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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

General Statement of the Problem

Each biennium the Legislature of Texas is asked by school authorities to provide funds for the equalization of educational opportunities in the State. The practice began with the enactment of a rural aid law in 1915. Since that time, each succeeding Legislature has passed a bill designed to assist the weaker districts. The equalization laws, commonly referred to as rural aid laws, have been added to the State's educational program in an effort to help provide equal educational advantages. By the term "equalization" is meant money which is provided by any authorized administrative school unit through legislative channels for the purpose of equalizing educational opportunities among the schools. For the purpose of this study, "equalization" refers particularly to funds provided by the State of Texas for equalizing educational opportunities through the enactment of biennial laws. The terms "equalization aid," "Rural Aid," and "State Aid" are used synonymously throughout this study.

1Laws of Texas, 1915-17, H. B. No. 8, Chapter 10, Thirty-fourth Legislature, First Called Session, pp. 22-26.
Specific Statement of the Problem

It is the purpose of this study to make the following investigations: (1) to trace briefly the historical background of equalization in the United States; (2) to present briefly a cross-section of the plans of equalization used by representative states in the United States; (3) to analyze the principal legal provisions of the equalization laws of Texas for the purpose of showing the growth and development of the State's equalization policy; and (4) to present a summary, to draw conclusions, and to make certain recommendations in the light of the information derived from the study.

The Significance of Equalization of Educational Opportunities in Texas

Educational inequalities exist to a pronounced degree in Texas. This is true in spite of the fact that, for the past twenty-five years, the State has maintained a plan for equalizing educational opportunities and has appropriated millions of dollars in support of the policy. A survey made under the auspices of the State Board of Education in 1935-1936 revealed some startling facts concerning such inequalities. ² This was especially true from the standpoint of inequalities in district wealth as compared with scholastic

population. The survey revealed that thirty-seven independent districts, with 26,508 schoolastics, had an assessed valuation per schoolastic of less than $499. One hundred thirty-five of the independent districts, with 302,648 schoolastics, had an assessed valuation of over $4,000 per schoolastic. It was also found that the assessed valuation per schoolastic in the independent districts for the State as a whole varied from $250 to more than $18,000.

According to the survey, a similar condition was found to exist among the common school districts. Six hundred ninety-three districts, with a total schoolastic population of 47,197, had an assessed valuation per child of over $4,000, while for the State as a whole, the assessed valuation per schoolastic in the common school districts also ranged from $250 to more than $18,000.³

From the figures given above, an idea can be had of the variations in wealth to be found among the school districts of Texas. Inequality in wealth is the basis for inequality of educational opportunity; therefore, the existence of such conditions presents a major problem for the State to solve. The attempt at the solution of this problem in Texas has resulted in a series of equalization laws that will be analyzed in this study. Every biennial law has had many points in

³Ibid.
common which have contributed to the growth and development of the State’s equalization program.

Sources of the Data

Data relating to the problem have been gathered from the following sources: (1) the Laws of Texas, (2) the biennial reports of the State Superintendent of Public instruction, (3) the Public School laws of Texas, (4) A Report of the Adequacy of Texas Schools, (5) the annual reports of the State Auditor, regarding the equalization funds, (6) the Texas Alumni, (7) the Texas Outlook, (8) professional books in the field of school finance, (9) bulletins of public school laws, and other educational literature from the State Departments of Education in various states in the United States.

Organization and Presentation of the Data

This study is divided into four chapters. The first chapter gives an introduction to the problem. In it is found a general statement of the problem, a specific statement of the problem, some pertinent points regarding the significance of the equalization of educational opportunities in Texas, the sources of the data, and the organization and presentation of the data.

Chapter II presents a brief historical background of equalization policies in the United States which is followed
by a brief sketch of the equalization policies of various states in the United States in order to show the relationship between those plans and the equalization policy of the State of Texas.

In Chapter III is given an analysis of the Texas equalization legislation. Table 1, page 31, lists the principal provisions contained in all the biennial equalization laws, beginning with the first act for the biennium of 1915-17 and ending with the act for the current biennium of 1939-41. The first part of the chapter deals with a general analysis of the various biennial acts, while the remainder of the chapter gives a specific analysis of the principal common provisions of the thirteen biennial laws. This specific analysis of the common provisions of each act is given in an attempt to show the evolutionary development of each provision from biennium to biennium in its relation to the entire principle of equalization.

Chapter IV contains a summary of the preceding chapters and some conclusions and recommendations for improvement of the program of equalization in Texas.
CHAPTER II

EQUALIZATION AID IN THE UNITED STATES

Historical Background

"The history of changes in state policies of public school finance is essentially a history of changing conceptions as to the nature and extent of the State's responsibility."¹ This statement recognizes that changes have come in state policies and that such changes have come as a consequence of different philosophies of state finance. The beginnings of equalization aid in the United States and the important revisions that are taking place in procedures will be discussed in this chapter.

The tendency of all states to provide equalization funds for their weaker districts is evidence of the fact that lawmakers are accepting the State's responsibility to provide a minimum of educational opportunity for every child. The present policies of equalization as practiced by most of the states of today did not spring to life spontaneously. Their development was slow and uncertain.²

²Ibid., p. 191.
The history of equalization aid to schools has its roots as far back as 1795, before any idea of making payment according to district ability ever came into being. It was during that year that Connecticut passed a law creating a permanent school fund. The purpose of this fund, the first of its kind in America, was to stimulate local interest; but instead of stimulation, the effect was that local interest was destroyed, and for several years, 1821 to 1854, the common school districts of Connecticut collected very little or no tax money for school purposes and lived extravagantly at the expense of the State.\(^3\)

The idea of stimulation was adopted by the State of New York in 1812, however, general relief was added and the common school fund served a dual purpose. The funds were generally distributed over parts of the State, but the fact that local requirements were made served to stimulate initiative on the part of the local district. With New York’s effort as a basis, other states followed in her footsteps and set up stimulation funds for their common schools. Gradually, additional requirements were added which served to increase the stimulation and to narrow the general application. Thus, some of the states began to set up certain standards of eligibility for participation in the

\(^3\)Ibid., p. 195.
equalization funds. Participating schools were required to furnish lists of teachers, adopt salary schedules, maintain minimum length of terms, meet various curriculum standards, and employ teachers of accepted qualifications. All of those requirements had a tendency to stimulate local effort.

Not all of the stimulation funds had a part in the general development of equalization aid, since many of those funds were of a special nature; however, all funds under the heading of "stimulation funds" have had a part in the development of equalization aid, especially rural aid, since many of them have been incorporated in the laws of today. Special stimulation funds, such as those set aside to match Federal funds in the administration of the Smith-Hughes Act, are now as much a part of the present equalization program as they were in 1917. 4

The practice of spending money to stimulate special projects is in great favor with the present generation, as is evidenced by Neulen's study made in 1928. Neulen pointed out that, "Prior to 1913, forty different projects were being subsidized by the states, which number increased to sixty-one by 1923... an increase of 53 per cent." 5 Neulen

4L. E. Neulen, State Aid for Educational Projects in Public Schools, pp. 7-8.

5Ibid., p. 8.
continues: "The three states that had not at that time entered upon the policy of subsidizing an educational project involving the public school were Wyoming, Oregon, and Georgia. . . . Since 1920, every state has offered subsidy to one or more special educational projects."§

Stimulation has not only played an important role in the development of rural aid, but stimulation of special projects now maintains a very prominent place in the equalization policies of every state. Until 1913, however, no more recognition was given to one district than was given to any other district on the basis of ability to finance its own educational program. No special consideration was granted to the district which had a low tax valuation per child. It is evident that the tendency in the latter part of the nineteenth century, and during the first decade of the twentieth century, was toward solving the inequalities existent. The step was finally taken which recognized the inequalities of district wealth.

State Equalization Policies

Colorado.--In 1913, Colorado set aside a "sum not to exceed $60,000 to be paid to districts unable to derive from all other state, county, and district revenues a sum sufficient

§Ibid.
to pay each teacher employed at least fifty dollars per month for six months."7 In 1919, the amount was increased to $150,000, and in 1921, an act was passed which made it possible for the entire income from the public school funds of Colorado to be used as an equalization fund, if the occasion should arise.8

Texas.—In 1915, the Legislature, at the insistence of Governor James E. Ferguson, passed the first equalization bill for the State of Texas. One million dollars was appropriated for "improving the country schools."9 The development of equalization legislation in Texas will be discussed at length in the following chapter.

Mississippi.—In 1920, Mississippi passed two laws of importance to the development of equalization aid in that State. One of the laws was a compulsory attendance act, and the other law was an act increasing the appropriation for schools. The first act had the effect of increasing school enrollment and attendance, thus necessitating more funds; and the second act provided revenue, a part of which was set aside as an equalization fund to be expended at the discretion of the State Board of Education to equalize, as

7Swift, op. cit., p. 198. 8Ibid., p. 199.
nearly as possible, school terms and teachers' salaries throughout the State.\textsuperscript{10}

\textbf{Maine.--}In 1921, Maine followed the example of Mississippi by providing that $100,000 per year should be deducted from the State school fund for equalization purposes. Especial attention was to be directed to the equalization of educational opportunities in the rural districts.\textsuperscript{11}

\textbf{Michigan.--}In the same year that Maine set up an equalization fund, Michigan passed an act providing for State aid to the extent of $300 to each small, financially weak school. The act further provided that a minimum local tax of 1.2 mills would have to be assessed by each participating district.\textsuperscript{12}

\textbf{Maryland.--}Maryland recognized the equalization problem in 1922. A careful study was then made of the local school conditions throughout the State. The primary motive seems to have been to determine what conditions prevailed in the public schools and to make recommendations for improvement. The fact was revealed that most of the conditions that needed remedying required additional funds, because most of the districts had no way of raising additional funds.

\textsuperscript{10}\textit{Swift, op. cit.}, p. 200.

\textsuperscript{11}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 201.

for improvement. Low tax valuations also made the problem more complex.

Prior to 1932, the school funds in Maryland had been administered without regard for the ability of the district to help finance its own program. With this fact in mind, the committee making the study decided that an appropriation of $2,000,000 would be required to materially aid the underprivileged schools. It seemed impossible to raise that amount, therefore, the new policy which was finally adopted, and which was prophetic of the policies to come in other states, was given to the people of Maryland and incorporated in an equalization law.

Any county that cannot carry the new minimum salary schedule for teachers on a county school tax levy of 67¢ on each $100 of assessed valuation shall have such an allotment from the equalization fund as will enable the county to carry out the program; provided that no less than $245 of the current expense budget must be spent for purposes other than teachers' salaries. 13

Here is found a statement of the plan which had a three-fold purpose. First, it recognized the need for better pay for efficient teachers. Second, it recognized the worth of local initiative. Third, it recognized the necessity for proper physical equipment for schools as well as for the improvement of teaching ability.

The State of Maryland spent only $234,000 the first

13 Ibid., p. 204.
year of operation under the new plan as compared with the estimated $2,000,000 that would have been needed under the old method. Only the needy schools received the assistance, and this aid was provided after minimum standards of achievement were reached and after definite financial requirements were met by the local units. Such a principle of equalization has wide application today in many states besides the State of Maryland.

Minnesota.—Minnesota made a start toward establishing a permanent equalization fund in 1921. This was one year before Maryland adopted her new plan. Minnesota's equalization fund was called a "supplemental aid." The act creating the fund provided for assistance to districts which voted a local tax in excess of 2.0 mills. The State paid one-third of the excess from 2.0 mills up to 3.2 mills. A tax higher than 3.2 mills entitled the district to one-half the excess.14

West Virginia.—The State of West Virginia maintains a plan of equalization known as the "Foundation School Program." It is based on budgetary needs, teacher qualifications, size of schools, and local district support.

The Foundation School Program is hereby established as the basic essential of free public education in this State for the purpose of computing the amount of State aid that each county shall receive. So far as funds from state sources will permit, each county shall receive a sum which,

14Ibid., p. 205.
together with the amount of local revenue reasonably to be expected, will pay the cost of the foundation school program as computed in accordance with this article.\textsuperscript{15}

Ohio.—A foundation school program similar to the West Virginia plan is in operation in the State of Ohio.

If in any school district, which has a tax levy for current school operation of at least three mills, the revenues of any district are insufficient to enable the board of education thereof to conduct the schools in such district upon the minimum operating costs of a foundation program, as defined by or pursuant to law, such district shall be entitled to receive additional aid, to be apportioned from the state public school fund by the director of education, as hereinafter provided.\textsuperscript{16}

Alabama.—The State of Alabama has a plan of equalization which is termed the "Minimum Program Fund."

In order for the public schools of a county, including the independent cities, to share in the apportionment of the Minimum Program Fund, and to receive the maximum benefits therefrom, they shall meet the following conditions: The county shall for the year for which aid is requested, be levying and collecting the constitutional one mill state school tax, the constitutional three mill county school tax, and the constitutional three mill district school tax in the several districts covering the whole county, provided that in determining the funds to which a county that is not levying any one or more of these taxes or the equivalent is entitled, the proceeds from these taxes shall be considered as available for the educational program as though such taxes were actually being levied and collected. . . .\textsuperscript{17}

\textsuperscript{15}The School Laws of West Virginia, Section 3, Article 9-a, June, 1939, p. 66.


\textsuperscript{17}Alabama School Laws, 1935 Edition, Section 1, p. 58.
Rhode Island.—The smallest of the States, Rhode Island, provides for its equalization of educational opportunities as follows:

If in any town the amount of money that would be derived from a tax of ninety cents on each one hundred dollars of the equalized weighted assessed valuation of the taxable property, when added to the amounts which may be apportioned from the general treasury and balances carried forward from the preceding year in addition to all other revenues now provided by law for school purposes, shall not be sufficient to provide eighteen hundred dollars for the support of each of its elementary schools and one hundred dollars per capita for its resident pupils attending the town high school, or in the instance of a town not maintaining a high school, the number of pupils sent to high school on free tuition as required by section 2 of this chapter, then the director of education shall apportion to the town an additional amount, hereinafter called "equalization aid" sufficient to make an aggregate amount available for current maintenance of the public schools of the town equal to the amount necessary to provide eighteen hundred dollars for the support of each elementary school and one hundred dollars per capita for the support of each resident pupil attending the town high school or each pupil sent to high school on free tuition.18

Iowa.—Iowa provides for a "Minimum Standard" equalization program.19 For a district to qualify for special State aid, it must maintain one or more standard schools, and for a school to be rated as "Standard" it must meet several very rigid requirements. If those requirements are met to the satisfaction of the County Superintendent, then the State


grants equalization aid to the amount of six dollars for each pupil who has attended such school for a period of not less than six months of the previous year. This plan places a premium upon attendance and could be imitated in Texas with profit to the Texas schools.

Georgia.--An unusual plan of equalization is in effect in the State of Georgia. This plan calls for a division of the schools into five groups, depending upon the density of population in the county and the size of the school enrollment. The denser the population, the more pupils per teacher are provided, and likewise, the larger the enrollment in the schools, the fewer teachers, proportionately, the schools have. The range in the elementary grades is from one teacher for each forty pupils and major fraction thereof in Group I, to one teacher for each twenty pupils and major fraction thereof in Group V. The plan also provides for the operation of the schools of the State that are eligible for participation in the equalization fund for a minimum term of seven months upon a fixed salary schedule.\(^{20}\)

Oregon.--In the Far West, the State of Oregon is attempting to offer a program of equalization. That state maintains five types of school funds which are all termed "Equalization Funds." The five funds are the "County School Fund," the "State School Fund," known as the "Irreducible School

To be eligible for any of the vocational aid or high school tuition aid, the counties must group their schools into large attendance areas under the supervision of the County Boards.21

Idaho.—In Idaho, the minimum program provided by the State assures every eligible district an amount equal to $120 per month for the operation of each elementary teaching unit and $160 per month for each high school teaching unit. The sources of this support are (1) a three mill minimum district levy, (2) State support apportioned from the Public School Income Fund, and (3) a three mill county school levy. All costs over and above the minimum program are borne by the local units.22

Illinois.—Average daily attendance is made the basis for equalization aid in Illinois. An annual sum of $40 per year for elementary pupils and $80 per year for high school pupils is provided for all schools meeting the requirements for eligibility.23


Wisconsin.—Wisconsin's equalization law provides State aid to counties, towns, cities, and villages in the amount of $250 annually for each elementary teacher employed, provided each school meets certain conditions of attendance, local support, and teacher qualifications. In this respect, Wisconsin's law is quite similar to the Texas Equalization Law now in force.

New Mexico.—In New Mexico the equalization fund is called the "State Public School Equalization Fund." The aid is disbursed on the Classroom Unit plan. A Classroom Unit in New Mexico is based on a teacher-pupil ratio, and average daily attendance is made the basis of the teacher-pupil ratio. This plan has been in operation since 1927, and has continued to the present time with but slight modification.

Wyoming.—Wyoming's equalization program provides for a "minimum program" in which each eligible elementary school receives a sum sufficient to guarantee $1,000 per year from all sources for each teaching unit, and a sum of $1,161 annually for each eligible high school teaching unit. The participating high schools must levy a one mill tax.

but no such restriction is placed on districts maintaining elementary schools only.\textsuperscript{27}

\textbf{Washington}.—Another interesting plan of equalization is used by the State of Washington. The following excerpt from one of the State's leading educational bulletins gives the gist of the policy:

The Legislature of 1937 provided for a State School Equalization Fund which would give to each school district in the State the difference between what the local district revenue, based on the maximum tax levy without a vote of the people, would produce and enough to provide the district with fifteen cents for each day's attendance.\textsuperscript{28}

\textbf{Kansas}.—Since June 30, 1939, Kansas has been without a special State equalization fund. For several years prior to that date, the State paid $675 per annum to each elementary teaching unit, based on teacher-pupil ratio and average daily attendance, but the original act creating the fund provided that the act would become inoperative after June 30, 1939.\textsuperscript{29}

\textbf{Nebraska}.—The State of Nebraska has made some notable progress within recent years in providing State aid to weak districts. The following quotation sets forth the plan for aiding the needy local units.

\textsuperscript{27}\textit{School Laws of Wyoming, Bulletin No. 1, Series B, p. 76.}

\textsuperscript{28}\textit{School Revenues and Their Distribution in the State of Washington, Bulletin of State Department of Education, February, 1940, p. 31.}

\textsuperscript{29}\textit{Kansas School Laws, Revised Edition, 1937, p. 124.}
For the purpose of providing school each year in the first eight grades for the number of months required by this act for all the youth of this state whose parents or guardians live in public school districts whose funds are not sufficient to maintain school for the required length of time, there shall be paid to each district by the State treasurer such an amount as is necessary to enable such district to maintain nine months of school with a legally qualified teacher if there are ten or more children residing in the district who are seven years old and under sixteen years old, and to maintain six months of school if there are less than ten such children: Provided, that no state aid shall be given any public school district unless there has been levied a tax of forty mills and until the accounts of such district are audited and approved by the county superintendent of the proper county; and provided, further, no district containing less than twelve sections of land shall receive any aid under the provisions of this and the next two following sections. . .

**Louisiana.**—In Louisiana, where the parish is the typical unit of school administration, one-fourth of all the State funds for school purposes is appropriated as an equalization fund to the parish school boards. Each parish is required to levy a local maintenance tax of three mills. The general administration of this fund is placed solely under the jurisdiction of the State Board of Education.31

**Tennessee.**—Tennessee has two types of equalization aid for its schools. One fund is called the "Elementary School Fund," which enables all eligible elementary schools to maintain an eight months term, while the other fund is known as

---


the "Emergency Equalization Fund." This latter fund is pro-
vided to aid counties which have not heretofore been eligible
for elementary school aid, but which may become eligible
under another act; and to aid in the general supervision and
furtherance of consolidation and instructional projects in
the State. A minimum county school tax of five mills, or
fifty cents on the one hundred dollars of assessed valuation,
is required.\(^3\)

**Delaware.**—In providing for a program of equalization,
the State of Delaware derives its income from three sources:\(^3\)

1. Income tax (1\% to 3\%).
2. Corporation franchise tax.
3. Income from permanent school fund.

These sources produced for the year 1937-1938 a total
income of $4,263,701 to meet a budget for current expenses
of $3,825,000. The income tax produced thirty-four per cent,
the franchise tax sixty-four per cent, and the school fund
two per cent of the total raised.

The Legislature makes its appropriation from the school
revenues a lump sum with the following limitations (1938)
as to its expenditures:

General control, not more than five per cent

---


\(^3\) *State School Laws of Delaware, Edition of 1938,*
pp. 9-22.
Instructional service, not less than seventy per cent
Operation, not more than eleven per cent
Maintenance, not more than five per cent
Auxiliary and co-ordinate activities, not more than eleven
per cent
Fixed charges, not more than one and one-half per cent
Capital outlay, not more than two per cent
Debt service, 0 per cent (raised locally)

After taking out certain sums set forth in the appropriation act for State-wide activities such as for the State Department of Public Instruction (not more than two per cent), transportation, adult education, etc., the remainder is apportioned among the fifteen State units on the following basis:

§81 per pupil enrolled in the 10th, 11th, and 12th grades
§74.25 per pupil enrolled in the 7th, 8th, and 9th grades
§100 per pupil enrolled in special classes
§65.35 (1938-1939) per pupil enrolled in the first six grades

For the year 1937-1938 the Wilmington City Council added §213,925 and seven special and one State Board school district added §25,725 to their State allotments for current expense. The remainder of the schools is run on the State appropriation. About ninety-three per cent of the total current cost
of the schools of Delaware is made up of State and federal appropriations. 34

**North Carolina.**—North Carolina's equalization plan provides for an eight months school term from State funds. 35 A State School Commission, composed of the Lieutenant-Governor as ex-officio chairman, the State Superintendent of Public Instruction as vice-chairman, the State Treasurer, and one member appointed by the Governor from each congressional district has general control of the schools of the State and makes plans for the operation of the schools. The Commission classifies each county as an administrative unit.

Over each county there is a County Board of Education, and under the Board's jurisdiction is a County Superintendent of Public Instruction. In each school district there is a School Committee appointed by the County Board. This committee has authority to elect the principals and teachers, subject to the approval of the County Superintendent and the County Board of Education. Local districts are permitted to supplement the State's appropriation by levying a special tax for school purposes. The County Board and the County Superintendent prepare the annual budget for the schools of the county and disburse all funds to the county schools.

---

34Ibid., p. 23.

Transportation of school children in North Carolina is under the direct supervision of the State School Commission. All bus routes must be approved by the County Boards of Education. Children are eligible to ride the buses if they live as much as one and one-half miles from school.

Summary.--It may be observed from a study of the various equalization policies which have been briefly presented that the idea of equalization from the standpoint of assisting financially weak districts is comparatively new. The actual practice of equalization, to any marked degree, has been carried out in a definite form only during the past twenty-five years. Texas was probably the first state to adopt a definite policy of equalization. During the past twenty-five years, some progress has been made in each state to equalize educational opportunities through special equalization funds of some type. There has been no universally accepted policy from which the various states have received their incentives or fashioned their patterns; however, in so short a time, it is hardly to be expected that there would have emerged any very definite laws or concepts which could be accepted as nationally feasible. As concepts change, so the equalization laws change.

With few exceptions, each state has some financial plan for providing aid to weak districts and to districts offering special services. Most of the states provide special
funds for vocational work, transportation, and high school tuition. Several provide financial aid to crippled children and other defectives through the equalization funds. It is interesting to note, however, that no two states have the same identical plan of equalization. The lack of time and space forbids the discussion in this brief study of each and every equalization plan in use in the United States, but the plans presented in this chapter were given because they contain representative features and set out definite goals that may be found in similar legislation in other states. An effort has been made to mention those plans having unique, unusual, and worthwhile provisions. The policies of those states not mentioned in this study, which provide for equalization funds, generally conform to the plans in use in Maryland, Nebraska, West Virginia, Tennessee, Illinois, Washington, Ohio, or Texas.

Throughout the study of the various types of equalization legislation found in the several states, it has been evident that the criteria for eligibility for participation in the funds by the local school units have been quite general in demanding standards regarding average daily attendance, local tax support, teacher pupil ratios, and physical equipment. The idea of stimulation of special projects, as vocational agriculture, industrial arts, and rehabilitation of crippled and defective children, was found to be practically universal.
Many of the states now demand that local school units meet rather exacting standards, as regards teacher qualifications, budgetary control, and curriculum supervision, before they may participate in the equalization funds.

Scientific Studies in Equalization Finance

Thus far the discussion of the development of equalization legislation for education in the United States has been devoted to a review of some of the work done in that field by the state departments of education and by the state legislatures, since it is in those departments that the real activity has taken place; but along with this development, the scientific studies made by students of school finance should be noted, because these studies have had a profound influence on the trend of financial legislation affecting schools in the United States during the past fifty years. It is true that much of the theory advanced by scholars a generation ago has been superseded, just as many of the educational practices of the nineteenth century have been abandoned for the newer ideas of the present century; yet, there have been some theories advocated and research made, especially in the field of school finance, which have had some definite influence on the development of equalization legislation in America.

In 1905, E. P. Cubberley, \textsuperscript{36} one of the leading educators

\textsuperscript{36} E. P. Cubberley, \textit{School Funds and Their Apportionment}, p. 35.
in the United States, made what might be called an approach to the problem by suggesting that from five to ten per cent of the general funds for schools be set aside for cases of special need. His plan made no direct provision for aiding financially weak districts but a step was made in that direction.

Between 1921 and 1925, F. H. Swift, an authority on school finance at Columbia University, brought the idea of adequate financial support of all school districts to the attention of educators by pointing out the inequalities that existed in almost every state. He went further and suggested that the remedy must be furnished by the State. He called especial attention to the two factors in equalization that must be recognized: first, the need for greatly increased State funds; and, second, the need for a sound financial policy in the distribution of the funds.

Updegraff, in 1922, submitted a plan of equalization for the State of New York whereby the State would provide grants according to the taxable valuation and effort of the districts. Following this report, Mort, in 1924, Strayer

---


and Haig,\textsuperscript{40} in 1924, and Morrison,\textsuperscript{41} in 1927, concurred in the opinion that an equalization grant based on a graduated tax rate is in violation of the principle of equalization.

The work of these men and others has exerted a lasting influence on the state departments of education and the lawmaking bodies everywhere in the shaping of their equalization policies. With the attention of interested laymen, as well as the attention of the professional educators, attracted to the solution of the problem much has been done in an effort to equalize educational opportunities in the United States during the past decade.

Conclusions

The demands for State aid to equalize tax burdens and promote equalization of educational opportunities has steadily grown in intensity in the United States, since Cubberley, Swift, Mort, Updegraff, and others brought the importance of the problem to the attention of the public. A concerted effort has been made, since the passage of the Smith-Hughes Vocational Act by Congress in 1917, on the part of the several states to secure larger and larger grants of Federal aid to match State and local funds in the stimulation of special

\textsuperscript{40} G. D. Strayer, and R. M. Haig, \textit{The Financing of Education in the State of New York}, pp. 172-175.

educational projects. In a great measure, their efforts have been crowned with success, but in the attempt to secure Federal aid for financially weak districts on a per capita basis, the advocates of such a plan have not yet succeeded. A brief check will reveal that there has been practically no uniformity in State policies regarding the distribution of equalization aid except in the distribution of the funds provided by the Federal government.

There being such a large number of states and a great diversity in populations, vocations, interests, wealth, and types of social, political, economic, and educational organizations existing in the United States, it is doubtful whether any one plan or policy of equalization for the schools will be accepted for many years to come. Each state has its own plan and maintains that its plan is the best available. There is jealousy among educators which tends to cause disunion instead of tending to promote co-operative effort toward the coveted goal. The vested interests of the nation are "watch dogs of the treasury" and often times throw stumbling blocks in the way of equalization of financial burdens when educational leaders propose any new plan; therefore, the progress which has been made in this field has come in the face of staunch opposition. A foundation has been laid in all the states for some type of program for the equalization of educational opportunities, and upon that foundation it is safe to predict that further progress will be made in spite of the obstacles which will ever be present.
CHAPTER III

AN ANALYSIS OF EQUALIZATION

LEGISLATION IN TEXAS

In this chapter an effort is made to give an analysis of the growth and development of the legal provisions for equalizing educational opportunities in Texas by showing the changes in the laws from biennium to biennium, beginning with the first biennial act in 1915.\(^1\) Being the first law of its kind enacted for the State of Texas, this act served as a basis for all future equalization legislation in this State; therefore, its provisions will be discussed somewhat at length; but for the succeeding acts, only the significant changes made in the provisions from biennium to biennium will be discussed. The purpose of the discussion will be to show the evolutionary development of the principle of equalization of educational opportunities in Texas Schools.

Table 1, page 31, gives the principal provisions, in common, of each of the thirteen successive biennial equalization laws. First, a general analysis of each law, in its relation to the entire series, will be given; and second, the twelve specific common provisions will be analyzed to

### TABLE 1

**THE PRINCIPAL PROVISIONS OF TEXAS EQUALIZATION LAWS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Biennium</th>
<th>State of Appropriation</th>
<th>Maximum Grant Per School, Per Year</th>
<th>Budget Control</th>
<th>High School Tuition</th>
<th>Transportation</th>
<th>Special Grants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1923-25</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>By State Superintendent and State Board of Education</td>
<td>No provision</td>
<td>No provision</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1925-27</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>No provision</td>
<td>No provision</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1927-29</td>
<td>4,000,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>No provision</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>Library aid, not to exceed one-half cost of library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1929-31</td>
<td>6,500,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>No provision</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1931-33</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
<td>$1,000, exclusive of special grants</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>$10.00 per month, per pupil from one teacher schools</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>$2,000 consolidation bonus; $200 per school offering vocational work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1933-35</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>$5.00 per month, per pupil from districts laying a 75% tax</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>Same as for previous biennium plus $200 to certain schools under extraordinary circumstances to enable them to run six months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935-37</td>
<td>2,500,000</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>$7.50 per pupil, per month from districts laying 75% tax</td>
<td>$200 per auto truck, and one-half cost of operation, not to exceed $200 per auto truck</td>
<td>Same as for previous biennium, except $15,000 per year provided for each eligible county for County Equalization Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1937-39</td>
<td>6,500,000</td>
<td>No limit, except budget for balancing</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>Same as for previous biennium, except that high school must have at least 50 resident pupils</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>$500 consolidation bonus; 2500 vocational aid; 400 per year for previous grant and $15,000 per eligible county for County Equalization Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939-41</td>
<td>4,000,000</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>Same as for previous biennium, except only $50 per course provided for vocational and industrial work, instead of lump sum to schools</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>Same as for previous biennium, except $10 per teacher in schools of more than four teachers and not otherwise eligible for aid; $10,000 per year provided for county equalization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941-43</td>
<td>12,080,000</td>
<td>State Superintendent; State Board; State Advisory and Joint Legislative Advisory Committee</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>An amount not to exceed $400 per hop or one-half cost of transportation to districts of more than 50 square miles or to any consolidated district</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>$100 per course for vocational and industrial work; library aid of $10 per teacher in schools of more than four teachers and not otherwise eligible for aid; $10,000 per year provided for county equalization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1943-45</td>
<td>11,318,044</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>$8.00 per month, per high school pupil and $1.00 per month, per elementary pupil; all districts containing over 100 square miles to receive $1.00 per month on all pupils</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>No change from previous biennium, except $150,000 per year allowed for the rehabilitation of crippled and defective children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945-47</td>
<td>10,081,004</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>$7.50 per month, per pupil for a maximum of five months be accredited schools reporting to be in hands of Division of Equalization not later than June 15</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scholastic Population of District and School Enrollment</th>
<th>Teacher-Pupil Ratio</th>
<th>Average Daily Attendance</th>
<th>Local Tax Rates</th>
<th>Salary Schedule</th>
<th>Teacher Qualifications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not more than 500 scholastics enrolled in school</td>
<td>No provision</td>
<td>Not less than 50% of previous year's enrollment and not less than 75% of current year's attendance</td>
<td>Not less than $50 per hundred dollars of assessed valuation</td>
<td>No provision</td>
<td>Satisfactory evidence of efficiency and ability to the State Superintendent and local boards of trustees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not more than 500 scholastics enrolled in school</td>
<td>No provision</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>No provision</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not more than 500 scholastics in district</td>
<td>Twenty three as many pupils employed as teachers applied</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>An annual increase, not to exceed one-half the annual increase paid by the local district</td>
<td>Same as for previous biennium, except at least two-month summer school attendance every three years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same as for previous biennium</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not fewer than 15 nor more than 400 scholastics in district</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>Not less than $50 for 1924 and $40 for 1925</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same as for previous biennium</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>Not less than $50 for all districts</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not more than 500 enrollment in schools located in districts of not more than 400 scholastics population</td>
<td>One teacher for 20 to 25 pupils; additional teachers based on 20 pupils or fractional part</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>Regulated entirely by the State Board and State Superintendent, but no definite schedule adopted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same as for previous biennium</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Districts of 1,000 or more scholastics, and counties of 1,500 scholastics were not eligible for aid; otherwise, the requirements remained the same</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>A graduated scale adopted, based on the number of teachers in a school and type of certificate held</td>
<td>Same as for previous biennium, except two year college training required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not more than 400 enrollment in schools located in districts of not more than 500 scholastics</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>70% of enrollment for year which aid was applied, from opening of school until date of inspection by the Rural School Supervisor</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>A graduated scale with a base pay of $75 per month in rural schools, and $90 per month in accredited schools, for all teachers, administrators, and supervisors</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same as for previous biennium</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>65% of enrollment; allowance made for smaller percentage in case of epidemics, property certified by the County Health Unit</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>Base pay set at $65 in rural schools and $90 in accredited schools per month; minimum of 10 months for rural schools and 8 months for accredited schools</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aid made available to districts of not more than 500 scholastics, irrespective of size of the schools therein</td>
<td>Same as for previous biennium, except that the fractional part of 20 pupils must be at least two, before additional teacher employed</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>$50 minimum, exclusive of head tax, and rates must apply to sending districts as well as to receiving districts</td>
<td>Three years of college training required of teachers in rural schools and a degree required of teachers in standardized and accredited schools; certificate requirements same as for previous biennium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aid made available to districts of not more than 500 nor more than 500 scholastics, irrespective of size of the schools therein, provided, that this provision does not apply to those districts containing 40 square miles or more, or to districts 9 miles long or more</td>
<td>Same as for previous biennium, except that after fifteen teacher is employed, at the discretion of the Joint Legislative Advisory Committee, 50 additional pupils may be required for each additional teacher employed</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>Same as for previous biennium</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aid made available to districts of not more than 500 nor more than 500 scholastics, irrespective of size of the schools therein, provided, that this provision does not apply to those districts containing 40 square miles or more, or to districts 9 miles long or more</td>
<td>Same as for previous biennium, except that after fifteen teacher is employed, at the discretion of the Joint Legislative Advisory Committee, 50 additional pupils may be required for each additional teacher employed</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>Same as for previous biennium</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
show the progressive development of each provision through-
out the entire legislative program.

A General Analysis of Texas Equalization Laws

In 1915, Governor James E. Ferguson addressed the first
session of the thirty-fourth Legislature of Texas as follows:

In deliberating upon the question of how
best to expend the public money, I desire to
submit for your special consideration the neces-
sity of setting aside a liberal amount for the
cause of popular education, and the maintenance
of the rural schools. You are quite well aware
no doubt that this policy is strongly recommended
by the Democratic party of Texas, especially set
forth in the El Paso platform.

While you are being called upon to appro-
priate something in the neighborhood of four
million dollars for the support of the Normal
Schools, the Agricultural and Mechanical Col-
lege and the State University, I am sure you
will be equally willing to be as liberal with
those cutlying school districts, where the peo-
ple in their collective capacity are not able
to maintain their community schools.

I believe the people of Texas would be
gratified to see your body appropriate a full
million dollars, to be expended in the next two
fiscal years in the support of your country
schools. In order that the money would be sure
to reach the rural communities, care should be
taken that State aid thus extended should not
be made to schools in towns of more than one
thousand inhabitants, and should be restricted
to schools having not over two hundred scholar-
tics. The State Board of Education should admin-
ister and equitably distribute this fund in a
way that almost every country school in Texas
would receive some of the appropriation. I think
the amount should be restricted so that no school
should receive over one thousand dollars.

I beg to advise that in accordance with
these general ideas your special committee, com-
posed of Hon. J. M. Wagstaff and Senator Cowell
and the State Superintendent, Hon. W. F. Doughty,
to which gentlemen I am much indebted, have zealously co-operated with my department in the preparation of a bill specifically containing the ideas here expressed. I do not hesitate to say that I think the bill is an excellent one, and I trust that same will receive your favorable consideration and official approval.²

Governor Ferguson's first message to the Legislature is significant in several respects. First, it called attention to the inequalities between State support of higher institutions of learning and the country schools; second, it called attention to the demand of the people for some extra financial support for the country schools; third, it offered suggestions for procedure in the solution of the problem; and finally, it offered suggestions of policies which were incorporated into a law for the immediate biennium and which profoundly influenced future equalization legislation in Texas.

The original bill, as recommended by Governor James E. Ferguson, provided for $500,000 for each year of the biennium, 1915-17. The Governor signed the bill June 3, 1915, and the first equalization law in Texas became effective 90 days after adjournment of the session.³

Section 1 of this original act, commonly known as the Rural Aid Law, provided $1,000,000 for the biennium, or so

²Ibid.
³Laws of Texas, 1915-17, H. B. No. 8, Chapter 10, Thirty-Fourth Legislature, First Called Session, pp. 22-36.
much thereof as was necessary for the purpose of promoting the educational facilities of the country public schools.

Section 2 provided for the manner of distributing aid in the amount not to exceed $500 per school. The amount of aid for each eligible school was to be determined by the State Superintendent, who was authorized to appoint four Rural School Supervisors, known as Rural Aid Inspectors. It was the duty of those supervisors to visit the schools applying for aid, make an inspection, and then make recommendations to the State Superintendent, as to the amount of funds each eligible school was entitled to receive under the provisions of the Rural Aid Law.

Section 3 set forth the standards and requirements necessary to entitle the schools to participate in the provisions of the act.

Section 3. Standards and Requirements. Any school meeting the following standards shall be entitled to receive State Aid:

1. Location. Each such school receiving State Aid shall be well located on a plot of ground not less than one acre in extent, properly drained and suitably laid out.

2. School House. There shall be provided a suitable school house erected in accordance with the provisions of the school house building law of Texas or meeting substantially the requirements thereof.

3. Equipment. Each such school shall be provided with necessary desks, seats and blackboards; and with such library, books, maps and globes as
recommended in the State course of study, as in the opinion of the State Superintendent said school may be able to purchase.

4. Teachers. Teachers employed in country schools shall furnish to the State Superintendent satisfactory evidence of professional training to their credit, and all teachers must render efficient service of a high grade.

5. Attendance. In order to receive State Aid, each community school must have a scholastic enrollment of not more than two hundred pupils, and the attendance records of all such schools for the previous year must not be less than fifty per cent of the entire time that the school was in session, and said school must maintain an attendance record during the year in which it receives aid of at least seventy-five per cent, unless it can be shown to the satisfaction of the State Board of Education that the non-attendance is due to one or more of the following causes: (1) attendance elsewhere; (2) Completion of the course; (3) extreme poverty of the family; (4) physical or mental incapacity; (5) lack of transportation facilities beyond a two and one-half mile limit; and provided that no school receiving aid under the provisions of this act shall be located in a town or city having more than one thousand population according to the last Federal census.

6. Local Tax. The school district must have levied and be collecting a local school tax of not less than fifty cents on the $100 valuation; provided, that for the school year 1915-16 any district which having voted the required tax, whether being collected for that year or not, shall be entitled to receive the benefits of the act; provided, that the State Board of Education may, in its discretion, for one time only, apportion any amount not to exceed $200, whether any tax has been levied or not, and State Aid may be continued upon condition that the district levy and collect the required tax.

7. Subjects. Each country school shall teach the common school subjects as prescribed by law.
In Section 4, the State Board of Education was given the authority to make such rules and regulations, consistent with the intent of the law, which, in its opinion, was necessary in carrying out the provisions of the act.

Section 5 provided the State Superintendent with authority to pass on the eligibility of schools in accordance with the requirements of the law. He was further authorized to appoint Rural School Supervisors to go in his place to inspect the schools applying for aid.

Section 6 provided that aid might be granted a second time to a school on condition that the school applying for aid co-operated in making required reports and by measuring up to certain requirements, as prescribed by law and by State Board regulations. Before second aid could be granted a school, the Rural School Supervisor or the State Superintendent must again visit the school and pass on its needs and eligibility.

Section 7 set forth provisions for the issuance of State Aid warrants. The State Treasurer, upon approval of the State Board of Education, made out the warrants, comprising the total amount of State Aid to which each county was entitled, and transmitted them to the respective county treasuries, for disbursement by the County Board to each eligible district. This provision has remained practically constant throughout the administration of the equalization program in Texas.
Section 8 provided that no school district would be deprived of its per capita State apportionment by virtue of the fact that it had participated in the equalization fund.

Section 9 made provision for the salary and expense accounts of the Rural School Supervisors. Four thousand dollars per year was provided for the salaries of the four supervisors, and an equal amount was provided for traveling expenses.

Under the administration of the first equalization law in Texas, $1,000,000 was disbursed to the eligible schools. A maximum of $500 per school was allowed. Schools with not more than 200 scholastics enrolled were made eligible, provided they levied a local school tax of at least fifty cents on the $100 of assessed valuation and; provided, they met certain standards regarding teacher qualifications, buildings, equipment, and attendance. The State Board of Education and the State Superintendent were authorized to administer the funds, and the State Superintendent was given the power to appoint supervisors to aid him in the inspection of the State Aid schools.

For the biennium 1917-19, the Legislature appropriated $2,000,000. One million dollars of this amount was provided for each year of the biennium. The scholastic requirement for eligibility set forth in the original act was amended in the second act to provide aid to districts of not more than
300 scholastics. The first act provided aid to schools having not more than 200 scholastics enrolled. The maximum grant per school was again set at $500 by the second biennial law. The other provisions remained the same as in the original act. As more schools were made eligible under the scholastic population provision of the second act, additional funds were required to meet the needs. It is quite possible, too, that many eligible schools did not make application during the first biennium; thus, when they made application for aid under the second biennial act, the number of qualifying schools was increased. 4

Most of the changes made in the biennial law for 1919-21 over the previous act were designed to increase the scope of the act and to simplify certain technical difficulties. For this biennium, a total of $2,000,000 per year was appropriated, as compared with $1,000,000 per year for the previous biennium. The maximum grant per school was raised to $1,000 for salary aid; one-half the cost of transportation, not to exceed $500 per district, was provided for consolidated districts transporting children living more than two and one-half miles from school, by main traveled roads; library aid was provided, not to exceed one-half the cost of the library; districts of not more than 500 scholastics were made eligible;

the teacher-pupil load was recognized as a factor in equalization for the first time in Texas, and the ratio was fixed at one teacher for at least twenty scholastics enrolled in the school. The local tax requirement remained the same as for previous bienniums, fifty cents on the one hundred dollars valuation. Funds were made available to districts in which the State owned as much as ten per cent of the land; prior to the passage of this act, such districts were ineligible for participation in the equalization funds. The State Superintendent was given authority to lend special attention to those districts not able to run their schools six months with all other funds, and to grant State Aid to them sufficient to meet the constitutional requirement. An increase in salaries to teachers in rural and small town schools was provided, not to exceed one-half the annual increase allowed by the district. At least two months attendance upon summer school was required of all teachers in State Aid schools, not less frequently than one summer out of every three. This act gave the first recognition to any form of salary schedule, and to the value of college training for teachers.\textsuperscript{5}

The provisions of the act for the biennium of 1921-23 remained the same as those included in the preceding law,

\textsuperscript{5}Laws of Texas, 1919-21, S. B. No. 113, Chapter 94, Thirty-sixth Legislature, Regular Session, pp. 132-135.
except that the appropriation was lowered to $2,500,000 for the biennium; districts containing State owned lands were again made ineligible; and salaries were based upon the type of certificates held by the teachers. 6

The biennial law of 1923-25 differed significantly from the former statute. The appropriation was raised to $3,000,000 for the biennium; consolidation aid, in the form of bonuses was provided; the first provision for high school tuition in Texas was incorporated in this fifth act; aid for vocational work was authorized; the local tax rate was set at a minimum of seventy-five cents on the $100 valuation; and the scholastic eligibility requirement was set at a minimum of fifteen and a maximum of 400 scholastics per district. It may be pointed out that the number of scholastics for eligibility to participate in the funds gradually rose from biennium to biennium, thus raising the number of eligible schools and necessitating more funds. 7

The passage of the biennial law for 1925-27 brought but few changes in the equalization provisions. The monthly allowance of high school tuition per pupil was cut in half and was restricted to those children living in districts


levying a seventy-five cents school tax. Under extraordinary circumstances, the State Superintendent was permitted to grant $300 per school needing such emergency help, while provision was made that no part of State Aid funds could be used to retire the outstanding indebtedness created by districts in previous years. The increasing tendency of the Legislature to require more local tax support, as a requirement for participation in the State Aid funds, is evident in this act. 8

The equalization law of 1927-29 provided $3,200,000 for the biennium, and this amount was supplemented by a later act providing $450,000. High school tuition was set at $7.50 per month; transportation by auto-truck was authorized; vocational aid to schools was raised; consolidation bonuses were reduced fifty per cent and county equalization funds, to the amount of $12,500 per eligible county, was provided. The number of scholastics per district was set at not more than 400, while the scholastic enrollment per school could not exceed 300. The first change in teacher-pupil ratio since the biennial act of 1919-21 was made in this law, whereby one teacher was allowed for any number of scholastics from twenty to thirty-five; provided that additional teachers might be employed for each thirty additional

scholastics or fraction thereof. The State Superintendent
and the State Board were given wider discretionary power in
fixing salary schedules than they had previously possessed;
but for this biennium, no change was made in the salary
schedule from the previous biennium.9

It is interesting to note that the Legislature appro-
priated the largest amount of money for equalization pur-
poses in 1929 that had ever been provided for a biennium.
The sum of $5,500,000 was appropriated for the two years.
This large sum was necessary to meet the budgetary needs of
the State Aid schools, due to the removal of all prior fixed
maximum grants per school and to the establishment of need
as the basis for balancing the budget. This provision has
been constantly retained in all equalization laws of Texas
since that time. Provision for transportation, high school
tuition, and special grants were retained with but slight
variations from the previous biennium, however, the amount
of county equalization funds, per eligible county, was
raised from $13,500 to $18,000 per year; and provision was
made for a graduated salary schedule, based on the number of
teachers in the school.10

9Laws of Texas, 1927-29, S. B. No. 7, Chapter 38,
Fortieth Legislature, Regular Session, pp. 105-110.

10Laws of Texas, 1929-31, S. B. No. 3, Chapter 14,
Forty-First Legislature, Regular Session, pp. 56-63.
The forty-second Legislature appropriated $8,620,041, including a supplemental sum of $1,620,041, for the biennium of 1931-33. The transportation of children from districts, where their grades were not taught, to neighboring schools, had become a major financial problem in school administration by this time. The educational leaders realized that the demands upon the State Aid fund for additional transportation aid had to be curbed, therefore, only $400 per bus was allowed to consolidated districts, or to any district containing fifty square miles or more. This act made the first designation of transportation by buses that had been recognized in Texas equalization legislation. Instead of providing vocational aid to schools in lump sums, as was previously done, this act provided for grants on a "per course" basis. The bars were thrown down and virtually every district in the State, as well as the sparsely populated counties, was made eligible for aid on the basis of scholastic population. A significant provision of the act setting up the supplemental appropriation for this biennium was the allocation of the funds. This feature of the law will be discussed more fully under the discussion of the specific provisions of equalization legislation.

The tenth biennial equalization law for Texas provided

---

for an appropriation of $6,000,000 for the biennium of 1933-35. This act provided high school tuition for pupils attending accredited schools only. The monthly tuition rate was determined on the basis of the instructional costs of the receiving high schools. Previously, tuition had been allowed for pupils attending any type of high school. The Legislature made a complete change in the manner of financing transportation. Instead of providing lump sums for the purchase and maintenance of buses, as prior acts had done, the biennial law of 1933-35 provided for payment on a "per pupil transported" basis. Aid was granted to schools having not more than 400 scholastics enrolled in districts having not more than 500 scholastics enumerated. The percentage of attendance was reduced from seventy-five per cent, as provided in all prior acts, to seventy per cent. For the first time since the inception of equalization legislation in Texas, the State adopted a progressive salary schedule for the biennium of 1933-35. Salary increments were based on teacher training, experience, and duties, and a base pay was established, upon which all increments were added.\textsuperscript{12}

\begin{quote}
From an appropriation of $1,000,000, for the biennium of 1915-17, to an appropriation of $11,080,000, for the biennium of 1935-37, was the record of Texas Legislatures
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{12} *Laws of Texas*, 1933-35, H. B. No. 256, Chapter 211, Forty-third Legislature, Regular Session, pp. 637-634.
in two decades. One million eighty thousand dollars of the latter amount was a supplemental appropriation made by the Forty-fifth Legislature in order to make up a deficiency in the salary, transportation, and high school tuition grants for the 1936-37 school term. The Legislature had been viewing with alarm the demands for supplemental appropriations for State Aid schools; consequently, the act setting up the supplemental appropriation also provided for a new form of budgetary control. As has been pointed out, the budgetary administration of all State Aid funds was placed in the hands of the State Board and State Superintendent by the Thirty-fourth Legislature, in 1915. No change was made in that plan of administration until the Forty-fifth Legislature included a provision in the supplementary act, which provided for the creation of a Joint Legislative Advisory Committee whose duty it was to pass on all grants made by the State Superintendent and the State Board of Education. The act also provided that the State Auditor would be authorized to audit all grants coming from the State Department of Education and reduce, reject, or approve them in accordance with the provisions of the act. A few minor changes were made in this act from the previous act. The salary schedule was


slightly changed, as well as the requirements regarding average daily attendance and the certification of teachers.

In prior equalization legislation no funds had been appropriated for the rehabilitation of crippled and defective children. Upon the insistence of the State Superintendent, the Forty-fifth Legislature allocated $150,000 of the biennial appropriation for State Aid to that purpose. A total State Aid appropriation of $12,518,044, including a supplementary deficiency appropriation of $1,518,044, was authorized for the biennium of 1937-39. The Forty-fifth Legislature required more local tax support from State Aid districts than had any prior Legislature. It required a minimum local tax rate of fifty cents, exclusive of bond rate, and provision was made for this rate to apply to sending, as well as receiving, districts. Provision was made for a standardization program for all schools of the State desiring to participate, and higher qualifications for teachers in State Aid schools were demanded than any previous statute had required.

The present equalization law, for the biennium of 1939-41, has several provisions that differ somewhat from those in previous acts. The largest appropriation ever provided for

---


equalization purposes was made by the Forty-sixth Legislature, when it allocated $13,651,654 to teacher salary aid, transportation aid, high school tuition, vocational arts and trades and industries, rehabilitation of crippled and defective children, and general administration of the fund. The fund was to be administered in the same manner as provided by the Forty-fifth Legislature, with the Joint Legislative Advisory Committee as the chief supervisory disbursement agent. The current act limited the amount of high school tuition a school may collect to $7.50 per pupil for a maximum of five months. Heretofore, high school tuition was paid for any number of months a pupil might have attended, after the State per capita apportionment was applied at the rate determined by the budgetary cost of instruction. This act lends some further elasticity to the scholastic eligibility requirement, but places rather drastic penalties on any school official found guilty of misappropriating or misapplying any part of the State Aid funds or violating any of the provisions of the act. The use of State Aid funds for lobbying in the interests of increased appropriations for schools is made a felony by the present act.¹⁷

The general provisions of the successive equalization

laws have been traced, with emphasis being placed upon the most important provisions and the changes noted from biennium to biennium. An attempt has been made to show the progressive development of the principle of equalization in Texas since its inception in 1915 to the present time.

There have been thirteen biennial equalization laws enacted by the Legislatures of Texas. The general purpose of all of them has been to provide better schools for the children in the rural areas and small towns. The appropriations have increased over 1,300 per cent since the enactment of the first law. At first, eligibility for participation in the funds was restricted to a relatively small number of schools; but as time passed, provisions were made easier, a larger number of schools became eligible, and the appropriations increased accordingly. Special services were added from time to time, and the standards of service were improved. More local initiative was demanded by the State, and higher qualifications for the teachers in State Aid schools were required. Finally, rather drastic supervision of the disbursement of the funds was provided for, and severe penalties were set up for the violation of the provisions of the equalization statutes.

A Specific Analysis of the Principal Provisions of Texas Equalization Laws

In analyzing the growth and development of the principle
of equalization of educational opportunities, as reflected in the equalization laws of Texas, it is evident from a study of Table 1 that each law contains many common provisions contained in all preceding acts. The evolutionary development of these specific provisions will be traced to show the progressive changes made in each from the first biennial law to the current act. This discussion will include an analysis of twelve standard provisions, common to all the equalization laws of Texas. These standard provisions will be analyzed in the order given in Table 1; viz., size of appropriations, maximum grant per school per year, budgetary control, high school tuition, transportation, special grants, school enrollment and scholastic population of district, teacher-pupil ratio, average daily attendance, local tax rates, salary schedules, and teacher qualifications.

The Legislature appropriated $1,000,000 for the first biennium, 1915-17.\textsuperscript{18} The last biennial appropriation, the one for 1933-41, was $13,651,654.\textsuperscript{19} The tendency has been to make gradual increases in the appropriations from biennium to biennium, however, there have been two reductions. For the biennium of 1919-21, $4,000,000 was appropriated,\textsuperscript{20} while

\textsuperscript{18}Thirty-fourth Legislature, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 22.
\textsuperscript{19}Forty-sixth Legislature, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 216.
\textsuperscript{20}Thirty-sixth Legislature, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 132.
only $2,500,000 was provided for the following biennium. 21
The other reduction came in 1933, when an appropriation of
$6,000,000 was made, 22 as compared with an appropriation of
$6,620,041 for the preceding biennium. 23 Of the latter amount,
$1,620,041 was a supplementary deficiency appropriation, thus
making the original appropriation for the biennium of 1931-
33, only $5,000,000, as compared with the regular approipa-
tion of $6,000,000 for the biennium of 1933-35. The greatest
increase in appropriations was made by the Forty-fourth
Legislature, when it appropriated $11,080,000 for equaliza-
tion, 24 as compared with only $6,000,000 appropriated by
the preceding Legislature, for the biennium of 1933-35. 25
This was an increase of $5,080,000. The greatest percentage
of increase in appropriations was made for the biennium of
1917-19, when $2,000,000 was provided, 26 as compared with
only $1,000,000 for the previous biennium. 27 As new pro-
visions have been added to the equalization laws, and as new
and more services have been rendered by the schools, the
appropriations have been proportionately greater, however.

21 Thirty-seventh Legislature, op. cit., p. 141.
22 Forty-third Legislature, op. cit., p. 627.
24 Forty-fourth Legislature, op. cit., p. 833. 25 Ibid.
26 Thirty-fifth Legislature, op. cit., p. 97.
27 Thirty-fourth Legislature, op. cit., p. 23.
the size of the appropriations have not kept pace with the number and liberality of the provisions and with the demands of the schools for more money. Another factor affecting the size of the appropriations is the numerical change in the scholastic population of the State. It is of interest to note that, in 1915, the total scholastic population of the State was 1,139,152, while for the scholastic year 1939-40, the number had increased to 1,549,443. This was an increase of 630,391 scholastics in twenty-four years, or approximately 55 per cent. During the same period of time, the appropriations for State Aid to equalize educational opportunities in the rural and small town schools has increased 1,365.1 per cent. In 1915, the total scholastic population in the common school districts of Texas was 577,406, and in 1939, the number had decreased to 511,020, a reduction of 166,386 scholastics. This latter figure represents a decrease of nearly twenty-five per cent in the group of children for which the equalization funds have been intended. With an increase in State Aid appropriations of more than thirteen hundred per cent and a decrease in the common school scholastics of approximately twenty-five per cent, it is evident that the rural and small town schools are receiving

28 Letter from John Olsen, Director of the Division of the Census, Texas State Department of Education, Austin, June 20, 1940.

29 Ibid.
vastly larger per capita grants of State Aid; or, on the other hand, much of the money being appropriated for those schools is being spent in districts containing urban centers.

The amount of the grant to the individual schools has undergone considerable change since the passage of the first equalization law in 1918. Originally, State Aid was granted to schools with the idea that it would stimulate self-improvement; but the inability of many districts to provide for an adequate school program, and the desire on the part of others to get as much money as possible from the State Aid funds have affected the policies of equalization so much, that at present, many districts receive more than one-half of their revenue from equalization funds. The first law provided for a maximum grant of $500 per school, provided the school met certain standards, which have been previously discussed.\(^{30}\) The biennial laws of 1919–21,\(^{31}\) and of 1921–23,\(^{32}\) allowed as much as $1,000 per school, while the laws for the bienniums that followed, 1923–25\(^{33}\) and 1925–27,\(^{34}\) limited the maximum grant to any one school to $1,000, exclusive of transportation aid (not to exceed $500 for any one district);

\(^{30}\) Thirty-fourth Legislature, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 24.
\(^{31}\) Thirty-sixth Legislature, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 134.
\(^{32}\) Thirty-seventh Legislature, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 144.
\(^{33}\) Thirty-eighth Legislature, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 304.
\(^{34}\) Thirty-ninth Legislature, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 416.
consolidation aid of $1,000 to any group of districts forming a consolidation; and vocational aid, not to exceed $250. No further change was made in these provisions until 1930, when the ceiling was removed and need was established as the basis for balancing the budget of a State Aid school. That provision won popular favor and has remained unchanged since its origin. Since the laws have become broader, and the State has enlarged the scope of its educational program, the policy of balancing the budget on the basis of need has replaced the earlier policy of stimulation; therefore the individual grants to schools have increased by leaps and bounds, thus necessitating ever increasing appropriations for equalization.

Prior to 1937, the sole responsibility of administering the moneys appropriated for equalization purposes in Texas was placed in the hands of the State Superintendent and the State Board of Education. They were authorized to make any rules and regulations, consistent with the provisions of the law, that were necessary to facilitate the program and to adjust the many inadequacies that naturally arose. The first equalization law gave the State Superintendent authority to appoint the personnel of the Rural Aid Division in the State Department of Education, including the Rural School Supervisors, whose duty it was to inspect the State Aid schools

35 Forty-first Legislature, op. cit., p. 60.
and determine their needs. The original number of supervisors was four, compared with twenty-four at the present time. Those officials are now called Deputy State Superintendents. In 1937, the Forty-fifth Legislature was called upon to make a deficiency State Aid appropriation of $1,080,000 for the 1936-37 school term. 36 It responded by making the requested appropriation, but at the same time, it made provision for the appointment of a Joint Legislative Advisory Committee, composed of five members from each House of the Legislature, to aid the State Superintendent and State Board of Education in the administration and supervision of the Equalization Fund. The State Auditor was also authorized by the Legislature to check all grants of State Aid approved by the State Department of Education and the State Board of Education, and to change, reject, or approve such grants, in accordance with the provisions of the law. The Joint Legislative Advisory Committee was vested with final jurisdiction in the disbursement of the State Aid funds. As may readily be concluded, the authority for administering the educational policies of the schools participating in the Equalization Fund has, in great measure, been taken away from the rightful educational agencies and placed in the hands of a political group who have a restricted understanding of school needs and educational progress.

No provision was made until the biennium of 1923-25 for the payment of high school tuition for students whose grades were not taught in their district of residence. This first provision for high school tuition made available $10 per month for students living in school districts having only one-teacher schools, and the tuition was available only upon condition that the students actually attended a high school in a neighboring district, and provided, that no high school work was taught in the one-teacher schools. During the following biennium, only $5.00 per month was allowed for pupils under similar conditions, provided the sending districts were required to levy a seventy-five cents local tax. In 1927, the Legislature allocated the sum of $100,000 for high school tuition, which was to be paid at the rate of $7.50 per month for students attending any high school in the county of residence, provided their grades were not taught in the district of residence. This provision was changed in 1933 to apply only to those students attending accredited high schools, and the sum of $400,000 was allocated for the purpose. The appropriations for high school tuition have greatly

37 Thirty-eighth Legislature, op. cit., p. 306.
38 Thirty-ninth Legislature, op. cit., p. 418.
increased each biennium. The largest amount appropriated for this purpose was provided for the biennium of 1939-41, with an allocation of $1,564,954.\textsuperscript{41} In 1933, provision was made for tuition to be based on the cost of instruction, and to be paid for any number of months a pupil might attend, in excess of the number of months the per capita apportionment would provide at the rate of $7.50 per month. The law for the current biennium, 1939-41, provides tuition for a maximum of five months only, and that amount upon condition of an actual transfer.

The transportation of school children in Texas has grown to be a major educational problem. Transportation, as a part of the Rural Aid program, had its beginning with the passage of the equalization law for the biennium of 1919-21.\textsuperscript{42} That act provided for transportation aid to consolidated districts, not to exceed one-half the cost of transportation, or an amount not to exceed $500 per year, provided, that money available from the appropriation after all other claims had been paid. During the school term of 1921-22, there were only 7,140 school children transported in Texas at public expense,\textsuperscript{43} in 247 vehicles, at a total cost of

\textsuperscript{41}\textit{Forty-sixth Legislature, op. cit., pp. 220-221.}

\textsuperscript{42}\textit{Thirty-sixth Legislature, op. cit., p. 134.}

\textsuperscript{43}\textit{Twenty-second Biennial Report, State Department of Education, Austin, Texas, 1930-32, p. 37.}
$140,667, while for the term of 1930-31, there were 58,100 pupils transported, in 1,429 buses and approximately 400 private automobiles and trucks, at a total cost of approximately $1,000,000.\textsuperscript{44} For the term of 1937-38,\textsuperscript{45} the number of pupils transported had increased to 272,992, and they were transported in 6,022 vehicles at a total cost of $3,243,770. The biennial law of 1927-29 provided for $300 per auto truck, which amount was to apply on the cost of the vehicle; and one-half the cost of operation, not to exceed $300 per auto truck, transporting rural high school children.\textsuperscript{46} This provision was retained until the act for the biennium of 1931-33 provided for a maximum of $400 per bus,\textsuperscript{47} operated by consolidated districts, or by districts having more than fifty square miles, provided, such districts levied a seventy-five cents tax. In 1933, the State transportation system underwent a great change. The direct administration of the system was placed in the hands of the County Boards of Education and the County Superintendents. Those officials were given authority to set up systems of transportation for their respective

\textsuperscript{44}Twenty-seventh Biennial Report, State Department of Education, Austin, Texas, 1930-32, p. 37.

\textsuperscript{45}L. H. Hubbard, "Report of the Committee on 'Educational Progress within the State,'" Texas Outlook (January, 1940), p. 18.

\textsuperscript{46}Fortieth Legislature, op. cit., pp. 107-108.

\textsuperscript{47}Forty-second Legislature, op. cit., pp. 460-461.
counties, regulate the buses, make application for aid, dis-burse the funds, and enforce the transportation regulations provided in the law.\textsuperscript{48} This act also provided for remuneration to the owners of the buses at a rate of $3.00 per month for transporting high school pupils and $1.00 per month for elementary pupils. The bus drivers were required to submit monthly reports to the County Board; and the County Board and County Superintendent were required to make annual reports to the State Board of Education, and upon these reports, the State Board authorized remuneration to the owners of the county buses. As the local maintenance tax was figured in the State Aid budgets for salaries and maintenance, the State assumed the responsibility for the cost of transportation in salary aid districts.

The first special aid from State equalization funds was provided in the biennial law of 1919-21,\textsuperscript{49} when library aid was provided for State Aid schools, not to exceed one-half the value of the library, provided the school supplied suitable book shelves or book cases, and selected the library books from an approved list compiled by the State Department of Education. The biennial law of 1923-25 provided for a maximum of $250 per school that offered vocational subjects, according to the State's approved plan. This fund was to be

\textsuperscript{48}Forty-third Legislature, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 631-632.

\textsuperscript{49}Thirty-sixth Legislature, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 133.
used principally for the purchase of equipment for the teaching laboratories. In order to further stimulate consolidation, the State provided for a consolidation bonus of $1,000 to any two or more districts forming a consolidation. This bonus was also provided in the biennial law of 1923–25, but the biennial law of 1927–29 reduced the amount from $1,000 to $500 for each consolidation.50 The practice of offering a bonus for consolidation was retained until 1933. The biennial law for 1933–35 provided for a new system of transportation which was designed to take the place of the consolidation bonus.51

In 1931, the equalization law provided for only fifty dollars per course to schools offering vocational and industrial arts, therefore, the practice of granting lump sums to the schools for this type of work was discontinued.52 A new feature was introduced in the equalization law for the biennium of 1933–35. The Legislature recognized the need of a new fund and allocated $154,000 annually to the rehabilitation of crippled and defective children.53 Subsequent laws made provision for this aid. The biennial law

50Fortieth Legislature, op. cit., p. 107.
51Forty-third Legislature, op. cit., p. 630.
52Forty-second Legislature, op. cit., p. 459.
for 1939-41 provided $150,000 annually for rehabilitation work. 54

Eligibility for aid based on the scholastic population of local school administrative units has been an important factor in equalization policies for many years throughout the United States. This feature of equalization legislation in Texas has been included in every equalization law the Legislature has enacted, but it has undergone many changes since the passage of the first biennial law. 55 There is a distinction between "scholastic population" and "scholastic enrollment." The former is the actual number of children enumerated in the district, as approved by the Census Division in the State Department of Education, while the latter is the actual number of scholastics enrolled in a particular school. The first biennial law required a State Aid district to have not more than 200 scholastics enrolled in its schools, 56 while the following law raised the number and allowed districts to participate that had not more than 300 scholastics enrolled in school. 57 In 1923, districts were required to have not fewer than 15 scholastics nor more than 400 scholastics residing in the district to be eligible for aid. 58 This

56 Ibid., pp. 22-23.
57 Thirty-fifth Legislature, op. cit.
58 Thirty-eighth Legislature, op. cit., pp. 303-305.
provision was retained until 1927, when State Aid schools were required to have not more than 300 enrollment in districts containing not more than 400 scholastics.\textsuperscript{59} The provision was again changed in the biennial law of 1931-33 to provide aid to districts of 5,000 or more scholastics, and to sparsely settled counties of 1,400 scholastics or less.\textsuperscript{60} In 1933, schools of not more than 400 enrollment in districts of not more than 500 scholastics were made eligible for aid.\textsuperscript{61} A further change was effected in the biennial law of 1937-39, and aid was made available to districts of not more than 500 scholastics, irrespective of the size of the schools therein, provided, further, that the district had not less than twenty scholastics.\textsuperscript{62} The current equalization law contains the same provision, but it exempts all districts containing forty-eight square miles or more from this scholastic requirement.

Eligibility for aid on the basis of teacher-pupil ratio has varied but little in the provisions of the equalization laws, since the initial act setting up this requirement. The first provision for aid on this basis was incorporated in the

\textsuperscript{59}Fortieth Legislature, op. cit., pp. 106-106.
\textsuperscript{60}Forty-second Legislature, op. cit., pp. 457-458.
\textsuperscript{61}Forty-third Legislature, op. cit., pp. 627-630.
third biennial law. Twenty times as many scholastics enrolled per school as there were teachers employed was required as the teacher-pupil ratio.\textsuperscript{63} This provision was retained until 1927, when the law was changed to require from twenty to thirty-five net scholastics, exclusive of transfers, to be credited to the district, before the first teacher might be employed; provided, that additional teachers might be employed for each additional thirty scholastics or fraction thereof.\textsuperscript{64} This provision was amended in the following biennial law to require that the "net scholastics" would be construed to mean the number of white or colored children for which aid was applied.\textsuperscript{65} Colored scholastics could not be counted in determining the teacher-pupil ratio for a school attended by white children. The converse was also true. This provision was retained in all subsequent laws, however, the biennial law of 1937–39 made provision that "the fractional part of thirty for determining the number of teachers employed must be at least two scholastics."\textsuperscript{66} The current law contains the same feature, except that, upon the discretion of the Joint Legislative Advisory Committee, after a State Aid school employs the fifteenth teacher, forty

\textsuperscript{63} Thirty-sixth Legislature, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 134.

\textsuperscript{64} Fortieth Legislature, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 107.

\textsuperscript{65} Forty-first Legislature, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 58.

additional scholastics may be required for each additional teacher. 67

The foundation for eligibility of local school units to participate in equalization funds is, almost universally, some requirement regarding average daily attendance. The framers of the first equalization bill for Texas realized the value of such a provision and included one in the first Rural Aid law. This provision specified that:

In order to receive State Aid, each community school must have a scholastic enrollment of not more than two hundred pupils, and the attendance record of all such schools for the previous year must not be less than fifty per cent of the entire time that the school was in session, and said school must maintain an attendance record during the year in which it receives aid of at least seventy-five per cent. 68

After the expiration of the first biennial law, the succeeding acts omitted the "fifty per cent" clause in the attendance provisions, but retained the provision that an average daily attendance of seventy-five per cent of the enrollment during the year for which aid was applied was necessary for district eligibility to participate in the funds. It was not until the enactment of the tenth biennial equalization law, in 1933, that the provision was changed. It was then provided that only seventy per cent of the average

68 Thirty-fourth Legislature, op. cit., p. 23.
daily attendance was necessary for eligibility.\textsuperscript{69} The percentage requirement was again lowered in 1935, when the eleventh biennial law set the average daily attendance requirement at sixty-five per cent, with a further provision, that a smaller percentage would be acceptable in case of poor attendance occasioned by an epidemic; provided, such cause for a reduction was properly certified by the County Health Officer.\textsuperscript{70} No further changes have been made, regarding average daily attendance, in the equalization laws since 1933.

Every state in the United States that makes provision for an equalization fund requires some type of local tax support, as a determining factor in establishing eligibility of local school units to participate in the State Aid. The equalization laws of Texas, regarding local tax rates, have made a number of different provisions since the enactment of the first biennial law. A local district tax rate of not less than fifty cents on the one hundred dollars of assessed valuation was required in the first biennial law of 1915-17.\textsuperscript{71}

This rate included the tax for bond and for maintenance, if a district had both types of tax. For the biennium of 1925-27,\textsuperscript{72} a seventy-five cent rate was required, and this rate

\textsuperscript{69} Forty-third Legislature, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 629.
\textsuperscript{70} Forty-fourth Legislature, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 336.
\textsuperscript{71} Thirty-fourth Legislature, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 24.
\textsuperscript{72} Thirty-ninth Legislature, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 415.
was constant in subsequent laws until 1937, when a rate of fifty cents on the hundred dollars of valuation, exclusive of bond, was fixed as the minimum local maintenance rate for eligibility for State Aid. The fifty cents maintenance rate was to apply to the districts sending high school students to high schools in other districts, as well as to those districts receiving salary, transportation, or special aid. The current biennial law of 1939-41, carries the same local tax provision, except that, under the present statute, Local maintenance tax, in excess of fifty cents on the one hundred dollars of valuation, exclusive of bond tax, may be used at the discretion of the local boards of trustees, and not be included in the budget, when applications for State Aid are made.73

The first recognition of some type of salary schedule was evident in the biennial law of 1919-21.74 This act provided for an annual increase in salaries to teachers in State Aid schools, not to exceed one-half the increase paid by the local districts. The following act, passed in 1921, provided for a salary schedule to vary from a minimum of $100 per month to a maximum of $175 per month, depending upon the type of certificates held by the teachers.75 No further significant change was made in the salary schedule, until

73 Forty-sixth Legislature, op. cit., p. 219.
74 Thirty-sixth Legislature, op. cit., p. 134.
75 Thirty-seventh Legislature, op. cit., p. 145.
the biennial law of 1929-31 provided the legal basis for a graduated salary schedule, based upon the number of teachers in a school. A copy of the foregoing schedule is included in the Appendix, page 89. In 1931, a further provision was made, whereby, certain schools would be enabled to pay their teachers on a nine months basis.

In all districts that comply with the foregoing provisions of this act, and in addition thereto, levy and collect a tax of $1.00 on the hundred dollars valuation of property, and after provision is made for a term of six and one-half months on the ratio of the number of teachers provided for herein and on the basis of the salary schedule fixed by the State Board of Education, the proceeds of the local maintenance tax may be supplemented with a sufficient amount from the appropriation provided herein to guarantee a local maintenance fund equal to one hundred twenty-five dollars per teacher or as much thereof as may be necessary to maintain a term of not to exceed nine months. This was the first provision of its kind included in the equalization laws, and the subsequent laws made provision for balancing the budget, therefore, this provision was then omitted. It was in the tenth biennial law, the one passed in 1933, that the State Superintendent and State Board of Education were given exclusive discretionary authority to formulate salary schedules for State Aid schools. A graduated scale was adopted in which a base pay, with increments for training, experience, and duties, was provided. The

76 Forty-first Legislature, op. cit., p. 62.
77 Forty-second Legislature, op. cit., p. 481.
78 Forty-third Legislature, op. cit., p. 632.
base pay in rural and non-accredited schools was set at $75.00 per month, while $85.00 per month was fixed as the base pay in accredited schools.\textsuperscript{79} For the following biennium,\textsuperscript{80} the State Board of Education adopted a graduated salary schedule that is still followed in State Aid schools. A copy of this schedule, Table 2, is included in the Appendix.

The improvement of teaching service in the State Aid schools of Texas has not kept pace with the liberality of the Legislature in making appropriations for equalization of educational opportunity in the rural and small town schools. In fact, the standards of teaching for the State as a whole have not been raised very materially since 1921. At that time, thirty-four per cent of all the white teachers in Texas were graduates of State Normals, colleges, or universities,\textsuperscript{81} while in 1938, only fifty-four per cent of the white teachers were graduates of those institutions.\textsuperscript{82} The only qualifications set out for teachers in State Aid schools, by the first biennial law of 1915-17, was the requirement that the teachers in schools receiving aid would have to present satisfactory evidence of efficiency and ability to

\textsuperscript{79} A copy of this salary schedule was not obtainable for inclusion in the appendix.

\textsuperscript{80} Forty-fourth Legislature, op. cit., pp. 839-840.

\textsuperscript{81} Twenty-second Biennial Report, State Superintendent of Public Instruction of Texas, 1936-38, p. 208.

\textsuperscript{82} Thirtieth Biennial Report, State Superintendent of Public Instruction of Texas, 1936-38, p. 208.
the local boards of trustees and to the State Superintendent, however, the third biennial law required teachers in State Aid schools to attend summer school not less frequently than two months in every three years. This provision was retained in subsequent laws until the act for the biennium of 1939-41 required that teachers have at least two years of training in a standard college or university. No further change was made in this requirement until 1935, when the biennial law for 1935-37 required teachers in State Aid schools to hold six-year elementary or four-year high school certificates, or their equivalent, and to complete six semester hours of college work every two years, or, until a minimum of two years college work was completed. This regulation, regarding summer school attendance and completion of two years of college work, applied only to those teachers who were then employed in, or who had previously taught in, State Aid schools. All other teachers entering State Aid schools for the first time were required to have two years of college work already completed by the time they entered upon their teaching duties. The requirement regarding

83 Thirty-fourth Legislature, op. cit., p. 25.
84 Thirty-sixth Legislature, op. cit., p. 134.
85 Forty-second Legislature, op. cit., p. 463.
86 Forty-fourth Legislature, op. cit., p. 837.
college training was set at three years of completed work for teachers in non-accredited State Aid schools by the biennial law of 1937-39, while teachers in accredited State Aid schools were required to hold degrees.\textsuperscript{87} The current biennial law has retained the same provision.\textsuperscript{88}

This chapter is summarized in Chapter IV, which also gives certain conclusions and recommendations regarding the equalization laws of Texas.

\textsuperscript{87}Forty-fifth Legislature, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 1269
\textsuperscript{88}Forty-sixth Legislature, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 223-224.
CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In January, 1915, there were many small country schools in Texas which had scarcely any opportunity for maintaining more than four or five months of school a year. A similar condition existed in some of the village and small town schools. This was partly due to a lack of educational interest in the local districts and partly due to the inability of the districts to support an adequate school system. As a consequence, the primary object of the first equalization law for Texas was to stimulate self-improvement on the part of the local school units. The awards, or grants of State Aid, were made to schools on the basis of what they did to help themselves. The financial ability of the local school districts to support a progressive school program was considered, but only in a secondary manner. As later laws were enacted, the real needs of the schools became apparent. It was discovered that there were entirely too many schools and that many of them were unable to provide even a passable program. State Superintendents Blanton,\(^1\) in 1921, Harris,\(^2\)


in 1924, and Woods,\(^3\) in 1938, called to the attention of the people of the State that Texas stood near the bottom, in education, among the states of the United States.

The Rural Aid laws that were enacted in Texas, beginning with the biennial law for 1923-25, had some definite purposes in the equalization policy besides stimulation. Special grants to schools for vocational and industrial work and for the purchase of library books not only encouraged self-improvement but also placed a premium upon added services. The bonus granted for consolidation served to bring districts together into larger administrative units; but another incentive, which proved even more potent, was the stimulation furnished by the transportation system. This was begun to accommodate the children who lived far from school, in the consolidated districts; but as time passed, the program was expanded to include the children living as much as two and one-half miles from school in all districts eligible for State Aid.

Naturally, as more and more schools came together, additional standards were necessary. A teacher-pupil ratio for determining the number of teachers to be employed, a salary schedule, certification requirements, increased transportation aid, and the policy of balancing the budget on the basis

---

\(^3\)Thirtieth Biennial Report, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, 1936-38, Austin, p. 17.
of need all became a part of the equalization problem. The result has been greater concentration of administrative power, an expanded bus system of transportation, more trained teachers, and partially stabilized salaries for teachers. In general, an improved school system for Texas has resulted from the equalization program. Every provision of the equalization laws, to a certain extent, has affected the school system of the State as a whole.

There has been much discussion, pro and con, in recent years about the size of the appropriations for equalization purposes. As has been pointed out, the appropriations have increased from one million dollars to more than thirteen million dollars per biennium, since the enactment of the first Rural Aid Law in 1915. The growing demands for more equalization funds have caused the claims to exceed the appropriations during nearly every biennium. This condition usually necessitates an emergency appropriation to supplement the regular appropriation. In view of the fact that the State is expanding its school program to the extent that large sums of money are needed annually to provide a minimum of educational opportunities, it would seem logical to propose that the State provide for a larger and more stable equalization fund than is now provided.

The important factor is not the amount of money spent in this manner, but how much real equalizing value the money
is providing; how many children are affected; and what the permanent results will be. Some of the effects of the expenditures of equalization aid have been suggested, but it is difficult to determine the maximum effect of the program. The fact that the money has been spent for the purpose for which it was appropriated is generally accepted, and no definite charges of misapplication of the appropriations have ever been verified.

The only way to evaluate the expenditure of tax money is by the services purchased with it. The question has often been asked, "Where do we go from here?" This question is pertinent at this time, in the light of the developments of the past twenty-five years. During this period of time, the entire school program in Texas has undergone a considerable change. The scholastic population has increased, standards have been established and raised from time to time, new services have been added, and increased appropriations have been provided. As to what may come, it is conceivable that the past may be a good index to the future, regarding the educational policies of the State. That educational opportunities are not equal in Texas is obvious. There are still rank inequalities all about us, and one of the greatest causes of these inequalities may be found in the annual deficits in the equalization funds. The schools affected must close their doors before the term is completed or ask their teachers
to work without pay for the remainder of the school year. This procedure causes many of the best teachers to affiliate with schools that do not rely on State Aid.

There will probably be no permanent equalization legislation that will stabilize the fund and bring about a real, dependable educational program for Texas until education is accepted primarily as the State's responsibility, and until the State accepts its obligations to the schools as conscientiously as it accepts its other financial obligations.

The maximum grant of equalization aid per school was originally set at $500 per annum. This sum was later increased to $1,000, exclusive of special grants; however, the Legislature, in 1932, established need as the basis for balancing the budget of a State Aid school. This policy seems to be a wise one and should be continued.

The general administration and supervision of the equalization funds has been placed jointly in the hands of the State Board of Education, the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, the State Auditor, and the Joint Legislative Advisory Committee. Prior to 1937, the State Board of Education and the State Superintendent had sole authority in this respect. When the Legislature created the Joint Legislative Advisory Committee to aid in the budget control, it is possible that the members of the Legislature were more suspicious than inquisitive; however, they probably had some cause for believing that the school authorities
needed some supervision in the administration of the appropriations. It is to be remembered that the Forty-fifth Legislature was asked to appropriate $1,080,000 to supplement the regular appropriation made by the Forty-fourth Legislature in order that all State Aid claims might be paid for the school year ending September 1, 1937. Naturally, the legislators thought that some restrictions had to be placed upon the expenditure of the funds to prevent excess spending and unbalanced budgets from occurring annually; but when they assumed administrative functions, they probably exceeded their constitutional rights. The legislators are elected to enact laws, not to administer them. It is doubtful whether the members of the Legislature are qualified by training and experience to give expert advice in educational administration. It would be a wiser policy for the State to set up a sound educational program, safe-guarded by suitable legislation, and then entrust the administration of the school laws to the educational leaders.

Texas has been liberal in its appropriations for high school tuition. This type of aid is provided for children whose grades are not taught in the districts of their residence and who attend high school elsewhere. The first provision for the payment of high school tuition was included in the biennial equalization law for 1923-25. Ten dollars per month per eligible pupil was granted. Subsequent acts
provided $5.00 per month or $7.50 per month for each eligible pupil. The intention of the law is good, but in practice it is unsound. High school tuition should be paid on the basis of the need of the receiving high school. No distinction should be made between eligibility for high school tuition and salary aid. If a receiving high school can take the students from another district without additional cost, there is no need for high school tuition aid; but under present legislation, the tuition is paid regardless of the need. In some instance, more than $7.50 per month would be needed to defray the cost of providing high school facilities for non-resident students, while in others, the amount would be less than that sum.

The method of financing the transportation system for the Texas schools is unsound. The policy of paying $2.00 per month for high school pupils and $1.00 per month for elementary pupils transported should be changed. No distinction is made between long and short hauls, large and small numbers transported, good and bad roads, and low and high operating costs. All of these factors should be taken into consideration in financing a system of transportation. Some bus owners make a profit at the prevailing rates, while others lose money. Reasonable rules and regulations should be formulated to require each county to establish an adequate and economical transportation system, and then the State
should pay the cost of the service upon the basis of actual operating costs. Under present legislation, children living closer than two and one-half miles from school are not eligible to receive transportation aid. That provision should be amended to include children living one and one-half miles, or more, from school.

The equalization laws of Texas have provided liberal sums for the stimulation of special activities. Vocational agriculture, industrial arts, home economics, consolidation, library facilities, and the rehabilitation of crippled and defective children have all been subsidized from the State's equalization funds. Counties that maintain a county equalization fund of not less than $40,000 per year are subsidized by a special grant from the equalization fund. The State has made the special grants to the schools in lump sums, with few exceptions. This aid should also be based upon the needs of the school, and the grants should vary accordingly; furthermore, every school receiving such aid should be eligible to participate in the funds the same as those schools applying for salary aid for teachers.

The number of scholastics enumerated in the district and the number enrolled in the school have been one of the requirements for determining eligibility for aid throughout the equalization program. The first law was devised to give aid to small, financially weak schools only; but as time
passed, the benefits were extended to larger schools. The biennial law of 1939-41 provides aid to districts having not fewer than twenty nor more than five hundred scholastics, exclusive of transfers out of the district. No sound reason can be given for placing any scholastic restrictions on a district. The number of scholastics who live in a district is not a sound basis for determining the need of a district. If a school needs aid, it should be granted the funds regardless of the number of scholastics enrolled in school or enumerated in the district. In some instances a district with fewer than twenty scholastics would deserve aid, and in others, a district with more than five hundred scholastics would be justified in receiving equalization funds, or to transport the children to another school. Whenever consolidation of small schools can be effected at a reasonable cost and with satisfactory results, the step should be taken; but justice and reason should always guide those who form the policies of any equalization program.

The teacher-pupil ratio is a significant device for determining eligibility of schools for State Aid. Since the passage of the third biennial equalization law in 1919, this provision has been a feature of all State Aid legislation. A minimum of twenty pupils and a maximum of thirty-five pupils per teacher have been the prevailing ratios. It is apparent that the same principle should apply here as should
be applied to the scholastic enumeration and scholastic enrollment requirement for eligibility. Circumstances should alter cases. In extreme cases fewer than twenty pupils per teacher would be justifiable; however, a maximum number of pupils per teacher employed seems to be a reasonable requirement. Additional teachers are now employed for each additional thirty scholastics or fractional part thereof, provided, that the fractional part is not fewer than two scholastics. This requirement should be changed so that the fractional part of thirty scholastics would be not fewer than sixteen. Even then, there would possibly be some cases in which an adjustment of this number would be justified.

The average daily attendance requirement for participation in the State Aid funds has been constant throughout the equalization program in Texas. The percentage has ranged from sixty-five to seventy-five per cent of the enrollment in the school, or of the net scholastic population of the district. Since 1935, sixty-five per cent average daily attendance has been required. This percentage should be raised. Sixty-five per cent is entirely too low. With adequate transportation facilities, it would be reasonable to expect an average daily attendance of not less than eighty-five per cent, except in case of an epidemic affecting the attendance. Provision is made in the present Equalization Law for adjustments due to epidemics, provided, the County Health Officer attests to the fact.
A minimum local tax rate of fifty cents on the hundred dollars of assessed valuation and a maximum of seventy-five cents have been the range as required by the equalization laws for participation in the State Aid funds. The revenue derived from a minimum rate of fifty cents, exclusive of the bond rate, would be more than the local unit's share in financing an equalization program if the State should provide its just share of the funds.

The salary schedule now in use in the State Aid schools is commendable, but certain changes should be made in it. First, the base pay is too low. Second, the type of increments now provided for should be retained but should be increased. Third, the marital status of the teacher, the number of dependents of the teacher, and the size of the community in which the teacher works should all possibly be considered as factors in formulating a progressive salary schedule. Of course, any salary schedule should set minimum and maximum limits that are reasonable and equitable. It is furthermore recommended that future salary schedules make a distinction between men and women teachers. It is the opinion of the writer that men teachers should be paid more than women teachers until the women teachers have taught five years, after which they should be paid an equal salary with men teachers. A higher percentage of women teachers, proportionately, leave the teaching profession than men before the end of five years.
of service. The living expenses of men teachers, as a rule, are higher than those of women teachers. More men would be attracted to the teaching profession if they were paid a living wage. These factors should also be considered in planning a salary schedule for any state or local school system.

Texas, with its numerous colleges, affords ample opportunity for a well-trained teaching personnel sufficient to fill all of the positions in State Aid schools with teachers holding degrees. It would seem that, to require all beginning teachers to hold degrees, would be just and would go a long way toward equalizing educational opportunities in the smaller schools of the State. At the present time, only three years of college training are required of teachers in standardized State Aid schools and only two years are required of teachers in non-standardized schools, receiving aid. Teachers now are permitted to teach in these schools in any grade, depending upon the type of certificate held. This condition should be remedied. Every teacher, whether teaching in State Aid schools or not, should be required to teach in his major or minor field of preparation. In this way only can the best instructional service be obtained.

It is not the purpose of this study to propose a reorganization of the school system of Texas in order to effect greater equalization of educational opportunities, but it may be suggested that a thorough study be made of the State's
school system with the idea of proposing a plan that will be more economical and more efficient. The public school system of Texas is a huge enterprise, which requires large sums of money to operate, and it should be managed in a business-like way. Future reorganization should look forward to a county unit of administrative and supervisory control, adequate and equitable State support, and real equalization of school taxes and educational opportunities.

No reasonable amount of money is too much to spend on education if the proper values are realized; however, from certain facts found in this study, there are some economies in the administration of the equalization funds that could be accomplished if a new plan of equalization were adopted for the State of Texas. A complete reorganization for financial support and for administrative and supervisory control would decrease the number of administrative units and would increase the efficiency of the schools. That this has not already been done is due to the fondness of many for maintaining traditional methods and the pressure constantly brought to bear on the Legislature to maintain the status quo.

Much has been accomplished in the last twenty-five years in Texas through the use of the equalization funds. Equalization as a policy has been firmly established, but real equalization of educational opportunity, however, has not yet been achieved. Many fields of service have not
received sufficient attention. It is a fundamental principle of American education that the wealth of the State shall educate the children of the State, regardless of where the wealth is located and where the children reside. A unit of the State that does not have sufficient wealth to educate its children must be helped by the wealthier communities through a State school fund. The purpose of a State school fund is to equalize the burden of taxation for schools, and to secure, in a measure, equality of educational opportunity for all the children of the State.

It is a well-known fact that it is practically impossible for many local school districts in Texas to maintain even a minimum program of education at a level required by the needs of the present day without financial means being provided outside their own local resources. The State is the logical unit to supply this additional help. The State should determine what is to be the maximum program of education for all the children in Texas. It should determine by a careful study what are the maximum amounts of money that should be provided from all sources; and whenever any individual unit has made the maximum effort and still cannot offer the minimum program demanded, the State should step in and furnish financial aid to the extent that it will be possible for this unit to offer the minimum program recognized by the State. This is equalization through State aid.
There will be many communities which will not be satisfied with the minimum educational program required by the State. These communities will want to maintain a better program, therefore, they should be permitted to do so by raising locally the necessary additional funds. Equalization through a State fund should make possible the bringing of schools together so that they may reach the maximum level of achievement, but local initiative should not be handicapped by requiring the program to be left at this point.

A survey of the schools of Texas, completed in 1936, revealed that great inequalities still exist in educational opportunities. The report pointed out inequalities in the distribution of wealth, as measured by assessed valuation, mill levies and money expended. Inequalities were found to exist in the training, experience, tenure, duties, and salaries of teachers; in the length of the school term; in buildings, equipment, books, and supplies, not only among one-teacher rural schools but also among the village, town, and city schools of the State; and between urban and rural districts and between negro and white schools.

The causes of these inequalities are found, in a large

---


5 Ibid.
measure, in the system of taxation for school support, in the small rural school districts, and in the lack of an adequate and efficient program of State aid. Adequate financial support for public schools is the basis of all other educational problems. How to get this adequate and efficient support for the school system of Texas is a problem that is seriously engaging the best thought of educational leaders and many interested laymen as well. What changes should be made in the administration and supervision of the schools of the State? What changes should be made in the methods of financing the schools? What adjustments should be made in the bases of taxation? What changes must be required in the taxing unit in order that it may raise its share of school revenues? How shall the State assist in eliminating, as far as possible, these inequalities? These questions and many similar ones could well be asked in an attempt to solve the problem of equalization of educational opportunities in Texas.

It is recommended that the future educational policies in Texas be determined through a scientific study of the educational situation by a group of trained professional men and women and well-informed laymen. Such policies should be formulated with respect to the State as a whole and without partiality toward local conditions, local ideas, or special interests. Recommendations for improvement should then be made on the basis of efficiency, economy, justice,
and reason in the conduct of the State's educational program. The type of equalization program needed should be presented to the people of the State; legislation should then be enacted to insure the proper administration of the program; and an appropriation should be provided that will be sufficiently stable, equitable, and adequate to insure the full realization of educational equality for every child of the State.
APPENDIX

LEGAL PROVISION AS BASIS FOR THE OFFICIAL
SALARY SCHEDULE OF EQUALIZATION
AID SCHOOLS, 1929-31*

Section 11. In all districts that comply with
the foregoing provisions of this Act and in addition
there-to levy and collect a tax of one dollar on the
hundred dollars, and after provision is made for a
term of six and one-half months on the ratio of the
number of teachers provided for herein and on the
basis of the salary schedule fixed by the State Board
of Education, the proceeds of the local maintenance
tax may be supplemented with a sufficient amount from
the appropriation provided herein to guarantee the
following amounts or so much thereof as may be neces-
sary, to pay the salaries of teachers according to
the salary schedule for a term not to exceed nine
months, as may be desired by the Board of Trustees:
one teacher, $125; two teachers, $250; three teachers,
$375; four teachers $475; five teachers, $550; six
teachers, $600; seven teachers, $650; eight teachers,
$675; nine teachers, $700; ten teachers, $725; pro-
vided such supplemental grants shall not increase the
total grant for teachers' salaries from this appropria-
tion to more than $1,000 as provided in Section 13 of
this Act; except schools of more than five teachers
may receive not to exceed $1,500.

*Laws of Texas, 1929-31, 3. R. No. 3, Chapter 14,
Forty-Second Legislature, First Called Session.
OFFICIAL SALARY SCHEDULE
RURAL AID SCHOOLS
1939-1940

1. UNCLASSIFIED SCHOOLS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base Pay</th>
<th>Add for Principal</th>
<th>Add for 1st Yr. College</th>
<th>Add for 2nd Yr. College</th>
<th>Add for B. A. Degree or Equivalent</th>
<th>Add for M. A. Degree</th>
<th>No. Mon. Paid</th>
<th>Minimum Salary</th>
<th>Maximum Salary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>$85</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$85</td>
<td>$105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>85 $5 per teacher</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Maximum salary for serving as principal in an unclassified school is $90, based on eight (8) teachers or more.

There may be added to the salary of any teacher, principal, or superintendent of a salary aid school one dollar ($1) per month for each year's experience, provided such increase shall not exceed ten dollars ($10) per month. The teacher must have taught one full year before this increment becomes operative.

Five Dollars ($5) per month may be added to the salary of each teacher in a standardized school.

2. CLASSIFIED AND AFFILIATED SCHOOLS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base Pay</th>
<th>Add for 2nd Yr. College</th>
<th>Add for 3rd Yr. College</th>
<th>Add for B. A. Degree or Equivalent</th>
<th>Add for M. A. Degree</th>
<th>No. Mon. Paid</th>
<th>Minimum Salary</th>
<th>Maximum Salary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>$90</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$90</td>
<td>$110</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. CLASSIFIED AND AFFILIATED SCHOOLS: (Superintendent and High School Principal)

Eight (8) to Eleven (11) Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base Pay</th>
<th>Add for 2nd Yr. College</th>
<th>Add for 3rd Yr. College</th>
<th>Add for B. A. Degree or Equivalent</th>
<th>Add for M. A. Degree</th>
<th>No. Mon. Paid</th>
<th>Minimum Salary</th>
<th>Maximum Salary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supt.</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$90</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$140</td>
<td>$160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prin.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Twelve (12) to Nineteen (19) Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base Pay</th>
<th>Add for 2nd Yr. College</th>
<th>Add for 3rd Yr. College</th>
<th>Add for B. A. Degree or Equivalent</th>
<th>Add for M. A. Degree</th>
<th>No. Mon. Paid</th>
<th>Minimum Salary</th>
<th>Maximum Salary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supt.</td>
<td>$65</td>
<td>$90</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$155</td>
<td>$175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prin.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Twenty (20) or More Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base Pay</th>
<th>Add for 2nd Yr. College</th>
<th>Add for 3rd Yr. College</th>
<th>Add for B. A. Degree or Equivalent</th>
<th>Add for M. A. Degree</th>
<th>No. Mon. Paid</th>
<th>Minimum Salary</th>
<th>Maximum Salary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supt.</td>
<td>$75</td>
<td>$90</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$165</td>
<td>$185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prin.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Vocational home economics teachers may be paid on the basis of ten (10) months.

Vocational agriculture teachers may be paid on the basis of twelve (12) months, and a consideration of not more than six hundred ($600) dollars may be made for travel. (The monthly salary of a vocational teacher shall be determined in this way: Subtract the Federal subsidy from the annual contract salary and divide this remainder by the number of months agreed to in the contract).

No school with less than nine (9) teachers can have both principal and superintendent.

Elementary school principals in a school system having a four year high school may be allowed two dollars and fifty cents ($2.50) per month extra for each teacher under his supervision, provided the elementary school is located in a building apart from the high school building; provided that any elementary school principal who devotes three periods or more per day to supervisory work may have this increase without regard to the location of the elementary building.

Superintendents of seven teacher schools may receive salary on a twelve months basis at $5.00 less per month than superintendents of eight teacher schools. Superintendents of six teacher schools may receive salary on a twelve months basis at $10.00 per month less than superintendents of eight teacher schools.
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