

ADMINISTRATIVE PROBLEMS INVOLVED IN PROMOTING
THE BUILDING PROGRAMS OF DALLAS COUNTY

APPROVED:

James F. Webb
Major Professor

Harold Brenholtz
Minor Professor

J.C. Matthews
Director of the Department of Education

Jack Johnson
Dean of the Graduate Division

ADMINISTRATIVE PROBLEMS INVOLVED IN PROMOTING
THE BUILDING PROGRAMS OF DALLAS COUNTY

THESIS

Presented to the Graduate Council of the North
Texas State Teachers College in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

By

Erwin D. Douglas, B. A.

158423

Dallas, Texas

August, 1948

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	iv
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION.	1
Statement of Problem	
Delimitations	
Sources of Data	
Proposed Treatment of Data	
Related Studies	
II. SECURING THE AID OF DIFFERENT AGENCIES IN THE BONDS	7
Introduction	
Summary	
III. FINANCES.	38
Introduction	
Summary	
IV. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS. .	77
Summary	
Conclusions	
Recommendations	
BIBLIOGRAPHY	81

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Procedures Followed in Preparing the Taxpayers for the Need of a New School . . .	8
2. Procedures Employed to Acquire the Aid of Local Agencies.	18
3. Procedures Used to Select School Site.	23
4. Procedures Preliminary to Building Program . .	39
5. Procedures Used in Selling Bonds	51
6. Methods Used in Employing the Architect. . . .	61
7. Letting the Contract	68

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Statement of Problem

It has been generally accepted in our nation that one of the most important institutions of any community is its public schools. The citizens of our state and nation come from these schools, and from these schools they have gotten some idea as to what is considered right and wrong.

If the future citizens of tomorrow are to be educated, they must have, for one thing, at least, buildings in which to supply their needs adequately. This study is made with the realization that the physical plant does not make a good school, but with the idea that it does help a great deal. So with the thought of the administrative problems confronting a school superintendent in a building program, this study is made.

Delimitations

This study deals primarily with the following aspects of the building program: (1) preparing the tax payers for the need of a new school, (2) employing the aid of local agencies to assist in "selling" the tax payers, (3) the site of the plant, (4) taxes, (5) selling the bonds, (6) employing the architect, and (7) letting the contract.

This problem concentrates on the positive aspect of the program as though the bond election did carry. The problem surveys the White Independent Schools of Dallas County; however, the Dallas Independent School District will not be included. This study is made with the realization, that there are many other problems with which a superintendent is confronted in a building program, however, the seven as listed are very pertinent to any building program. Nevertheless, should some other problem become outstanding as a result of the study, it will be included.

Sources of Data

Some of the information gathered for this study is from reading in various college libraries. However, most of it is obtained from personal visits with the different superintendents of Dallas County, as well as from the questionnaires sent them for information.

Proposed Treatment of Data

In Chapter II this study deals with the public relations that exist in the several school districts contacted. This information is based on the personal visits with the superintendents and the tabulations of the questionnaires they answered. A report is made on the manner in which the local agencies contributed to help "carry" the bond election. A report shall also be given as to the manner in which each district selected its school site.

Chapter III consists of reports on the taxes of each district, the manner in which they sold their bonds, the method of selecting the architect, and the sale of bonds. This information will be reported as it is given from the visits and the questionnaires.

The summary, conclusion and recommendations are given in Chapter IV.

Related Studies

In a recent survey which Massey made in regard to school sites, planning, financing, and school board control, he arrived at some interesting conclusions. Massey points out that the school needs a central site, that the physical plant should definitely be adequate, and that serial type bonds should be issued to finance the program. He observes also that under the school laws of our state, the school board had all legal power to set up rules governing the use of the school property, in so far as they were reasonable.¹

Massey, in his conclusion, points out that the schools of Texas must be financed by state property tax and the ceiling of school taxes must be raised.² He further observes that much stress is now being placed upon the type of structure provided for the children and that the trend

¹Gabe E. Massey, "Laws Governing School Property in Texas," Unpublished Master's Thesis, Department of Education, Columbia University, August, 1931.

²Ibid.

is to give them better, larger, and more spacious buildings.

Massey further states:

One may conclude from this study that the people of Texas are vitally interested in meeting the needs of an adequate and efficient system of public education. Not only are the people of Texas interested in making these provisions but they are willing to make more lenient appropriations that this goal may be reached.³

Massey's study differs from the study of the writers in that he delves a little more into the history of the school building program than the writer cares to include. However, he does definitely consider the aspects of the local school site and the bond issue in a way that is very closely related to this study.⁴

Don L. Essex, in his thesis, made a study of bonding school districts. He endeavored to discover which would be better for a school district, to "pay-as-it-goes" or to vote bonds. Throughout his survey he studied different schools and schools of varied financial ratings. After his study had been made he concluded that he could not set any definite and positive rule, other than each school district must decide which of the plans would be more practical and govern itself accordingly.⁵

Essex's study differs from the writers in that he studied only bonds or finances, while this problem deals with sites and the planning of the structure as well.

³Ibid.

⁴Ibid.

⁵Don L. Essex, "Bonding Versus Pay As You Go", (Unpublished Master's Thesis, Department of Education, Teachers College Columbia University, 1931), pp. 66-72.

Strayer and Englehardt, in a book published in 1927, have some pertinent facts that are of special interest to this survey.⁶ They made a study of using the local service clubs and different organizations to assist in "selling" the idea for the school to the local patrons. The use of handbills, posters, and circulars were very much in use by the board and superintendent to stimulate interest and properly inform the patrons just what to expect after the bonds were voted. They also point out the difficulties that arose when the delegated joint committee and superintendent of construction failed to understand the objectives of each. The resulting grand jury investigation is also discussed.

The type of building, as outlined by Strayer and Englehardt, is also of interest in that any time a school goes into a building program, the type of structure must be identified.⁷

In an article edited by Dan H. Cooper, he makes the following observation:

A school's program should be designed to serve the entire community of which the school is a part and, in turn, the entire community should be available to serve the school.⁸

⁶George D. Strayer and N. L. Englehardt, School Building Problems, pp. 99-583.

⁷Ibid., p. 293.

⁸Warren C. Seybert, The Characteristics of a Modern Educative Program, p. 58.

Warren C. Seybert, also observes that the successful school administration must realize that his school is dependent upon the good will of the community in which it serves. However, he further observes that in many instances the community depends, to a great degree, for its success upon the school it supports.⁹

Claude V. Courter points out in an article, that in the administrative planning for a school program and plant, the school superintendent is the man who must carry the message for our present physical school plant to the patrons.¹⁰ However, he notes that before he does so, his mind should fully grasp the situation and he should also consult with specialists for their suggestions.

The superintendent should remember that the school building is not just a masterpiece of structure for an architect but that it houses the future citizens of tomorrow. These two studies differ from this writing in that they do not delve into the sale of bonds or into the employment of the architect as much as is anticipated in this survey.

⁹Ibid.

¹⁰Claude V. Courter, The School Administrator Initiates a School Building Program, pp. 53-57.

CHAPTER II

SECURING THE AID OF DIFFERENT AGENCIES IN THE BONDS

Introduction

Out of the twenty Independent School Districts of Dallas County, as listed in the State Department Bulletin, Public School Directory, 1947-48, none voted bonds during the school year 1947-48.¹ These bonds ranged from \$42,000 to \$500,000. The scholastic population of the school districts concerned ranged from 285 to 2,312.² So the problems encountered would apply to almost any type school or situation. Some of the schools are rural, while some are definitely urban.

From the questionnaires, to which answers were secured from each superintendent during a personal visit, many excellent suggestions and ideas were obtained. To illustrate the points made and for some better understanding of the procedures carried out in each of the districts, tables have been prepared to indicate the results. Table 1 will indicate

¹Myrtle L. Tanner, Public School Directory, p. 78.

²Ibid.

the procedures used in "selling" the need of voting the bonds to the taxpayers of the districts. It will be of interest to note that a majority of the superintendents found some of the same methods and techniques of value in presenting the situation to the voters of their respective districts.

TABLE 1

PROCEDURES FOLLOWED IN PREPARING THE TAXPAYERS
FOR THE NEED OF A NEW SCHOOL

Different Agencies Utilized to Sell Program	Superintendents by Schools Number 1-9									Total	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Yes	No
Utilize Aid of Parent Teachers Association	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8	1
Seek Assistance of Local Newspaper	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8	1
Utilize Aid of Local Newspaper	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9	0
Did You Write Articles for Program in the Paper	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	4	5
Sell the Board for the Program	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9	0
Have School Visitation Days	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	3	6
Use Local Theatre to Run Slides and Slogans "for"	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	1	8

TABLE 1--Continued

Different Agencies Utilized to Sell Program	Superintendents by Schools Number 1-9									Total	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Yes	No
Employ Assistance of School Paper	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8	1
Obtain Help of Pupils	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9	0
Seek and Get Help of Teachers	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9	0
Employ Aid of Principals	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9	0
Get Aid of Bus Drivers, Custodians and Lunchroom Workers	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	7	2
Present Special School Assemblies for the Program	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	5	4

From a study of Table 1, it is noted that the items which were common to each school were as follows: full aid of the local newspaper, the assistance of the pupils, the aid of the teachers, and the full support of the principals.

Each superintendent contacted was asked what position he would have taken had the local editor chosen to oppose the program. Without exception each remarked that he would not have stopped his plans, but each did suggest some possible procedure he might have followed. It was generally

agreed that the first thing the superintendent should do would be to go to the editor and explain the situation to him. Not very many of the superintendents had opposition, in fact only two of the nine. One was able to convince the editor that he was in error, and the editor, when fully convinced, assisted in every respect. The other superintendent was not so fortunate. He went to the editor, and the editor immediately told him that from that time he was dedicated to oppose any additional taxes; that he realized that the school needed some few things, but that he was against additional taxes and would continue to say so. The superintendent felt rather despondent at first, but one of his loyal friends on hearing of the incident and being keenly for the program suggested that he could at least be of some assistance with the editor. He did so, possibly because he and some of his friends were spending quite a sum of money for advertising in the paper each week. Whether this is good or bad is questionable; however, the superintendent feels that it was a determining factor in the election, since it carried by a rather narrow margin.

As a rule the versatile superintendent will figure out some way to solve any problem he deems essential to the welfare of the school. Also as a rule, among the best friends school people have, are the editors of the local papers. In the personal experience of one of the school men, he had most heartening results. In this particular school

district there are two small weekly papers. The editors of these papers never wavered one time when their assistance was needed to inform the patrons of that community about the school's needs. Most likely the superintendent is rather a diplomat, as he is able to cause the two papers to support the program with such force.

From a study of Table 1, the beginning superintendent might get the impression that the Parent Teacher Association would, just as a matter of fact, be for the building program. This is not necessarily true. In each of the nine districts contacted, the superintendent agreed without hesitation that he had spent a great deal of time with the several Parent Teachers Association committees, and that he had also contacted the executive committee of the Parent Teachers Association shortly after he had recommended the proposed program to the school board. In most instances, the school Parent Teacher organizations are for the best interests of the school, but they are not always for the increase in local taxes that may come as a natural result of voting bonds.

In securing the support of the different civic clubs, according to Table 1, eight of the nine schools were successful. The manner in which the superintendent or board may utilize the support of the clubs may be in one of several ways. The nature of the community may, and likely will, have a great deal to do with it. The superintendent is usually a member of the most outstanding club or civic group within the

school district. Many times, especially when a building program is suggested, the superintendent will be in great demand as a speaker. The groups are eager, as a rule, to know the plan, its costs, and what will be given in return. The sensible superintendent, with some careful planning, will not fumble an opportunity of that type. He will take pride in explaining fully and completely the proposed program. He will not leave, ever, the impression that the program is "his", but that it is "ours". Most civic groups have a sense of respect for the school district and a keen sense of competition may be created if they feel that some other club in the county has done more for their school than they themselves have done for theirs. The nine superintendents contacted, each and everyone stressed the fact that the dealings must be open and fully explained, that there must be complete understanding on the part of the parents.

In the nine schools checked, four of the superintendents stated that they did write articles for the bond issue, five did not. Each superintendent that wrote articles remarked that he was requested to do so, either by the board or by the local editor. Each stated, that to the best of his ability, he had related the facts involved, and had tried to write in such a manner as not to confuse his readers. Each one felt that the articles he wrote had benefited the cause.

Of the five that did not write, three were definitely instructed not to do so by the board, while the other two stated that they never thought of it. The boards that did

not want their superintendents to write gave as a reason that they did not want the superintendent mixed up in a community controversy, and seemed to think it was their problem. The local community with its customs, traditions, and ideals, may and likely will, determine whether the superintendent will or will not furnish articles for publication in the local newspaper.

Table 1 shows that every school man reported that his board was for the program. This is a most significant fact, since it is generally known that the board is actually the administrative body of the school, and should a superintendent fail to convince the members of the board of the needs of the school, most likely he could not possibly convince the voters that they should "go over the heads" of the elected body to vote bonds. In the beginning of any successful building program, the board must be "sold". If and when the board does see the necessity of the new program, the superintendent has the strongest ally any man could have. However, there is no intention here to leave the impression that just because the board says yes, the program will go. This study does reveal that unless the board is for the proposal, it would be better to drop it for the time being. In the mind of each superintendent who undertook a program of expansion, the full support of the board was paramount. The one superintendent who reported that he had one board

member against the program, stressed most emphatically the need of having the board one hundred per cent for the plan.

× Table 1 denotes that three of the nine schools questioned had designated a school visitation day and considerable publication was given to that date, as the entire citizenry was asked to visit school, at that time. The parents who came were shown around the then existing facilities, and were shown what the school needed and what could actually exist with the voting of the bonds. Each superintendent that reported yes for the visitation day felt that it payed in every respect. The superintendents that said no for the visitation day, after discussing it among themselves, felt that they had probably missed a very strong point in failing to do so. The visitation day also brings together friends and patrons, and the superintendents feel that it has a tendency to raise the general moral of the school as well as the community.

In the utilization of the local theatres as agencies to inform the patrons of the school needs, only one school in Dallas County, Grand Prairie Independent School District, did so. Some of the smaller districts do not have local theatres, but of the nine schools checked six schools do have. Each superintendent that had not used the theatre, when asked why, without exception said that he had not one time thought of it. Here again it seems, the superintendents now feel that they missed an excellent opportunity to use a powerful educational aid by which they could have contacted

many people that otherwise did not know the reasons for or against the program. It is a known fact that many people attend shows or listen to the radio but they never read the local community paper, or any other, as a matter of fact. The use of slides in the local theatres is now a "must" with some of the superintendents.

Eight of the nine schools that voted bonds used the school paper to acquaint the parents with the proposal. The school paper is a most important channel through which the parents, at least, will be contacted. The superintendent surely must use it wisely. In fact, each superintendent agreed that if it should become a sounding board and nothing else, the people would lose faith with the proposal. Each superintendent remarked, when the school paper was discussed with him, that he, as superintendent, wrote very few articles in the school paper. The patrons know that if he so desired, he could force the editors to publish the superintendent's articles. As a result, most of the editorials were written by pupils, who were allowed to express simply why they felt they needed a new school. The parents will read the school paper, especially if it gives them definite school news. They like that. The one superintendent who did not have a school paper did get out a group of posters and handbills. He felt that was of significance in the carrying of his bond issue. The superintendent should be especially careful, as the administrative head of the school, not to

permit articles to be published in the paper that will hinder the proposed building plans.

Of the nine schools visited, it was found that each superintendent gave a resounding yes, when asked if the pupils were stimulated to talk for the program. The pupils can almost carry or defeat any election. When the issue has been explained to them, and it is natural for any youngster to desire a new school, they will certainly talk for the proposal. Each superintendent felt that here, again, he must be especially careful. Anytime the superintendent suggests to the students that they talk "for" a building project, some parents will immediately say that the pupils are coerced into insisting on the proposal. The boys and girls certainly have a way of getting the voters out for an election. This study reveals that in the experience of the Dallas County superintendents, the aid of the pupils is a "must". No two superintendents will go after or get the assistance of the students in the same way, but the superintendent should not overlook this valuable source of help.

When the superintendents were asked if the teachers were for the program, here again they answered one hundred per cent, yes. This too may be a dangerous issue if not properly executed. One of the superintendents had editorials written in the local paper about him, to the effect that he had deprived the teachers of their "rights" by

forcing them to support the program. He even had letters from the state department of education suggesting no future coercion. This was brought about by some parent or group of parents who were not properly informed or were against the building proposal. The teachers in every school contacted were for the program. They, too, have civic pride and are willing to vote bonds and pay more taxes when taken into the confidence of the administration. These teachers always have friends that will also vote for the bonds on the teacher's suggestion. Do not leave the teachers out. They could be the factor that "swings the election".

Each school also sought and obtained the aid of the principals in supporting the bond issue. They are also of vast importance to the entire program, as they are really second-in-command in their own schools. No superintendent out of the nine reported any difficulty in obtaining the most hearty support of his principals. In two of the schools the superintendent felt that the aid of the principal was the winning factor. Be sure to take your principal with you.

Seven of the nine schools reported that they were able to utilize the aid of the bus drivers, lunchroom workers and custodians. These people are also a most potent factor in any community. This group contacts as many patrons and children as any other group of school employees. The bus driver, as well as the custodian, listens and hears many complaints, while the lunchroom helper contact the entire

student body each day. They can, and usually will, when taken into the confidence of the administration, win many votes for the bonds. No wide-awake superintendent will fail to go after these people and win their loyal support. The two schools that reported that they did not utilize the aid of this group of people were surprised that they had forgotten such key people.

TABLE 2
PROCEDURES EMPLOYED TO ACQUIRE THE AID
OF LOCAL AGENCIES

Different Agencies Contacted	Superintendents' Answers for Schools 1-9									Totals	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Yes	No
Selling the "big" taxpayers	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	6	3
Obtain support of Civic Clubs	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	8	1

When discussing with the superintendents the "big" taxpayer, they all agreed that certainly they were usually influential and should be convinced of the schools' needs. As a rule there are in each community a few men or women that are exceptionally wealthy. It often occurs that in years past some of these good people may have served on the school board, and may even have given the land when the school was first organized. However, since these people are now

older and have reared their families, they do not choose to sponsor any additional taxes. Often these wealthy families are related to other people in the community, and their relatives have a tendency to listen to this financial leader of the family for at least two reasons. First, he is respected because he is a financier, or so he is thought to be, for after all he is a big land owner now. Then often, his word is as good as his bond. He is respected and loved, so it behooves each superintendent to cultivate the friendship and respect of these people, who may, or seem to be, taking only a passive interest in the school until taxes are about to be increased. A great many times these stalwart people may be easily convinced that a positive stand is well worthwhile to them and to the community. Again these people who possess leadership may be sold on their ability to lead the bond campaign fight, or if they are still ambitious to make more money, they may be shown that the new school will enhance the value of their real estate in the district. Table 2 denotes that six of the superintendents either directly or indirectly were able to persuade the "big" taxpayers to help the cause. The superintendents have assisted in this study by pointing out the plan of attack they used.

Almost every school man realizes that unless it is an emergency it is almost impossible to vote bonds "overnight", so to speak. For this reason plans are made several years

in advance, and an attempt is made to foresee the future demands of the schools. In the meantime, not for political but for common sense reasons, they have been busy cultivating the friendship and respect of the "big" taxpayer. The wise superintendent may in this manner win and keep as his competent aids the very people who could have been so easily overlooked. Table 2 shows that three superintendents failed to win the "big" taxpayer. This study reveals that the reason one of the three superintendents gave for failing to gain the friendly support of the "big" taxpayer, was because he felt that the bond issue was too small. This is one of the most unusual conditions that any superintendent can ever come up against. This superintendent finally did persuade the opponent of the wisdom of the small bond issue, just to get by for the present, as materials were terrificly expensive, and he did not wish to squander the taxpayers' money. Since the opponent was a good financier he could see the wisdom of the superintendent's idea, and as a result, agreed not to fight the proposal. Had the superintendent failed to talk to this opponent, he feels that his issue would have been lost. He visited with him in his home and the two had long friendly talks. It is agreed that all men are not so understanding or all superintendents so resourceful; however, this superintendent was well pleased with his solution and he feels that it will usually work.

In one of the two remaining schools, the man of money

fought the bond issue because of personal feelings. In the 1946-47 term of school, his daughter had been "fired" out of the public schools. The "big" taxpayer did not say openly that he was trying to get even with the school. He said that the board and superintendent were asking for too much money and that he would always be against it, that the times were not right, and that materials were too high. The bond issue carried over his protest. That is important as it shows that money does not always control the thinking of people. However, the superintendent readily admits that he and the board were deeply concerned, as they could not determine the extent of the influence their opponent was exerting. This superintendent says that if it is at all possible, the aid of the "big" money should be sought and used.

In the last of the three schools where the "big" money was against the proposal, the superintendent and friends of the building program, but the opponent could never see the sense to it, or so he said. This issue also carried but it was no easy task. It should be pointed out also that this man owned a large amount of property in the school district, but he worked in Dallas proper, and merely resided in the district. However, his influence was very potent.

After the talks with the different superintendents, this study reveals that if it is at all possible, the "big

tax" payer should be persuaded to support the proposed building program.

When asked if the superintendents utilized the aid of the local civic clubs, each school, with one exception, reported that he did. Table 2 shows that one man failed to accomplish this; however, he says quiet frankly that he did not undertake to do so. This club was small and he missed the pleasure of going before them to seek their aid.

Another problem that must be discussed considerably with local citizenry of any school district is the site of the new school. Many school superintendents agree that the selection of a site may be a factor that determines whether or not the bond issue carries. For the purpose of clarifying some of the problems in the selection of a site, we use Table 3. In the selection of the site, eight of nine did so before the bonds were voted. The superintendents, without exception, agreed that this should be done. However, one man pointed out that he was not able to swing one of the "big tax" payers on the question until after the election. He also favors the early selection of a site as he feels that it will surely eliminate many problems. Without exception the men agreed that the citizens should know where the new school would be located, as the complete proposal should be publicized for their information. Many times, too, the men pointed out from previous experience, that if they waited until after the election every person

in the school district wished to select the site. All nine men recommend the earliest possible election.

TABLE 3
PROCEDURES USED TO SELECT SCHOOL SITE

Site Selection- Methods and Site Qualifications	Superintendents' Answers Schools 1-9									Totals	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Yes	No
Did you select site before voting	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8	1
Did Superintendent select site	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	0	9
Did board select site	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Not	No	No	2	7
Did board and Superintendent select site	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	7	2
Did faculty help in selecting site	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	1	6
Did an expert select site	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	0	9
Did Parent Teacher Association select site	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	0	9
Did a group of local real estate men select site	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	0	9
Was site selected after careful scientific study	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	4	5

TABLE 3--Continued

Site Selection- Methods and Site Qualifications	Superintendents' Answers Schools 1-9									Totals	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Yes	No
Did site selected benefit most of students	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9	0
Is site adjacent to but not on main traffic lane	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9	0
All things con- sidered was site most economical	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	8	1
Was site pur- chased from an agent	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	0	9
Site purchased from owner	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	2	7
Did you condemn the property	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	0	9
Is site away from factories	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8	1
Does site allow for possible future growth	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	8	1
Is construction on permanent basis	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9	0
Are parks near site	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	1	8

Table 3 illustrates that the nine superintendents stated that they did not select the site for the proposed building. The most common reasons given were that the superintendents did not feel qualified, did not have the authority delegated to them, and that they did not care to assume that much responsibility.

Superintendents of two of the nine schools contacted stated that the board selected the site of its own volition. The superintendents were hesitant to criticize too freely, but most of them feel that most school boards are not qualified to select the site for a project as important and as vital to a community as its school. Occasionally if the board selects the site without consulting any person or group of persons, they lose the confidence of the citizens, because of a poor selection. Then, too, it was pointed out that once in a great while some board member may be influenced by some selfish motive if the board is egotistical enough to go right ahead and select the site. The main objection raised here is that board members are not well enough informed, as a rule, to select the desired site with the necessary qualifications for a good school at the present, or for the future.

When asked if the board and superintendent selected the site, seven of the nine schools reporting answered yes. The superintendents did point out that many times when this happened, the superintendent actually selected the site.

As a rule, when this practice is followed, the superintendents with a committee of the board sets out to find the desired location. The superintendent, being a school man and knowing what he wants in a site, may practically, if not completely, dominate the selection of the site. This, too, could be either good or bad. If the superintendent is sincere, honest and thinking only of the best interests of the community, he will do all that is in his power to make a good selection. He will probably consult with several "experts" before he makes a recommendation to the board. If the superintendent should happen not to be able to control his committee, he may be "told" what to recommend to the board, and as a result will be given credit for making a selection that may be actually obnoxious to him. The selection of the site is of vital importance and the superintendent and his board should never be too hasty in making a decision.

One of the nine superintendents reported that his faculty assisted in the site selection. However, that is a very small percent, as a rule the classroom teacher is not consulted on the possible future school site. No superintendent attempted to justify not calling on his teachers to assist him. They all thought that perhaps they should have done so, but just did not. The one superintendent who reported that he had used the opinion of his teachers felt that it had paid him greatly. The teachers appreciated it,

he said, that they had been called in to play a small part in the school's administrative life; they were happy. Each superintendent felt that the faculty should be given an opportunity to express itself if the selection of the site.

The nine schools reporting stated that none used an expert in the site selection. However, one of the men did suggest that when it seemed his board and some local citizens had deadlocked over the site, the architect came to a board meeting and suggested the plan by which the deadlock was broken. This architect had drawn a plan showing the fall of the terrain, drainage, elevation and any other necessary item that might be needed to demonstrate his choice. His suggestion was followed and apparently the feelings of resentment, that one time existed have been almost completely absorbed. Based on the questionnaire and the experiences of the nine superintendents contacted, this study would suggest the use of some qualified person in the selection of the site. Generally the patrons are better satisfied if this is done. Whether the decision is as good as the board and superintendent would have made or not, people just seem to like the idea of having some well qualified person select the site. The findings here do not intend to leave the impression that the expert will not need help from the superintendent, the board and the patrons. But he, basically, should make the selection.

The nine schools questioned reported that the Parent Teacher Association did not assist in the site selection. That is possibly as it should be. The Parent Teacher Association has, as part of its constitution, "to work with the school, and not in the school". The superintendents seemed to think that if a person should desire the help of the Parent Teacher Association, it would be an excellent idea to call them in, but generally the superintendent felt that he and the board are responsible for the site selection.

When questioned about the local real estate men assisting in the site selection, three of the nine schools reported that real estate men had wanted to help, even though they were not consulted.

In one of the three schools where the real estate men came in on the site selection, they were determined to purchase the old school site and develop it into a business district, and have the new school erected in one of their chosen plots, with the possibility of one of the men making several thousand dollars. The men in the community insisted on moving the school and put the pressure untold on the board to move the plant. The board in turn placed the responsibility of making the move right back on the real estate men by setting the price of the old site high enough to purchase the site suggested. The real estate men refused to pay the price and as a result, the patrons, at least most of them, felt that the board had been fair, that they had

made it possible for the plant to be moved, and that the real estate men failed. As a result the school was not moved and the board is getting along nicely and quietly. The patrons as a whole are for the board.

In one of the other three schools reporting that real estate men sought to control the site selection, one man offered to "give" the land to the school if the new building would be erected on his land. He knew that the board would have to purchase a site, and as the cost of materials was so high, he said publically that he could save the school several thousand dollars. The board did not want to accept the offer but felt the common sense had forced them to. However, just before the land was formally accepted, it was learned that the adjacent land was being plotted for dwelling houses and business. Had the board accepted the offer, they would have been criticized unmercifully as the real estate man would have made money, and lots of it, at the expense of the school. The board in the community is now being reorganized. There is still some feeling that the land should have been accepted, some do not agree. This reveals the experience of this one school and indicates that the early selection of a site is very nearly mandatory.

In the one other school where the real estate men are exerting pressure for a particular site, they almost accomplished their purpose. The superintendent did not feel that they were as interested in the welfare of the pupils as they

claimed but were more concerned with monetary gains. The board in this district finally went ahead with their plans not to purchase the site suggested, and for the time there seems to be complete peace and harmony in the district.

However, all of these problems could have been avoided had the site been officially selected when the bonds were voted. So from the point of view of the superintendents, early selection of the site is definitely recommended.

Four of the superintendents indicate that their sites were selected after careful study. This is as it should be. The four indicate that the topography and drainage were the most common items discussed. The men who said they had made no careful study of the site, felt they had been in error. The study of this problem indicates that a careful examination should always be made of the proposed site.

Table 3 indicates that all nine schools reported that their sites would best serve most of the pupils. Each superintendent indicated that he had checked his census, addresses, and other facts to determine a location that would serve the people the best. Most all of the superintendents had conducted a survey of where the children live, and so far as possible, constructed on the most accessible site.

On the question regarding traffic lanes, the schools reported one hundred per cent that they were not on the main highways. The chief consideration heard from the different men was safety. Each superintendent who reported verbally

felt very keenly his deep responsibility in protecting the youngsters from the traffic hazards of today. If only from a commonsense point of view, it can be understood that any good superintendent will do all in his power to protect his students.

From the viewpoint of economy in the purchase of a school site, eight men reported that they had purchased or used the most economical one available. Some paid a high price for the land but felt that for the future possible growth of the school and the desirability of the location, the price was not too much for the school district to pay. The one superintendent who reported that he had not used the most economical site, admitted frankly that he was pressured into agreeing to buy a tract of land that was undesirable. The land was not expensive in dollars, but the location caused him to feel that the school district had been forced to purchase something that did not meet the requirements of a good school site. He felt that he could have won the dispute over the site, but in so doing he would have actually lost the support of many self-styled friends. They wanted the less expensive site and argued that by choosing it he would save the taxpayers' money for a more elaborate school plant. This superintendent feels today that where he failed was in not starting early enough to educate his board, and the citizens of the community as well.

He definitely recommends the early selection of a site before, long before, the bonds are voted, if at all possible. *

* Each superintendent contacted in regard to the purchasing of a site through a land agent reported "no". Each one remarked that this is a definite problem, since many times some agent in the community may have a most desirable location, or he may have "connections". If either be true, in most instances, he will make his profit from school taxpayers. We find, too, that some people would much rather sell land higher to a school or some organization than to an individual. Too, many times, if the information gets out that a certain plot of land is being considered, some land agents will do all in their power to acquire possession of it. The early selection and acquisition of the school site is most desirable.

* In the purchase of the land, only two of the schools obtained the site from the owner. The remainder were either fortunate enough to have some available plot, or they were "forced" not to move the school because some agent or owner wanted too much money for the desired location. The two schools that purchased the land from the owners seemed to think they were very fair. In one of the schools the owner convinced the board that the only persons or organization to whom he would sell was the school. He even insisted that some impartial committee evaluate the property in order to endeavor to be fair in his price. The other school that

purchased from the owner also felt that he was exceedingly fair in his price. These two men sincerely and honestly recommend that the property be purchased directly from the owner.

School number seven reports that an attempt was made to purchase a forty acre tract of land for a new grade school. The site was ideal; it was well drained, located out of the little town, accessible to all the pupils and utilities, and the possibility for future growth was unlimited. This question came up: the property belonged to one of the members of the school board. As soon as the information got out that one of the members was going to sell the land for the school, many people felt that the board should not purchase from one of its members. As a result of this feeling, and partially because of the cost, the idea was dropped and the new grade school of the district is located on a site the school previously owned. However, it is too small for the possible future growth of the school.

A great many schools may have to condemn property in order to take care of the necessary growth of the schools. This may be done, and has been done, but none of the Dallas County schools contacted has had to acquire property in this manner to date. One superintendent did state that as soon as he checked the legal aspects of the necessary procedures, he was going to have some property condemned. He admitted that it was most distasteful. He had tried very

diligently to make the purchase without process of law but had failed. This particular owner felt that the school must have his property and had placed a prohibiting price on it, so the board had agreed to take the matter to the courts. It will be a most interesting case but will not have been settled before this writing is completed.

Each school man reported that his plants were away from the noisy factories except school number five. The superintendent agreed that he and the board felt that the site was undesirable in that respect, but taking into consideration all other points, they had proceeded with their plans to construct the school on the site selected. This one thing happened to them. The site had been owned for quite some time, and the factory was moved into the district near the site. This is one objection to early selection of sites, but all things considered, the site was still the best choice. The administration there feels that the factory, even though large, will not be so noisy as to actually interfere with the school.

All schools reported that the site selected and used allowed for future growth, with the exception of one. This superintendent said without hesitation that his schools were overcrowded at best, and that the cost of another site prevented the erection of a new grade school in some other location. However, his plant at present will take care of his student population for some time to come. However, he thinks that all sites should be large and roomy.

All nine schools are constructing their new buildings on a permanent basis. Each superintendent remarked that if the statistics we now have in regard to birth rates are considered, the school buildings erected must be permanent and larger. The extent of the construction that is being done in these nine schools varies greatly. In one school four classrooms are being added. In another school an eighteen-room grade school, gymnasium and lunchroom, and seven classrooms for the high school are necessary to meet present needs. Another district is constructing a junior high building. These are all permanent, and one of the superintendents felt that soon additional bonds will be necessary to take care of an expected influx of pupils, due to industrial development in his district.

Only one school reported that parks and playgrounds were available. Each superintendent, when questioned on this topic, felt that the schools should make some positive concerted effort to utilize all parks now available. If parks were not convenient, the school should endeavor to set up some type of summer program for the youngsters who do not have a job or any type of work to do during the summer months. Fortunate indeed are the children who have a desirable place to play and relax.

From the study of the replies to the questionnaire in regard to the utilization of the public in promoting the

voting of bonds, and in regard to the points to be considered in the selection of the site, a summary will give a more definite picture of the ideas suggested.

Summary

In preparing the taxpayers for the need of a new school, the following procedure is suggested:

1. Utilize the full support of the Parent Teacher Association, civic clubs, newspaper and school board.
2. Seek the complete support of the pupils and utilize fully the school paper.
3. Employ the aid of the principals and teachers, and all the personnel of the school.

When employing the aid of the local agencies, the following points are important:

1. Winning completely the aid of the "big" taxpayers, as well as all local civic and community clubs.
2. Furnishing the public with complete, accurate information on the issues involved.

In selecting the site, the three points that stand out as a result of this study are:

1. That the superintendent and board select the site before the bonds are voted.
2. That the site be purchased from the owner, and be located in such a place as to serve the greatest number of students in the most commonsense manner.

3. That the site selected be the most economical,
all other things being considered.

CHAPTER III

FINANCES

Introduction

Any person who has been connected with a school building program knows the vast importance of the finances that are involved in the project. The writer does not intend to indicate that there are only four phases of finances involved in the program, but for this study four definite problems were found that are closely related in the Dallas County Schools, as indicated by the superintendents of the county.

One big problem with which any superintendent will be confronted, not only in Dallas County but in other counties as well, will be the taxes of the school district. So in this chapter, as in Chapter II, to better illustrate the findings, tables will be used to indicate the results of this part of our survey, which covers taxes, selling the bonds, employing the architect and letting the contract for construction.

One of the most difficult tasks any superintendent must face in a building program, if the tax values must be raised, is to persuade the citizens of the need. The average

taxpayer sees the assessed value as something permanent. Generally speaking, it is. The rate may change, but the value is usually the same each year unless some person's property is assessed out of line. Then an adjustment may be made by an equalization board. In Table 4 are shown the findings in nine schools of Dallas County as related to the outstanding tax problems with which each superintendent was confronted when a building program was started in his school.

TABLE 4
PROCEDURES PRELIMINARY TO BUILDING PROGRAM

Procedures employed to finance program	Superintendents' Answers Schools 1-9									Totals	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Yes	No
Did you raise tax values	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	7	2
Did you increase tax rate	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	4	5
If an increase was needed did you call in an expert to set values	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	1	8
Did you use a local tax board to set values	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	8	1
Does your district now have a \$1.50 tax rate	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	2	7

TABLE 4 (Continued)

Procedures employed to finance program	Superintendents' Answers Schools 1-9									Totals	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Yes	No
Did your patrons go with you if a tax raise was necessary	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9	0
Did you, as superintendent make speeches for necessary tax raise	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	6	3
Did board members make public appearances for tax raise	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	5	4
Did members of the State Department of Education make speeches for your tax increase in the community	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	0	9
Does your district have its own tax collector	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	8	1
Did you make a survey of the district to determine its ability to pay	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9	0

One will note from Table 4 that when the nine superintendents were asked if the tax values of the school

district were raised in order to have sufficient valuation for the approval of the bonds, seven reported "yes". An increase in valuation is a difficult task. It would be futile for any superintendent to permit his board to call an election, then find out the value was not there; therefore, the board should be reminded that the district must have the necessary valuation before they have gone to the expense of calling an election.

To the question of whether they had to raise the rate, four of the nine reported that they had done so. In the minds of the people, the objection is not so much to a change in rate as to a change in valuation. Some districts take the value of the district, and then use a rate of from less than fifty cents on the \$100.00 valuation to as much as the \$1.50 allowed by law. The rate may change depending upon the growth of the community in tax wealth, on the financial needs of the school, or on both. We will note from Table 4 that some schools not only raised the values, but the rate as well. Generally, that does not cause much discussion within the community unless a thorough program of presenting the needs of the school to the public has been carried out long before election time.

When asked if the schools had used an outside tax expert to come into the district and set up the values of the property, we find that only one of the schools had done so. According to that superintendent, it was a mistake.

Perhaps it might have worked in some other place, but since it occurred in one of the schools under consideration, we shall give a brief summary of the happenings.

The expert came into the district, and after looking it over in many respects, gave the assessor some very exacting figures to use in setting the values on the different types of structures. After the values had been set and most property had advanced, the people were asked to meet with the equalization board to discuss any discrepancy that might exist. The equalization board is appointed by the school board, and is composed of citizens who reside within the district. They are to hear any complaints from property owners who feel that their property values have been set out of line with other property in the district.

In school Number 4 so many people met with the board that it was next to impossible to control the group. As a result, the equalization board resigned in a body. The school was then in a terrible condition. The old school had burned and a new one had to be built. The insurance would not replace the building. The equalization board yielded to the pressure, but unless some group would serve the people could not be heard, and under the law, when the property value is increased the owner is entitled to a hearing.

One of the main objections to the "tax expert" was

that they felt he was a stranger, did not know them or the conditions, and simply was ruthless in his recommendations to the assessor. In this school the superintendent and board finally persuaded some of the leading business men of the town, men who had many friends and were respected, to agree to serve on the equalization board. The citizens then were heard, but a great many of them are still not satisfied. The school got the necessary valuation to vote the bonds, and the election carried; however, there is a strong possibility that had the old building not been burned, the election would have failed. The superintendent of school Number 4 does not recommend an outside "expert".

Eight of the nine schools questioned reported that a local board was used to set the values. In one particular school the school board asked and did get five men who were either builders, contractors or laborers to serve. These men met with a committee of the board, superintendent and tax assessor-collector. After several nights of discussion, figuring and planning, they suggested some figures to the assessor to use in order to arrive at values. The school had grown rapidly within the past six years, and the tax values were lagging to the extent that no additional bonds could be voted for any type of school. When the assessor had finished his task of re-evaluating the property, according to the plan set up by the local men, he had raised the values within the district considerably.

By law, when a person's property has been valued higher for tax purposes he is entitled to a hearing from an equalization board. The school board had appointed the equalization board, and cards had been sent out to all people whose property values had been increased to meet with the equalization board. When the people came they were out of hand; some of them cursed, they stormed down the halls, and walked on the shrubbery. But the equalization board stayed fast on the job. After much more explaining to them, as taxpayers, the need of the increase, and when they realized that the assessor was going by the recommendations of some of their own friends and neighbors, they were, as a rule, much better satisfied.

The election carried here, but the needs were mandatory. Since that time, within nine months of the first bond issue, the patrons have voted an additional \$85,000 to complete more classrooms. Some of the other schools had similar experiences, but from what has happened in most instances in Dallas County, the superintendents are of the opinion that the local tax board is preferable to the expert.

In answer to the question whether the school had a \$1.50 tax rate, two of the nine schools reported in the affirmative. There are many angles to the tax rate and valuation problem. A school may have a \$1.50 tax rate and have the values set so low, that another school with a

sixty cent or seventy cent tax rate and high valuation will collect much more revenue.

The wisest procedure is to have a low valuation and a high rate, as long as the school is a salary aid school and the superintendent does not want to vote bonds. This would be especially true if the superintendent wanted to collect a great amount of revenue from the state department of education and protect his own taxpayers. Some schools have a high valuation and a low tax rate, in order to have the valuation to vote bonds. Another point to remember, if you have a salary aid school, is that if you remain eligible to receive salary aid, the values may not be decreased, unless it is possible to show that there has been an actual loss of property that was beyond the control of the school.

Each superintendent reported that his patrons were "for" the tax rate or value increase, otherwise it would not have been possible to carry the bond election. Many times the superintendent feels that all the patrons are opposed to tax increases. However, this is not true. The patron who opposes the proposal will come to the meetings and express his thoughts, and many times is well satisfied with the project on leaving; but the people who are for the undertaking usually stay at home and use their influence for good. The citizenry, generally speaking, is to be depended upon. They need to be, and must be informed.

Six of the nine superintendents questioned made public speeches in behalf of the building program. Each of these men indicated in their conversation that they were invited over and over to attend meetings of various clubs and to make public addresses. This they were glad to do. The Parent Teacher Association and Dads' Clubs were especially eager to have the superintendent report on his anticipated program. Occasionally some fellow will "take you apart", but when a superintendent is fair, democratic and honest, most of the people are also. They respect honesty. Other superintendents reported that they were at times questioned and criticized, but that they were glad to meet and know the people better. The Parent Teacher Associations and Dads' Clubs were a real blessing in most communities.

The superintendents who did not make public addresses for the project made the following reports. Some felt that since their bond issue was small they did not wish to become involved in any differences that might arise within the community. Another was asked by his board to stay as clear of the friction as he possibly could, because any disagreement in which he might be involved could have a tendency to disrupt the progress of the school. However, in most cases, the wise superintendent will meet with the different groups and encourage them to ask questions and get the full information.

When asked if the board members made public appearances for the proposal, five of the nine schools reported in the affirmative. There was some difference of opinion in accounting for the reasons. Some contended that their board members were interested in the program and would exert every ounce of energy to help carry the election for the benefit of the children. One superintendent reported that he had one member that talked the issue to "death". Every opportunity he had, he would get to his feet and start discussing the proposal. He was in a local business and many people had different opinions as to exactly what his motive was. Another superintendent had a "talking member" that did a lot of talking and actually said nothing. He was so confused on tax values, state aid and the simple fundamentals that after he finished his talk the patrons were more confused than ever. Then there is the solid, sensible board member who really has the necessary information. When he talks, people listen. He is informed, he knows the law and he is not guessing. When he talks he has genuine influence. He has told people the facts often, and they have reason to believe him. Based on the reports of these superintendents, it seems best to recommend that the board members talk for the proposal, if they are well informed, and command respect in the community. It is better for them to talk than to have no apparent interest in the program.

In the schools where the board members did not talk in public for the bond issues, the superintendents felt that they were not in the right place at the right time, or that instead of getting up before a group each time the opportunity afforded, they were consistently talking to individuals, and that actually their influence was terrific. That type of board member is invaluable to any school. Some other members, however, are not of a disposition to become involved, and will permit either non-interest or pressure to dictate to them the position they take.

Each school reported that they had not used representatives from the state department of education. The superintendent of each school said he felt that he should try to inform his patrons through all the different local agencies, and not take the attitude of "pressuring" the people from higher sources into a feeling that there must be a building program. However, if necessity demanded, the superintendent should not hesitate to call on the State Department for aid, if he should feel that it were necessary for the benefit of the youngsters in the school district.

Eight of the nine schools reporting stated that they had their own school tax assessor-collector. The chief reason given was that they feel they can keep some better record of delinquent taxes and the amount of taxes collected. In school Number 7, the district has had its own local

collector for the past year only. This tax assessor-collector has been accused of everything a person can imagine, but now that he has his office built, and since he is rather businesslike in his dealings, he has won many people. He is allowed to assess and collect for the amount allowed by state school law, said amount being two per cent of the amount assessed and two per cent of the amount collected. Many people did not understand this and had the impression that he was allowed to take a larger per cent if he could collect more taxes. When the strong critics realized that he was paid on a percentage basis regardless of the amount collected, the opposition quieted. Some of the other districts that have recently begun to collect their own taxes say that they have had the same trouble.

According to Table 4, school district number 8 does not have a local tax assessor-collector. The superintendent reports that they have their taxes collected through the county tax collector's office. The fee for this service is one-half of one per cent. The district is trying to save money for the time being. Generally speaking, the local districts have found it preferable to have its own assessor-collector, if the district can possibly finance the program without hampering other areas of the school in its educational progress.

Each school reported that some type of survey was made before an attempt was made to raise the tax value or rate. This survey was carried out in several ways. In some districts it was made by the school board and superintendent, in some by a committee of the board, in others by a board appointed for that purpose and in yet others by an "expert". Each superintendent affirmed that a survey should be made, with the one big thought in mind of not what values may be at some outrageous inflated price, but on some consistent basis, a basis that will set the school up on a sound financial basis. That basis will and must be determined by local conditions and the desires of the local citizenry.

Based on the information obtained from the questionnaire is the fact that, of the nine schools, there were six grade schools erected or added to, two high schools erected or added to, while one school is erecting a grade school, gymnasium, and adding some rooms to the existing high school. Six of the nine schools are also contemplating a lunchroom in their building programs. This should give us some idea of the types of buildings that are now in greater demand in Dallas County.

Fortunate indeed is the man who finds that he does not have to raise either the tax rate or value, or possibly both. However, it is not generally necessary to raise both the value and the rate. The next step is a vital point, and

TABLE 5 (Continued)

Methods employed in selling bonds	Superintendents' answers Schools 1-9									Totals	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Yes	No
Did your patrons come to the open meeting to hear the bonds sold	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	3	6
After sale of bonds did you publish the in- formation in the local paper	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9	0
Do you have interest and sinking bonds	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9	0

In checking Table 5, it is noted that all nine schools reported that they did advertise the date and place of the sale of the bonds. This is in line with the legal requirement that the bond sale be publicly announced. Some schools have, at times, gone directly to the state department of education, and without any questions, sold them. At one time the sensible thing to do was just that, as the state department of education could save the schools considerable money, as four per cent interest was considered very good. Now, however, at the present rates, school people are able to borrow money at a much cheaper rate. So by advertising, it is possible to do much better than the state department of education will do, since the rate

of interest over a period of years may mean several thousand dollars. Too, if the state department is not offered the bonds, and the notice has not been publicly made, the board is liable for much criticism and may pay higher interest than they would have to pay had they got competitive bids. It is then recommended, based on the experience of the superintendents interviewed, that the bond sale should always be advertised in advance and several bids obtained, if it is at all possible.

When asked if they used the local paper to advertise the sale of the bonds, six of the nine schools reporting answered "yes". The reasons given for so doing are several, but the most common one was that it was to satisfy the wishes and curiosity and give information to the local citizens. All said that they really counted on their publicity coming from the larger papers but the local paper was used for home consumption.

Three schools did not use a local paper. Two of the communities do not have a local paper, and one said that he felt it was simply a waste of money to use a small, local paper to advertise the bids because he knew the circulation was so small. From the questionnaire and discussion, it would seem that for the benefit of the entire community the relations might be better if the local paper was used to educate the citizens to vote for the bonds, so make use of the local paper for advertising them.

When the question of selling the bonds in an open meeting came up, six schools reported that they did so. Several reasons were given, but most of the superintendents felt that the best reason for selling the bonds in an open meeting was to promote good public relations. The voters of the district have in reality made it possible for the bonds to be sold, so they should be extended the courtesy of knowing the rate of interest they will have to pay, and any other information they desire. Some patrons do take a lot for granted and may be rather obnoxious to some members of the board, but in the dealings of one school last year with the selling of two bond issues, it was found much better to invite the patrons in. The other six superintendents concurred in this belief. At times, in a meeting of this type, criticisms may be made of and to the board. However, if there is a wise and experienced man as the president of the board, he can handle the situation. If he is not capable of so doing, the superintendent may be placed in the position of having to prompt the chairman in his suggestions. That can be either good or bad for the superintendent, depending to a great extent on his diplomacy and the feeling that exists in the group.

The three men that did not sell the bonds in an open meeting each felt, after discussing the matter, that they could have done better had they done so. They stated that they had not thought of it or thought it necessary at the

time. All nine superintendents stated that now they are all definitely for selling the bonds in an open meeting of the board. It should be pointed out here also, that some board members may object to the public coming in to hear the bonds sold. Should this condition exist the superintendent has another administrative problem that will require tact and judgment.

The option bond came up for discussion next. When asked if they requested their boards to insist on an option bond, two of the nine superintendents replied "no", while seven said "yes". The option bond, by way of explanation, is a bond that may be paid off in its entire amount before maturity, with the borrower paying perhaps a year's interest on the unpaid balance when the funds are called in. The advantage of this type of bond is that the borrower may save a few years' interest. The one big disadvantage is that possibly he will be forced to pay a higher rate of interest when he borrows the money. However, most people favor the option bond since it gives them a little more leeway in paying. This was given as the chief reason for favoring the option bond, as most superintendents felt there might be a need for paying the bonds off before maturity date.

In their first sale of bonds the past year, one school opened the bids and after the low bidder had been determined, one of the men on the board insisted that the board have

the option of paying off the bonds at the end of twenty years. The bidder, at first, stated emphatically that he was not interested, but after some discussion the board was able to get the option clause in the bid at the same rate of interest that would have been paid for a series bond. The series bond, as you may know, must be paid in certain denominations yearly until paid. The other members, at first, thought him out of line, but came to appreciate him for his stand after it was more fully understood. Should a board become involved in a dispute of this kind, the superintendent is again placed in a most uncomfortable position, as he is considered the likely person to settle the question. As a rule, it would be better to decide definitely on the type of bonds wanted and insofar as possible never permit the board to get crossed up. Yes, it takes a lot of planning but it is worth it.

The two schools that did not get option bonds feel now that they were simply out-talked. That may or may not have been true, but by their own statements they do not have option bonds. Had the board stayed steady and held out, they would probably have gotten the option bond. Another very strong point for the option bond is the fact that the hometown people who come to hear the bonds sold feel, if they knew what an option bond is, that the board has done an excellent job of selling when it is stated or announced that they do have option bonds. As a result of

the findings of the questionnaire and from interviews with the several superintendents, option bonds are definitely to be recommended.

The next question was whether the schools had received bids on the bonds from local financiers. Two of the schools reported yes, the other seven no. The two schools which reported yes are still having some difficulty with their finances. One of the local men felt that since he was the owner of the local newspaper and president of the bank that it should have been an open and closed deal. He was not concerned with the legality of the question, but just thought that since he was a resident tax payer he should be extended the privilege of purchasing the bonds. Naturally, with the local newspaper at his disposal, he wrote some very pointed editorials. This did not benefit the school any. The superintendent had a tremendous task of trying to convince the banker that there must be bids and that the board was protecting his own interests along with all other patrons of the district. He did not succeed, and relations between the two men are not too good.

The young superintendent just starting out is especially likely to run into a problem of this kind, due to lack of experience in the technical aspects of planning a building program. The problems are many and varied, so the best way to avoid trouble is to plan and keep planning before the building program actually is to start.

In the other district where the local man bid he got the bonds. He bid just as the other bond companies did, but was in a position to give a very low rate of interest. This gentleman was civic minded and he wanted to help his community, and did so in this way. He not only helped it financially but made for friendly relations. Fortunate indeed is the school district that has within its boundaries great men that are honest, fair and dependable.

The superintendent of each of the schools which reported that no local man submitted a bid for the school bonds indicated that there was no man within the district financially able to handle the bonds. From a study of the questionnaire, it seems likely that a school board would be better off not to have a local bidder for the school bonds.

Eight of the nine schools reported that the bonds went to the highest bidder. Most anyone can see that if a school has several bids, the normal disposition of the bonds would be to make the most sensible deal they could, which would be to save the most possible money on the school bonds. In the one school where the school board did not sell to what appeared to be the best buy from a monetary point of view, it was pointed out that the board felt that the legal counsel they were extended along with the bond sale fully compensated for a slighty higher rate. This might be difficult to explain to some patrons, but when the full and complete details are set out, they usually understand.

In answer to the question of the patrons' coming to the open meeting to hear the bonds sold, three schools replied yes, six no. In the three affirmative schools the superintendents felt that in some instances the patrons came not with the best attitude, but to find fault. However, in many cases, the people came because they were interested in their school, community and the boys and girls. As a whole, the three superintendents who had visitors were well pleased since the people who are informed can be the best ally of the school. Each of the superintendents was glad they had patrons with enough interest in the school to come to the meeting.

The six schools reporting on the negative side seemed to think that the patrons simply were not interested. Some were slightly concerned, and some were uneasy. The six men as a whole seemed to feel that possibly it would have been better had the taxpayers been present. This report, is most interesting and proves that the method employed by a superintendent in one community might be a tremendous success, and yet be a complete failure in another. The personality and philosophy of any school superintendent may be of great influence in the success of the school building program.

When asked if the complete information of the bond sale was publicized in the local paper, or some facsimile, the answer was "yes" unanimously. News of the school is of

interest to most people. Every superintendent felt that it was his responsibility or that of the board to inform the patrons of matters concerning the school. Many times unless correct information is given out, incorrect information is spread and many people will get the wrong impression of the school and its program. On the basis of opinions voiced in the questionnaire, full and complete information should be given to the patrons as soon as it is available, not in a premature state but in its complete details.

Each school contacted was asked what method was used to finance the bond issue. All nine schools stated that they use the Interest and Sinking type bonds. This enables the district to collect money each year from the local school taxes to defray the cost of financing the bonds. From the answers to the questionnaire and personal discussions it appears that the Interest and Sinking Fund Method is the most desirable.

Another problem that is of paramount interest, concern and importance to the superintendent and his board is the selection of the architect for the proposed school. This is usually done after the bonds have been voted, however, it may or may not be done before the site is selected. To illustrate some methods used in the Dallas County schools, Table 6 is used to outline the outstanding problems that were involved.

The one man that must know his buildings is the architect. Each time that one of the schools in Dallas County has gone into a movement for expansion, the architect came in for some very heavy discussion. The school is generally of a structural basis that is considered permanent. It must house the boys and girls and as a result must certainly be comfortable and safe. The architect is the master planner. If the board should happen to know what they want and are able to outline it to the architect, he still must find all the weak points from a structural standpoint, if for no other reason. So the choosing of the architect must be carefully considered.

In no instance did any of the superintendents questioned take the full responsibility for selection of the architect. Several reasons were given. For one thing, the superintendent, nominally, does not have the authority to select the architect, and another is that most superintendents would not care to have the responsibility in so important an undertaking. In two of the schools where the superintendent was asked to select the architect, he wisely declined. It was extremely fortunate in one case especially that the superintendent did not make the selection as the wall in one of his buildings fell down. Since that date there has been much criticism of the architect. The architect blames the general contractor, and the contractor blames the architect. The dispute is now in court for settlement. The superintendent

is wise not to become too egotistical and take authority each time it may be extended to him.

The superintendents in two of our nine schools report that their boards selected the architect without discussing his qualifications with them. The remaining seven were consulted by their boards in the architect's selection. There may be several reasons that the superintendent is not consulted by the board. Sometimes the board members feel that they know more about construction than the board will ever know; sometimes it may be for the fact that the board fails to recognize the superintendent as administrative head of the school; and in other cases the superintendent may conduct himself in such a manner as to cause the board to have good reason for doubting his ability. In nearly all cases in which the board refuses to or does not consult the superintendent, he is probably as much at fault as is the board.

In seven of the schools contacted, the board suggested that a committee and the superintendent check the qualifications of several architects and report back to the board. In all seven cases where the committee reported favorably, the board followed them through on the recommendation. That is teamwork, and the superintendent that has the ability to work with his board and to persuade them to see what he is trying to do can make much progress. Based on this study,

the best procedure seems to be for the board and the superintendent to work together as a team to select the architect.

Each superintendent questioned was acquainted with the fact that the architect must possess a Texas license. Each school that was actually engaged in a building program had a licensed architect on the job. This is required by law, but many people fail to read the law, and through ignorance might hire a man without the required license. The board needs all the assistance the superintendent can possibly give them in a building program, particularly in the selection of the architect. This is a definite finding from this study.

Only two of the superintendents reported that a local architect asked for the job in his own district. Seven had applications from men outside the district only. In one of the two schools where there was a local applicant, there was and still is trouble, and the superintendent feels that there always will be. The superintendent in this school could not recommend the applicant to the board. Possibly one reason might have been personal, and if so that was wrong. The fact remains that the local architect did not get the job and today is still fighting the building program. He has been given several jobs by the city government, and has used all his influence to fight the school board and superintendent. The school superintendent has tried to reason with the man and tried to show him that his selection

would not have been best, but the fight will probably continue until one of the men moves. It is difficult to know how best to cope with such a problem. In this instance the superintendent felt that he might have been too hasty in his recommendation. The beginning superintendent should remember that if he does have local men that are capable, an effort should be made to appease or satisfy them. In the other school where the local man bid for the job, he was convinced finally that he was not able to finance the project. Then, too, another type of construction came up for him, and he took that. Much careful planning should insure the superintendent against making any suggestions for or against the use of local architects that he might regret.

In the seven schools that had no local man to apply for the job, there was no local man capable of financing the project. All seven of these superintendents were pleased that the architect was not a resident of the local district.

Each reporting school stated that the architect was required to stay on the job to make inspection of materials and the plans to see that everything was carried out in strict compliance with the plans as submitted by the architect to the board. Too, the architect would naturally be interested in getting the best job possible, since the finished product is really his own suggestion as taken from

the blueprints. From a study of the questionnaires, it seems essential to require the architect to remain on the job.

This problem came up in one of the schools. A local builder felt that he knew much more than the architect, and proceeded to inform the superintendent of construction that the building was not in compliance with the plans. He then went to members of the board with information that caused them to think that the architect was a "crook". A board meeting was called and the local man was told to stay off the job from that date on. Shortly thereafter the superintendent of the school was passing the job and saw this local man being chased off the job by a group of iron workers. They were in close pursuit of the fellow with hammers and any other piece of metal they could get their hands on. Fortunately the man got to his car and sped away. He did not come back to inspect the job anymore. He did have the foreman placed under a peace bond and the contractor was caused some difficulty in keeping his foreman out of jail for a few days. From that time on, the men in charge of construction were not disturbed.

All schools reported that the architect met with the board when invited to do so by the board or the superintendent. The answers and discussions were to the effect that since the architect was the man responsible for the structure, he should approve the estimates for payments as submitted by

the contractor to the board, as well as suggest any changes in plans that might be necessary. Each superintendent though he was due the courtesy of being asked to meet with the board. Each superintendent also stated that the architect was employed on a percent basis rather than on a salary. This procedure is customary, and should a question arise as to the percent usually paid, this study has revealed that in the case of these schools, the amount was ordinarily six percent of the bid that is let to the contractor.

The next major problem to confront a school superintendent and board is the letting of the bid for the actual construction of the building. Naturally there are many problems in letting the contract for the erection of any building, but in the erection of a school building, where a great number of patrons, tax payers and civic minded people are concerned, it behooves the superintendent and board to secure the very best contractor possible. Some of the more pertinent questions to be discussed with the superintendent are outlined in Table 7.

According to answers to the questionnaire, all nine schools advertised for bids on the construction. This is a requirement set up by Texas Public School Law. There had been some difference of opinion on this matter, but it was ruled by the attorney for one of the schools that three separate advertisings, one each week for three consecutive

TABLE 7--Continued

Methods employed in letting the Contract for actual Construct- ion	Superintendents Answers Schools 1-9									Totals	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Yes	No
Does your board usually let the contract the night the bids are opened	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	6	3
Do you favor a general con- tractor rather than letting bids on in- dividual items	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	9	0

The chief reason given by the nine schools for selling their bonds in an open meeting was that it would cause the patrons to feel that they were more a part of the program. Certainly any school man needs all the local support that he can muster when he goes into a building campaign, and selling the bonds in their presence gives them confidence in you and the program.

The architect was present in eight of the nine board meetings when the bids for construction were opened. The other school had invited him to be in their meeting, but it was necessary for him to be out of town. Each of the nine superintendents recognized the architect as the key

man in the building program, and felt that he should be present for the opening of the bids. Many times the architect can assist the board at this time by pointing out to them certain conditions that should or should not be specified in the builder's contract.

No one of the superintendents was faced with the problem of having a board member bid for the construction. This was unusual, since often a local contractor's bid does bring this problem to the superintendent and board. Some contractors who reside within the district may be of untold value to the school, provided they are more interested in the entire school than they are in individual profits. The individual will be the determining factor in this instance.

Two schools reported that pressure had been brought to bear upon them and the board in order for some local contractor to get the construction of the school. Seven had not had this problem. The superintendent and the board may be placed definitely on the spot when a group of local citizens are clubs back a local contractor. The chief reason given is that he is a taxpayer and should be permitted to share in the profits of the construction. It is usually pointed out that he will use local labor, which in turn would give employment to other residents. Another point often emphasized is the fact that he is an excellent and trustworthy builder, probably better than any other man submitting a bid. Generally speaking, however, in schools of

the size that we are considering, the contractor has not erected so many large buildings as the so-called big contractor that operates on a big scale. In both schools the local man did not get the job and in both schools there has been some dissention, as any local person will have some friends in the community who will think that he should have been given the contract.

The superintendents of the seven schools reporting that there was no local contractor bidding for the jobs felt that they were free to use their deliberate choice in their selection. There was little or no dissention in these cases, so when possible it is likely better to use a contractor from out of the school district.

Four of the nine schools reported that the architect was in charge of the legal aspects of the job. They seemed to feel that he was a technical as well as a legal adviser to the board. The five schools reporting that the architect was not in charge of the legal aspect of the program used an attorney. The use of the attorney will incur additional expenses, but it is well worth it in the minds of the five superintendents that were fortunate enough to have the attorney. Of the four schools that did not have an attorney, two were emphatic in their belief that every school should have one. The other two were in agreement that an attorney is needed, but not essential. The chief reason given for

not having an attorney was the lack of funds, or the general feeling, in the beginning, that legal advise was not necessary.

All schools were in agreement in furnishing or making it possible for each contractor to be furnished with a set of plans before he submitted his bid. This is necessary, for no contractor could sensibly bid on any project unless he could know just what he was to construct. Each school, however, did require that a forfeit of from \$25.00 to \$30.00 be placed with the board, and then if the plans and specifications were returned in good condition, the contractor was refunded the amount he had "put up".

When asked whether the contract was let the night the bids were opened six schools reported yes, three no. The schools which let the contracts felt that the bids were in order, and too, there were a great many people listening to see just how the boards were going to spend the taxpayers' money. However in most instances, the contract was let because the board was satisfied with the bid and it was within the amount of bond money the district had voted. All other things, being equal insofar as the several boards could tell, they all took the lowest bid.

The three schools that did not accept the bids the night the bids were opened gave various reasons. Two were not sure of the legal aspects of the program, as they did

not have an attorney. The other school did not have a bid that came within the amount of bond money the school possessed. As a general rule, when a school advertises for bids, there is a notation within the bid that the school reserves the right to accept or reject any or all bids, so when the bids do not come within the amount of money available the school was within its rights in refusing to accept any bids. Generally speaking, all the superintendents thought it would be better to accept the bids the night they were opened, if it were possible to do so.

Another point of discussion was in regard to letting the contract to a general contractor, or to several independent contractors. The chief reason for not letting the contract to a general contractor is that it will likely be more expensive. This is true since the general contractor will sublet a great amount of the work, and each time he does, he figures his own profit over and above what the subcontractor figures for his profit. So the chief objection to the general contractor is the additional money it will cost.

Each school man reported that he favored a general contractor. The superintendents did not want to let the contracts as individual items, because no one person is responsible for the entire project. Many times if the program goes slowly, the cement man blames the publisher or vice-versa. There is no complete unification on the job. In the long

run the job may cost more if let to several unit contractors, though the apparent cost at first is not so much. So all the superintendents favor letting the job to one man, then holding him responsible.

There are other problems with which a superintendent will be confronted any time he enters a building program. No school will have the same identical problems, nor will the people react the same. The time that has been covered in this problem is immediately post war. Generally speaking the people have money. Also during the war the schools did not spend very much money for building purposes. It is believed that a study of the problems herein presented will be of assistance to any school man beginning his first building program.

Summary

For emphasizing the more important findings in the preceding chapter, these outstanding points are made:

- I. In order to vote bonds for the school districts to construct needed school buildings:
 1. A majority of the districts raised the tax values, but not the tax rates. The tax values were set by a local board, and not by a tax expert.
 2. A very small number of the schools checked have as much as \$1.50 tax rate. The superintendents

and board did all they felt they could to educate the people on the school needs.

3. The type of schools constructed varied, but all general enough to cover almost any situation.
4. A majority of the schools have their own tax assessor-collector.

II. When the district was ready to sell the bonds:

1. The place and date of the sale was advertised in the local paper, and the public invited.
2. A majority of the schools insisted on an option bond, with the highest bidder getting the bonds.
3. The schools finance the bonds by use of an interest and sinking fund.
4. The details of the sale of the bonds is completely publicized in the local paper for the benefit of those who do not come to hear the bonds sold.

III. The following considerations were necessary in the selection of an architect:

1. The board selected the architect with the help of the superintendent.
2. The architect was required to have a Texas license.

3. The architect is not, as a rule, a local man, and is required to stay on the job for inspection.
4. The architect meets with the board at their invitation, and is employed on a percent basis.

IV. After the bonds had been sold and the architect had been employed, the next important step is to let the contract for actual construction.

1. Bids were advertised in the local paper and sold in an open meeting with the architect present.
2. As a rule, the board members do not bid on the job, nor do the local citizens bring undue pressure for some local contractor to be awarded the job.
3. A majority of schools use an attorney for legal advise on the construction of a job.
4. Usually the board lets the contract the night the bids are opened, having previously made it possible for each bidding contractor to have a copy of the plans and specifications. Most of the school men favor a general contractor.

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

This study has been made with the full knowledge that in the immediate postwar period schoolhouse bonds have been relatively easy to vote. The chief apparent reasons are the run-down condition of the schools, overcrowded schools and the excess amount of money people seem to possess. The following points seem to be outstanding:

1. A good public relations program should be carried out before a school superintendent endeavors to vote bonds.
2. All agencies within the school district, both civic and non-civic, should be taken into the full confidence of the school authorities and their aid sought.
3. The school site should be selected by the superintendent and his board.
4. A complete tax survey should be made before the bonds are voted.
5. The bonds should be sold in an open meeting with the public invited.
6. The architect should be selected by the board upon the recommendation of the superintendent.

7. The contract for actual construction should be let in an open meeting, only after due publicity has been given same.

Conclusions

The following conclusions have been reached as a result of this study, provided the information given by the different superintendents of Dallas County is true and correct:

1. The school board will need and must have the cooperation of the entire community to carry out successfully a worthwhile building program.
2. The school authorities should supply complete and detailed information in regard to the proposed building program.
3. The school site should be selected before the bonds are voted by the school board and superintendent.
4. A complete survey should be made to determine the ability of the district to pay additional taxes before the bonds are voted.
5. The place and date of the sale of the bonds should be advertised and the bonds should be sold in an open meeting.
6. The serial bonds should be financed by using an interest and sinking fund.
7. The board should select an architect, with a Texas license, upon recommendation of the superintendent.

8. Bids for actual construction should be taken in an open meeting, and sold the night they are opened.

Recommendations

Based on the information obtained as a result of this study, the following recommendations are offered with the thought that possibly some superintendent may be benefited when he shall undertake a building program in his school:

1. The school board and all agencies connected directly or indirectly with the school should be convinced of the need for a new school plant.
2. The site should be selected by the superintendent and board before the bonds are voted, and purchased from the owner at the most economical price possible.
3. The tax increase, if needed, should be arranged through the local tax assessor-collector, with the aid of some local citizens appointed by the school board.
4. The option type bonds should be sold in an open meeting with the understanding that an interest and sinking fund will be used to finance them.
5. A qualified architect, employed on a percentage basis, should be selected by the superintendent and the board.
6. The bids for the actual construction should be sold in an open meeting after due publicity has been given through the local paper.

7. The school attorney should be present to advise the superintendent and board on legal questions.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Courter, Claude V., School Administration Initiates a School Building Program, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1941.
- Essex, Don L., "Bonding Versus Pay as You Go", Unpublished Master's Thesis, Columbia University, August, 1931.
- Massey, Gabe E., "Laws Governing School Property of Texas", Unpublished Master's Thesis, Department of Education, North Texas State Teachers College, August, 1945.
- Seybert, Warren C., The Characteristics of a Modern Educational Program, Chicago, University of Chicago Press Co., 1947.
- Strayer, George D., and Englehardt, N. L.; School Building Problems, New York, Teachers College, 1936.
- Tanner, Myrtle L., Public School Directory, Bulletin No. 484, Austin, 1947-48.