

Ohio's Resource for Reliable Data & Analysis



**Review & Critique of
Brookings Institution and
Greater Ohio Policy Center Report:**

***"Restoring Prosperity:
Transforming Ohio's
Communities for
the Next Economy"***

**William Driscoll and Howard Fleeter
for the
Education Tax Policy Institute**

October 2010

Ohio's Resource for Reliable Data & Analysis



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Review & Critique of "Restoring Prosperity" – EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Earlier this year, the Brookings Institution and the Greater Ohio Policy Center released a report entitled *Restoring Prosperity, Transforming Ohio's Communities for the Next Economy*. The Brookings Institution is widely regarded as a highly capable nonpartisan research organization. Unfortunately this report does not adhere to the usual high standards of sound research and close reasoning typically characteristic of Brookings publications.

Restoring Prosperity (hereafter the Report) claims to offer policy options for improving the Ohio economy. This critique will focus on Chapter IV of the Report: "Catalyze Transformative Changes in Government." The Report recommends a three part agenda. The second item on its agenda proposes that Ohio "radically restructure government."

1). The language used and general tone of the Brookings Report suggest that the authors had already established their conclusions before they began the project. The Report uses the term "proliferation" repeatedly and erroneously to imply that Ohio has had an explosion of local governments when in fact the opposite is true. The authors refer with condescension to Ohioans' preferences for "little box jurisdictions." Their language reflects a contempt for residents who prefer small local government.

2). The report shows a single-minded obsession with one concept of efficiency – potential duplication of services. In addition to failing to prove that this in fact is the case in Ohio, the report's larger problem is failing to understand that Ohio's system of multi-layered local government actually serves to increase another type of efficiency - matching levels of services provided to the preferences of local residents. This concept of efficiency is a fundamental issue in Public Finance and is not acknowledged even once in the report.

3). The conclusions in the report are not grounded in data. This is the biggest deviation from a typical Brookings study. The recommendation to eliminate 200 school districts in Ohio is literally pulled out of thin air.

Review & Critique of "Restoring Prosperity" – EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

4). The Report's representations about the need for consolidation of school districts and local governments rely primarily upon a working paper prepared by Prof. Philip Trostel entitled *Ohio State - and Local-Government Payroll and Expenditure*. That paper reviewed various data collected by the Census Bureau. The paper also includes explicit cautions about the use of the data presented in it. Prof. Trostel warned that such general data may indicate situations with a potential for inefficiency, but he states that the data do not provide proof that such inefficiency exists. He states that his analysis cannot be used to conclude that there is waste in the provision of public services in Ohio. Brookings completely ignores these cautions.

5). The Brookings Report's recommendation that Ohio reallocate K-12 education spending from "administration" to the "classroom" relies on the implicit assumption that "administration" represents at best a necessary evil, and that the only good education expenditures occur "in the classroom." The Report offers no data to support this position. No researchers have identified a magic mix of education spending. However, some consensus appears to exist that improvement comes with standards and accountability. Such functions require more administration, not less. Recently, Education Week's *Quality Counts 2010* ranking of the states placed Ohio fifth in the nation. The state's strong showing resulted in part from its fourth place rank in the implementation of Standards, Assessments, and Accountability.

6). While the Brookings Report relies on Prof. Trostel's paper to show that Ohio spends a higher percentage of its personal income on K-12 education payrolls than average, it omits other data from Trostel's paper showing that Ohio actually spends less payroll per pupil than the national average - Ohio's \$5,795 per pupils versus U.S. average \$5,960 per pupil.

7). The recommendation that Ohio reduce 600 school districts to 400 relies on the misrepresentation of data from Prof. Trostel's paper. It occurs without reference to the quality of educational services provided. It makes no attempt to match the remedy of fewer school districts with actual improvement in education outcomes.

Review & Critique of "Restoring Prosperity" – EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

8). While the Report finds reason to eliminate 200 public school districts, it completely ignores the one area of Ohio public finance where small units of administration actually have "proliferated" within the last decade or so. Ohio's community schools now number over 300, and most are quite small. The Report completely ignores this development. Its omission of community schools from its analysis implies that small public school districts create inefficiency, but that even smaller community schools do not.

9). The Report's recommendation that school districts enter aggressively into shared services agreements would have been right on target had it been made about 100 years ago. Education Service Centers (formerly County Boards of Education) were created in 1914 to achieve economies of scale in the delivery of supervision and curriculum services as well as many other aspects of school administration. Ohio's Joint Vocational School District system achieves economies of scale in the delivery of career tech educational programs. Educators recognize Ohio's career tech system as a model for the delivery of quality vocational education. Finally, voluntary regional cooperatives save districts millions of dollars through aggregate purchasing power and the achievement of other efficiencies in the delivery of goods or services needed by school districts. The Report cites two meritorious, but trivial, examples of school district cooperation. If the authors of the Report had engaged in actual research, they would have found that Ohio regional cooperatives enroll public and private school districts in programs with 283 purchasing opportunities. These cooperative ventures benefit schools with enrollment in excess of 1.7 million pupils.

10). The Report justifies its radical recommendation for school district consolidation by reference to studies from Pennsylvania, New York, and Maine. These reports *predict* savings from school consolidation. None of them substantiate that any savings actually occurred. Nor does the Report's analysis make any attempt to verify whether school districts in those other states use the cooperative arrangements followed in Ohio.

11). The report's conclusions about non-school local government in Ohio are fundamentally flawed. In order to find that Ohio local governments spend more payroll than the U.S. average, the Report references the same payroll-as-a-percent-of-income data as it used selectively to support its argument for school consolidation. This means that the Report used parts of Prof. Trostel's data that included school expenditures as part of local government to show that non-school governments spend 10% more on payroll than the U.S.

Review & Critique of "Restoring Prosperity" – EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

average. In fact, Prof. Trostel's data show that non-school local governments spend about 8% less than the U.S. average on payroll expenditures. As a practical matter, the Brookings Report uses school spending patterns to justify the consolidation of townships or villages. To put it bluntly, either the authors did not understand their own data, or they deliberately misrepresented the data to further an agenda unsupported by the facts.

12). The Report deplores the number of local governments as a drag on its bizarre theory that metropolitan economies now matter more than national economies. However, many local governments play their most important role in rural areas. The most numerous form of local government in Ohio is the township. Villages come second as the next most numerous. The Report fails to show how consolidation or cooperation among the townships in Seneca County (for example) would help the state's metropolitan areas function more effectively. In the context of the fiscal difficulties faced by the state, savings available from consolidation of such small units of government amount to very little.

13). While the Report cited examples of general fiscal stress caused by recent economic conditions, it failed to connect the cause of that stress to the number of local governments in Ohio or to the efficiency with which they operate. The Report provides *no data* to justify its call to "radically restructure government" in Ohio.

The analysis in the Report never connects the reality of where the multiplicity of schools and local governments exist to its own focus on metropolitan areas. As a result, it offers solutions applicable to the state with no connection to specific public policy problems. For example, it fails to show how the elimination of small school districts in rural counties will address education's problems in Cleveland or Columbus.

Faced with a statewide fiscal problem of \$4 billion to \$8 billion per year, the Report has identified as a solution school consolidations. Given that the same number of pupils will require an education both before and after consolidation, and given that those pupils will remain as geographically dispersed as under current circumstances, and given that school districts use a variety of tools now to achieve economies of scale and improve efficient operations, the elimination of school districts cannot possibly reduce the total cost of education by more than a relatively trivial degree. The Report conducted no independent research to determine potential savings in Ohio. It relied upon reports prepared in other states with no attempt to verify that those states had comparable measures of formal and informal cooperation as present in Ohio districts. Moreover, it relied

Review & Critique of "Restoring Prosperity" – EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

on reports of projected savings in other states without any proof that actual savings matched the projections.

Moreover, the Report's recommendation occurred without consideration of any effects on the quality of educational services. The Report assumes that all administrative expenditures for school purposes are unnecessary until proven otherwise. At the same time, the Report either failed to identify or deliberately omitted mention of extensive programs for cooperative purchasing and administration already implemented either by Ohio law or by the initiative of school districts themselves.

The Report relied upon Prof. Trostel's analysis of Census data to set up its superficial analysis of schools and local government. Prof. Trostel warned in his paper that his research "cuts a wide, but shallow, path in analyzing Ohio public spending policies." The Report did not deepen the insights provided by Prof. Trostel's path with thorough research of its own. Instead, the Brookings Institution slapped its own template for government reform on Ohio with little recognition of specific public finance issues and with little evidence related to the specifics of local government quality and performance in the state. In the process, the Brookings Institution managed to convey its contempt for Ohio's "tiny little box jurisdictions" and for the preference of Ohio residents for accessible and responsive local government.

To cover the shallow depth of its own analysis, the Brookings Institution's paper blathers about the replacement of national economies by metropolitan economies, "unified visions" of development policy, and "catalyzing transformative changes in governance." No one should mistake such puffery for economic or public policy analysis let alone act on the basis of such empty verbiage. ■

Ohio's Resource for Reliable Data & Analysis

ETPI 

FULL REPORT

Overview

Earlier this year, the Brookings Institution and the Greater Ohio Policy Center released a report entitled *Restoring Prosperity, Transforming Ohio's Communities for the Next Economy*. The Brookings Institution is widely regarded as a highly capable non-partisan research organization. Unfortunately this report does not adhere to the usual high standards of sound research and close reasoning typically characteristic of Brookings publications.

Restoring Prosperity (hereafter the Report) claims to offer policy options for improving the Ohio economy. This critique will focus on Chapter IV of the Report: "Catalyze Transformative Changes in Government."

Generally, the Report sketches an ambitious agenda for changing Ohio government. In fact, the Report itself proposes that Ohio "radically restructure government." However, this agenda rests upon a shallow economic analysis. For example, in the Report's Executive Summary, the following statement appears:

The next economy has a fourth key characteristic that also matters very much for Ohio: It will be metropolitan led. There is no U.S., or German, or Chinese, or Ohio economy, but rather a network of sophisticated, hyper-linked, and globally-connected metropolitan economies. These metropolitan regions create, and benefit from, a multiplier effect that results from linking human capital, innovative activity, infrastructure, and value-creation in goods and services in dense geographies. In short, metropolitan areas are where it all comes together. p. iii

The characterization of future economic conditions as grounded in metropolitan areas either amounts to a statement of utter banality as in "human economic activity will exist where human beings live" or to a statement of ideological rather than research-based content. For example, economists generally consider such economic concepts as access to labor and input markets, availability of credit, transportation logistics, and national trade policy as critical components of economic analysis. The Report's proposal to "radically restructure" Ohio local governments relies upon no analysis of the relationship between these economic factors and Ohio local government policy. Therefore, while the Report makes a global generalization about the importance of metropolitan areas, it shows no evidence that metropolitan areas must function at the governmental level as a unit in order to participate in the new metropolitan economy. At best, the Report only can offer the argument that its radical reorganization of government will lower the cost of government directly and thereby lower taxes indirectly.

Review & Critique of "Restoring Prosperity"

An example of the Report's reliance upon shallow or uninformed research appears in its Introduction where it asserts:

"Income tax receipts dropped by 35.6 percent from April 2008 to April 2009 as the recession tightened its grip on Ohio families."

A footnote cites the Office of Budget and Management's (OBM) Monthly Report for May 2009 as the source for this information. The statement contains two false implications. First, its reference to a 35.6% drop "from April 2008 to April 2009" implies a year-to-year reduction in the income tax of over one-third. Second, the reference to the recession implies that economic collapse accounted for all of the income tax reduction over the period.

In fact, a 35.6% reduction did occur in income tax receipts when the month of April 2009 *by itself* is compared to the month of April 2008. The OBM report from May 2009 cited by the Report clearly shows that the 35.6% reduction represents a one month only comparison. The OBM report also shows that the year-over-year reduction from April 2008 to April 2009 amounted to less than one-half of the percentage cited in the Report or 15.3%. Either the authors did not understand that a comparison of a single month within a fiscal year has little meaning unless considered in the context of the whole year, or they did understand but preferred to use the misleading one-month comparison with the deliberate intention to mislead readers.

Similarly, the Report's implication that the reduction in income tax receipts resulted from the Recession alone ignores the fact that during the period in question a legislated reduction in income tax rates accounted for a significant part of the lower tax receipts.

Of course, the Report's general point that Ohio has suffered from the recent economic crisis remains valid. However, the use of such sloppy research and the apparent willingness to exaggerate some facts while omitting others undermines the entire credibility of the Report at least to the extent that it addresses matters of public finance.

Public finance is a major focus of the Report's chapter on government restructuring. The contention here is that Ohio must restructure schools and local government to eliminate inefficiency. On three occasions, the Report cites research by Philip Trostel about Ohio's expenditures on instructional expenditures and non-instructional payroll expenses in education and on Ohio's local government payroll relative to the national average payroll. The Report uses statistical relationships identified by Trostel in Census Bureau data to support its contention that Ohio's school and local government structure is inefficient and in need of "radical" restructuring.

Review & Critique of "Restoring Prosperity"

However, review of Trostel's entire work shows that the Brookings Report ignored and refused to include five cautions that Trostel made in the narrative portion of his paper.

1) *The presence of possible excess costs in the provision of public services is identified by comparing Ohio's levels of payroll, employment, and expenditure to those in the rest of the nation and to nearby states. Such a simplistic method clearly cannot prove the existence of waste in the provision of Ohio's public services. Cost factors and service levels and quality can differ across states. Thus, this study only identifies the presence of possible excess costs. The intention is to suggest service areas that may deserve closer inspection.* **Ohio State- and Local-Government Payroll and Expenditure**, Philip A. Trostel, 2009, p. 2

2) *There are numerous ways that this analysis provides only an incomplete picture of Ohio's provision of specific public services. All of the potentially important issues simply cannot be addressed within one study. Thus, this report makes no claim that any specific government service in Ohio is adequately studied here.* **Ohio State- and Local-Government Payroll and Expenditure**, Philip A. Trostel, 2009, p. 2

3) *As will hopefully become apparent in the following report, to adequately understand Ohio's provision of public services it is crucial to examine the individual functions. There is limited value in just examining the aggregate totals.* **Ohio State- and Local-Government Payroll and Expenditure**, Philip A. Trostel, 2009, p. 2

4) *An ideal measure would be the cost per unit of output. Moreover, an ideal measure such as this would also account for differences in service quality and differences in prices across states. Such data do not exist, which is part of the reason why there are various (imperfect) measures of government costs.* **Ohio State- and Local-Government Payroll and Expenditure**, Philip A. Trostel, 2009, p. 3

5) *There are two important problems in trying to identify unnecessary duplication of services. First, the desirable level of fragmentation will certainly vary depending on the service in question. There are clearly greater economies of scale, and hence a lower desirable level of duplication, in providing postsecondary education than in providing elementary education. Thus, evidence of excess costs from unnecessary duplication of services in one category does not necessarily imply excess duplication and costs in another service category.*

Review & Critique of "Restoring Prosperity"

Second, there often is no straightforward measure of the degree of duplication. The number of governments may seem like an obvious measure of duplication. It might not yield an accurate measure of duplication, though, because government sizes obviously vary considerably. For example, nine very small town governments and one large county government (ten governments) could provide a given level of services more effectively than, say, five somewhat small town governments and one very small county government (six governments), even if there are sizable economies of scale. The reverse could also be true. It depends on the nature of the service in question.

*Thus, with limited data, inferring the degree of duplication is problematic. This study uses two imperfect measures to try to quantify duplication in providing local-government services. The number of local governments providing a particular service is examined. As discussed in the preceding paragraph, this measure is far from ideal. This study also uses differences in payroll as a percentage of personal income as a rough measure of the degree of duplication. This measure quantifies the value of the labor used to provide the service. Obviously this is not an ideal measure either. Payroll relative to income can vary for reasons other than duplication of efforts. **Ohio State- and Local-Government Payroll and Expenditure**, Philip A. Trostel, 2009, p. 6*

As the preceding excerpts make clear, Professor Trostel took great pains to qualify the extent to which counting governmental units or payroll should dictate policy. On p. 2 of his paper, he states clearly that his study only identifies "possible" excess costs and that it intends to identify items that "may deserve" more analysis (*emphasis added*).

From Trostel's tentative, prudent, and scholarly assessment, the Brookings Report leapt to the conclusion that Ohio should eliminate at least 200 school districts and an unspecified number of local government jurisdictions or functions.

Consideration now shifts to some specific recommendations of the Report applicable to schools or other local governments.

1.) Shifting K-12 Dollars to Classrooms

The Report advocates a shift in education spending from "administration" to the classroom based on statistical data that show Ohio spends among the lowest states on "instruction" and among the highest for "administration." This recommendation suffers from a number of errors in logic.

Review & Critique of "Restoring Prosperity"

A) First, the recommendation to shift spending from administration "to the classroom" implies that dollars spent for administration have no educational value. However, no evidence supports the existence of some ideal proportion between instructional and administrative expenditures. Schools can deliver educational services through an enormous variety of structures and through an enormous number of combinations of functions. The Report taps into the prejudice that government administrators waste money and perform unnecessary functions until proven otherwise. This undocumented assumption leads to the presumption that schools will become more "efficient" if they shift dollars from administration to the "classroom." No data in the Report support this assumption. Moreover, increased "efficiency" does not necessarily mean increased "effectiveness." (If the Report's logic were applied to the U.S. Army, it would reduce the number of "administrators" to put more troops "in the front line." Undoubtedly, the Army would become more "efficient" if it substituted more privates for officers. It is doubtful that it would become more effective).

The focus of efforts to improve education should center on demonstrable improvement in quality. The Report includes no analysis or proof to substantiate its assertion that fewer administrators or fewer school districts will improve quality in the delivery of educational services. No single combination of educational inputs guarantees maximum performance of an educational system. The Report merely assumes that such a magical combination exists.

B) As noted above, the Report does not even address educational quality; its entire focus centers on a one-dimensional measure of efficiency. Logically, it is possible that smaller school districts may operate with less "efficiency" and still deliver a superior product. Some recent evidence for this conclusion comes from the *Quality Counts 2010* report by *Education Week*. The report shows that the overall score for Ohio schools improved the state from sixth in the nation in 2009 to fifth in 2010.

Specifically, the *Quality Counts* analysis ranked Ohio fourth in the country in its Standards, Assessments, and Accountability measure. Accountability means oversight. Oversight requires administrators to enforce standards and to measure performance.

Other recent results from national comparisons in 2010 show that Ohio pupils performed better than their counterparts on all sections of both the ACT and SAT college readiness tests. On the ACT, Ohio pupils ranked 7th of the 27 states where 50% or more of high school graduates take the test. SAT scores registered well above national averages.

The Report chooses to interpret *part* of the data about schools in Ohio to justify a radical restructuring of Ohio's educational services delivery. However, an

Review & Critique of "Restoring Prosperity"

alternative interpretation based on more data indicates with at least equal validity that Ohio's commitment to strong school administration makes the school system successful in its primary mission: to educate Ohio's children. Based on such an interpretation, a shift of funds from administration in favor of the "classroom" could weaken accountability and lessen quality rather than improve it.

C) Among school districts, the percentage of expenditures on instruction only tells part of the story. For example, assume that one school district spends 55% of \$10,000 per pupil on "the classroom." Assume that another district spends 65% of \$8,000 on "the classroom." Which district spends more on "instruction?" The first district spends \$300 per pupil *more* on instruction than the second district even though the second district has a higher instructional spending percentage. Again, the tacit assumption in the Report holds that the amounts spent on administration have no effect on the quality of the school's output. There are no data in the report to substantiate this assumption.

D) The Brookings Report relies on Professor Trostel's report. Trostel in turn relied upon Census data for an analysis which he characterized on p. 2 of his paper as "wide, but shallow." Census data must use broad categories to group activities into a manageable format. The underlying activity in each category still may differ across states or districts, however. For example, administrative expenditures on a superintendent in a small school district may buy a different package of functional services compared to expenditures for the same position in a large district. This can occur even though both individuals have the same title. Measured by the "efficiency" of administrative versus other expenditures, the large district may spend relatively less. However, measured by the efficiency of faster or more effective decision-making, the small district may achieve better delivery of a quality product.

2) Make Costs of School District Administration Transparent to Ohioans

This recommendation would require school districts to add more data to district report cards. The additional information would report percentages of expenditures for instructional and non-instructional purposes. The requirement would have school districts report expenditure ratios for instructional and administrative functions. The Report would require schools to include this financial information on district websites and in at least one annual mailing to parents. All of this information currently appears at the Department of Education website. District report cards already run seven pages in length. The addition of financial data to the report cards would add printing costs for any mailed reports.

Review & Critique of "Restoring Prosperity"

Overall, school districts should have no objection to publishing in electronic format information that Ohio law already designates as public. What schools should object to is the implication that by publishing a few ratios about expenditures they will make easily understandable, i.e., transparent, public finance issues of considerable complexity. While the analysts at the Brookings Institution may consider these particular ratios to have some magical significance, they actually represent only one of several ways to perceive the effectiveness of public education expenditures.

The use of the term "transparent" in this context implies that schools have intentionally obscured their public finances simply by not publishing these simplistic Brookings ratios. In fact, school districts in Ohio regularly submit proposed property and income tax levies to their voters. School districts have proposed an average of nearly 300 operating issues per year over the past 25 years. This high level of ballot activity makes Ohio's local education finances among the most intensively scrutinized school district finances in the country.

3) Push School Districts to Enter Aggressive Shared Services Agreements

The Report recommends that the Ohio Department of Education should encourage and then require school districts to "share services ranging from personnel to health care" (p. 34). It is not clear what services the designated range would include. The Report then cites two examples of shared services agreements: an arrangement between Orrville and Rittman school districts and a project in Greene County. The citation of two examples leaves the impression that not much happens on the shared services front in Ohio if Brookings Institution could find only a couple examples of such activity.

Data provided by the Ohio School Boards Association shows that Ohio schools have created ten regional cooperative initiatives for shared services. These initiatives arose without the need for compulsion from ODE. The ten cooperatives offer 67 different kinds of cooperative service arrangements. Not all of the cooperatives offer the same services. However, school districts are not limited to membership in one cooperative only. Through these cooperatives, Ohio school districts can participate in a total of 245 cooperative purchasing opportunities.

In addition, these ten regional cooperatives do not exhaust the list of cooperative activity. Ohio's statewide school organizations (Ohio School Boards Association, Buckeye Association of School Administrators, and Ohio Association of School Business Officials) have created other cost-saving arrangements in areas such as the purchase of electric power and the sharing of workers compensation risks and

Review & Critique of "Restoring Prosperity"

costs. For example, the Ohio School Boards Association offers 38 services. Among these services are training opportunities, assistance with labor relations issues, and legal assistance. In addition, all three statewide school management organizations worked together to negotiate a power pooling arrangement that has saved school districts in excess of \$8 million on schools' electricity purchases over the past year alone. Between the regional cooperatives and the school organization cooperatives, Ohio schools can choose from among 283 cooperative programs. (An appendix lists these coops and the programs that they offer).

A critical reader of the Report cannot help but wonder why the report found a relatively minor agreement between two small school districts significant enough to merit mention in its review of school district cooperation, while, at the same time, it ignored a much larger and more comprehensive catalog of coordinated measures spread across the entire state. This observation speaks volumes about the thoroughness and care with which the Brookings Institution slapped together its assessment of Ohio's school administration structure.

4) Create a Commission to Mandate Best Practices in Administration and Cut the Number of Ohio School Districts by at Least One-Third

The Report recommends the creation of a commission and then mandates that the commission eliminate at least 200 school districts from 611 to 411. Thus, the Brookings Institution already has dictated the major result of the commission's work. "Best Practices" in administration means fewer school districts. What person with any intellectual integrity would serve on a commission about Ohio schools whose conclusions were pre-determined by a Washington "think-tank?"

The Report sets up this recommendation at the beginning of its discussion of Ohio schools by asking the following rhetorical question:

*Can the state afford, and do Ohioans want, the current proliferation of 611 school districts and consequent duplication of some administrative costs?
(Restoring Prosperity, p. 33)*

Notice that the use of the term "proliferation" implies an ongoing increase in the number of school districts. Reference to standard sources shows that "to proliferate" means to increase or multiply.

However, no rapid increase of Ohio school districts has in fact occurred. The current number of 613 represents about half of the districts in existence in 1960 and about one-fifth of the districts in 1914. In recent years, exactly two new school districts have been constituted by the voters in Manchester Local School

Review & Critique of "Restoring Prosperity"

District (LSD) in Adams County, formerly a part of the Ohio Valley LSD and by the voters in Monroe LSD formerly a part of Middletown City School District (CSD) in Butler County. The creation of both these new districts occurred since 2000.

Over the same period that Ohio "proliferated" school districts at a percentage rate of 0.33% (cumulatively not annually), Ohio also permitted the creation of literally hundreds of community schools. Presumably, community schools impose no administrative costs because the Report never refers to them in any way or context. As a result, the "proliferation" of two new school districts results in a problem from Brookings' perspective, but the creation of over 300 community schools does not.

The arguments in favor of community schools often cite the ability of such schools to avoid bureaucratic sclerosis by keeping school administration close to parents and students. For some reason unaddressed by the Report, small school districts apparently fail to confer any such advantage. At the risk of belaboring the obvious, it is important to emphasize that the argument against the Brookings Report is not that they also should have recommended the elimination of many small community schools. Rather, the point is that the failure to address small schools *consistently* again reveals either an utter lack of rigor in the Report's research or a deliberate lack of objectivity in its recommendations.

The Report's omissions do not end with its failure to acknowledge the existence of community schools as potential sources of redundant administrative costs. The Report also failed to acknowledge the existence of important aspects of the Ohio education delivery system designed to maximize economies of scale where appropriate and to maximize local control of schools at the same time.

First, Ohio maintains a system of career tech or vocational education in which inter-district cooperation receives the highest priority. Forty-nine joint vocational school districts coordinate delivery of career technical services to pupils in 508 school districts. Another 17 school districts act as lead providers of career technical services in contractual arrangements for the delivery of such services to pupils in 80 more school districts. Only 25 school districts offer comprehensive career technical programs, and this group includes most of the state's largest school districts. Ohio's system for the delivery of vocational education stands out as a model for other states.

Second, since 1914, Ohio has supported its local school districts with a system of Educational Service Centers (these ESCs were originally known as "County Boards of Education"). Currently, 56 centers achieve economies of scale in the delivery of services such as teacher supervision, curriculum design, teacher training, and gifted and special education supervision. A 2010 survey of service centers shows that they delivered roughly 50 different kinds of services to some

Review & Critique of "Restoring Prosperity"

or all districts within their respective service territories.

Third, the ten regional cooperative associations mentioned earlier enable 746 school districts or schools to achieve significant economies of scale in purchasing. The coops open membership to public school districts, community or charter schools, and private or parochial schools. The members represent a total enrollment of 1,789,869.

The Report omitted any discussion of the activities of joint vocational school districts, vocational contract programs, and education service centers from its discussion of school efficiency. The Report does claim that evidence exists to document "saving" from school consolidation in other states. It cites New York, Pennsylvania, and Maine as examples.

However, the studies of savings in New York and Pennsylvania both represent *estimates or projections of potential* savings rather than the identification of actual savings. The Maine study appears to document an actual savings of \$36 million in state dollars with additional local savings. However, the applicability of the Maine experience to Ohio's situation remains entirely outside the bounds of the Report. Did Maine already offer consolidated career tech programs? Did Maine already have the equivalent of Education Service Centers? Did Maine school organizations on their own initiative create regional purchasing cooperatives? Did Maine school associations offer other opportunities for saving on electric power and other commodities?

The Report failed to address any of these issues. It failed to show any comparability to Ohio in the organizational conditions in Maine, Pennsylvania, or New York. Nevertheless, it advocates the elimination of 200 Ohio school districts without *any* analysis of actual conditions in Ohio schools other than Census data reported in broad categories.

Similarly, the Report never shows any awareness of the unique role of periodic property tax ballot issues in the financing of Ohio schools. Under a school consolidation plan, what likelihood exists that support for local school levies will remain sufficient under circumstances where forced consolidation has occurred? The failure of the Report to identify many major variables related to its topic reveals superficiality in its method and a profound lack of critical thinking as a foundation for its proposals.

The Report relies upon the data shown in Table 1.

(next page)

Table 1: Comparison of Ohio and Local Payroll as a Percentage of Personal Income

	State	Local Total	County	Cities & Towns	Special Districts	Schools
1) Ohio Expenditure as % of Personal Income	1.60%	4.76%	0.87%	1.00%	0.12%	2.77%
2) U.S. Average Expenditure as a % of Personal Income	1.64%	4.33%	0.92%	1.15%	0.10%	2.17%
3) Ohio minus U.S. Average	-0.04%	0.43%	-0.05%	-0.15%	0.02%	0.60%
4) Ohio Percent relative to US average	-2.44%	9.93%	-5.43%	-13.04%	20.00%	27.65%

Source: *Ohio State- and Local-Government Payroll and Expenditure*, Philip Trostel; computations by Driscoll & Fleeter

In its first two rows, the table shows government expenditures as a percentage of total personal income for Ohio. The data come from Table 3 of Philip Trostel's paper entitled *Ohio State- and Local-Government Payroll and Expenditure*. Prof. Trostel in turn obtained the data from the U.S. Census Bureau. The fourth row of the table shows the percentage relationship between the first two rows obtained by subtracting row #2 from row #1. The difference obtained in this way (as shown in row #3) is then divided by the U.S. average as shown in row #2 to show Ohio's relationship to the national average. For example, in the first column 1.60% minus 1.64% equals negative 0.04%. That amount - negative 0.04% - divided by 1.64% yields a quotient of negative 2.44%. Thus, Ohio's state payroll expenditure equals 2.44% less than the national average as shown in row #4.

The last column of the table shows that Ohio schools spend more than the U.S. average expenditure, in some respects. However, it is critically important to understand that the measurement used here shows payroll expenditures *as a percentage of personal income*. In the case of school payroll, this results in a payroll measure almost 28% higher than the national average.

However, Table 2 shows that the percentage relationship in row #3 of Table 1 only tells part of the story.

(next page)

Table 2: Comparison of Payroll Expenditure Per Pupil and Total Expenditure Per Pupil in Ohio to the U.S. Average

	Payroll Expenditure Per Pupil	Total Expenditure Per Pupil
1) Ohio	\$5,795	\$9,929
2) U.S. Average	\$5,960	\$9,233
3) Ohio minus U.S. Average	-\$133	\$696
4) Ohio Percent relative to U.S. average	-2.77%	7.54%

Source: *Ohio State- and Local-Government Payroll and Expenditure*, Philip Trostel; computations by Driscoll & Fleeter

Table 2 shows that Ohio's payroll for elementary and secondary education in dollars per pupil falls *below* the national average (\$5,795 in Ohio vs. \$5,960 U.S. average), although Ohio spends more per pupil for all purposes (\$9,929 in Ohio vs. \$9,233 U.S. average). The fact that Ohio spends less per pupil on payroll than the national average causes the entire argument that higher expenditures result from unnecessary administrative expenditures to collapse. Ohio's high percentage of expenditures relative to personal income reflects long-term economic trends in the state rather than a profligate history of expenditure.

The Report's reliance on superficial and inapplicable research reveals both a lack of professional rigor as well as a contempt for the validity of local preferences in public policy-making. The Report cavalierly disposes of 200 Ohio school districts on the basis of data that its own expert called "limited."

5) Local Government

The Report begins its discussion of local government with the following statement:

Ohioans live and work amidst a proliferation of local governments. Restoring Prosperity, p.36

Again the Report uses the term "proliferation" with its implication of a condition of rapid growth. The term implies that local governments are multiplying in number. In fact, the basic configuration of Ohio local government became established at the end of the Eighteenth and the beginning of the Nineteenth Centuries. Ohio actually has slightly fewer townships now than at the highest point of township activity since municipalities have absorbed some townships. Ohio's number of counties at 88 has not changed for over 100 years.

Review & Critique of "Restoring Prosperity"

The misuse of a term like proliferation within the report should not be taken lightly. It goes to the core of the problems with the study itself and promotes a false sense that the recommendations to downsize local government are valid.

The Report cites a finding in Philip Trostel's paper that Ohio's local government payroll is 10% higher than the national average. Trostel makes a statement to this effect based on Table 3 of *his* report. The comparisons of Ohio state and local government expenditures from Trostel's Table 3 appeared in Table 1 above.

Table 1 reproduces the computations used by Prof. Trostel to determine that Ohio's local payroll as a percentage of personal income exceeds the national average by 10% (actually 9.93%). This percentage appears in row #4 of the column labeled "Local Total" on Table 1. Now here is the crucial point. The "Local Total" column on Table 1 *includes* schools' payroll. This means that the higher local government payroll in Ohio relative to the U.S. average occurred because Prof. Trostel defined local expenditures in his Table 3 as inclusive of School expenditures.

The inclusion of school district expenditures as "local" expenditures in and of itself is appropriate. However, in the context of the Report, the Brookings Institution chose to address school expenditures and consolidation separately from other local governments. Then, it shifted the discussion to those other non-school local governments. At the same time, the Report carried over school expenditures and included them with other local government expenditures as a measure of local government spending relative to the U.S. average. In effect, the Report double-counted school expenditures. It used them once to address school consolidation, and then it used them again to address other local government consolidation.

Table 3 shows local government payroll expenditures as a percentage of personal income *exclusive of school payroll expenditures* because the Report itself chose to address school payroll expenditures separately.

(next page)

Table 3: Comparison of Ohio and Local Government Payroll as a Percentage of Personal Income after Exclusion of School Payroll Expenditures

	Local Total	County	Cities & Towns	Special District
1) Ohio Expenditure as a % of Personal Income	1.99%	0.87%	1.00%	0.12%
2) U.S. Average Expenditure as a % of Personal Income	2.16%	0.92%	1.15%	0.10%
3) Ohio minus U.S. Average	-0.17%	-0.05%	-0.15%	0.02%
4) Ohio Percent	-7.87%	-5.43%	-13.04%	20.00%

Source: *Ohio State- and Local-Government Payroll and Expenditure*, Philip Trostel; computations by Driscoll & Fleeter

After the exclusion of school payroll expenditures, all other local governments in Ohio actually spend *less* as a percentage of personal income than the U.S. average expenditure for the same classes of local governments. The bottom row of the table shows that Ohio's non-school local governments actually spend 7.87% *less* than the national average on payroll. By including school data among the payroll data for other local governments, the Report distorted Ohio's local government expenditure patterns.

The Report's discussion of Ohio's 10% excess in payroll expenditures by local government compared to the national average clearly occurs in the context of a broader discussion about the delivery of services such as police, fire, emergency, and economic development activities. *In other words, the assertion that Ohio local governments spend 10% more than the average on payroll relies upon school expenditure data to make a point about consolidation of services never provided by school districts.*

After its misleading reference to patterns of Ohio state and local expenditure, the Report points out that higher than average local payroll expenditures and lower than average State payroll expenditures appear to reflect a preference for local versus state delivery of services.

Local Government in Ohio

Based on the erroneous representation that Ohio local governments, other than schools, spend more than the national average on payroll, the Report lists four ways in which it claims that Ohio's system of local governments has become problematic.

A) "Little Box" jurisdictions create a staggering array of costs and duplication of services

While the proliferation of local governments and the fragmentation of the state into tiny "little box" jurisdictions may satisfy residents' desire for accessible, responsive, small governments, it also creates a staggering array of costs. Restoring Prosperity, p. 36.

Even ignoring another misuse of the word "proliferation," could the Brookings Institution have delivered a more condescending and patronizing assessment of Ohioans preferences for the delivery of government services? It seems unlikely.

The Northeast Cincinnati Chamber of Commerce website offers the following perspective from one of Ohio's "tiny little box jurisdictions," Deerfield Township.

Just as in 1803, Ohio townships today are political subdivisions of the state. Over the years the functions and duties of the township have evolved to keep pace with changing times. The state legislature has granted townships authority to fulfill these increasing duties. A Home Rule Township, Deerfield Township has grown in scope and autonomy. Because residents have a voice in how their community takes shape, township government could be said to be the form of government closest to the people. Welcome to Deerfield Township <http://www.necchamber.org/home/community/deerfield/index.php>

However, the Report dismisses the concern that local government be closest to the people with the assertion that accessible, responsive, small governments create a "staggering array of costs." The Report *never* offers any substantiation for this assertion other than its erroneous depiction of local government costs as higher than the U.S. average. It assumes that duplication of effort and dis-economies of scale in "little tiny box jurisdictions" create staggering costs. No documentation of these costs exists.

The Report specifically refers to police, fire, and emergency services as sources of such duplication. However, even the expert cited by the Report fails to confirm its claims. For example, Prof. Trostel's paper presents four tables about police expenditures, payroll, FTEs of employment, and police power jurisdictions. While Ohio has more jurisdictions with police power, variables related to police protection in the state *per crime* show that Ohio spends \$840 below the national average for total expenditures, spends \$840 less than the national average in payroll, and employs fewer FTEs of police protection per crime than the national average by .009 FTEs. On these measures, Ohio ranks 28, 27, and 31, respectively.

Review & Critique of "Restoring Prosperity"

Prof. Trostel's research shows that Ohio does spend more on fire protection, firefighter payroll, and FTEs providing fire protection services. His research contains no separate comparison for other emergency services, except that Table 14 of Prof. Trostel's paper compares firefighter payroll to "other" fire payroll. "Other" may include EMT services often provided by fire departments in Ohio. While firefighter payroll exceeded the national average as a percentage of personal income by 0.05%, "other" fire payroll exactly matched the national average. Therefore, while Ohio ranked 5th in firefighter payroll as a percentage of personal income, it ranked 24th in "other" fire payroll.

If Ohio's "proliferation" of local governments really created a "staggering array of costs," a reasonable expectation might anticipate higher general administration costs. Prof. Trostel's "Other Government Administration" data (Table 15) presents information about the central administration of counties, cities, townships, and the State. Even though Ohio has more local governments than average, the total expenditures, payroll, and employed FTEs for these governments fall slightly below the national average.

As a follow-up to its undocumented reference to a "staggering array of costs," the Report also asserts that:

The most obvious (reason for such costs) is that the many separate jurisdictions in a given region often duplicate infrastructure, staffing, and municipal services. Restoring Prosperity, p. 36

The Report never identifies the actual existence of such duplication. It assumes that existence. Further, even an actual showing that multiple local jurisdictions offer potentially overlapping or duplicative services does not necessarily mean that the provision of such services occurs in a wasteful manner. Prof. Trostel's narrative states that point quite clearly. (See p. 6 of Prof. Trostel's paper).

Even more importantly, when this alleged duplication of services or functions does occur, the result may not be economically inefficient at all.

One of the most glaring errors in reasoning made by the authors of the Report is the complete failure to acknowledge that a local government structure characterized by a large number of smaller jurisdictions can actually serve to allocate resources *more* efficiently. Any researcher even casually familiar with an introductory Public Finance textbook should be aware of the "public goods problem." Unlike private goods, which are consumed individually, public goods and services must be shared by all members of a community. This creates the problem of determining the level of public goods service that is consistent with the preferences of the most members of the community. The classic solution to

Review & Critique of "Restoring Prosperity"

this problem was offered by Charles Tiebout in a 1956 paper that is among the most influential and most widely cited papers in economics ("A Pure Theory of Local Public Expenditures, Charles M. Tiebout, Journal of Political Economy Vol. 64, 1956,; pages 416–424). The basic premise of this paper is that a local government structure that allows residents to choose among many communities, each offering varied combinations of public services and taxes, will result in an efficient sorting of individuals according to their preferences. Competition among communities for residents will assure both that the level of services remains consistent with the preferences of individuals and that communities have an incentive to keep their costs (and hence taxes) down or else risk losing community members.

Rather than acknowledging that Ohio's multi-layered structure of local governments actually serves to improve the extent to which government provides necessary services at quality levels desired by residents, Restoring Prosperity instead chooses to mock Ohioans for living in "Little Box" jurisdictions that are alleged - with no compelling supporting evidence whatsoever - to be overly costly and too fragmented to foster economic development. By failing to understand that one type of efficiency involves the provision of a good or service at its lowest possible cost while another type relates to providing commodities tailored to the preferences of the people who consume them, the authors of the report display a complete lack of understanding of the most basic notions of economics.

For example, one township may decide that the maintenance of an emergency medical service is not necessary, while another township may prefer to have such a service. The creation of a county wide service may lower administrative costs by eliminating some duplication. However, that reduction in costs occurs at the expense of forcing a level of service on some townships that they never wanted in the first place. The result is a different kind of inefficiency - a kind not contemplated by the Brookings Report.

Finally, as in the case of school districts, the Report fails to identify the existence of extensive cooperative agreements or agencies among local governments. Contracts between townships and county sheriffs for policy protection and regional 9-1-1 emergency response systems present two examples.

B) "Little Box" jurisdictions are too fragmented to develop a unified vision for economic development

The Report offers a second reason for consolidation or cooperation of Ohio local governments.

Review & Critique of "Restoring Prosperity"

Second, the many "little box" governments within Ohio's regions—all with their own parochial interests and priorities—are simply too fractured to develop a unified vision for economic development and mobilize regional stakeholders to realize it. Restoring Prosperity, p. 36.

Once again, the Report's patronizing tone toward the preferences of Ohio residents reeks of Washington elitism. All those parochial local governments with their lack of a "unified vision" simply get in the way of progress. The Report offers only one unpublished paper in support of this vague notion. In fact, economic theory does not support the necessity for a "unified vision." Rather, capitalism thrives on diversity in the marketplace. Innovation occurs through the initiative of individual participants in the market at least as much as it occurs through the unity of stakeholders' visions. The former Soviet Union organized its economy on the assumption that a "unified vision" provided the best method for the organization of economic activity. It failed.

The subtext in this reason for reducing the number of local governments is that village or township zoning boards may represent the last bastion to prevent undesirable developments. Local governments currently provide the means to prevent the "vision" of one group of stakeholders on the east side of the county from destroying the quality of life for those who reside on the west side.

The State's Department of Development has the tools for envisioning coherent economic development policies. The fact that local governments have some autonomy from the implementation of those tools is fully consistent with the Report's identification of "quality places" as one of four key components of long-term economic success in Ohio. However, the Report would define quality on its own terms rather than through the preferences of the residents of "tiny little box jurisdictions."

C) Fragmentation facilitates segregation by race, class, and ethnicity

The Report contains no evidence in support of its assertion that "fragmentation" of local government has the effects assigned to it here. Nor does the report contain any explanation about how the elimination or consolidation of local governments will lessen such segregation. Nothing in the report relates its contention about segregation to actual data about Ohio local government.

The report does contend that segregation has negative economic effects because it mismatches workers and jobs. Poor workers remain in central city neighborhoods or in older suburbs. Meanwhile, according to the Report, job growth occurs elsewhere. What the report does not explain is how the elimination of local

Review & Critique of “Restoring Prosperity”

governments or better coordination among them will eliminate *economic* segregation.

The City of Columbus has implemented an aggressive annexation program for many years. It has annexed large portions of Franklin County for the purpose of delivering city services and imposing consistent city regulation. Annexed territory includes many areas served by suburban school districts. An innovative territorial annexation agreement, called the Win-Win agreement created a revenue sharing arrangement between suburban school districts and Columbus City Schools.

In spite of the removal of local government boundary lines in large sections of suburban Franklin County, segregation by economic wealth remains a problem and the geographical separation of low-income workers from outer-belt jobs remains a problem as well. Even if Brookings could argue economic segregation is less in Columbus than in other metropolitan areas of the state (it is not clear whether data support this or not), this example shows that it is possible to successfully address these issues through innovative policies rather than through forced government consolidation.

The Report simply provides no data to support the contention that elimination of local governments somehow will lead to economic integration throughout Ohio metropolitan areas. It also omits any analysis of how cooperation among local governments through cooperative purchasing, joint planning, or other collaboration would affect divisions based on race, economic status, or ethnicity.

D) Fragmentation exacerbates sprawl, decentralization, and the draining of Ohio's core cities and older suburbs

As in the preceding discussion, the Report traces the existence of sprawl and decentralization to fragmentation of local government, but it provides no evidence to support its theory. Regional cooperation is offered as a solution to these problems without any consideration of the effects of such issues as availability of land, real estate markets, labor markets, or capital markets. Some economists consider those factors at least as important as the number of townships and municipalities in a state.

Recommendations for local government collaboration and cooperation

The Report offers a series of short, medium, and long-term recommendations for the encouragement of local government collaboration or cooperation. Most of these recommendations have merit to some extent. However, the recommendations do not match with the initial analysis of Ohio's local government problem

Review & Critique of "Restoring Prosperity"

(which asserts that Ohio has too many local governments, and that those local governments are inefficient.)

The Report confuses data about schools *and* other local governments with data about *non-school* local governments only to make a false claim that those local governments are inefficient. The Report's own expert shows Ohio local governments spend less than the national average for non-school governments. The Report makes the bald assertion that the excessive number of local governments means that they do not benefit from economies of scale. It further determines that Ohio municipalities and townships lack the resources to provide the services that they have undertaken to provide.

In the process, the Report misses obvious aspects of local government finances in Ohio by which the state's municipalities already benefit from revenue sharing opportunities. For example, for 60 years, Ohio municipalities have had the power to tax the income of workers who work within the city even if the workers reside elsewhere. Municipal income tax laws have the effect of providing preference to the city of employment over the city of residence. This feature of local government finance in Ohio mitigates potential revenue effects caused by local government "fragmentation." When an "analysis" fails again and again and again to identify important examples of cooperation or consolidation, a critical reader must question how much else has the analysis ignored or deliberately omitted in order to compel Ohio's situation to conform to a pre-conceived ideology.

Conclusion

The Report's chapter on local government consistently mismatches its analysis with its proposed solutions. While the Report's introductory material emphasizes the importance of metropolitan areas, the analysis in the chapter about school or local government operations includes a statewide perspective. As a result, the Report concludes that Ohio has too many school districts and local governments. It concludes in explicit terms that Ohio should eliminate at least one-third (200) of the school districts in the state. It implicitly concludes that Ohio should reduce the number of non-school local governments.

The analysis disconnects the reality of where the multiplicity of schools and local governments exists from its own focus on metropolitan areas. As a result, it offers solutions applicable to the state with no connection to specific public policy problems. For example, it fails to show how the elimination of small school districts in Seneca County will address education's problems in Cleveland or Columbus.

The Report deplores the number of local governments as a metropolitan problem when many of them play their most important role in rural areas. The most

Review & Critique of "Restoring Prosperity"

numerous form of local government in Ohio is the township. The Report fails to show how consolidation or cooperation among the townships in Seneca County (for example) would help the state's metropolitan areas function more effectively. In the context of the fiscal difficulties faced by the state, savings available from consolidation of such small units of government amount to very little.

Faced with a statewide fiscal problem of \$4 billion to \$8 billion per year, the Report has identified as a solution school consolidations. Given that the same number of pupils will require an education both before and after consolidation, and given that those pupils will remain as geographically dispersed as under current circumstances, the elimination of school districts cannot reduce the total cost of education by more than a relatively trivial degree. The Report conducted no independent research to determine potential savings in Ohio. It relied upon reports prepared in other states with no attempt to verify that those states had comparable measures of formal and informal cooperation as present in Ohio districts.

Moreover, the Report's recommendation occurred without consideration of any effects on the quality of educational services. The Report assumes that all administrative expenditures for school purposes are unnecessary until proven otherwise. At the same time, the Report either failed to identify or deliberately omitted mention of extensive programs for cooperative purchasing and administration already implemented either by Ohio law or by the initiative of school districts themselves.

The Report relied upon Prof. Trostel's analysis of Census data to set up its superficial analysis of schools and local government. Prof. Trostel warned in his paper that his research "cuts a wide, but shallow, path in analyzing Ohio public spending policies." The Report did not deepen the insights provided by Prof. Trostel's path with thorough research of its own. Instead, the Brookings Institution slapped its own template for government reform on Ohio with little recognition of specific public finance issues and with little evidence related to the specifics of local government quality and performance in the state. In the process, the Brookings Institution managed to convey its contempt for Ohio's "tiny little box jurisdictions" and for the preference of Ohio residents for accessible and responsive local government.

To cover the shallow depth of its own analysis, the Brookings Institution's paper blathers about the replacement of national economies by metropolitan economies, "unified visions" of development policy, and "catalyzing transformative changes in governance." No one should mistake such puffery for economic or public policy analysis, let alone act on the basis such empty verbiage. ■

APPENDIX

March 2010

Areas offered by cooperative...

	AEPA	Ashtabula	MEC	Toledo [MTEPA]	OME-RESA	Ohio Schools Council	SEOVEC	SOEPC	SCSCOG	Unified Purchasing Coop	OSBA	TOTALS
403(b) TPA									•			1
Administrative salary & staffing services											•	1
Administrative Software	•	•	•		•		•	•				6
Administrative training											•	1
Arbitration/ULP assistance											•	1
Architectural Services						•						1
Art Supplies		•	•	•	•	•	•	•		•		8
Asbestos Training & Services								•	•			2
Athletic Surfacing	•	•	•					•				4
Audio Visual Supplies/Equipment		•	•	•		•	•	•		•		7
Board training											•	1
Bond Program - Treasurer, Business Manager & Position											•	1
Business Services Consulting						•						1
Carpeting	•	•	•					•				4
Checks/Forms		•	•				•		•			4
Chemical Management						•						1
Classroom Supplies	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•		10
Collective bargaining services											•	1
Communication audit											•	1
Communication services											•	1
Computer and Electronics recycling program						•			•			2
Computer printers and software							•		•			2
Computer Technician Services					•	•	•					3
Contract analysis											•	1
Copy Machines	•	•	•					•	•			5
Copying & Binding Services		•		•					•			3
Custodial/Maintenance Supplies		•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•		9
Custom workshops											•	1
Data Processing Services		•	•		•	•	•					5
Document Management	•											1
Drug/Alcohol Testing Services		•	•					•	•			4
Electricity		•				•		•			•	4
Energy Efficiency Program						•						1
Energy for Education III						•						1
eGovernance											•	1
E-surplus	•											1
ESC academies											•	1
Federal lobbying											•	1
Floor Cleaning Equipment		•		•		•						3
Food Service [Dairy, Bakery, Food Products, Paper/Plastics, Small Wares]			•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•		8
Food Service management software						•						1
Fuels - Gasoline & Diesel			•			•	•	•	•	•		5
Furniture - Classroom and Office	•	•	•				•	•	•	•		7
GPS program						•						1
Hotel Discount						•						1
Indoor Hardwood & Sports Flooring	•											1
Industrial Arts Products						•						1
Industrial Supplies Catalog	•											1
Insurance - Dental, Health, Life		•	•		•	•	•	•	•		•	8
Insurance - Fleet, Property, Boiler, Liability						•	•	•	•		•	5
Insurance - Business travel and personal accident											•	1
Interactive Technology Catalog	•											1
Job description service											•	1
Lamps and Electrical Supplies		•	•	•		•	•	•	•	•		8

APPENDIX

March 2010

Areas offered by cooperative...

	AEPA	Ashtabula	MEC	Toledo [MTEPA]	OME- RESA	Ohio Schools Council	SEOVEC	SOEPC	SCSCOG	Unified Purchasing Coop	OSBA	TOTALS
Legal Assistance Fund											•	1
Legal "Hot" Line Services					•	•			•		•	4
Levy assistance											•	1
Library Books		•	•	•		•	•	•		•		7
Library Supplies						•						1
Medical exams for school bus/van drivers		•						•	•			3
Medical Supplies		•	•		•	•	•			•		6
Musical supplies and equipment			•				•					2
Natural Gas - Self Help Program			•		•	•	•	•	•	•		7
NSF check collection						•					•	2
Office Supplies	•			•	•	•	•	•		•		7
On-Line Policy hosting											•	1
On-Line Training		•				•			•		•	4
Paint Products		•	•				•	•				4
Paper - Computer and Fine Papers		•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•		9
Physical Education supplies and equipment		•	•			•	•	•				5
Policy Services											•	1
Publications											•	1
Purchase Card						•					•	2
Rapid Notification Services	•	•			•	•	•		•		•	7
Refuse Removal Services						•			•			2
Roofing	•		•			•	•	•				5
Safety training											•	1
School Buses		•	•	•		•	•	•	•			7
Science equipment and supplies		•	•			•	•	•		•		6
Sports Catalog	•		•			•	•	•				5
State conference											•	1
State lobbying											•	1
Strategic planning											•	1
Strike assistance											•	1
Superintendent/Treasurer Search		•				•			•		•	4
Survey Service											•	1
Technology Catalog	•											1
Telephone Services						•		•				2
Transportation Supplies [Batteries, Fluids, Tires, Tubes and Road Service]							•	•	•			3
Used school bus auction program						•						1
Vehicles	•		•					•				3
Vendor exposition											•	1
Video services											•	1
Welding Supplies							•					1
Workers/Unemployment Compensation Services						•		•	•		•	4
	17	28	28	12	14	44	30	31	27	14	38	283