

THE EFFECT OF HOUSE BILL 212
ON THE COMMON SCHOOLS OF THE DEPENDENT
DISTRICTS OF CHOCTAW COUNTY

THE EFFECT OF HOUSE BILL 212
ON THE COMMON SCHOOLS OF THE DEPENDENT
DISTRICTS OF CHOCTAW COUNTY

By

HAROLD OSWALD DOENGES

Bachelor of Arts

OKLAHOMA CITY UNIVERSITY

1928

Submitted to the School of Education
Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College
In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
For the Degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE

1937

LIBRARY
A. & M. COLLEGE
MILLIKEN BLDG.

APPROVED:

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "J. M. ...", is written above a solid horizontal line. Below the line, the text "In Charge of Thesis" is printed in a bold, sans-serif font.

J. M. ...
In Charge of Thesis

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "G. C. ...", is written above a solid horizontal line. Below the line, the text "Dean of School of Education" is printed in a bold, sans-serif font.

G. C. ...
Dean of School of Education

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "D. S. M. ...", is written above a solid horizontal line. Below the line, the text "Dean of Graduate School" is printed in a bold, sans-serif font.

D. S. M. ...
Dean of Graduate School

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer is indebted to Doctor J. C. Muerman, Doctor M. R. Chauncey, Professor Guy A. Lackey, Doctor Haskell Pruett, and others whose valuable suggestions are appreciated; to Mr. Ben. P. Herman, County Superintendent of Schools in Choctaw County, Miss Maurine Tyce, his assistant, Mr. I. R. Armstrong, Mr. Joe Wolfe, Mr. A. G. Dickinson, Mr. Ed Miller, and Mr. J. Lee Rogers for the use of the records in their possession.

H.O.D.

PREFACE

The purpose of this survey was to obtain information that would prove beneficial in any future study of school finances, attendance, consolidation, and other important problems, by obtaining definite information of the effect of House Bill 212 upon Choctaw County along these lines.

Choctaw County has very poor official records, especially those concerning the schools. It is a county where all schools are on state aid. It is a typical agricultural county where the soil has been depleted by years of careless farming and erosion. All available records have been used and six of the seven tables show a definite effect of better financing of the schools under House Bill 212. The seventh table shows a result that could be expected under the more favorable conditions, and verifies, as the other tables do, the partial hopes of the authors of House Bill 212.

As similar surveys are made in other counties sampling the different conditions of the state of Oklahoma, the hypothetical nature of school legislation should become more actual, and more rapid improvement should be possible.

H.O.D.

CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
I	A BRIEF HISTORY OF CHOCTAW COUNTY AND ITS EDUCATIONAL INTERESTS	1
II	A SUMMARY OF HOUSE BILL 212	11
III	ANALYSIS AND EVALUATION OF DATA	15
IV	CONCLUSION OBTAINED AS A RESULT OF THIS STUDY	46

TABLES

Table	Page
I. The Number of Teachers in the Common School Districts of Choctaw County	18
II. The Number of Days Taught in the Common School Districts of Choctaw County	20
III. The Average Daily Attendance in the Common Schools of Choctaw County	25
IV. Maintenance Costs in the Common School Districts of Choctaw County	27
V. The Levy in Mills for the Common School Districts of Choctaw County	32
VI. Assessed Valuation of the Common School Districts of Choctaw County	37
VII. The Total Teachers Salaries for the Common School Districts of Choctaw County	42

CHAPTER I
A BRIEF HISTORY OF CHOCTAW COUNTY
AND ITS EDUCATION

Choctaw County began its life as part of the Choctaw Nation upon the signing of the treaty of Dancing Rabbit Creek between the United States and the Choctaw tribe in Mississippi in 1830.¹ This gave the southern part of what is now Oklahoma to the Choctaw Nation.

The journey of the Indians to their new homes began in 1831. A few white missionaries and traders preceded them. Among these were the Doaks Brothers who settled at Doaksville in the southeastern part of what is now Choctaw County. They apparently had been advised as to the home site of the Choctaws since they settled, dug wells, and established themselves in preparation for the arrival of their Choctaw friends.²

The Nation gradually reduced its area by various treaties. In one of these the Chickasaws were given

1 James Shannon Buchanan and Edward Dale, A History of Oklahoma (Norman, Oklahoma, 1924), p. 114.

2 Roy M. Johnson, Oklahoma South of the Canadian. (Chicago, Ill. 1925), Vol. I, p. 468.

tribal rights,³ land was rented to the government for the location of western tribes⁴ and was later deeded to the government for this purpose.⁵

The Choctaw territory was only slightly affected by the Civil War. The inroads of whites as inter-married citizens and laborers following immediately upon its close, they became an important problem in all future tribal affairs.⁶

In 1905 the inhabitants of Indian Territory unsuccessfully attempted to form the State of Sequoyah.⁷ In this state we find the present Choctaw County listed as Hitchcock County, and having practically the same boundaries as Choctaw County of today.⁸ The new name was attached after the state of Oklahoma had been divided into seventy-five counties.⁹

After statehood in 1907 we find this county located north of the Red River and along the Kiamichi River.

³ James Shannon Buchanan and Edward Everett Dale, op. cit., p. 116

⁴ Ibid., p. 118

⁵ Ibid., p. 147

⁶ Roy M. Johnson, op. cit., p. 156

⁷ James Shannon Buchanan and Edward Everett Dale, op. cit., pp. 276-277

⁸ Ibid., p. 277

⁹ Ibid., p. 284

Doaksville, Grant, and Ft. Towson were the earliest settlements and towns, while the present county seat, Hugo, was founded in 1903, at the crossing of the St. Louis and San Francisco lines, east and west, north and south, five miles north of Grant.¹⁰ This city grew in size while the other towns of the county have gradually become smaller and less important as transportation became more rapid and efficient.¹¹ Grant, the most southern town in the county has dropped from a population of one thousand seven hundred fifty¹² to the present population of two hundred ninety-six.¹³ Ft. Towson, the most easterly village, once a great lumber center with a population of one thousand,¹⁴ now has a bare four hundred eighty-six.¹⁵ Soper and Boswell both located west of Hugo, have fallen in population from their peaks of one thousand six hundred¹⁶ and one thousand two hundred¹⁷ to the present four hundred seventeen¹⁸ and nine hundred eighty-four,¹⁹ respectively.

10 Roy M. Johnson, op. cit., pp. 467-478

11 Ibid., p. 467

12 Ibid., p. 467

13 Federal Census, 1930

14 Roy M. Johnson, op. cit., p. 467

15 Federal Census, 1930

16 Roy M. Johnson, op. cit., p. 468

17 Ibid., p. 468

18 Federal Census, 1930

19 Ibid.

Hugo, while faring better than these towns on account of its central location, has nevertheless suffered because of the backwardness of farming, the principal occupation of the entire district. As the lumber mills receded from Ft. Towson the property valuation diminished greatly. Cotton and attendant crops became so poor in quantity and price that at present Hugo finds its schools on state aid and in the midst of a none too hopeful future financially.²⁰

The Choctaw Nation with which one must begin in relating the history of this territory, established its first tribal school in Mississippi on April 19, 1819 with a membership of ten children, supported from funds provided by the nation.²¹ The first schools to be located in the Indian Territory west of the Mississippi River, by the Choctaw Nation, was a male academy at Goodland²² and a female academy at Wheelock;²³ later,

20 Ed Ansley, Commercial Conditions in Choctaw County, 1930 to 1936. Chamber of Commerce, Hugo, Oklahoma, 1937. February

21 George Shimmerhoen, Beginning Among the Choctaw Indians. Hugo, Oklahoma

22 Mrs. Bella McCollum Gibbond, Work Among the Indians. Hugo, Oklahoma, 1930. p. 16.

23 Ibid., p. 8

Pineridge,²⁴ Mt. Pleasant,²⁵ Goodwater,²⁶ and Spencer academies were established.²⁷

Goodland is the oldest of any of the present mission schools, and is located near Hugo, Oklahoma. It was founded in 1845.²⁸ At first it was supported by contributions from friends, but in 1902 the government gave a small amount for boarding pupils. The number has been enlarged until in 1930 eighty pupils are cared for in this manner. The Indians donated land for the school, and friends of the school had by 1930 helped to build two dormitories.²⁹ It now has six dormitories, three teacherages, one gymnasium, a chapel, barns, and other vocational buildings besides five hundred acres of land.³⁰ Thirteen teachers now make up the teaching staff for sixty-five high school students and three hundred grade pupils, not all of these have to be boarded as some are from local homes in the district.³¹ Goodland seems to be

24 Ibid., p. 16

25 Ibid., p. 16.

26 Ibid., p. 16.

27 Ibid., p. 16

28 Mrs. Bella McCollum Gibbons, op. cit., p. 16

29 Ibid., p. 16

30 Edward Miller, Annual Report to Presbyterian Home Home Mission Board, 1936. Hugo, Oklahoma

31 Ibid.

an institution that has grown with the increasing needs of the times. And under the supervision of their various superintendents, including the present administration under Mr. Ed Miller, the institution has justified its existence and is looking forward to increasing its service to Indian children of the Choctaw Nation.

There are now forty-five dependent districts and four independent districts, all on state aid, in Choctaw County.³² The state requirements for teachers have improved the quality of teachers, and the county now has independent high schools located at Soper, Boswell, Ft. Towson, and Hugo. Grant's High School is dependent.³³ These high schools are located not more than eighteen miles from Hugo, the central point. In fact, Boswell lies eighteen miles west of Hugo and Ft. Towson seventeen miles east; both places are located within a few miles of their respective boundaries of the county. All of the high school students with the exception of Boswell and Ft. Towson could easily be transferred to Hugo.

The high schools range in pupil enrollment from fifty-nine at Grant³⁴ to four hundred three at Hugo,³⁵

32 Ben Harman, Annual Report of the County Superintendent, of Choctaw County, 1934. Hugo, Oklahoma

33 Ibid.

34 Ibid.

35 Harvey M. Blac, Annual Enumeration Record. Hugo, Okla.

where sixteen high school teachers are employed³⁶ in contrast to three at Grant.³⁷

Very little transportation is carried on.³⁸ The districts are located not to save money, but apparently to form schools at the various towns, and the roads in bad weather present a serious problem to transportation.

There are thirteen one-teacher schools, sixteen two-teacher schools, nine three-teacher schools, and two four-teacher schools in the county.³⁹ The enrollments vary from an average daily attendance of thirteen in district forty-seven to two hundred fourteen in district thirteen.⁴⁰ Besides these schools there is a negro high school in Hugo and twenty-eight negro grade schools throughout the county.⁴¹

There have been five county superintendents in Choctaw County,⁴² F. M. Hughes, H. G. Bennett, J. T. Reed,

36 Ibid.

37 Ibid.

38 Ben Herman, op. cit.,

39 Ibid.

40 Ibid.

41 Ibid.

42 Ibid.

A. N. Conder, and Ben P. Herman who has served the last two terms, while the newly elected superintendent of schools, Rex Perkins, will take office July 5, 1937.⁴³

Numerous schools in the county have changed their entire teaching staff during the past few years. Hugo and Soper are examples. At Soper the entire staff was discharged again this year. This is the second time within a period of four years. The estimated turn-over of teachers in the common schools was 10 per cent annually over a period of three years, from 1934-to 1937.⁴⁴

According to the high school records at Hugo, 45 per cent of the graduates in the past four years attended college.⁴⁵ A majority of these attended Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College at Stillwater,⁴⁶ because of the agriculture work offered in that school which prepares them for a better life in their native county. The second largest number attended Oklahoma University at Norman.⁴⁷ The third largest number attended Southeastern Teachers College at Durant, while the fourth

43 Hugo Daily News, Vol. XXII Issue 125, July 6, 1936

44 This estimate was made by the present county superintendent stating he had no definite data from which to give accurate figures.

45 Ira R. Armstrong, Hugo High School Records, Principal Office

46 Ibid.

47 Ibid.

largest number attended Murray Agricultural College at Tishomingo. They attended Murray Agricultural College because of its training outlined for Indian students.

In a survey made in Hugo,⁴⁸ and in Choctaw County,⁴⁹ it was found that children 1/16 Indian or over, comprise only 10 per cent of the 1936 and 1937 school enumeration.

The county records show that a majority of the Indian children go to school.⁵⁰ The government Indian agents are busy encouraging their attendance.

The great amount of change in the report forms from year to year has made the acquiring of data a rather difficult problem. Figures for more than two years along many of the comparisons considered for this thesis were found to be either inaccurate or incomplete. Many changes were found in the annual records kept in the county superintendent's office.

Teacher tenure, qualification of teachers, total expenditures, warrants outstanding, warrants retired, and other statistical information had to be excluded because of the lack of complete records for more than two years.⁵¹

48 Ibid.

49 Ben Harman, County Enumeration Records, 1935, 1936, 1937.

50 Ibid.

51 Ibid.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. BOOKS:

1. Buchanan, James Shannon, and Dale, Edward Everett. A History of Oklahoma. Row, Peterson and Company, ed., 1924.
2. Gibbons, Bella McCollum. Work Among the Choctaw Indians. Presbyterian Committee of Publication, ed., Richmond, Virginia and Texarkana, Arkansas and Texas.
3. Johnson, Roy M. Oklahoma South of the Canadian. John P. Gilday and Mark H. Salt, ed., Vol. I, Chicago, Illinois. S. J. Clarke Publishing Company, 1925.

B. NEWSPAPERS

1. Hugo, Oklahoma. The Hugo Daily News. Vol. XXII, July 7, 1936

C. MANUSCRIPTS

1. Ansley, Ed. Present Commercial Conditions of Choctaw Indians. (Covers from 1800 to 1850) Original copy owned by Rev. Johnson Bob, Hugo, O Oklahoma.

D. REPORTS

1. Armstrong, Ira R. Hugo High School Report. 1935, 1936, 1937. Principal Office, Hugo, Oklahoma.
2. Black, Harvey M. Annual Enumeration Record, Hugo, Oklahoma. Supt. Office, Hugo City Schools, 1937.
3. Herman, Ben. Annual Report of The County Superintendent. Choctaw County, 1930, 1932, 1934, 1936. County Court House, Hugo, Oklahoma.
4. Miller, Ed. Annual Report to the Presbyterian Home Mission Board. 1936. Hugo, Oklahoma.

CHAPTER II

A SUMMARY OF HOUSE BILL 212¹

Briefly summarized House Bill 212 is as follows: the state legislature appropriated eight million two hundred thousand dollars for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1936 and June 30, 1937, for the purpose of aiding in the support and maintenance of the public schools of Oklahoma.

It was the duty of the State Board of Education to divide the money according to law and to notify the local school board as to the amount. These moneys shall be mailed by warrants to the County Treasurers monthly.

Primary aid shall be issued with a Minimum Salary of:

- (1) For each teacher holding a first grade elementary certificate issued on examination, \$50.00 per month;
- (2) For each teacher holding an elementary certificate issued on forty hours of college work, \$65.00 per month;
- (3) For each teacher holding a State Certificate issued on forty hours of college work, \$75.00 per month;
- (4) For each teacher holding a State Certificate issued on a bachelor's degree, \$90.00 per month;

1 John Vaughan, School Laws of Oklahoma, (Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, 1935) pp. 132, 133, 134, 135.

- (6) For each teacher holding a State Certificate issued on a Master's degree or a high grade certificate, \$100.00 per month.

The total number of needed elementary teachers in any district shall be determined by dividing the number of pupils in average daily attendance during the preceding year:

- (a) By eighteen, in districts with an average daily attendance of less than two pupils per square mile;
- (b) By twenty-two, in districts having an average daily attendance of two and less than three pupils per square mile;
- (c) By twenty-six, in districts having an average daily attendance of three and less than six pupils per square mile;
- (d) By thirty, in districts having an average daily attendance of nine or more pupils per square mile.
- (e) By thirty-two, in districts having an average daily attendance of nine or more pupils per square mile.

In case the school enumeration fell off or increased, the State Board might change the number of teachers at their own discretion.

Secondary Aid. Where the district after having voted ten (10) mills levy and still finds itself short of a full term, a secondary aid fund is provided to maintain the school at a minimum schedule for a minimum term. The school must meet these requirements.

The Board of Education must by a sworn statement show that:

- (a) The district has lawfully assessed ten (10) mills for school taxes.
- (b) That the ten mills and the Primary Aid and other funds is insufficient to maintain the schools the minimum term.
- (c) The proportion of teachers to pupils is proper.
- (d) The schedule of teachers salaries is reasonable.
- (e) The Budget for maintenance expenses and building repairs is commensurate with the actual needs of the district.

This shall be distributed, under the direction of the State Board of Education and the Governor, alike to all schools who qualify.

The Board of Education of each district must make complete reports on blanks to be furnished by the State Department for that purpose, before funds shall be issued, and reports must be turned in by a date specified by the State Department.

The last section of the law provided for the source of funds and the time the law became effective.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. BOOKS

1. Vaughan, John. School Laws of Oklahoma. 1935.

B. GOVERNMENT DOCUMENTS

1. State Support for Public Education. Fifteenth Legislature, House Bill Number 212.

CHAPTER III
ANALYSIS AND EVALUATION OF DATA

The schools of Choctaw County studied for this survey have been classified according to the State Department's classification into dependent and independent school districts. The study has included in detail only the schools in dependent districts.

The schools are those located in districts where either no high schools or small high schools are maintained, and are principally rural schools with from one to four teachers. They are under the direct supervision of the county superintendent and the state rural supervisors. All funds are handled by the county and vacancies on the school boards are filled by the county superintendent of schools. There are forty-five of these schools in Choctaw County.¹ Seven factors have been used in making this study, they are; total number of teachers, number of days taught, average daily attendance, total teachers salary, maintenance, assessed valuation, and mill levy. Definite information in the form of this data is found in the County Superintendent's Office and the years 1930, 1932, 1934, and 1936 were used because these years would present a good sample of the

1 Ben Herman, Annual Report County Superintendent 1937. Hugo, Oklahoma

conditions of these schools under various financial conditions and state regulations. There are logical reasons for the use of these four years which are as follows:

The year 1930 was chosen as one of the years because it was a pre-depression year and representative of a condition in government finances in which an opportunity to better finance the schools was possible.

The year 1932 was chosen because it apparently was an average depression year and practically all the data shows a gradual trend downward in finances and other governmental activities that are of interest in this study.

The year 1934 is considered the bottom year financially for schools. It is the last year before House Bill 212 went into effect. State aid had practically ceased; the Federal government was called upon to furnish additional finances to make an eight months term possible that year. According to the data found, the assessed valuation of every common school district in Choctaw County decreased in 1934.²

The year 1936 was the first of the two years provided for by the state legislature under House Bill 212³ and the only one for which records are available. It is hoped that, although the full recommendations

2 Ben Herman, Annual Report County Superintendent. (Hugo, Oklahoma, 1930, 1932, 1934, 1936).

3 Fifteenth Legislature, House Bill 212.

of the various commissions outlining school finance plans have not been followed completely,⁴ the effect of House Bill 212 on the common schools of Choctaw County can definitely be seen.

From Table 1, "Total Number of Teachers Employed in Common School Districts in Choctaw County",⁵ is shown that in 1930 out of the forty-five common school districts fifteen were one-teacher schools, fourteen were two-teacher schools, eleven three-teacher schools, four four-teacher schools, and three five-teacher schools. In 1932 there was a slight change, there were sixteen one-teacher schools, thirteen two-teacher schools, nine three-teacher schools, the four-teacher schools remained the same in number and the five-teacher schools increased to three in number.

In 1934 there was a slight tendency to consolidate the one-teacher schools into two-teacher schools. In fact, three of the one-teacher schools became two-teacher schools apparently under the stress of the economic condition.

The 1936 figures show only one change in the number of teachers in a district and that is in

4 Brookings Institution. Washington, D. C. E. W. Marland Good Government Fund. Oklahoma City, Oklahoma. 1935. Published by Harlow Publishing Corporation. pp.17-42

5. Ben Herman, op. cit.

TABLE NO. I

Total Number of Teachers in the Common School Districts in Choctaw
County

<u>District No.</u>	<u>Number of Teachers</u>			
	<u>1930</u>	<u>1932</u>	<u>1934</u>	<u>1936</u>
3	4	4	4	4
5	4	5	5	5
7	3	4	4	5
8	2	2	2	2
10	3	3	3	3
11	2	2	2	2
12	2	2	2	2
13	1	5	4	6
14	3	3	2	2
15	1	1	1	1
16	1	1	1	1
17	4	4	4	3
18	1	1	1	1
19	3	3	3	3
20	1	1	1	1
21	3	3	3	4
22	2	2	2	2
23	2	2	2	2
24	2	2	2	2
25	1	1	1	1
26	2	2	2	1
27	3	2	2	2
28	3	3	3	3
29	3	3	3	3
30	3	3	3	3
31	4	4	4	4
32	5	5	5	4
33	3	3	3	3
34	1	1	1	1
35	2	1	2	2
36	3	2	2	2
37	1	1	1	1
38	2	1	3	3
40	2	2	2	2
41	1	1	1	1
42	2	2	2	2
43	1	1	2	2
44	2	2	2	1
45	2	3	3	3
46	1	1	1	1
47	1	1	1	1
48	1	1	1	2
49	1	2	2	2
50	2	1	1	2
51	1	1	1	1
TOTAL	97	100	102	104

district thirteen where two teachers were added, making this a six-teacher school. According to the figures compiled to show the number of teachers employed in the various districts, it seems safe to say that under House Bill 212 there was practically no consolidation in the common schools of this county. Circumstances in 1934 seem to have done far more for the consolidation movement than the Legislative Bill. In taking a cross-section of the figures it was found that eleven schools have been one-teacher schools for the four years, nine have been two-teacher schools for the four years, five during this seven-year period have remained three-teacher schools and one has remained a four-teacher school. This makes a total of twenty-six schools that have not varied in their teacher employment during the four years recorded.

From Table II, "Number of Days Taught in the Common School Districts of Choctaw County"⁶ a definite increase in number of days taught over any of the other three years is shown in the 1936 data. In fact, in summarizing the school year of 1930, supposedly a rather prosperous year, we find that only sixteen of these districts had one hundred eighty days of school. One district had one hundred seventy days, eighteen districts had from one hundred sixty to one hundred

6 Ben Herman, op. cit.

TABLE NO. II

Total Number of Days Taught in the Common School Districts in Choctaw County

District No.	1930	Number of Days Taught		1936
		1932	1934	
3	180	180	*	180
5	160	178	160	180
7	160	160	160	178
8	160	160	160	160
10	160	160	160	170
11	160	160	170	180
12	160	160	160	155
13	155	180	180	180
14	180	173	173	180
15	145	180	160	160
16	180	180	160	172
17	150	135	160	160
18	180	180	160	180
19	160	160	160	160
20	156	155	160	173
21	160	160	160	170
22	160	150	180	160
23	180	180	173	170
24	180	180	180	180
25	160	150	170	160
26	180	120	160	180
27	180	180	180	180
28	180	180	180	180
29	180	180	180	180
30	160	160	160	180
31	160	180	160	170
32	160	160	160	160
33	180	165	180	180
34	160	137	169	170
35	180	160	180	160
36	180	180	170	171
37	154	155	180	180
38	153	160	160	175
40	160	160	127	180
41	109	155	160	160
42	160	160	160	180
43	160	160	180	174
44	160	155	153	175
45	180	170	156½	175
46	180	160	160	155
47	180	180	180	180
48	157	160	180	170
49	140	160	180	180
50	145	165	160	180
51	170	170	165	180
TOTAL	7,359	7,340	7,290	7,560
AVERAGE	163½	163¼	160 1/5	165 7/9

*No record available.

seventy days, six districts had between one hundred fifty and one hundred sixty days, three districts had one hundred forty to one hundred fifty days, and one district had only one hundred nine days which is slightly over a five months term. The average daily attendance in 1930 for common schools was one hundred sixty-three and one-half days, while the average daily attendance in 1932 was decreased one-fourth of a day, or one hundred sixty-three and one-fourth days. In 1932 only thirteen schools had one hundred eighty days of school, while the one hundred sixty to one hundred seventy range has the largest number of nineteen districts. Just above this in the one hundred seventy to one hundred eighty days of school are four school districts, two of these schools were former one hundred eighty day schools, while one held its own, the other came up from the one hundred sixty day level. Six schools again had one hundred fifty days of school, while two have been reduced to this level and the school in 1930 having only one hundred nine days had in 1932 one hundred fifty-five school days. The level below this has added two more schools, two schools having one hundred thirty days to one hundred forty days, and one having one hundred twenty school days.

Table No. II reveals that in 1934 the average number of days taught for the common schools surveyed averages one hundred sixty and one-fifth days. In the

one hundred eighty day classification thirteen schools are recorded, while there are five schools in the one hundred seventy to one hundred eighty days taught, twenty-three of one hundred sixty to one hundred seventy, two of one hundred fifty to one hundred sixty, one with one hundred twenty-seven days. The increased number, having one hundred sixty days of school was most likely caused by the Federal appropriation of relief funds made in that year for the continuation of schools to the eight months term in communities of less than five thousand population. This year undoubtedly would have shown a great decrease if the Federal Government had not made funds available for an eight months term, as over two months was added by this method.

The figures of 1936 in Table No. II show a definite increase of days taught by an average of slightly over five and one-half days. The one hundred eighty day level now has twenty schools, the one hundred seventy to one hundred eighty day level now has fourteen schools, and the one hundred sixty or minimum state requirement was maintained in eight schools. Only two of the forty-five districts in 1936 had less than one hundred sixty days and these both had one hundred fifty-five days. This is a definite improvement over any one of the former years, the districts having the lowest number of days taught in 1936, one hundred

fifty-five days, had forty-six more days of school than the one hundred nine days in 1930, thirty-five days more than the one hundred twenty day low of 1932, and twenty-eight days more than the lowest of 1934 with only one hundred twenty-seven days. Another interesting study was the fact that six districts: district three, twenty-four, twenty-seven, twenty-eight, twenty-nine, and forty-seven have during all these years maintained a nine months school, while six districts, namely; district eight, twelve, seventeen, nineteen, thirty-two, and forty-one have never had more than one hundred sixty days of school.

From these figures definite conclusions can be drawn and these facts positively stated that the common schools of Choctaw County have had more school under House Bill 212 than before; that there has been a definite stabilizing effect in increasing the length of terms upon the average days attended, as will be shown in Table No. III. In 1936 only two schools had less than one hundred sixty days, in 1934 three schools were in this classification, in 1932 nine schools, and 1930 ten schools fell below the eight months level. There can be no doubt as to the effect of House Bill 212 upon the number of days of school in this county.

From Table No. III, "The Average Attendance of the

Common Schools in Choctaw County",⁷ contrasting the total and average daily attendance in the forty-five districts, it was found that in 1930 the total average daily attendance was 1629.2, the average for each of the districts is 36.2. In 1932 the total average daily attendance was 2073, the average for each of the districts was 46. The year 1934 shows a slight decrease from 1932 level. It dropped to 1988 total daily attendance or an average for each of the districts of 44.2 days. The year 1936 is the high one with 2148 a total average daily attendance, and an average per district of 47.66. This data on attendance cannot be considered and studied in detail for direct effects of the Legislative Bill on daily attendance. This is due to the various factors that govern the migration of the many tenent farmers in Choctaw County. Moving as they do from one district to another would naturally cause the rise and fall of the daily attendance in the respective districts which could not be attributed to House Bill 212. Nevertheless, there is an increase in average daily attendance due, undoubtedly in part, to the peoples' recognition that there would be a definite length of term at their school for 1936. The survey showed that two districts, forty-one and sixteen, had

7 Ben Herman, op.cit.

TABLE NO. III

AVERAGE ATTENDANCE IN THE COMMON SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN CHOCTAW COUNTY

District No.	Average Attendance			1933
	1930	1932	1934	
3	130	140		129
5	81	111	*	117
7	63.5	110	132	123
8	36	32	34	40
10	76	83	60	48
11	46	38	36	32
12	21.1	27	22	30
13	12	123	169	199
14	46	43	36	31
15	11	17	15	21
16	66	6	14	11
17	39	50	44	53
18	21.6	21	27	21
19	39	53	50	55
20	19	18	18	19
21	104	105	83	86
22	43	30	41	35
23	26	22	24	27
24	23	24	19	30
25	18	15	23	17
26	32	29	20	18
27	48	38	38	48
28	61	70	75	71
29	27	65	52	47
30	44	48	45	51
31	40	67	56	60
32	54	73	86	71
33	56	73	61	66
34	20	21	24	23
35	31	10	25	36
36	80	39	45	49
37	28	49	35	33
38	37	54	61	51
40	25	40	35	34
41	9.5	12	13	16
42	32	47	34	32
43	17	24	55	51
44	37	37	34	31
45	44	59	61	61
46	20	16	23	14
47	14	10	17	13
48	18.7	18	26	38
49	17.9	50	47	31
50	21	31	38	53
51	22	25	20	26
TOTAL	1,629.2	2,073	1,988	2,148
AVERAGE	36.2	46	44.2	47.666

*No record available.

the lowest attendance, each two years out of the four years studied. The lowest attendance was in 1932 when district sixteen had only an average daily attendance of sixteen; while district forty-one's low period was during 1930 with an average of nine and one-half. In 1936 there were seven schools in the county with an average daily attendance of less than twenty, and five districts, with an average attendance of between twenty and thirty. In checking back on the number of teachers, it was found that all of these districts had one-teacher schools except one, and it had two teachers with an average daily attendance of twenty-seven. In district thirty-seven the one-teacher school had an average daily attendance of thirty-three, while in district sixteen the one-teacher school had an average daily attendance of eleven.

From Table No. IV, "Maintenance Costs in Common Schools of Choctaw County,"⁸ a definite story of the depression and subsequent continuation of reductions of expenditures for the physical plants of the schools is told. Undoubtedly, this maintenance field in former years was unnecessarily exploited by various individuals and not dealt with by the experts necessary to give the tax-payer his needed dollar for dollar value.

8 Ben Herman, op. cit.

TABLE NO. IV

MAINTANENCE OF THE COMMON SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN CHOCTAW
COUNTY

District No.	1930	1932	1934	1936
3	\$2019.55	\$2475.67	\$1975.50	\$5701.86
55	1230.65	1433.61	1000.09	1715.33
7	1216.69	3344.10	1940.49	2803.22
8	199.39	188.70	223.81	217.52
10	424.72	449.46	262.83	452.65
11	219.30	152.98	64.48	376.64
12	151.35	227.33	50.84	118.88
13	14.10	834.39	2702.69	8106.41
14	1377.18	1083.27	242.59	509.00
15	113.74	225.62	85.76	79.49
16	143.50	317.40	7.83	27.07
17	205.35	175.93	15.29	601.11
18	145.35	112.90	33.40	131.88
19	587.76	520.81	93.97	102.21
20	142.60	84.16	69.92	34.80
21	2572.81	2943.25	1676.86	2268.89
22	719.57	714.53	119.84	541.98
23	163.97	34.25	55.65	92.62
24	267.42	575.26	2.00	58.49
25	477.36	33.62	87.53	293.86
26	259.15	133.85	84.05	90.94
27	1133.00	1234.00	264.66	178.78
28	106.30	578.10	188.92	240.19
29	969.63	1143.21	721.41	325.09
30	1467.75	977.19	109.51	302.95
31	640.40	450.04	1090.79	1384.23
32	1008.98	889.62	225.61	575.58
33	367.25	128.62	187.79	245.05
34	111.95	155.02	34.56	211.74
35	166.30	37.88	52.71	265.73
36	589.56	1101.06	277.06	682.08
37	143.90	133.20	220.62	513.23
38	248.95	361.90	31.75	134.27
40	94.25	302.85	102.71	155.71
41	499.45	47.10	29.14	657.02
42	188.60	121.65	46.50	396.03
43	122.39	102.52	30.02	191.20
44	266.44	179.35	134.28	230.65
45	147.64	213.48	190.44	412.77
46	148.80	109.00	40.36	98.41
47	167.35	15.21	66.46	112.05
48	324.44	134.95	72.45	203.67
49	299.60	84.75	106.80	335.37
50	192.90	258.65	62.89	308.13
51	305.34	237.37	131.15	91.25
	<u>\$2,362.28</u>	<u>\$26,497.81</u>	<u>\$15,213.95</u>	<u>\$32,576.03</u>

In this county, in 1930, there were only two districts that spent less than one hundred dollars for maintenance. District forty spent ninety-four dollars and twenty-five cents, while district thirteen, the lowest in 1930 with only twelve students, spent only fourteen dollars ten cents. These figures may be contrasted against districts three and twenty-one, both spending over two thousand dollars. Six other districts spent over one thousand dollars, and five districts spent between five hundred and one thousand dollars.

Table No. IV shows in 1932 the lowest maintenance cost was found in district forty-seven where fifteen dollars and twenty-one cents was expended. Seven schools had spent less than one hundred dollars. The high figure for this year was in district seven where four thousand seven hundred eighty-four dollars and ten cents was spent. Two other districts were above the two thousand dollar mark, while five districts spent between one thousand and two thousand dollars, and six districts fell between five hundred and one thousand.

The figures for the year 1934 tell the most pathetic story and the severity of the depression upon these schools can be definitely seen, twenty-two schools spent less than one hundred dollars. In fact, seven schools, as compared to four of the previous

year, fell under fifty dollars, and three schools fell beneath the low of fifteen dollars and twenty-one cents in 1930 or 1932. The lowest figure was in district twenty-four where only two dollars was spent on maintenance for this school. The high in expenditures has dropped to two thousand seven hundred two dollars and sixty-nine cents in district thirteen; five schools spent over a thousand dollars each. In the class between five hundred and one thousand dollars there is only one school, while the one hundred and two hundred dollar class, heretofore not having enough schools to mention, now has nine schools. The two to three hundred dollar class has seven school districts, leaving one school district at seven hundred twenty-one dollars as the only school between three hundred and one thousand dollars.

Table No. IV shows that in 1936 there is a great decrease in the number of schools who spent less than one hundred dollars. Only eight schools were in that classification, twenty-eight dollars and seven cents being the lowest figure. Twenty-four schools spent between one hundred and five hundred dollars. Seven schools are in the five hundred to one-thousand dollar group. Just six more than two years before, only two schools now rank between one thousand and two thousand dollars. This is still a great decrease over the

years 1930 and 1932. Some schools, formerly in this class, have now gone into higher classes. Two schools spend between two and three thousand dollars, one school spends \$5,710.86, and district number thirteen spends \$8,106.41 the highest amount. It is to be recalled that district thirteen is the Goodland Indian School having an orphanage and a boarding school for Indian children of the Choctaw Nation.

The totals of these figures in Table No. IV show there has been a definite increase of money spent on which figures were taken. In fact, under House Bill 212 the expenditures in 1936 were double the amount spent in 1934, in which year they fell to the low figure of \$15,213.95. Two years before, in 1932, it had been \$22,362.38. In 1936 the total for the common schools of the entire county was \$32,576.03. The deduction made from this study of maintenance expenditures in the county is that there has been a definite increase of more than twice the amount of money spent for maintenance during the period two years before. The amount spent for care of the physical plants and equipment, which every school must have to function properly, under the primary and secondary aid program provides for the barest necessities. Six of the county's forty-five districts had to cut their expenditure for maintenance to a lower level than that

of 1934. The other thirty-nine districts were able to increase their expenditures.

In Table No. V, "Levy in Mills of the Common School Districts in Choctaw County",⁹ it is shown that in the common school districts there is a definite decrease and increase during the four years studied. In 1930 the survey shows that thirty-six of the forty-five districts voted the maximum fifteen mill levy for school finances. When it is pointed out that in 1932 thirty-seven of the districts voted the fifteen mill levy, and there was a great lack of funds throughout the county for the schools, one cannot blame the people of the districts for an improper system of finance. This definitely shows that they were willing to vote the necessary mill levy allowable by law. To complete the discussion of the 1930 mill levy, three other districts voted fourteen mills, one voted thirteen mills, three voted eleven mills, one voted from nine to ten mills, and the least levy to be voted was that of district fifteen, a seven mill levy.

In 1932 we find very similar conditions. A few schools have lowered their levy, but they are the schools that had not voted fifteen mills before. In fact, four schools increased their levy, while three reduced theirs. This year 7.05 mills was the lowest levy voted. One school voted between nine and ten

9 Ben Herman, op. cit.

TABLE NO. V

LEVY IN MILLS OF THE COMMON SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN CHOCTAW COUNTY

<u>District</u> <u>No.</u>	<u>1930</u>	<u>1932</u>	<u>1934</u>	<u>1936</u>
3	15	15	12.5	13.17
5	15	15	7.28	114
7	15	15	11.84	13.94
8	15	15	7.25	14
10	15	15	7.73	12.42
11	15	15	8.52	14
12	15	15	11.08	14
13	15	15	7.25	4.63
14	15	15	9.05	14
15	7	15	5.88	8.38
16	15	15	9.02	14
17	15	15	10.95	13.81
18	15	7.05	7.04	13.26
19	15	15	9.82	13.05
20	11	10.32	9.32	14
21	15	15	11.54	13.98
22	15	15	10.35	14
23	9.2	13.48	4.74	8
24	14.5	15	13.73	13.5
25	15	15	11.08	14
26	15	15	9.29	14
27	15	10.5	6.05	4.2
28	15	15	8.67	14
29	15	15	11.82	13.14
30	14.3	15	10.87	13.73
31	15	15	9.54	13.05
32	15	15	9.92	14
33	15	15	4.27	14
34	15	15	7.4	14
35	15	15	4.83	14
36	15	15	12.00	14
37	15	15	8.02	14
38	14	15	11.47	14
40	15	15	7.43	14
41	15	13.32	10.56	14
42	15	15	4.67	14
43	15	15	7.01	14
44	15	15	4.97	14
45	15	15	6.04	14
46	11.5	9.92	8.49	9.63
47	11.5	11.15	10.04	14
48	15	15	9.38	14
49	15	15	8.02	14
50	13.7	12	9.94	12.63
51	15	15	6.27	14

OCT 19 1937

mills, two school districts from ten to eleven, one eleven, one twelve, one thirteen, one fourteen, and the remaining thirty-seven schools, fifteen.

In the 1934 figures of Table No. V we see the economic effect expressed by the reduction of the levies. This may have had its origin in the people beginning to feel that the Federal Government was to be depended upon for funds for their every wish and the willingness that became prevalent at that time to trade anything they had, even their privilege of home regulation of schools, for financial aid. Not one of the common school districts in the entire county voted a fifteen mill levy, although the fifteen mill levy had not been sufficient to give a nine months term in many of the districts before 1934. In only one district was there a levy of thirteen or more mills voted. Two districts voted from twelve to thirteen mills, six voted from eleven to twelve mills, five voted ten to eleven mills, nine voted from nine to ten mills, five voted from eight to nine mills, eight voted from seven to eight mills, three voted from six to seven mills, one voted from five to six mills, and five districts voted from four to five mills. Attention is called to the fact as shown in Table No. VI that the assessed valuation of the combined districts had

LIBRARY
A. B. F. COLLEGE
ST. LOUIS, MO.

dropped one million two hundred eighty-four thousand eight hundred ninety-one dollars and not one district voted a full fifteen mill levy. Every district reduced its levy for schools. In fact, nine districts voted a smaller levy than any district voted in 1930 or 1932. The pathetic condition of schools at this time can readily be seen. I believe I am correct in the supposition that the people in the two previous years under the relief system had come to expect everything of a financial nature from the Federal Government. This is characteristic of a definite change in their ideals of support and control of education because the Federal Government had to refuse aid for schools until the state would amply provide for them in the future.

The 1936 outlook from the condition portrayed in Table No. V shows a far more definite tendency for the people to again shoulder their own school responsibilities. In twenty-eight districts a school levy of fourteen mills was made, in ten districts from thirteen to fourteen mills were levied; in two districts from twelve to thirteen, in one district from nine to ten, in two districts from eight to nine, and in two districts from four to five. As compared to 1934, only two districts are below the low point of 1930 and 1932. This is a great improvement as far as the

schools are concerned and certainly shows the positive improvement with regard to the financial set-up and the recurrent responsibility placed again upon the people.

In this county, the County Excise Board has, through a loop-hole in the law which provided a five mill levy for schools, because of political pressure and their knowledge that the district will be partly reimbursed by the state treasury, taken one mill in each of the last two years, 1935-36 and 1936-37, from the schools for county expenses. This has seriously handicapped the schools in promoting the enrichment program that should be carried on. Of course, the most of this is because of the great political pressure that is locally brought to bear upon the excise board. It is reasonable to conclude that if this is not stopped by legislative action it will be merely a period of time until the local school will be completely deprived of its five mill levy and be dependent entirely upon the ten mill special levy and state aid. It is impossible for school Boards to raise teachers salaries, as it was hoped, as long as a practice of this type demands that as much as possible of the constitutional levy be divided annually among the political county employees who are dependent upon their political ability to retain

their position in contrast to the teacher who hopes for added remuneration and continued employment because of years of successful tenure in the school systems of the state and added study in some institution of higher learning.

In Table No. VI, "Assessed Valuation of Common School Districts in Choctaw County",¹⁰ we find a definite tendency to decrease the district valuation in each of the four years studied. The total valuation for 1930 was \$6,219,054.00. This figure is set up as a standard of comparison. Although the valuation has always been relatively low in Choctaw County, it is still two million dollars higher than the figure studied for 1936. Only one district has an assessed valuation of over three hundred thousand dollars. Ten districts have an assessed valuation of between two and three hundred thousand dollars. Eleven districts have an assessed valuation of between one and two hundred thousand dollars. Twenty-three districts have an assessed valuation of one hundred thousand dollars. The lowest valuation in the county is seventeen thousand five hundred dollars.

The date of 1932 in Table No. VI shows that the assessed valuation has dropped three hundred thirty-seven thousand four hundred and three dollars to a

10 Ben Herman, op. cit.

TABLE NO. VI

ASSESSED VALUATION OF THE COMMON SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN CHOCTAW COUNTY

<u>District No.</u>	<u>1930</u>	<u>1932</u>	<u>1934</u>	<u>1936</u>
3	\$505,523	\$509,228	\$384,109	\$379,430
5	171,220	144,214	111,925	110,877
7	295,165	417,245	300,842	287,186
8	59,950	48,083	33,990	36,383
10	119,475	120,710	92,551	93,585
11	103,380	96,645	68,695	67,904
12	111,970	95,280	68,535	69,608
13	51,415	46,088	35,930	36,831
14	236,135	238,506	154,014	153,406
15	73,575	63,017	45,705	47,400
16	17,505	60,150	42,068	42,490
17	206,055	157,220	123,905	129,290
18	87,510	73,005	57,415	62,158
19	168,622	151,780	113,106	105,572
20	63,610	53,275	41,445	42,119
21	295,256	287,705	211,660	201,964
22	154,139	146,999	105,236	94,123
23	130,970	120,138	96,240	102,079
24	160,321	155,076	112,386	107,182
25	75,685	57,774	21,420	39,888
26	85,730	81,940	62,845	63,035
27	291,232	300,031	214,122	200,935
28	164,750	157,709	115,967	120,120
29	297,768	290,486	206,035	202,625
30	214,205	188,154	141,665	143,734
31	252,313	232,654	171,536	158,179
32	297,067	262,083	192,961	194,524
33	69,295	53,435	37,940	38,446
34	59,645	42,905	29,485	30,921
35	83,245	49,715	33,945	36,518
36	205,560	193,947	143,434	126,218
37	69,960	62,768	46,985	27,260
38	145,431	144,950	104,358	94,886
40	91,990	75,710	50,445	51,197
41	71,675	51,705	37,150	41,625
42	75,115	62,575	42,190	46,129
43	44,200	35,155	24,275	25,022
44	48,105	41,370	29,515	30,507
45	89,735	69,047	50,920	49,461
46	83,050	81,210	60,625	59,616
47	120,141	122,574	88,220	84,945
48	54,165	51,395	36,370	34,502
49	88,275	84,780	57,525	61,754
50	59,366	51,015	35,395	37,511
51	69,555	53,110	41,675	44,507
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
	\$6,219,054	\$4,881,651	\$4,596,760	\$4,233,552
Total reductions since 1930		1,337,403	1,623,294	1,985,502
Total reduction from previous year		1,337,403	284,891	362,208

new level of \$5,881,651.00 Six districts, increased their valuation approximately \$180,000.00. This means that the other thirty-nine districts had all decreased their valuation by a total of over \$500,000.00. In summing up this year's figures we find that two districts are above the level of five hundred thousand dollars; one district is at the three hundred thousand dollar level; five districts between the two and three hundred thousand dollar level, twelve are in the one hundred thousand to two hundred thousand dollar level, leaving twenty-five schooldistricts below the one hundred thousand dollar level. The low this year was in district forty-three with a thirty-five thousand one hundred fifty dollar level.

According to the figures of 1934 on assessed valuation every common school district in Choctaw County had reduced its valuation, not even one held its own. If Table No. V. is consulted it shows that besides the reduced valuation the schools had to stand a reduction in mill levy in every district. The total loss in valuation in the county was \$1,284,891.00. This year there were no districts having above a four hundred thousand dollar valuation; only two districts were above three hundred thousand dollar valuation, three were between a two hundred and three hundred thousand dollar valuation, twelve were in the one hundred thousand dollar group and the lowest valua-

tion set for the year was in district forty-three where twenty-four thousand two hundred seventy-five dollars worth of property was assessed.

According to Table No. VI in 1936 there is still a continued reduction in assessed valuation for the entire county. Twenty-six districts did have their valuation increased. Nineteen were decreased below the 1934 level which was undoubtedly as low as should have possibly been anticipated for any year. The total assessed valuation was three hundred sixty-three thousand two hundred and eighteen dollars less than even the thirty-four level or in total numbers \$4,233,552.00. In classifying these again according to their valuation ranges there was only one district having an assessed valuation of over three hundred thousand dollars, four had between two hundred and three hundred thousand dollars, eleven between one hundred and two hundred thousand, twenty-nine were under the one hundred thousand dollar classification and district forty-three was the lowest with twenty-five thousand and twenty-two dollars. As can be seen by comparison of these four years there has been a definite tendency for the districts in the higher level to gradually come down to a lower level. In the four years classified eleven and twelve districts each year have had an assessed valuation between one hundred and two hundred thousand dollars; while the level beneath one hundred thousand has year by year increased from

twenty-three districts in 1930 to twenty-nine in 1936. The two hundred thousand dollar and three hundred thousand dollar group has been reduced from ten districts in 1934 to five districts in 1932, three districts in 1934 and in 1936 back to five districts. A reduction in total valuation of two million dollars in six years, when the first valuations were not relatively high in comparison with other districts in the state, is certainly a death blow to any institution that must look to a tax source for its revenue.

Choctaw County had its first big reduction in taxes in 1925 when crop failure began. For example, the gins in Hugo had a total capacity and their registered number of bales of cotton ginned from 1920 to 1925 were over thirty thousand bales annually, while from that date to the past summer the output has been between five and twelve thousand bales.¹¹ This shows, as well as other features, that assessed valuation needed to be reduced in this county. More than half, in fact 60 per cent,¹² of the farms are owned by insurance companies, loan companies, and landlords who are renting to the tenant farmer who is, without question, the poorest type farmer in the world. With landlords and tenant farmers both living off of the county's land, and

11 A. G. Dickinson, Manager of Southern Compress Company 1931. Hugo, Oklahoma, report 1936.

12 Joe Wolf, Realestate Agent, Hugo, Oklahoma, 1937.

both of them indifferent to the building up of anything stable, it is safe to say that valuations will not increase in Choctaw County to any appreciable degree in the future and that the school systems of the county would have been in as deplorable a financial condition in 1936 as they were in 1934 if House Bill 212 had not placed the schools on as stable a financial basis as it did.

The final Table No. VII,¹³ which is on "Total Teachers Salaries in the Common School Districts of Choctaw County," shows as all the former tables a gradual reduction of 50 per cent from 1930 to 1934. In 1930 the total teachers salaries for the common schools of the county were \$107,592.00. This was for ninety-seven teachers or an average salary of one thousand one hundred and nine dollars per year. Since the division of salaries in various districts where there was more than one teacher can scarcely be figured because of the manner in which the division was made, the evidence is that five hundred and twenty-five dollars or less was the lowest salary paid. Two years later there was an increase of three teachers for the common schools and a decrease in total salaries for the county of \$35,050.34. This is a

13 Ben Herman, op. cit.

TABLE NO. VII

TOTAL TEACHERS SALARIES OF THE COMMON SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN CHOCTAW COUNTY

<u>Distrist</u> <u>No.</u>	<u>1930</u>	<u>1932</u>	<u>1934</u>	<u>1936</u>
3	\$ 6975.00	\$ 2899.00	\$ 2445.04	\$ 3630.22
5	2840.00	2893.55	2450.82	4181.18
7	3215.00	1920.00	2190.83	4447.40
8	1560.00	1520.00	894.11	1402.50
10	2360.00	2066.00	1464.53	2269.40
11	1760.00	1627.68	1026.38	1503.50
12	7600.00	1339.85	1011.77	930.00
13	800.00	1843.00	2910.00	5455.00
14	2817.00	2655.00	1272.58	1710.00
15	725.00	665.00	400.00	520.00
16	965.00	700.00	450.00	579.67
17	2990.00	2580.55	2399.44	1800.00
18	900.00	720.00	576.70	675.00
19	1950.00	2058.00	1194.42	1781.75
20	775.00	634.40	473.33	642.51
21	2090.00	1381.81	1541.10	3229.49
22	1800.00	1617.52	350.00	1475.00
23	1500.00	1540.75	851.00	975.00
24	1980.00	1710.00	1503.55	1810.50
25	890.00	850.00	578.10	605.05
26	1665.00	1230.00	858.90	675.00
27	3256.00	1900.00	1350.00	1340.00
28	2520.00	2400.00	1618.61	2250.00
29	3468.00	3195.00	2650.87	2520.00
30	2160.00	2055.00	1400.00	1845.00
31	3360.00	3239.50	1157.02	1375.95
32	3900.00	3267.60	2301.76	2800.00
33	2700.00	2475.00	1420.48	1845.00
34	800.00	675.00	482.86	678.06
35	1209.00	680.00	844.84	1310.00
36	2648.00	1972.50	1438.70	1760.00
37	1138.00	800.00	675.00	765.00
38	1900.00	2015.00	1451.41	2064.12
40	1200.00	1090.00	765.66	1070.00
41	550.00	590.85	449.87	711.73
42	1600.00	1513.70	652.76	1574.00
43	800.00	800.00	940.69	1418.87
44	1600.00	1400.00	818.91	1260.00
45	1620.00	2120.00	1385.40	2309.30
46	880.00	900.00	600.00	571.95
47	1125.00	1125.00	1090.85	1125.65
48	800.00	800.00	563.54	1235.70
49	1190.00	1360.00	1093.33	1572.63
50	1050.00	825.00	600.00	1385.21
51	835.00	900.00	546.66	450.00
TOTAL	\$107,592.00	\$ 72,541.68	\$52,241.82	\$75,636.58
AVERAGE	1,109.10	725.00	512.17	727.27

decrease per teacher in average salary of \$384.00. It appears that the higher paid teachers at this time have suffered the greatest decreases; at least the districts having the highest salaries two years before show the most outstanding reduction. For some reason or other eight districts did slightly increase their salaries. District thirteen seems to have paid the lowest salaries in this year, having a total of five teachers and paying a grand total salary of \$1,843.00. This would be an average salary of three hundred and fifty dollars for each individual teacher.

The 1934 figures of Table No. VII show that with the total of one hundred and two teachers now teaching in the common schools of the county the total salaries were \$52,241.80. This is a reduction of twenty thousand three hundred dollars from the former year or a total reduction in four years of \$55,350.18. The average salary at this time is five hundred twelve dollars and seventeen cents and the low salary seems to be around four hundred dollars. District fifteen had one teacher paid exactly four hundred dollars; district forty-two had two teachers and paid a total salary of \$652.76.

In comparing 1936 with 1934 there is an increase in teachers salaries of 45 per cent. The increase amounts

to twenty-three thousand three hundred ninety-four dollars and fifty-six cents bringing the total up to \$75,646.58. This sum divided among one hundred and four teachers now employed gives an average salary of \$727.27. When the administrators salaries are taken into consideration, some of the teachers salaries are reduced below the five hundred dollar level. In fact, in district fifty-one, where one teacher only is employed, the salary is \$450.00. In district twenty-three, where two teachers are employed, they receive a total salary of \$975.00. In district thirty-two, where four teachers are employed, they receive a total salary of \$1,375.95. This would be an average of three hundred forty-three dollars and ninety-nine cents per person.

In summarizing the effect of House Bill 212 on the teachers salaries of the common school districts of Choctaw County, this study shows conclusively that there has been an improvement of the salaries of teachers under the administration of this act outside of the few special districts. In fact, Table No. VII shows that only three districts have reduced salaries while all others have increased them. The Federal Aid to schools in 1934 is not shown on our county records. This amounted to from two to two and one-half months relief salary at approximately sixty dollars per month for districts able to qualify.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. GOVERNMENT DOCUMENTS

1. State Support for Public Education. Fifteenth Legislature, House Bill Number 212.
2. Federal Census. 1930. Copy (Hugo High School Library.)

B. REPORTS

1. Herman, Ben. Annual Report of the County Superintendent. Choctaw County, 1930, 1932, 1934, 1936. County Court House, Hugo, Oklahoma.
2. Dickenson, A. G. Manager Southern Compress Company. Estimates made from his office reports. Hugo, Oklahoma
3. Wolf, Joe. Realestate Agent. Estimate made of farm owners.
4. Rogers, J. Lee. Insurance and Realestate Agent. Estimate made of ownership.

CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSIONS OBTAINED AS A RESULT OF THIS SURVEY

1. No consolidation of the common schools of Choctaw County because of House Bill 212.
2. That thirty-nine of the forty-five common schools in the county had longer school terms in 1936 by House Bill 212.
3. The total average daily attendance for the county schools was 10.4 days higher in 1936 than in 1930, 1.6 days higher than in 1932, 3.4 days higher than in 1934, this indirectly due to the stabilizing effect of a guaranteed financial condition.
4. There has been an increase of over one hundred per cent in the amount of money spent for school maintenance in the common schools of Choctaw County in 1936.
5. The people are willing to do their part in this county to make schools possible and have voted the maximum mill levy when this would guarantee schools for their children.

The survey also shows the tendency of the people to shove off their responsibilities whenever possible to some other part of the government when the government gives them an opportunity.

There is a need for a law guaranteeing the schools their lawfully allowed five mill levy that

in this county is being used for other county expenses. The political pressure upon the excise board by those who are involved politically and are personally interested for some reason, if continued, will undoubtedly take more and more of this five mill levy until it will all be taken for general county purposes, allowing the state to bear a greater burden of the local schools.

6. The assessed valuation of the common school districts of Choctaw county decreased from the highest valuation studied in 1930, 21.5 per cent in 1932, 26 per cent in 1934, 31.9 per cent in 1936. The total loss was three million dollars. A fifteen mill levy with a total valuation of four million two hundred thirty-three thousand five hundred fifty-two dollars for 1936 would provide sixty-three thousand five hundred three dollars and twenty-eight cents to be divided among the forty-five school districts, which is too small a sum to run schools on the House Bill 212 minimum schedule.

The financial aid furnished to schools in Choctaw County under House Bill 212 was necessary for the continuation of school in 1936.

7. Teachers Salaries in the common school districts of Choctaw County were 44 per cent higher in 1936 under the House Bill 212 than in 1934 the year of lowest salaries for teachers. In 1936 they were

reduced from the 1934 schedule in three districts.

While the number who received a raise in salary cannot be figured accurately, the average salary was increased in 1934 to 1936 one hundred fifty-five dollars and ten cents. This not enough salary, on nine months basis. This seven hundred twenty-seven dollars and twenty seven cents salary for 1936 is equal to eighty dollars and eighty cents a month. Out of this the teachers must live twelve months, so why not divide the seven hundred twenty-seven dollars and twenty-seven cents by twelve? This gives sixty dollars and sixty cents a month salary.

This average salary must pay expenses, in many cases for summer school, and if we as teachers are fortunate we will be able, by putting a lot of political pressure on the legislature two years from now, to pass a bill giving us a five dollar a month raise. For this, we will be accused of lobbying, political intrigues, and forcing a group of politicians to unnecessarily spend the people's money when it should have been saved.

Typist:

Miss Ammie Pruett