

A COMPARISON OF THE OPERATION OF HOUSE
BILL NO. 212 AND HOUSE BILL NO. 6 IN THE
INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICTS OF BLAINE,
DEWEY, ELLIS, ROGER MILLS, AND WOODWARD
COUNTIES

A COMPARISON OF THE OPERATION OF HOUSE
BILL NO. 212 AND HOUSE BILL NO. 6 IN THE
INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICTS OF BLAINE,
DEWEY, ELLIS, ROGER MILLS, AND WOODWARD
COUNTIES

By

LOYD H. COSSEY

Bachelor of Science

Central State Teachers' College

Edmond, Oklahoma

1931

LIBRARY
A & M COLLEGE
EDMOND OKLA

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

1940

OKLAHOMA
AGRICULTURAL & MECHANICAL COLLEGE
LIBRARY

iii

AUG 6 1940

APPROVED:

J. P. Merriam
Adviser

W. C. Coughlin
Head of the Department

W. B. M. Intosh
Dean of the Graduate School

126835

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The writer is indebted to a great number of friends for their help and encouragement while this study was being made.

An expression of appreciation is made to Mr. Marshall Gregory, Director of Research, State Department of Education, and his staff for their assistance in securing statistics for this thesis.

For the records so kindly furnished, the writer wishes to make known his gratefulness to each County Clerk, County Superintendent, and County Treasurer in Blaine, Dewey, Ellis, Roger Mills, and Woodward Counties.

Thanks are extended to Dean N. Conger, of the School of Education of Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College for his guidance and suggestions.

Special acknowledgement is made to Dr. J. C. Muerman, of the School of Education of Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College for his untiring suggestions and counseling during the writing of this thesis.

L. H. C.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction

Chapter One - - House Bill 212 and House Bill 6 - Page 1

Chapter Two - - The Minimum Program - - - - - Page 7

Chapter Three - Primary Aid - - - - - Page 10

Chapter Four - Secondary Aid - - - - - Page 13

Chapter Five - Teachers' Salaries - - - - - Page 18

Chapter Six - - General Maintenance - - - - - Page 23

Chapter Seven - Transportation - - - - - Page 26

Chapter Eight - Total Expenditures - - - - - Page 30

Summary

Bibliography

LIST OF TABLES

I	- - - - -	PRIMARY AID
II	- - - - -	SECONDARY AID
III	- - - - -	NUMBER OF TEACHERS AND AMOUNT EXPENDED
IV	- - - - -	AMOUNT EXPENDED FOR MAINTENANCE
V	- - - - -	AMOUNT EXPENDED FOR NEW BUSES
VI	- - - - -	NUMBER OF PUPILS TRANSPORTED DAILY
VII	- - - - -	AMOUNT EXPENDED FOR TRANSPORTATION
VIII	- - - - -	ASSESSED VALUATION
IX	- - - - -	GENERAL FUND EXPENDITURES
X	- - - - -	TOTAL EXPENDITURES
XI	- - - - -	NUMBER OF MILLS USED
XII	- - - - -	AVERAGE DAILY ATTENDANCE
XIII	- - - - -	EXPENDITURES FOR LIBRARY AND INSTRUCTIONAL SUPPLIES
XIV	- - - - -	PER CAPITA COST

INTRODUCTION

In this study it is the intention of the writer to present comparative facts concerning the operation of House Bill 212 and House Bill 6 in the twenty-five independent school districts located in Blaine, Dewey, Ellis, Roger Mills, and Woodward Counties. It is believed the schools studied are representative enough to show the true financial trends of other counties in the state.

An average individual is perfectly aware of the many important phases to be considered within the school such as pupils, teachers, parents, general public, physical plant, library, instructional supplies, etc. This same individual gives very little thought as to financial condition of the school other than wanting his child to be better provided for and school expenditures to be sharply reduced. There are some cases where it is satisfactory for the schools' expenses to run the same as long as the financial burden is shifted to some outside source. The last two school measures enacted by the legislature are direct results of public opinion.

The last decade has seen a gradual shifting of the schools' financial burdens from the local districts to the state. Many terms such as Primary Aid, Secondary Aid, Homestead Exemption, and several of the formulas now used have become common by-words.

During the period when schools were financed locally, all money available was appropriated and spent by the schools as they saw fit without reference to maintenance, transportation, salaries, per capita cost, average daily attendance, per unit cost, or minimum program. Since the era of state financing, we have become very specific in the above mentioned divisions. Until the time comes when schools are almost wholly financed by the local district, these conditions will continue to exist.

This statistical study considers a fairly wide range of schools. They vary in number of teachers from 6 to 44, in average daily attendance from 125 to 1100, and in annual expenditures from \$10,000.00 to \$65,000.00. Twenty-four of the twenty-five schools furnish transportation. Many of the districts cannot support half of their school program without state aid; while others can finance their complete program.

From this statistical study the writer believes that one may gain a fair knowledge of the financial and educational trends of the schools in Oklahoma.

Statistics used for this comparative study were secured from: House Bill 212, House Bill 6, Rules and Regulations of State Board of Education, Annual Statistical Reports of Independent Districts--1935-36, 1936-37, 1937-38, 1938-39; Annual Transportation Reports for Independent Districts--1935-36, 1936-37, 1937-38, 1938-39; Annual

SECRET

Financial Reports for Independent Districts--1935-36, 1936-37, 1937-38; School Expenditures of Independent Districts from County Treasurers' books--1938-39; School Estimates--1935-36, 1936-37, 1937-38, 1938-39; Supplemental Estimates from County Treasurers' offices--1938-39; Oklahoma Educational Directory for 1935-36, 1936-37, 1937-38, and 1938-39; and Seventeenth Biennial Report of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction.

Chapter One

HOUSE BILL 212 AND HOUSE BILL 6

Prior to the passage of House Bill 212 by the Oklahoma Legislature in April, 1935, very little financial assistance had been received by the schools from sources other than local revenue. Most independent districts had been unable to operate for a full term of nine months on available funds. These conditions resulted from the reductions in property valuations as sponsored by Governor William H. Murray. In a number of counties assessed valuations had been reduced from twenty-five to fifty per cent with no provisions made by the Governor or his political associates to make up the deficit in school funds. From 1930 to the school year 1935-36 the financial condition of schools in Oklahoma were very poor.

Several patch-work designs were formulated by school boards and superintendents in order to operate the schools on the available funds. In many cases teachers' salaries were reduced. This method proved to be far from satisfactory to the teacher, pupil, parent, or general public, since several of the most competent teachers left the teaching profession. In other cases the total number of teachers were decreased to keep from reducing salaries. This adjustment was satisfactory to the teacher, but particularly poor from the instructional standpoint. Still in other cases buildings, grounds, and other physical parts of the school

were not maintained or improved as in prior years. This method proved to be very costly because of the depreciation on such large investments. Probably the poorest method and most unsatisfactory one was that of shortening the term of school. Patrons as a whole objected more to the shortened school term than all the others combined.

When the Oklahoma Legislature met in 1935, the school public in general backed the proposed bill for the financial aid to common schools. People were demanding adequate funds for maintaining public schools. Legislators were forced to consider a bill that directly concerned all of their voting public. Bills introduced in the legislature were often sectional in scope; this one, however, was one that could not be evaded by a single representative or senator, regardless of what section of the state he represented. Even though the financial condition of Oklahoma was in a very low condition, \$8,200,000.00¹ was appropriated for the use of public schools. Any number of disputed sections appeared during the operation of the first bill; however, it marked the first step in equitable distribution of state aid for schools.

House Bill 212 could not have been termed a weak school bill. Of the \$8,200,000.00² appropriated, \$5,400,000.00³

1 House Bill 212, Section I.

2 Ibid

3 House Bill 212, Section IV.

was ear-marked as Primary Aid. Any school regardless of its financial condition could receive this aid, based upon the teachers' qualifications and experiences. No set number of mills to be used by the schools were required. After \$5,400,000.00 were used as Primary Aid, only \$2,800,000.00 were left to equalize educational opportunities of the pupils in the poorer districts of the state. The financial divisions of this bill indicated a lack of knowledge of the legislative members as to the real needs of the poorer districts. In most of the weaker districts, only eight months were maintained. The bill was administered by the State Department of Education and the State Board of Education. In most instances, it was left up to their judgment rather than any set formula or specific statement included in the bill.

By the time the 1937 Oklahoma Legislature convened, public opinion was such that all members were asked to continue the state assistance to schools. All interested people readily admitted conditions the past two years had been far better than the four or five preceding ones. This served as an incentive to try to get the legislature to appropriate enough money to operate all common schools in the state, regardless of financial condition, for a full term of nine months.

Members of the Committees of Education in both the House of Representatives and Senate were instructed to work together in making a survey of the necessary financial needs of all school districts in the state. When the survey was

completed and all statistics assembled, the committees reported the needs to be \$14,300,000.00. Some members of the committees agreed the reported needs were in excess of the necessary requirements. They were satisfied, that adequate funds for the operation of the schools would be left after a compromise between the Liberals and Conservatives had been reached.

A short time before adjournment in May, 1937, the legislature passed House Bill 6. Most of the controversy concerning the bill was over the amount to be used as Primary Aid and the amount to be used as Secondary Aid. The senators and representatives from the wealthier districts contended for a large amount of Primary Aid. Members representing the poorer districts asked that more be set aside for Secondary Aid. On final passage, House Bill 6 appropriated \$12,800,000.00⁴. Of this amount \$5,200,000.00⁵ was to be used as Primary Aid, \$5,800,000.00⁶ as Secondary Aid, and \$1,800,000.00⁷ to replace losses due to Homestead Exemptions.

4 House Bill 6, Section I.

5 House Bill 6, Section IV, Sub-section ii.

6 House Bill 6, Section IV, Sub-section iv.

7 House Bill 6, Section IV, Sub-section i.

In considering the last two common school bills, several improvements may be noticed. The total appropriation of the bills was increased from \$8,200,000.00 in House Bill 212 to \$12,800,000.00 in House Bill 6. A glance at these figures leaves the impression that the net increase was \$4,600,000.00. This would have been true, had it not been for further losses suffered by the passage of House Bill 3, which exempted homesteads up to \$1,000.00. To replace these losses, House Bill 6 appropriated \$1,800,000.00. Any unexpended balance in the fund, after losses were replaced, automatically reverted to the Primary Aid fund and was used as a supplemental apportionment. Rather than having a net difference in the two bills of \$4,600,000.00, there was a net difference of \$2,800,000.00.

Primary Aid balances showed very little difference in the two bills. House Bill 212 appropriated \$5,400,000.00, and House Bill 6 appropriated \$5,200,000.00.

The greatest difference in any single specified appropriation appeared in the Secondary Aid. This amount was raised from \$2,800,000.00 to \$5,800,000.00, a net increase of \$3,000,000.00. Senators and representatives from the poorer districts of the state forced the increase in Secondary Aid in order to equalize educational opportunities for those whom they represented.

Other improvements developed with the passage of House Bill 6. Maintenance and Transportation allowances were increased proportionately in order to pay necessary expenses. Regulations and formulas were specified in the bill that curbed the actions of the State Superintendent of Public

Instruction and State Board of Education in its administration. In spite of these formulas and specifications, weak sections were found in the bill which were used for political purposes.

Chapter Two

THE MINIMUM PROGRAM

The Minimum Program was the most common expression used in the public school aid bills from 1935 to 1939 inclusive. This could be easily understood because all state allocations to the local districts were made on its requirements. Everything was considered from minimum salaries, minimum maintenance, and minimum transportation costs. All schools became Minimum Program conscious.

Under House Bill 212 the Minimum Program was defined as: "an eight months program of educational opportunity which the state guaranteed to every child".¹ Under House Bill 6 the number of months were increased to nine.² Any school operating for a shorter period of time had their state funds reduced proportionately.

A shift was made in the Minimum Program from House Bill 212 to House Bill 6. In the first bill, general maintenance was allowed at a yearly rate of \$150.00³ per teacher; however, all extra increment and time allowed superintendents and principals was included in the Minimum Program.⁴ In the

1 Finance Circular Number 11, March 14, 1936

2 Finance Bulletin Number 145, page 22

3 Finance Bulletin Number 11, March 14, 1936

4 Ibid

second bill, general maintenance was increased somewhat by allowing six and one-half cents per day per pupil in attendance.⁵ A reduction resulted because extra time and increment of the superintendents and principals was shifted to the local initiative or betterment program. In most cases the average school district of fifteen or sixteen teachers did not improve financially. Even though they received more money for general maintenance, they lost as much or more by having to assume payment of extra time and increment. Practically all districts' Minimum Program increased because of the extra money allowed for transportation.

In calculating the total costs of the Minimum Program for House Bill 212, it was necessary to consider the following:⁶

(1) Number of pupils transported daily for the highest month times the allowance of \$12.00 and \$15.00 for pupils residing in and outside of the district respectively for 1935-36. These amounts were raised to \$14.00 and \$17.00 in 1936-37.

(2) \$150.00 per teacher per year for maintenance times the total number of teachers for which the district qualified.

(3) Number of teachers for which the district qualified according to average daily attendance and their monthly salaries according to the Minimum Program schedule.

Any school in the state was entitled to funds equal to the total Minimum Program costs. If all funds could not be

5 Finance Bulletin Number 145, page 9

6 Finance Bulletin Number 11, March 14, 1936

raised from local income and primary aid, the state would allocate enough secondary aid to equal the total Minimum Program costs.

Costs of the Minimum Program for House Bill 6 were calculated the same way except maintenance which was figured at six and one-half cents per day per pupil in attendance. Transportation was figured according to density of pupils instead of a flat rate.

Adjustments in the Minimum Program were made to all qualifying districts. In the first, they were made according to the judgment of the State Department of Education. In the second, adjustments were made in maintenance and transportation as a result of a ten per cent increase over the preceding year.⁷

Most of the \$157,301.74⁸ increase in the total expenditures under House Bill 6 was due to the independent districts qualifying for more funds under the Minimum Program.

7 Finance Bulletin Number 145, pages 27 and 28

8 Table on Total Expenditures

Chapter Three

PRIMARY AID

"Primary Aid is that part of the state support made available by the legislature for the partial support of the public schools of the state."¹ In both House Bill 212 and House Bill 6, Primary Aid has been based upon the qualifications and experiences of the teachers.

Appropriations for the aid of public schools have very closely resembled congressional representation of states. In order to satisfy both the large and small states alike, two senators were allowed each regardless of population while representatives were chosen according to population. In the two school bills most any ordinary school could qualify for Primary Aid. Only the weaker schools could qualify for Secondary Aid according to the Minimum Program requirements.

There was only \$200,000.00 difference in the total appropriations of Primary Aid of the two bills. House Bill 212 called for an appropriation of \$5,400,000.00² and House Bill 6 called for an appropriation of \$5,200,000.00³. State allocations remained practically the same to all districts provided they qualified for an equal number of teachers.

During the operation of the first of these two bills, all schools could draw Primary Aid if they had as many as eighteen pupils in average daily attendance. This number

1 Finance Circular Number 10

2 Finance Circular Number 11

3 Finance Bulletin Number 145, page 6

was reduced to fifteen in 1937 under the second bill;⁴ however, the average daily attendance requirement did not change the status of any of the independent districts studied.

While no specified number of mills was included in the first bill in order to qualify for Primary Aid, the second required that at least eight mills be voted and used.⁵ Of the twenty-five schools surveyed none was affected by this clause. Many of the wealthier districts of the state did not draw Primary Aid under the second bill. They were unwilling to use an excessive number of mills and an excessive amount of money which was not necessary for ordinary school purposes.

In 1935-37 an average number of mills amounting to 24.51⁶ was used in each of the five counties. A raise of 1.90 mills for the years 1937-39 brought the average up to 26.41.⁷ Even though House Bill 6 appropriated \$1,800,000.00 to replace losses incurred from Homestead Exemptions, 26.41 mills used brought in general fund money of \$586,190.92⁸ compared with \$583,990.95⁹ raised the preceding two years.

4 Rules and Regulation of State Board, May, 1935

5 Finance Bulletin Number 145, page 13

6 Table on Millage Used

7 Ibid

8 Table on General Fund Expenditures

9 Ibid

I
PRIMARY AID RECEIVED

School	Under 212	Under 6
Gage	\$ 7,700.00	\$ 7,003.70
Fargo	6,695.84	5,953.12
Arnett	6,838.00	6,517.22
Shattuck	7,791.00	9,106.51
Seiling	6,832.00	7,041.61
Vici	6,794.14	7,161.50
Leedey	6,253.90	6,072.57
Oakwood	4,748.40	4,986.94
Taloga	3,798.92	5,412.52
Cheyenne	8,560.38	7,625.93
Hammon	7,320.06	7,317.43
Reydon	7,525.50	6,497.55
Mutual	4,300.00	3,805.15
Quinlin	3,316.00	3,347.65
Mooreland	6,583.00	7,036.90
Woodward	22,630.75	22,878.99
Supply	4,256.00	3,919.35
Sharon	5,026.00	5,184.30
Greenfield	8,490.00	6,791.71
Canton	5,640.00	6,162.86
Okeene	8,568.00	8,397.70
Watonga	11,854.00	11,960.36
Hitchcock	6,528.25	4,740.72
Longdale	5,152.00	5,731.22
Geary	11,783.97	10,508.10
Total	\$184,986.11	\$181,161.61

Statistics from School Estimates and Financial Reports

The independent districts of Blaine, Dewey, Ellis, Roger Mills, and Woodward Counties were apportioned \$184,986.11 Primary Aid in 1935-37.¹⁰ In 1937-39 they were apportioned \$181,161.61.¹¹ Due to the \$200,000.00 decrease in Primary Aid appropriations, the losses suffered in the twenty-five schools of this section were small.

Ten of the twenty-five schools which the writer surveyed drew more Primary Aid in 1937-39 than the preceding two years. This may be explained by an increased average daily attendance and extra number of teachers employed.

Prior to the passage of House Bill 6, Primary Aid was paid to the districts in nine equal monthly payments. During the two years of its operation, no money was paid any of the districts until the estimates were filed with the state and inspected to see if they qualified for said funds. Payments were then started the first of the next month and continued for five payments; all of these were equal until excess Homestead Exemption funds reverted to Primary Aid. The last or fifth payment included the supplemental apportionment.

Each of the two bills required all payments to be used to apply on teachers salaries.¹²

10 Table on Primary Aid

11 Ibid

12 Finance Circular Number 10 and 145

Chapter Four
SECONDARY AID

"Secondary Aid is that part of the money made available by the legislature to aid in the support of schools in districts which do not have sufficient income to support the Minimum Program."¹

A sum of \$2,800,000.00² was apportioned as Secondary Aid by the legislature in House Bill 212, while House Bill 6 called for \$5,800,000.00³. The reasons for the \$3,000,000.00 increase can be directly attributed to additional agitation among school patrons forcing legislative members to provide funds to insure a minimum school term of nine months.

In order for a district to qualify for Secondary Aid funds, during the operation of House Bill 212, it was necessary to meet the following requirements:⁴

- (1) A ten-mill general fund levy shall have been levied on the total assessed valuation of the district.
- (2) The proceeds from the ten-mill levy, together with all non-ad valorem revenue of the district, must be insufficient to maintain the Minimum Program.
- (3) The proportion of pupils to teachers must be reasonable.

1 Finance bulletin 145, page 20

2 Rules and regulations of State Board, May, 1935

3 Finance bulletin 145, page 6

4 Rules and regulations of State Board, May, 1935

- (4) The schedule of salaries of teachers, principals, and superintendents must be reasonable.
- (5) The budget for transportation of pupils, maintenance expense, and building repairs must be commensurate with the actual needs of the district.

In order for a district to qualify for Secondary Aid funds, it was necessary to meet the following requirements under House Bill 6:⁵

- (1) Vote at least an eight months term of school for the current year.
- (2) Levy and use a ten-mill ad valorem tax for the general fund.
- (3) Qualify either for Primary Aid or Isolation.
- (4) Do not have sufficient income to support the Minimum Program as defined.

In the first set of requirements, no specific statements were made but the words "reasonable" and "actual needs" were used. In the second group every requirement was specifically and pointedly stated.

Practically all of the funds appropriated for Secondary Aid was used to pay for salaries and transportation expenses under House Bill 212. House Bill 6 specifically designated the items for which Secondary Aid funds were not to be spent. These were:⁶ purchase of sites, construction of new buildings, additions to buildings, interest on warrants, and sinking fund requirements.

Sixteen schools of the five counties studied received

5 Finance Curcular 11, March 14, 1936

6 Finance Bulletin 145, Page 26

Secondary Aid funds during the years of 1935-37.⁷ Only three schools of the twenty-five failed to levy and use ten mills as required.⁸ They failed to do this only one of the two years. Evidently these districts would have been able to qualify for Secondary Aid had they applied and adhered to the other regulations as set forth in the bill. Twenty-four of the twenty-five districts received funds⁹ under House Bill 6 even though the requirements were more specific and rigid.

Under each of the bills, schools were required to use the ten-mill¹⁰ levy, plus practically all of their miscellaneous revenue. Secondary Aid funds were then apportioned to the schools according to the immediate needs rather than by regular monthly allocations.

Sixteen districts of Blaine, Dewey, Ellis, Roger Mills, and Woodward Counties received \$136,222.90 from Secondary Aid funds during the school years of 1935-37.¹¹ This amount increased to \$263,271.67 in 1937-39 with twenty-four of the twenty-five districts sharing.¹² An increase of \$127,048.77 can be noticed in the second bill.

7 Table on Secondary Aid Received

8 Ibid

9 Ibid

10 Finance Bulletin 145 and 11

11 Table on Secondary Aid Received

12 Ibid

II

SECONDARY AID

School	Under 212	Under 6
Gage	\$ None	\$ 5,143.00
Targo	1,951.00	8,301.00
Arnett	None	14,179.00
Shattuck	None	8,117.00
Seiling	9,628.00	13,772.16
Vici	9,614.90	16,122.00
Leedey	8,478.00	13,501.00
Oakwood	6,764.00	11,165.51
Taloga	8,970.00	10,789.18
Cheyenne	9,199.00	16,168.00
Hammon	13,985.00	16,520.00
Reydon	12,675.00	16,959.00
Mutual	None	4,687.00
Quinlin	None	585.00
Mooreland	None	None
Woodward	None	2,731.00
Supply	None	3,665.00
Sharon	5,369.00	9,552.00
Greenfield	11,734.00	14,687.53
Canton	6,093.00	9,418.10
Okeene	5,773.00	16,994.71
Watonga	None	15,343.48
Hitchcock	2,597.00	2,090.00
Longdale	11,649.00	14,942.00
Geary	11,473.00	17,839.00
Total	\$136,222.90	\$263,271.67

Statistics from School Estimates, Treasurers' Books,
and Annual Financial Reports

Of the original sixteen districts qualifying for Secondary Aid, only one failed to receive more the last two years than the first two. That particular district received \$400.00 less and this was due to the decreased number of pupils in attendance.¹³

For each pupil in average daily attendance in the twenty-five independent districts studied, Secondary Aid funds were allocated at the average rate of \$8.48 per pupil under House Bill 212. Under House Bill 6 they were allocated \$16.18 per pupil, which was approximately one hundred per cent more.

Requirements were used in both bills to determine the maximum number of teachers the state would allow the district to use under the Secondary Aid schedule. Each school was allowed teachers in 1935-37 according to the following table:¹⁴

Elementary School		High School	
Pupils	Teachers	Pupils	Teachers
18-29	1	40-51	2½
30-43	2	52-64	3
44-59	2½	65-78	3½
60-83	3	79-92	4
84-101	3½	93-106	4½
102-116	4	107-129	5
117-132	4½	130-146	6
133-158	5	147-172	7
159-193	6	173-200	8
194-229	7	201-228	9
230-266	8	229-257	10
267-304	9	258-287	11
		288-319	12

"Elementary schools having more than 304 pupils in average daily attendance shall be allowed one teacher for

13 Table on Secondary Aid

14 Finance Bulletin 11, Page 3

each thirty-two pupils or major fraction thereof."

The following schedule was used during 1937-39:¹⁵

Elementary School		High School	
Pupils	Teachers	Pupils	Teachers
15-29	1	36-54	3
30-59	2	55-66	4
60-89	3		
90-110	4		

"Four teachers were allowed for the first 110 and one extra for each additional thirty-two in the Elementary School. In High School four teachers were allowed for the first sixty-six and one extra for each additional thirty-two pupils."

These regulations allowed some of the larger schools with fifty and sixty students in each of the lower grades to remedy the over-crowded conditions. In smaller schools, fewer grades were taught by the same teacher. Summing it up briefly, pupil-teacher ratio was equalized. Each student in a Secondary Aid School had the same opportunity for individual instruction regardless of the size of the school he attended.

15 Finance bulletin 145, page 15

Chapter Five
TEACHERS' SALARIES

The item of teachers' salaries over-shadows any of the other items in the average school's expenditures. A set salary schedule has been inserted into the last two state aid bills in order to insure a uniform salary scale.

In House Bill 212 the following constituted the basic salary schedule for the calculation of the Minimum Program:¹

Training	Years Teaching Experience					
	None	1	2	3	4	5
Master's Degree	\$85.	\$90.	\$95.	\$100.	\$105.	\$110.
Bachelor's Degree	80.	85.	90.	95.	100.	
90 hours or above, but no degree	75.	80.	85.	90.		
60-89 hours	70.	75.	80.	85.		
40-59 hours	65.	70.	75.	80.		
1st Grade	--	60.	65.	70.		
2nd Grade	--	50.	55.	60.		
3rd Grade	40.	45.	50.			

House Bill 6 authorizes the State Board of Education to set up "a minimum salary schedule", which shall provide for salaries not lower than the schedule used as the basis of apportionment as set out in the body of the bill.² In accordance with the law quoted, the following minimum monthly salary schedule was approved by the State Board of Education for the payment of teachers in all school districts receiving Primary Aid or Primary and Secondary Aid, and any district paying any teacher less than the amount shown in

1 Rules and Regulation of State Board, May, 1935

2 Finance Bulletin 145, page 29

said schedule shall have the difference deducted from the amount of state funds allocated.³

Training	Years Teaching Experience					5
	None	1	2	3	4	
Master's Degree	\$85.	\$90.	\$95.	\$100.	\$105.	\$110.
Bachelor's Degree 90 hours or more, but no degree	80.	85.	90.	95.	100.	
60-89 hours	75.	80.	85.	90.		
40-59 hours	70.	75.	80.	85.		
1st Grade	65.	70.	75.	80.		
	--	55.	60.	65.		

No particular change was made in the regular teachers salary schedule other than restricting schools who were employing teachers with 2nd and 3rd grade certificates from drawing state funds.

In House Bill 212 the following regulations were put into effect by the State Board of Education in regard to superintendents and principals extra increment:⁴

Number of Teachers in District	Maximum Monthly Allowance Per Teacher		
	Superintendent	Principal	Total
2-4	None	\$5.00	\$5.00
5-6	\$6.00	None	6.00
7-11	6.00	3.00	9.00
12 or more	6.00	5.00	11.00

Under House Bill 6, "school districts qualifying for two or more teachers, the minimum salary schedule for Superintendents and Principals shall be equal to the allowances for training and experience set up in section one-hundred-eleven plus the allowances for administrative service indicated in the following schedule":⁵

3 Finance Bulletin 145, page 29

4 Ibid

5 Finance Circular 11

Number of Teachers in District	Maximum Monthly Allowance Per Teacher	
	Superintendent	Principals
2-5	None	\$5.00
6-7	\$6.00	None
8-11	6.00	3.00
12 or more	6.00	5.00

No material change was made in extra increment other than a slight variance in the number of teachers under the principal.

Superintendents and Principals under both bills were allowed extra weeks pay according to the total number of teachers and busses employed.⁶ The number of extra weeks varied from a minimum of two to a maximum of eight.

In the twenty-five independent districts studied, 625 teachers, superintendents, and principals were paid \$564,840.17 during the school years of 1935-37 while House Bill 212 was in operation. The average yearly salary amounted to \$903.79.⁷

During the operation of House Bill 6, 675 teachers were paid \$675,137.96. This shows an increase of fifty teachers and \$110,266.79 in expenditures. The average yearly salary for the school years of 1937-39 increased \$96.41 per teacher to \$1,000.20.⁸

The above mentioned increase can be explained from two standpoints. First, many teachers improved their

6 Finance Circular 11 and 145, pages 2 and 31

7 Table on Teachers' Salaries

8 Ibid

III

NUMBER OF TEACHERS AND AMOUNT EXPENDED

School	Under 212		Under 6	
Gage	29	\$25,894.56	30	\$28,001.71
Fargo	21	16,820.00	22	20,342.78
Arnett	22	20,084.50	27	25,096.75
Shattuck	30	30,370.92	31	36,007.15
Selling	23	20,591.93	26	27,131.87
Vici	24	21,688.70	26	25,018.73
Leedey	20	18,258.42	23	21,787.79
Oakwood	18	15,060.00	18	18,936.00
Taloga	16	14,941.96	18	17,802.42
Cheyenne	24	23,479.42	29	27,620.75
Hammon	28	25,444.06	26	26,018.70
Reydon	22	19,467.01	22	23,994.94
Mutual	14	11,160.00	16	14,450.00
Quinlin	14	9,945.02	13	11,603.15
Mooreland	29	34,787.00	30	33,037.27
Woodward	83	77,062.13	88	88,716.04
Supply	16	12,150.83	16	17,420.00
Sharon	16	14,811.50	18	16,695.22
Greenfield	25	23,568.90	25	26,143.10
Canton	18	17,726.20	21	21,066.56
Okeene	28	26,317.21	32	31,219.59
Watonga	31	29,900.00	42	41,518.51
Hitchcock	20	17,517.45	20	20,232.53
Longdale	18	15,323.90	20	18,539.90
Geary	36	33,498.55	36	35,736.50
Total	625	\$564,870.17	675	\$675,137.96

Salary Average \$903.79 Salary Average \$1,000.20

Statistics from Educational Directories, Treasurers' Books, and Annual Financial Reports

salaries by added years experience and improved qualifications. Secondly, the main part of the increase can be attributed to the basic salary schedule used in order for a number of schools to participate in Secondary Aid funds.

Only sixteen schools⁹ of the twenty-five shared in Secondary Aid under House Bill 212. Some of these participated only one of the two years. The only reason schools of this section could have possibly given for not participating in Secondary Aid was their lack of knowledge of its educational advantages. Under House Bill 6, only one school of the twenty-five failed to qualify for Secondary Aid.¹⁰ This seemed to be the logical reason for the \$96.41 yearly increase in teachers salaries.

Considering the total number of teachers employed and average daily attendance in Blaine, Dewey, Ellis, Roger Mills, and Woodward Counties, an increase can be noticed in the amount of money expended on teachers salaries per pupil. In 1935-37, \$35.15 per pupil was used for the payment of teachers salaries. In 1937-39 the amount increased from \$35.15 to \$41.48. This showed a net increase of \$6.33 per pupil or approximately seventeen percent.

Teachers in counties throughout the state have been encouraged by the yearly increase in salaries. It is

9 Table on Secondary Aid

10 Ibid

believed that forward steps have been made; however, states with less wealth than Oklahoma have done more for the advancement of teachers' salaries.

According to facts presented to a group of administrators in California in July, 1939, the average yearly salary of teachers throughout the United States was \$1,380.00. Even after our increase, we are still \$379.80 below the average.

Only ten of the forty-eight states have lower annual salaries than the state in which this study was made.¹¹

¹¹ Seventeenth Biennial Report of State Superintendent, page 1

Chapter Six

GENERAL MAINTENANCE

With the exception of transportation, possibly the greatest advancement made from the first to the second school bill was in general maintenance allowances.

According to House Bill 212, "general maintenance includes all general fund expense except transportation costs and salaries of teachers, principals, and superintendents".¹ House Bill 6 with one exception reads the same. Basic salaries of teachers, principals, and superintendents were used instead of the above mentioned corresponding clause.

The independent districts of the five counties surveyed benefited from the increased maintenance allowance. In 1935-37 each school was allowed \$150.00 per teacher annually for maintenance costs.² In 1937-39 each school received maintenance at the rate of six and one-half cents per day per pupil in attendance.³

Assuming all schools could qualify under the Minimum Program for all the teachers employed, only \$93,750.00 would be apportioned for maintenance costs at the rate of \$150.00 per teacher per year. Using six and one-half cents per day per pupil for 180 days, times the average daily

1 Finance Circular Number 11

2 Ibid

3 Finance Bulletin Number 145, page 22

attendance which was 16,071, \$188,030.70 could have been available. This comparison showed an increase of one hundred per cent. Due to the change in the method of calculation the above increase was made possible. Many of the schools were in a poor condition trying to finance their maintenance costs on \$150.00 per annum per teacher. As a result, a great share of the betterment program funds were used for those purposes.

If the maintenance calculation method of 1935-37 had been used in 1937-39 the total allowance would have been \$101,250.00. Using the six and one-half cents per day per pupil method, the districts were allowed \$190,405.80. The added allowance of \$89,155.80 showed the extra load taken from the local districts during the operation of House Bill 6.

The twenty-five independent districts studied in Blaine, Dewey, Ellis, Roger Mills, and Woodward Counties showed maintenance expenditures of \$190,360.42⁴ for the school years of 1935-37. Using the Minimum Program allowance of \$93,750.00, the districts were required to use \$96,501.42 from their betterment funds to finance their maintenance costs. Under House Bill 6, the total local funds needed above the minimum program allowance to finance maintenance costs were \$25,697.57. \$190,405.80 were allocated by the State Board of Education of \$216,103.37⁵ expended.

4 Table on Maintenance

5 Ibid

IV

AMOUNT EXPENDED FOR MAINTENANCE

School	Under 212	Under 6
Gage	\$ 9,419.22	\$ 8,917.14
Fargo	9,411.02	9,037.04
Arnett	9,142.39	7,908.82
Shattuck	10,704.33	9,715.14
Seiling	6,247.10	7,591.54
Vici	4,660.82	5,309.35
Leedey	3,867.53	5,794.61
Oakwood	3,058.37	4,295.36
Taloga	3,869.25	3,754.10
Cheyenne	5,664.58	7,130.77
Hammon	5,803.78	5,305.77
Reydon	7,903.51	6,485.16
Mutual	2,962.81	6,862.60
Quinlin	5,386.57	6,271.05
Mooreland	7,427.56	9,308.86
Woodward	33,410.37	40,165.55
Supply	2,936.12	4,209.46
Sharon	3,840.21	5,464.45
Greenfield	5,293.45	5,610.74
Canton	5,468.20	6,740.10
Okeene	9,576.65	9,604.99
Watonga	10,363.06	16,967.58
Hitchcock	8,909.58	6,561.62
Longdale	6,351.62	6,459.12
Geary	8,582.32	13,442.46
Total	<u>\$190,260.42</u>	<u>\$218,103.37</u>

Statistics from Treasurer's Books and Financial Reports

Seventeen of the twenty-five districts expended more money under House Bill 6 than under House Bill 212. This would have been impossible had it not been for the increased maintenance allowance. In observing the maintenance chart, it was evident that most districts had to finance their excess expenditures from funds other than those allowed by the state through the Minimum Program.

Each bill allowed adjustments in general maintenance if an unusual increase in average daily attendance occurred. Most increases were a result of the increased number of grade transfers from Dependent Districts.

Chapter Seven

TRANSPORTATION

Transportation has been one of the most difficult problems to face in the independent schools in the last decade. Very little transportation was provided prior to that time. In a number of cases, students were deprived of equal educational opportunities because they did not live close to school or were not furnished transportation. Though our present situation is far from ideal, forward steps have been made in this field.

A distinct difference existed in the transportation facilities available in the earlier periods than those of the present period. Prior to the passage of the legislative law creating the Oklahoma Department of Public Safety, inspection of vehicles was left to the State Department of Public Instruction. In 1937 the Department of Public Safety started inspecting school busses. Within a short time nearly all school districts furnishing transportation became safety conscious. School districts were asked to obtain new busses or improve the old ones in order to pass rigid safety inspection. Most districts made concentrated efforts to meet all requirements.

A noticeable difference can be detected in transportation allowances set up in the two bills. House Bill 212 did not offer enough variance in different school districts to fit the individual necessity for transportation purposes. The

bill stated:¹

Any school district authorized by law to furnish transportation may spend not to exceed twelve (\$12.00) dollars per legally transported pupil inside the district, and fifteen (\$15.00) dollars per transported high school pupil outside the district.

The preceding paragraph was changed by the State Board of Education to read as follows for the school year 1936-37:

Under the Minimum Program, the allowance for transportation shall be \$14.00 for legally transported pupils living inside the district and \$17.00 for legally transported pupils living outside the district.

Even after the second year's adjustment, there was not enough flexibility in the bill. Districts in which the students were compactly located transported pupils for less money than the state allowed them. In the large districts where the pupils were scattered, it was impossible to operate on the money available.

Under House Bill 6, the allowance for transportation was calculated according to density of pupils. The bill stated:²

The amount of transportation in each district shall be determined by multiplying the average number of pupils legally transported daily by the district during the month of the preceding year in which the greatest number of pupils was transported by the appropriate amount per pupil set out in the following schedule.

- (a) 8 or more per square mile, \$10.00 per pupil.
- (b) 5.0 to 7.9 per square mile, \$15.00 per pupil.
- (c) 2.0 to 4.9 per square mile, \$18.00 per pupil.
- (d) 1.0 to 1.9 per square mile, \$20.00 per pupil.
- (e) Less than 1.0 per square mile, \$25.00 per pupil.

1 Rules and Regulations of State Board, page 4

2 Finance bulletin 145, page 22

AMOUNT EXPENDED FOR NEW BUSES

School	Under 212	Under 6
Gage	\$3,263.81	\$2,656.91
Fargo	3,534.67	2,012.08
Arnett	650.00	5,718.35
Shattuck	2,700.00	2,625.00
Seiling	3,565.40	3,193.79
Vici	None	3,169.75
Leede	1,200.00	770.81
Oakwood	2,400.00	2,713.91
Taloga	None	None
Cheyenne	1,700.00	1,531.22
Hammon	338.00	None
Reydon	1,866.93	1,771.00
Mutual	1,819.65	None
Quinlin	None	1,643.87
Mooreland	1,690.57	2,139.00
Woodward	None	None
Supply	None	None
Sharon	1,475.00	1,009.23
Greenfield	2,368.37	1,798.33
Canton	1,664.15	900.00
Okeene	946.00	3,019.06
Watonga	None	1,727.65
Kitchcock	1,375.00	1,300.00
Longdale	None	324.00
Geary	None	None
Total	\$33,297.55	\$40,874.46

Statistics from Annual Financial and Transportation Reports

- (f) When the density is less than 0.6 per square mile, the State Board of Education shall have the right to make special adjustments to meet the actual costs of transportation.

The density was calculated according to the following formula:³

"The average number of pupils per square mile shall be determined by dividing twice the number of legally transported pupils living inside the district plus the number of legally transported pupils living outside the district by twice the area of the district plus the area served by the district for transferred pupils."

Each of the twenty-four districts furnishing transportation in Blaine, Dewey, Ellis, Roger Mills, and Woodward Counties in 1937-38 received allowances from the minimum of \$16.00 to the maximum of \$25.00.

Under House Bill 212, there were seven districts of the twenty-four furnishing transportation that did not spend some money to improve their transportation equipment. These seventeen districts expended \$33,297.55.⁴ This averaged approximately \$2000.00 per school.

Under House Bill 5, only four districts of the twenty-four furnishing transportation failed to purchase some new equipment. These twenty schools purchased \$40,874.46 worth of new busses.⁵ A net increase of \$7,576.91 was shown in the expenditures.

3 Finance bulletin 145, page 23

4 Table on transportation

5 Table on New busses

VI
NUMBER OF PUPILS TRANSPORTED DAILY

School	Under 212	Under 6
Gage	238	263
Fargo	309	339
Arnett	433	493
Shattuck	161	310
Seiling	311	405
Vici	325	362
Leedey	240	308
Oakwood	282	277
Taloga	150	174
Cheyenne	264	306
Hammon	229	116
Reydon	493	356
Mutual	227	216
Quinlin	155	147
Mooreland	242	266
Woodward	None	None
Supply	171	179
Sharon	297	295
Greenfield	538	470
Canton	227	292
Okeene	324	352
Watonga	211	248
Hitchcock	228	246
Longdale	313	316
Geary	484	396
Total	<u>6,852</u>	<u>7,042</u>

Statistics from Annual Transportation Reports

VII

AMOUNT EXPENDED FOR TRANSPORTATION

School	Under 212	Under 6
Gage	\$8,254.15	\$9,968.60
Fargo	9,429.67	8,816.85
Arnett	7,722.30	15,357.29
Shattuck	6,420.00	9,715.14
Seiling	6,877.43	6,459.22
Vici	5,680.18	9,620.35
Leedey	6,238.37	6,411.22
Oakwood	6,676.26	6,163.83
Taloga	2,393.50	4,099.97
Cheyenne	6,248.89	7,119.34
Hammon	4,169.75	5,151.15
Reydon	7,071.93	7,820.33
Mutual	6,993.46	4,905.03
Quinlin	3,622.50	6,199.87
Mooreland	6,462.09	7,710.77
Woodward	None	None
Supply	4,374.94	3,635.00
Sharon	5,223.00	6,162.40
Greenfield	9,238.09	8,674.63
Canton	4,471.69	3,703.52
Okeene	7,305.96	8,294.27
Watonga	2,690.00	6,437.95
Hitchcock	6,920.99	5,797.25
Longdale	4,972.29	6,747.08
Geary	9,451.75	9,705.00
	<u>\$145,377.51</u>	<u>\$174,676.06</u>

Statistics from Financial Reports and Treasurers' Books

Including the amount spent for new busses, \$145,377.51 were spent for all transportation items during the years of 1935-37.⁶ This amount increased to \$174,676.06 during the years of 1937-39.⁷ A net increase of \$29,298.55 was shown by the total figures.

The average daily number of pupils transported under the first bill was 6,352⁸, compared with 7,042⁹ in the second. The per pupil transportation cost under House Bill 212 was \$21.22, and under House Bill 6, \$24.81. This showed an increase of approximately 17%. This may be attributed to the added number of elementary schools in dependent districts transferring to independent districts.

6 Table on transportation

7 Ibid

8 Table on the average number of pupils transported

9 Ibid

Chapter Eight

TOTAL EXPENDITURES

The total expenditures of a school district is accepted as the total amount of legally issued warrants against funds collected by the district treasurer. Money collected can be divided into about three different classes: first, funds collected by levying a specified number of mills against the total assessed valuation of the school district; secondly, miscellaneous revenue such as beverage tax, back taxes in process of collection, etc.; and thirdly, cash funds received by the district from the State Treasurer.

Since the school year of 1935-36, a gradual increase in total expenditures has been noticed. Schools have been trying for the last few years to reach the standard in operation prior to the lowering of the assessed valuation and decreased tax collections in the local districts. Oklahoma ranks thirty-eighth in total expenditures according to the number of pupils attending school.¹

The twenty-five independent districts had an assessed valuation of \$32,443,296.00² in the years of 1935-37. Due to the passage of the Homestead Exemption Law, the assessed valuation dropped to \$28,269,695.00³ in 1937-39. The individual valuations dropped to a new low for the period beginning in 1935 and ending in 1939. Individual valuations of districts varied from \$386,183.00 under House Bill 212 to

1 Seventeenth Biennial Report of State Superintendent, page 1

2 Table on Assessed Valuation

3 Ibid

VIII
ASSESSED VALUATION

School	Under 212	Under 6
Gage	\$1,723,536.00	\$1,533,534.00
Fargo	1,022,382.00	878,191.00
Arnett	1,194,766.00	1,015,848.00
Shattuck	1,885,686.00	1,726,975.00
Seiling	924,028.00	876,386.00
Vici	900,006.00	682,853.00
Leedey	805,271.00	691,519.00
Oakwood	627,032.00	639,674.00
Taloga	386,183.00	342,082.00
Cheyenne	1,071,582.00	919,380.00
Hammon	715,646.00	587,035.00
Reydon	836,704.00	700,237.00
Mutual	877,040.00	815,501.00
Quinlin	1,033,312.00	965,000.00
Mooreland	2,253,794.00	2,047,837.00
Woodward	5,522,576.00	4,733,447.00
Supply	1,011,143.00	937,557.00
Sharon	813,778.00	758,399.00
Greenfield	1,085,853.00	923,479.00
Canton	843,072.00	721,405.00
Watonga	1,975,210.00	1,640,340.00
Okeene	1,068,547.00	867,146.00
Hitchcock	1,563,556.00	1,381,587.00
Longdale	569,478.00	493,976.00
Geary	1,733,115.00	1,411,307.00
Total	<u>\$32,443,296.00</u>	<u>\$28,289,695.00</u>

Statistics from School Estimates

IX
GENERAL FUND EXPENDITURES

School	Under 212	Under 6
Oage	\$35,867.93	\$32,438.60
Fargo	27,013.85	22,929.55
Arnett	30,357.19	25,452.64
Shattuck	39,704.25	37,473.12
Seiling	17,258.46	13,365.62
Vici	15,470.66	15,325.83
Leedey	13,863.02	13,138.05
Oakwood	13,232.23	10,661.74
Taloga	8,436.09	8,669.59
Cheyenne	17,633.51	16,461.93
Hammon	14,112.53	11,409.19
Reydon	14,241.95	41,916.33
Mutual	16,214.04	15,559.39
Quinlin	15,633.09	19,312.42
Mooreland	30,990.74	33,331.00
Woodward	33,266.82	90,411.60
Supply	16,205.39	14,652.61
Sharon	13,751.43	13,949.77
Greenfield	17,674.44	16,141.71
Canton	15,550.52	13,259.00
Okeene	23,853.92	21,675.44
Watonga	31,099.06	32,934.20
Hitchcock	24,122.77	23,815.63
Longdale	9,900.91	10,096.54
Geary	23,275.65	25,202.32
	<u>\$533,990.95</u>	<u>\$536,190.92</u>

Statistics from Financial Reports and School Estimates

X
TOTAL EXPENDITURES

School	Under 212	Under 6
Gage	\$43,567.93	\$46,897.35
Fargo	35,660.69	39,241.67
Arnett	37,195.19	48,362.86
Shattuck	47,495.25	57,724.01
Seiling	33,713.46	41,409.48
Vici	31,929.70	40,356.33
Leedey	28,864.92	33,993.62
Oakwood	24,794.63	28,395.19
Taloga	21,205.01	25,819.29
Cheyenne	35,392.89	41,780.86
Hammon	35,417.59	36,475.62
Reydon	34,442.45	28,300.43
Mutual	21,216.27	26,250.54
Quinlin	18,594.00	23,489.07
Mooreland	37,573.74	50,056.90
Woodward	112,700.03	127,831.59
Supply	20,460.89	25,183.96
Sharon	24,146.93	29,622.07
Greenfield	39,234.09	43,461.67
Canton	28,425.49	32,819.89
Okeene	43,199.92	49,601.85
Watonga	45,553.54	68,655.21
Hitchcock	33,248.02	33,307.40
Longdale	27,099.37	31,636.81
Geary	52,413.92	60,128.99
	<u>\$913,550.92</u>	<u>\$1,070,852.66</u>

Statistics from Financial Reports and School Estimates

\$5,522,576.00⁴ under House Bill 6, they varied from \$342,082.00 to \$4,733,447.00. Only one of the twenty-five districts had an increased valuation after the Homestead Exemption Law went into effect.

By levying an average millage of 24.51 against the total assessed valuation of \$32,443,296.00 and adding all other funds available, the independent districts expended a total of \$913,550.92 during the school years of 1935-37.⁵ In 1937-39 an average millage of 26.41 was levied, and \$1,070,852.66 was expended.⁶ The above figures showed a net increase of \$157,301.74 in total school expenditures. Even though the valuation decreased as a result of the Homestead Exemption Law, the extra mills levied raised the total local income. \$583,990.95 in local funds were available in 1935-37. After the passage of House Bill 6, the funds were raised to \$586,190.92.⁷

In operating any school, the per cent of money spent for teachers' salaries, maintenance, and transportation must be considered. Under the first of these two bills, maintenance costs were \$190,260.42⁸ or about 20.8% of the

4 Table on Assessed Valuation

5 Table on Total Expenditures

6 Ibid

7 Table on General Fund Expenditures

8 Table on Amount Expended for Maintenance

total; transportation costs were \$145,377.51⁹ or about 15.9%. This left approximately 63.3% for teachers salaries. Under the second bill, \$216,103.37¹⁰ or 20.2% was used for maintenance; \$174,676.06¹¹ or 16.3% for transportation. This left approximately 63.5% for teachers' salaries. Each of the three divisions increased proportionally according to the increased expenditures.

A wide variance can be noticed in the scale of different schools' per capita costs. Watonga had the lowest with \$37.86 and Fargo had the highest with \$77.10 during the years of 1935-37. In the two following years, Geary had the lowest with \$47.72, while Mutual had the highest with \$83.57¹²

The per capita cost increased from \$55.90 under House Bill 212 to \$64.95 under House Bill 6. This \$5.05 increase per pupil represented an increased expenditure in maintenance of \$25,842.95,¹³ in transportation of \$29,298.55,¹⁴ and in teachers' salaries of \$110,267.79.¹⁵

9 Table on Amount Expended for Transportation

10 Table on Amount Expended for Maintenance

11 Table on Amount Expended for Transportation

12 Table on Per Capita Cost

13 Table on Amount Expended for Maintenance

14 Table on Amount Expended for Transportation

15 Table on Number of Teachers and Amount Expended

XI

NUMBER OF MILLS USED

School	Under \$12	Under 6
Gage	27.14	28.67
Fargo	26.14	27.94
Arnett	26.50	28.48
Shattuck	25.81	28.16
Seiling	26.34	27.10
Vici	26.40	27.00
Leedey	24.28	26.88
Oakwood	26.17	25.20
Taloga	25.08	25.20
Cheyenne	26.17	25.19
Hammom	23.87	25.54
Reydon	25.24	25.17
Mutual	24.03	23.90
Quinlin	19.15	25.50
Mooreland	19.70	23.40
Woodward	25.95	26.40
Supply	28.83	23.50
Sharon	27.04	27.97
Greenfield	23.80	25.80
Centon	21.40	25.40
Okeene	23.30	25.80
Watonga	22.16	27.80
Hitchcock	20.80	26.20
Longdale	22.20	25.40
Geary	25.25	27.62
No. of districts	25) 612.75 (24.51	25) 660.22 (26.41
	Average	Average

Statistics from School District Estimates

XII

AVERAGE DAILY ATTENDANCE

School	Under 212	Under 6
Gage	593	580
Fargo	503	535
Arnett	545	681
Shattuck	798	884
Seiling	601	707
Vici	632	640
Leedey	496	574
Oakwood	398	407
Taloga	421	462
Cheyenne	674	727
Hammon	708	609
Reydon	585	538
Mutual	288	314
Quinlin	254	229
Mooreland	628	629
Woodward	2212	2191
Supply	288	308
Sharon	405	388
Greenfield	656	614
Canton	547	509
Okeene	754	776
Watonga	1158	1193
Hitchcock	380	353
Longdale	491	482
Geary	<u>1056</u>	<u>944</u>
	16,071	16,274

Statistics from Statistical Reports

XIII

EXPENDITURES FOR LIBRARY AND INSTRUCTIONAL SUPPLIES

School	Under \$12	Under \$6
Gage	\$1,144.83	\$1,006.66
Hargo	890.00	825.66
Arnett	706.57	805.47
Shattuck	1,454.60	2,063.22
Seiling	950.35	1,619.49
Vici	502.89	736.27
Leedy	1,184.27	578.93
Oakwood	388.39	165.64
Taloga	544.07	21.63
Cheyenne	249.74	477.82
Hammon	711.54	407.00
Reydon	458.17	1,012.95
Mutual	None	272.19
Quinlin	367.55	399.60
Mooreland	1,403.10	1,699.60
Woodward	2,951.46	3,813.21
Supply	165.49	974.41
Sharon	447.00	949.67
Greenfield	242.56	955.26
Canton	987.30	905.13
Okeene	1,181.97	1,255.34
Watonga	2,562.27	1,626.00
Hitchcock	251.68	302.59
Longdale	235.24	537.20
Geary	452.00	1,085.95
Total	\$20,440.03	\$24,880.57

Statistics from Financial Reports and Treasurers' Books

XIV
 PER CAPITA COST

AUG 6 1940

School	Under 212	Under 6
Gage	\$68.52	\$72.66
Fargo	77.10	79.24
Arnett	65.18	71.06
Shattuck	61.98	69.69
Seiling	56.11	58.57
Vici	48.09	58.27
Leedey	49.82	51.06
Oakwood	59.55	63.99
Taloga	42.97	48.19
Cheyenne	45.12	49.14
Hammon	41.19	53.68
Reydon	53.99	64.21
Mutual	65.18	63.57
Quinlin	66.09	73.93
Mooreland	57.77	73.87
Woodward	53.81	61.23
Supply	64.07	77.32
Sharon	58.94	75.70
Greenfield	52.60	65.82
Canton	50.07	54.93
Okeene	50.99	60.49
Watonga	37.86	70.83
Hitchcock	74.68	95.12
Longdale	51.90	53.52
Geary	44.02	47.72
No. of schools 25)	\$1,397.60 (\$55.90 Average)	\$1,623.81 (\$64.95 Average)

Statistics from Financial Reports

The library and instructional supplies which were purchased increased about 17% from the first to the second bill. The High School Inspectors have been mainly responsible for the emphasis placed on the purchase of additional materials with which the students could work.

While more money was expended during the operation of House Bill 6, no over-emphasis can be detected in either the teachers' salaries, transportation, or maintenance divisions.

SUMMARY

Public opinion was instrumental in the passage of both House Bill 212 and House Bill 6. State funds were necessary to support the schools because of the decreased assessed valuations within the districts. A great deal of improvement was made by the appropriation increase from \$8,200,000.00 to \$12,500,000.00.

Even though Primary Aid was decreased \$200,000.00 under House Bill 6, ten of the twenty-five schools surveyed were allocated more money than the two preceding years.

The weaker schools of this section and throughout the state were materially benefited by the \$3,000,000.00 increased appropriation for Secondary Aid. A nine months term of school was a reality for the first time in almost a decade.

Teachers' salaries, transportation, and maintenance were all improved by House Bill 6. Each teacher's salary was approximately \$100.00 more each year. Better facilities were furnished as a result of additional transportation allowances. Six and one-half cents per day per pupil for maintenance caused general school conditions to improve.

Nearly all schools' per capita cost increased in 1937-38 and 1938-39 because of greater expenditures; however, no one division expended more than its pro rata share since each showed approximately the same percentage as the two prior years.

While the improvement of House Bill 6 over House Bill 212 is noticeable, Oklahoma still ranks well down the list when compared with other states.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Annual Statistical Reports of Independent Districts, 1935-36, 1936-37, and 1937-38. State Department of Education, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma.
2. Annual Statistical Reports of Independent Districts, 1938-39. County Superintendents' Offices in Watonga, Taloga, Arnett, Cheyenne, and Woodward.
3. Annual Transportation Reports of Independent Districts, 1935-36, 1936-37, 1937-38. State Department of Education, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma.
4. Annual Transportation Reports of Independent Districts, 1938-39. County Superintendents' Offices in Watonga, Taloga, Arnett, Cheyenne, and Woodward.
5. Annual Financial Reports of Independent Districts, 1935-36, 1936-37, 1937-38. State Department of Education, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma.
6. School Expenditures of Independent Districts, 1938-39. County Treasurers' Offices in Watonga, Taloga, Arnett, Cheyenne, and Woodward.
7. School Estimates, 1935-36, 1936-37, 1937-38, 1938-39. County Clerks' Offices in Watonga, Taloga, Arnett, Cheyenne, and Woodward.
8. Supplemental Estimates, 1938-39. County Treasurers' Offices in Watonga, Taloga, Arnett, Cheyenne, and Woodward.
9. House Bill 212 as passed by the Oklahoma Legislature in April, 1935.
10. House Bill 6 as passed by the Oklahoma Legislature in May, 1937.
11. Oklahoma Educational Directory for 1935-36, 1936-37, 1937-38, and 1938-39.
12. Rules and Regulations as set forth by the State Board of Education.
13. Seventeenth Biennial Report of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction.