financial base for a period of three years and then be evaluated for placement at the appropriate level for state aid for current expense.*
3. *A special fund be available to the Commissioner to fully fund innovative and promising programs in urban-suburban cooperation.*

Federation Committee Reaction

The Federation's Reorganization Committee supports recommendations 1 and 2 on the same basis they supported the recommendations under Sections IX and X. However, the Committee suggests that recommendation number 3 be changed to read, "A special fund be available to the Commissioner to fund innovative and promising programs including urban-suburban cooperation." This change would emphasize the desirability of all innovating and promising programs.

SECTION XII

IMPLEMENTATION OF AID PROGRAMS

Commissioner's Committee Recommendation

1. *The financial recommendations be fully implemented to support the incentive recommendation for reorganized districts and to provide needed aid for all districts.*

Federation Committee Reaction

The Federation's Reorganization Committee has mentioned earlier in this report the necessity for high financial incentives. Without these incentives, the Committee feels that voluntary reorganization would not be effected.

SECTION XIII

STATE SCHOOL BONDING AUTHORITY

Commissioner's Committee Recommendation

1. *The establishment of a state school bonding authority to issue all schools bonds and pledge the full faith and credit of the state behind such issues. The school district reimburse the authority for principal amortization and interest costs.*

Federation Committee Reaction

The Federation has already gone on record endorsing S-266 and S-267 (1970) which creates a \$500,000,000 State School Building Authority. No further action was taken by the Federation's Reorganization Committee.

SECTION XIV

MORATORIUM

Commissioner's Committee Recommendation

1. *The State Board of Education place a moratorium on the reorganization of school districts or the dissolution of sending and receiving relationships until the passage of implementing legislation and the development of the master plan by the County Reorganization Commission.*
 - a. *Exception: When a proposed reorganization is certified by the county superintendent as meeting the criteria for reorganization and is approved by the Commissioner an exception to the moratorium shall be granted.*

Federation Committee Reaction

The Federation's Reorganization Committee supports the concept embodied in this recommendation. Safeguards

are necessary to insure a coordinated and comprehensive approach to an optimum county plan. A comprehensive County Reorganization plan is necessary to assure all children of a quality educational program. The Committee recommends that this section be titled, "Safeguards" rather than the negative term "Moratorium."

The Federation's Reorganization Committee would also like to point out a possible problem concerning school building construction which occurred in Pennsylvania and possibly in other states which have reorganized. Districts which feared reorganization but which felt that it might be inevitable, launched intensive building programs to insure their children of attending schools within the geographic boundaries of the existing districts. Also, the cost of the new construction had to be shared by the constituent districts once the reorganized district was formed. Safeguards should be taken to avoid this problem.

**COMMITTEE TO STUDY REORGANIZATION
1969-70**

George Heller, Chairman; President Park Ridge, Bergen County,
K-12; 2005 enrollment
Mrs. Lorraine Gaire, Vice-Chairman; Hackettstown, Warren
County, K-12; 2047 enrollment
Mrs. Rose Lopchuk, East Paterson, Bergen County, K-12;
3226 enrollment
Mrs. Eleanor Steward, North Hanover Township, Burlington
County, K-6; 2504 enrollment
Walter W. Kanigowski, Riverside, Burlington County, K-12;
1924 enrollment
Seymour Gerber, Pennsauken, Camden County, K-12;
6778 enrollment
Joseph Purtell, President Mantua, Gloucester County, K-6;
1615 enrollment
Joseph J. McKeon, President North Bergen, Hudson County,
K-12; 7135 enrollment
Mrs. Grace J. Guido, Hamilton Township, Mercer County,
K-12; 14,827 enrollment
Charles A. O'Malley, Little Silver, Monmouth County, K-8;
1058 enrollment
Mrs. Rose A. Hlatky, Ocean Township, Monmouth County,
K-12; 4542 enrollment
Dr. Robert Spreat, President Long Beach Island Consolidated,
Ocean County, K-6; 489 enrollment
David A. Wiseman, Jr., Medford Township, Burlington County,
K-8; 1363 enrollment

Mrs. Hilda Weissberg, Ocean County Vocational, Ocean Co
31.8 average enrollment
Mrs. Dorothea Tutwiler, President Watchung Hills Regional
Somerset County, 9-12; 1479 enrollment
Carter E. Porter, President Cranford, Union County, K-12;
6356 enrollment
Alvin Stokes, Chesilhurst, Camden County, Non-operating
William Chatman, President Chester Township, Morris Cou
K-8; 1179 enrollment
Frank Yannucci, Haledon, Passaic County, K-8; 648 enroll

CONSULTANTS

Dr. Gabriel H. Reuben, Superintendent Willingboro Public
Schools, Burlington County, K-12; 12,450 enrollment
Mrs. Vera M. Sullivan, Secretary/Business Administrator La
Camden County Regional Board of Education, 7-12;
3,324 enrollment

STAFF

Mark W. Hurwitz, Director of Special Services, State Feder
of District Boards of Education
Claire C. Edwards, Research Associate, State Federation of
District Boards of Education

New Jersey

State Federation of District Boards of Education

407 W. State St., P. O. Box 909, Trenton, New Jersey 08605

Return Postage Guaranteed

Non-Profit
Organization
**U. S. POSTAGE
PAID**
Permit No. 1068
Trenton, N. J.

PROFESSIONAL LIBRARY
NEW JERSEY STATE LIBRARY SBN
185 WEST STATE STREET
TRENTON, NEW JERSEY 08625