Citizens of Texas RECOMMEND...

...a public school program to meet the needs of their children
TEXAS STATE TEACHERS ASSOCIATION
316 West 12th
Austin, Texas

PLEASE NOTE THESE CHANGES

Since this booklet was printed, the Hale-Aikin Committee has held its final meeting and minor changes have been made. These changes are:

PROPOSAL I - Pages 9 and 10 - The words "nine and one-half months" and "ten months" were deleted.

PROPOSAL III - Item 2 - Page 21 - Item 2 was deleted.

The proposed salary schedule referred to on pages 3 and 38 is amended to provide minimums of $4,000 to $5,000 for the bachelor's degree and $4,225 to $6,000 for the master's degree. The revised schedule follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEARS OF EXPERIENCE</th>
<th>B.A.</th>
<th>M.A.</th>
<th>or M.A.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>$4,014</td>
<td>$4,225</td>
<td>$4,225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4,113</td>
<td>4,324</td>
<td>4,324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4,212</td>
<td>4,423</td>
<td>4,423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4,311</td>
<td>4,522</td>
<td>4,522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4,410</td>
<td>4,621</td>
<td>4,621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4,509</td>
<td>4,720</td>
<td>4,720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4,608</td>
<td>4,819</td>
<td>4,819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4,707</td>
<td>4,918</td>
<td>4,918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>4,806</td>
<td>5,017</td>
<td>5,017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4,905</td>
<td>5,116</td>
<td>5,116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>5,004</td>
<td>5,215</td>
<td>5,215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>5,103</td>
<td>5,314</td>
<td>5,413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>5,213</td>
<td>5,413</td>
<td>5,611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>5,312</td>
<td>5,512</td>
<td>5,809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>5,411</td>
<td>5,611</td>
<td>5,908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>5,510</td>
<td>5,710</td>
<td>6,007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>5,609</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>5,708</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>5,807</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The 55th Legislature expressed a desire, through enactment of House Concurrent Resolution 105, to evaluate the Texas public school program. This resolution authorized the appointment of a 24-member committee—six appointed by the Governor, six by the Lieutenant Governor, six by the Speaker of the House, and six by the State Board of Education.

The Committee of 24 met, organized, and began its work on Oct. 16, 1957. In order to involve the citizens of every county in the state, a counterpart of the state committee was created in each of the 254 counties. These county committees were to act in an advisory capacity to the state committee.

The state committee furnished the county groups with study guides and a suggested report form. The study guides were to aid local people in examining their own schools.

More than 50,000 Texans participated directly in the county evaluation of schools and in preparing the county reports. Many thousands of others contributed to the study in some way.

The county committees made a careful study of their own school systems and recommended improvements that would strengthen the educational program.

Every one of the 254 committees made recommendations!

The state committee studied carefully the recommendations in these reports, received research reports from other sources, and then made recommendations of their own directly to the Governor and the Legislature.

This official report is reproduced in full and a summary of the county reports is given also.

The study has been a thorough and excellent one, but the results which emerge will depend upon action taken by the Legislature, by the State Board of Education, and by local boards of education.

To put into effect these recommendations made by the citizens of Texas will require that a legislative program be enacted into law by the 56th Legislature. A proposed program to accomplish this purpose is presented as part of this booklet.

Every citizen of Texas is urged to study carefully the state recommendations, the county recommendations, and the program which will make available the improvements desired.

Texans are justly proud of their public school system, but it is necessary that this educational program be strengthened to meet the demands of today's atomic age.

Texans have said what they want...but to obtain the school program they desire will require the continued efforts of all, united for improved education in Texas. "second to none."
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TEXAS STATE TEACHERS ASSOCIATION
316 West 12th Street
Austin 1, Texas
SUMMARY OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION
TO PLACE IN OPERATION CITIZEN
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPROVED
PUBLIC SCHOOL PROGRAM

The citizens of Texas have recommended specific improvements in their public school program through 254 County Committees and the Hale-Aikin Committee of 24.

The Hale-Aikin Committee, which is charged by law with the responsibility of developing proposals and presenting recommendations to the Legislature and the Governor, has met its responsibility in full and has after careful deliberation prepared 22 proposals and recommendations.

The next step in activating the recommendations for improvement of the Texas public school program must be taken by the 56th session of the Legislature convening in January, 1959.

The proposals as submitted fall generally into three categories: (1) Those requiring specific laws to place the recommendations into operation, (2) Proposals directed to the State Board of Education, local Boards of Education, the teaching profession, and the public suggesting action which should be taken to improve the public school program, (3) Proposals relating to state policy which may require legislation but such legislation should be proposed by a department of the state government, or by the Legislature itself.

A proposed legislative program which would implement the recommendations requiring specific laws to place them in operation follows:

Amendments to Minimum Foundation Program Law should include:

1. Amend Foundation Program to provide a program of education of not less than nine and one-half months per year with a minimum of 180 days of classroom instruction and a minimum of five days for formal in-service education program for teachers and staff members which conforms to standards established by the Texas Education Agency.

2. Amend Foundation Program to provide the allocation of professional units on the basis of current average daily attendance. Provided, however, that a local school district may use the average daily attendance of the preceding year to support the professional units employed (this guarantees that no district will be penalized by this amendment).

3. Amend Foundation Program to provide special teacher units for academically talented pupils in districts which develop a program approved by the Texas Education Agency.

4. Amend Foundation Program to provide one special service teacher for each 17 classroom teacher units and add to the five positions now classified under special services a sixth position—driver education.

5. Allot a full-time principal for the first 16 classroom teacher units and one additional principal unit for each additional 24 classroom teacher units.

6. Amend Foundation Program to provide an assistant superintendent unit allocated on a special formula.

7. Amend Foundation Program to provide $600 allotment for each professional unit and delete $100 allowance.
8. Amend Foundation Program law by adding $380 per bus to the formula now set forth in that law.

9. Amend the Minimum State Salary Schedule to provide a minimum annual salary of $3,800 for a beginning teacher with a bachelor's degree based upon nine and one-half months of service. Annual increments in the amount of $10 per month for each year of service shall be added until the state guaranteed maximum reaches $5,000 for nine and one-half months. For teachers holding master's degree, the minimum beginning annual salary shall be $4,000 based upon nine and one-half months of service. Annual increments in the amount of $10 per month for each of the first 12 years of service and an annual increment of $20 per month for each of the succeeding years shall be added to attain a master's degree state maximum of $6,000 for nine and one-half months of service.

Individual bills should be introduced in the Legislature to activate other recommendations included under Item (1). The subjects involved include:

1. Provide in statute the framework for the public school curriculum that will include the subject areas outlined by the Hale-Aikin Committee.

2. Special pre-school instructional units for non-English speaking children should be provided in accordance with the plan to be developed by the Texas Education Agency.

3. Regional libraries for audio-visual materials, including films, should be created and financed on a matching basis by the state and local districts.

4. The statutes should be amended to provide for the distribution of the State Available Fund on an average daily attendance basis and provision should be made for biennial census on even numbered years under rules and regulations to be set by the State Board of Education.

5. Any school-age child who is a resident of the state of Texas is eligible to contribute toward the district's eligibility for state financial assistance regardless of the district in which his attendance is established. Provision should be made to protect local school districts through granting local Boards of Education the power to approve or reject transfers.
THE HALE-AIKIN COMMITTEE OF 24 RECOMMENDS
A PUBLIC SCHOOL PROGRAM TO MEET THE NEEDS
OF TEXAS CHILDREN.
TO THE CITIZENS OF TEXAS

This is a tentative draft of the proposals which the Hale-Aikin Committee of Twenty-four will present to the Governor, the Fifty-sixth Legislature, and to the people of Texas as provided by House Concurrent Resolution 105. (See Appendix B.) Fifteen thousand copies of this draft of the proposals are being mailed to the chairmen of the 254 Hale-Aikin County Committees, the Governor, members of the Legislature, the State Board of Education, the press, state-wide educational organizations, and other interested citizens.

Although an unprecedented amount of public interest has already been shown in the proposals, the Committee believes still greater interest will be shown in them between now and the time they are presented formally to the Fifty-sixth Legislature. There is the possibility that this report may serve as a blueprint for educational improvement in Texas for years to come. The proposals are not limited, therefore, to those which would require legislative action.

The Committee of Twenty-four would welcome any additional information or reactions which the County Committees or other persons reading this report might wish to make available to the Committee.

The Legislature directed the Hale-Aikin Committee of Twenty-four to make a thorough study of the Texas public school system. The men and women serving on this Committee have dedicated themselves to the task of making proposals which will guarantee standards of quality in education. The Committee's basic belief in the paramount importance of education is expressed through the proposals contained in this report.

The Committee bases its proposals upon many facts and convictions, from which the following basic principles have been formulated:

1. As a whole, we can be proud of our public schools as they exist today. Many of our Texas schools are giving instruction of excellent quality and rank with the best schools of the nation.

2. The advancement and continuing support of public education is a fundamental obligation of state and local government. A free society must develop its human potential by identifying, nurturing, and wisely using its talents.

3. All the evidence we have indicates that boys and girls will need more and better educational opportunities in the future than have been provided in the past. The quality of education should be such as to enable each child to develop to his full capacity as an individual and as a citizen.
4. The tremendous increase of citizen participation in educational planning in recent years has resulted in decisions by local school boards to provide programs beyond the minimum legal requirements. This indicates that Texans want better educational opportunities than are guaranteed by existing statutes.

The outstanding progress made in the last decade toward establishing a basic educational program for all Texas children has been attributed largely to the Gilmer-Aikin Laws enacted by the Legislature in 1949. The Hale-Aikin Committee, like the earlier Gilmer-Aikin Committee, is composed of six members appointed by the Governor, six by the Lieutenant Governor, and six by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The present Committee has, in addition, six members appointed by the State Board of Education.

House Concurrent Resolution 105 empowered the Committee of Twenty-four “to effect its own organization and adopt such procedure and operate as may be necessary to carry out fully” the purposes of the resolution.

The Committee was organized October 16, 1957. Officers elected were Senator A. M. Aikin, Jr., chairman; Representative L. DeWitt Hale, vice-chairman; and J. W. Edgar, secretary. Subcommittees and chairmen were named for each of the four problem areas specified in HCR 105: School Program, Nat Williams; Teacher Supply, Horace K. Jackson; School Construction, John Ben Shepperd; School Finance, Charles E. Simons. The death of Lewis Taylor and the resignation of Mr. Shepperd resulted in two committee vacancies which were filled in April, 1958, by the appointments of Brooks L. Harman and Mrs. Van Hook Stubbs. Thomas B. Ramey of Tyler replaced Mr. Shepperd as the subcommittee chairman for School Construction.

The Committee published a study guide designed to solicit facts, opinions, suggestions, and recommendations from every county and school district. Ninety-six thousand study guides were distributed throughout the State. The local committees which conducted the study in each county were organized with the assistance of county superintendents and other school administrators. Lay citizens outnumbered the school personnel serving on the local committees by approximately four to one.

Every one of the 254 counties made detailed reports after more than 50,000 Texans had participated directly in the evaluation of their schools and in preparing the county reports. Information made available by local school officials provided a factual basis for the county reports. Professional organizations and research agencies gave helpful information and assistance. Unanimity of opinion rarely prevailed on any question. Each area of the state has educational needs which differ in some ways from those of other areas.

The Committee insisted that every viewpoint expressed in the county reports be brought to its attention. In this way, the comments and recommendations originated by local study groups received careful consideration by members of the Committee and provided a source of information during all the Committee’s deliberations. The proposals in this report are generally the same as those proposed in the majority of the county reports, but the Committee exercised its right of independent judgment after considering all recommendations from every source.

The Texas Legislature has consistently demonstrated its willingness to provide good schools when the facts are available upon which to base a sound program of legislation. In his charge to this Committee, Governor Price Daniel reiterated the Texas goal of making our schools “second to none.” The Committee believes a school system “second to none” is an objective worthy of every Texan’s careful consideration and support.
SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

Traditionally each school district in Texas has financed schoolhouse construction through the issuance of school district tax bonds with maturities usually ranging from 15 to 30 years. The extent to which local school districts may incur bonded debt is limited by law.

Two statutes govern the amount of debt that may be incurred by a school district. One statute authorizes a school district to incur a bonded debt that may be serviced by a fifty cent tax levy on the $100 assessed valuation. The other legal authority provides for a maximum bonded debt of from seven to ten per cent of a districts assessed valuation, the exact percentage being determined by the tax levy for maintenance purposes. The qualified voters of each district may determine the statutes under which the district will operate. In determining whether a district has the financial ability to provide needed additional classrooms, it must be assumed that the district will exercise the authority granted it by statutes.

What Is The Present And Predicted Need For Classrooms In Texas School Districts?

Reports from County Hale-Aikin Committees indicate present and predicted need for classrooms as follows:

Present Need:
—107 counties indicated they have enough classrooms to house current enrollment.
—138 counties reported a total current need for 3,373 classrooms.
—9 counties made no report on this question.

Future Need:
—Counties reported a combined need for 17,284 additional classrooms during the five-year period, 1958-63. The combined present and future need is for 20,657 classrooms.

Analysis Of Need:
Each County Hale-Aikin Committee was asked to determine the present need for additional classrooms on the basis of local policies governing the organization of the instructional program. These County Committees were also asked to estimate scholastic population growth through the 1962-63 since 1947. The need for additional classrooms school year, to determine the future need for classrooms and to establish a value of the present and future classrooms needed in terms of local construction costs. No attempt has been made to convert these data to a uniform standard for the state as a whole.

The reported need for classrooms was categorized in terms of (1) the scholastic population changes that have occurred in the counties reporting the classroom deficiency, and (2) the reasons for the shortage which were cited in the county reports.

—Analysis of scholastic population trends in Texas shows that 61 or 24 per cent of the counties of the state have experienced a growth in scholastic population of more than 26 per cent since 1947. The need for additional classrooms in these 61 counties represent 76.8 per cent of the total needed additional classrooms as reported by the state as a whole. Only 12 per cent of this need was reported by the 144 counties that have shown a decline in scholastic population.

County reports indicate that the present and future need for classrooms is 20,657. Increased enrollment accounts for 18,080, program changes for 572, administrative changes for 147, and other changes for 1,858. Needs are based on the percentage of county scholastic population change between 1947 and 1957.

Can Needed Classrooms In Texas School Districts Be Financed Under Present Legal Structure?

The County Hale-Aikin Committee Reports indicated an estimated cost of $373,008,338 to finance the construction of the 20,657 classrooms needed between now and 1963.

One or more school districts in 43 counties were reported to be unable, under their present legal authority, to finance the construction of needed classrooms. Investigation of the school tax rates in these counties revealed that some of the districts apparently were unaware that they are authorized to vote bonds under the provisions of Article 2784e-1.

Even after applying Article 2784e-1, however, there are 73 school districts in 35 counties which could not finance their estimated classroom construction costs with their present assessed valuations.

Analysis of assessment data and estimates of funds needed to finance needed additional classrooms submitted by County Committees indicates that each district in Texas could provide the needed additional classrooms under present bonding auth-
ority and not exceed the highest assessment ratio used by some of the school districts in the state.

**PROPOSAL I**

The present practice of financing school buildings from local district tax funds should be continued, with careful study being given to the available legal alternatives which might enable the local district to obtain additional resources.

Some of the legal alternatives include:

— Increasing property assessments for school purposes.

— Increasing tax rates.

— Reappraising classroom needs to provide the minimum essential classrooms for educational purposes.

— The possibility of combining districts with nearby districts.

Declining population districts may join their educational programs with districts experiencing population growth. Likewise, districts with declining income may seek attachment to a wealthier adjoining district, thereby pooling their financial resources for the benefit of all school children and the community.

Each school district must determine what should be included in school construction. The limited resources of a particular community may call for a reduction of desires as distinguished from needs.

Studies in improved utilization of school plants have been underway in Texas during the past two years and extensive research being done now is aimed at reductions in the cost of school buildings. Experimentation and research in the field of school plant utilization and building construction should continue to be emphasized. Research findings and promising ideas for better utilization should be made available to all districts which have a present need or predicted need for additional classrooms.

It is easier to maintain sound business practices in the management and expenditure of public funds when those funds are locally controlled and administered. As long as the citizens of each community, through their local school boards, are authorized to set policies for and manage their own schools, Federal or State encroachment is less likely to interfere with the long-established pattern of local control of education in Texas.

**SCHOOL PROGRAM**

**Statutory Requirements Regarding Curriculum**

Since the beginning of the Texas public school system, the Legislature has from time to time enacted statutes affecting the curriculum in the public schools. These statutes have been concerned with such matters as teaching the constitutions of the United States and Texas, citizenship, and requirements regarding certain specific subjects that should be taught in Texas schools. These statutes were enacted separately over a long period of years and form no cohesive pattern that will serve to guide a conscientious school administrator who wishes to conform to the laws of this State.

Present statutes define a school day as being at least seven hours, and the Minimum Foundation Program provides that each school offer instruction for nine months. This has been interpreted by the State Board of Education to mean a minimum of 175 days of instruction. Many Texas schools now exceed this minimum.

Certain other statutes define the responsibility of the State Board of Education and local boards of education, but they have never been organized into one comprehensive proposal which clearly defines the minimum responsibility of the State Board of Education and local boards for curriculum planning.

It is the opinion of this committee that certain of the present statutes pertaining to curriculum should be repealed, and a statute enacted that will clearly define the subjects that must be taught in each school, and the responsibility of the State Board of Education and local boards of education in regard to the curriculum of Texas schools. This statute should also establish the responsibility of each district in regard to the number of years of education available and the length of the school year. The following is proposed in order to achieve these objectives.

**PROPOSAL I**

1. Each public school district should provide a full 12-grade program of education of not less than nine and one-half
months per year with a minimum of 180 days of classroom instruction and a minimum of five days for formal in-service education programs for teachers and staff members which conform to standards established by the Texas Education Agency. Local districts may elect to operate a ten-months program with a minimum of 190 days of instruction and a minimum of five days for formal in-service education programs. In either instance, the allocation of Minimum Foundation Funds will be based on the number of months taught.

Each district should provide the 12-grade program of instruction within its own bounds or make financial arrangements with the receiving district to provide educational facilities for transferred pupils.

2. The statutes of the State should require each public school system to provide adequate instruction in:
   —English, spelling, reading, writing and arithmetic in the primary and elementary grades
   —The Constitutions of the United States and Texas (Article 2663b—1 Sec. 1)
   —Citizenship, the American heritage and patriotism (Article 289—Penal Code)
   —The history and geography of Texas, the United States, and the world (Article 2911)
   —Use of the English language (Article 2911 and Article 238 of the Penal Code)
   —Pre-school orientation in basic English for non-English speaking children
   —Mathematical concepts and skills
   —Scientific knowledge
   —Health and physical fitness, including the harmful effects of alcohol and narcotics
   —Such other instruction as may be required by the State Board of Education or by local school boards as determined to provide for the varying needs of all pupils in the district, both terminal and college bound. This instruction should include vocational education and foreign languages.

3. The Texas Education Agency should be specifically charged with the responsibility for developing the detailed policies for implementing the instructional program described herein and for setting standards of performance and for the promotion of pupils. It is understood that these standards should be such as will upgrade, as rapidly as possible, the program of education to a high level of excellence.

4. The local school board should have the optional authority to use local funds to establish kindergartens, operate programs of adult education, and provide additional courses for enrichment of instruction that have been approved by the Texas Education Agency. The cost of such programs and/or courses should not be included as a part of the cost of the Minimum Foundation Program.

The citizens of Texas have expressed a desire that every child in this state be provided a sound and adequate program of education that will enable him to develop to his full capacity as an individual and as a citizen.

Many reports from county study groups indicated that the school program should be strengthened by increasing the amount of time pupils spend in school. Suggestions were made for adding to the length of the school day, the school year, and to the number of years spent in school.

Some local study groups also reported that many of the statutes concerning the school curriculum are now outdated or obsolete and, therefore, are not applicable to present-day educational needs. There were many suggestions that statutory requirements concerning the school curriculum be stated in general terms and that flexibility for meeting changing conditions be provided by charging the State Board of Education with the responsibility of implementing statutes.

In addition to the responsibility of the State Board of Education for implementing statutes, it was indicated that the local boards of education should retain the responsibility for enrichment of instruction beyond the minimum essentials established by law and State Board policies.

**ALLOTMENT OF INSTRUCTIONAL UNITS**

The Minimum Foundation Law presently provides for the allocation of classroom teacher units (CTU) on the basis of the average daily attendance of pupils during the previous school year. This results in hardships for rapidly growing communities with increasing school enrollments.

Many Texas school districts have developed accelerated programs for academically talented
pupils, but there is no state-wide plan for providing a minimum program of education for these pupils, and no provision in the Minimum Foundation Act for additional teachers for such instruction.

The Legislature has assigned to the Department of Public Safety and the Texas Education Agency the responsibility for keeping high standards in the driver education program. Teachers of driver education are not now included as special service teachers under the Minimum Foundation Laws, although many local school districts do provide these teachers through the regular classroom teacher allotment or through the use of local funds.

At the present time, full-time principals are allocated on the basis of one for each 20 classroom teacher units and an additional one for each 30 units.

General administrative positions are not provided by the Minimum Foundation Program in proportion to the size of the school, which means that a school with several hundred teachers must provide assistant superintendents, business managers and other administrative positions, as needed, from local funds.

Research has shown that many children who enter school without a speaking knowledge of the English language are required to repeat a grade one or more times during their school career. A solution to this problem has been attempted in many local districts by providing, through local funds, special pre-school work for non-English speaking children. The State makes no provision for this type of special instruction, although it is needed both to prevent drop-outs from school and to avoid the unnecessary repetition of grades because of a language barrier.

The Committee believes a stronger program of instruction could be provided if the following changes were made in the allocation of units under the Minimum Foundation Law.

**PROPOSAL II**

1. The teacher-pupil ratio should be calculated on the basis of current average daily attendance, provided, however, that any decrease in average daily attendance should not cause a school to lose a teacher unit during the current year.

2. Special teacher units for the academically talented pupils in secondary schools should be allotted to districts which develop a program approved by the Texas Education Agency to provide for such pupils and which have a designated number of pupils who can qualify as being eligible.

3. Teachers of driver education classes should be added to the present categories for special service personnel.

The number of classroom teacher units required for allocating special service units should be changed from 20 to 17, provided the school operates a program of driver education approved by the Texas Education Agency in which special service teacher units are used to staff the program.

4. The formula for allocation of full-time principals should be changed to provide one for 16 classroom teacher units and an additional principal unit for each additional 24 classroom teacher units. In no event should more than one full-time principal per campus unit be approved.

5. Assistant superintendent units should be allocated on the same salary schedule as high school principals but on a 12-month basis, according to the following formula:
   
   - 1 for 150-299 CTU's
   - 2 for 300-499 CTU's
   - 3 for 500-999 CTU's
   - One additional for each additional 1,000 CTU's

6. Special pre-school instructional units for non-English speaking children, who are at least five years of age and who are eligible to enter the first grade the ensuing year, should be provided in accordance with a plan to be developed by the Texas Education Agency.

Many of the county reports requested a lowering of the present teacher-pupil ratio for classroom teacher units and thereby provide additional teachers. Because of the difficulty of securing qualified teachers and the great cost of decreasing the teacher-pupil ratio for classroom teacher units, it is recommended that the teacher-pupil ratio for classroom teacher units not be changed but that the instructional program be strengthened by making the changes described in Proposal II.

**PREPARATION OF TEACHERS**

The continuing effort to improve the competence of teachers after certification—generally referred to as in-service education—is a responsibility of the local district and has depended almost exclusive-
ly upon the leadership given to it by local school officials.

In 1955, the Texas Legislature passed a new certification law. In implementing the provisions of this law, the State Board of Education adopted standards requiring teacher education candidates to have approximately 40 per cent of their work in general education, 40 per cent in the area of academic specialization, and 20 per cent in courses designed for the professional preparation of teachers. Since this program does not affect all teachers now teaching in the state, the following proposal is made.

**PROPOSAL III**

1. Although the 1955 certification act provided for a balanced program of teacher training for all teachers beginning training after this date, many certified teachers now in service have not had this balanced program. State and local policies should encourage all teachers who have not completed the balanced program provided by the certification act of 1955 to continue training until they have a major in the area of teaching assignment. Ultimately, the State Board of Education should require all teachers to teach in their major field.

2. Each school district should develop a plan for formal in-service education programs for teachers and staff members consisting of a minimum of five days which conforms to standards established by the Texas Education Agency.

**INSTRUCTIONAL SUPPLIES AND EQUIPMENT**

Before the Gilmer-Aikin laws, there was no state provision for instructional materials other than in the rural schools covered by the Equalization Acts. The Minimum Foundation Program Act provided an allotment for general maintenance and operation of the school and for the purchase of instructional supplies. The amount now allocated is $350 per classroom teacher unit in the larger schools and $400 per teacher in the small schools. These figures were in the law passed ten years ago and are not realistic in terms of the increased costs in maintenance and operation that have occurred during the past decade.

Many schools are unable to provide adequate instructional materials and to equip laboratories and libraries with the allotment now provided. Almost half of the counties reported that there were schools in the county with inadequate elementary and/or high school libraries.

The Federal Communications Commission has assigned the State of Texas 18 television channels to be used for education purposes. Fifteen of these channels are still unassigned and unless positive action is taken by the Legislature and educational institutions, it is possible that the State may lose some of these channels.

For more than ten years the State has not purchased additional materials for the State Film Library. In a number of areas regional libraries developed by local school systems and colleges have met the needs for schools within the area served.

The following proposals are made in order to improve laboratories, libraries, and provide adequate audio-visual instruction.

**PROPOSAL IV**

1. The allotment of State funds for services and operating cost should be increased from $350-400 to $600 per eligible professional unit, and the $100 per unit credit now provided in the Minimum Foundation Law in establishing the local fund assignment should be abolished.

2. The Legislature should take the necessary steps to preserve for the children of Texas the television channels now allocated for educational purposes, and the Texas Education Agency should continue to inquire into developments in this field and at some subsequent date make recommendations to the Legislature.

3. Regional libraries for audio-visual materials should be established on a cooperative basis with the State, participating school districts, and colleges sharing the cost.

**EDUCATIONAL GUIDANCE SERVICES**

The Minimum Foundation Act presently provides one counselor or supervisor for each 40
classroom teacher units and one additional for each additional 50 classroom teacher units or major fraction thereof. One counselor may serve several smaller schools that participate in a cooperative agreement. In addition to these provisions, many schools employ counselors from local funds.

The State Department of Education has not had a Division of Guidance Services although consultative guidance services to local schools have been available on a very limited basis.

**PROPOSAL V**

1. A division of Guidance Services should be established in the Texas Education A-

**SCHOOL TRANSPORTATION**

The present laws permit, but do not require, each school district, with county board approval, to establish a system of transportation for school children. If a pupil lives two or more miles from school, measured by the nearest public road traveled, or two or more miles from a commercial bus line within a city, he is eligible to ride a school bus and can be counted in determining Foundation Program allocations.

The State contributes to this program according to a formula based on (1) the greatest number of pupils on a bus at any one time, which varies from 72 pupils per bus to 15-19 pupils per bus and ranging in cost from $2,350 per year to $1,450 per year, (2) the average length of bus routes which are 45-55 miles of daily travel, and (3) the condition of the roads over which the buses travel.

In addition to the transportation program provided by the State, local districts have the authority to provide transportation for resident pupils regardless of distance they may reside from school, provided these costs are paid from local funds.

**PROPOSAL VI**

1. The transportation formula should provide for an additional $400 per year for operation and replacement of buses in districts operating on a ten-months basis; or $390 per year for buses operating in districts on a nine and one-half months basis.

2. The provision of the law imposing a limitation on the transportation of children living within city limits of cities where there are public transportation systems should be amended so that all children will have equal opportunities under the law for public school transportation.

3. Any child whose route to school involves unusual hazards should be entitled to transportation under the Foundation Program regardless of the distance involved. The determination of "hazardous" to be made by local Board of Education and approved by Texas Education Agency.

**COMPULSORY ATTENDANCE LAW**

Present statutes, Article 2892, V.C.S., and Article 297 of the Penal Code, provide that all children who are seven years of age and not more than 16 years of age must attend school for at least 120 days annually in the districts where they reside or in districts to which they may have been transferred.

Article 2893, V.C.S., and Article 298 of the Penal Code, list exemptions from school attendance which are summarized as follows:

1. Children attending private or parochial schools.
2. Children who are physically or mentally ill.
3. Children who are blind, deaf, or feeble-
minded where special instruction is not provided by the home school.

4. Children living more than two and one-half miles from school where free transportation is not provided.

5. Children who are more than 16 years of age who have completed the ninth grade.

Article 1577, Penal Code, permits the county judge to issue work permits to children over 12 years of age who have completed the fifth grade and whose parents are in needy circumstances.

Article 2899, V.C.S., provides for attendance officers in county or district schools but has no present significance as the salary of such officer is limited to two dollars ($2.00) per day.

Present day demands for an educated citizenship cannot be met with a six-month (120-day) period of compulsory attendance, which period itself is most difficult to enforce under present statutes.

PROPOSAL VII

Present statutes should be revised to provide for the enforcement of compulsory education for all children of scholastic age (between six and seventeen) for the full school year unless:

1. A child is exempt because of (a) attendance in a private or parochial school, (b) has completed a 12-grade school program, (c) is physically or mentally unable to attend.

2. The child concerned is at least 14 years of age and has a work permit issued by the county judge.

TEACHER SUPPLY

Industrialization and a continuing high birth rate have accelerated the population growth of Texas in recent years. More and more children will be seeking an education next year and for many years to come. The supply of qualified teachers must, therefore, be increased each year at an expanding rate.

Substantial progress has been made. The comparison of the qualifications of the average Texas teacher of today with those of an average teacher of ten years ago would yield some pleasing results. Texas teachers, aided and supported by a strong public interest in good schools, have come a long way toward making their profession worthy of the ablest college graduates. Other professions requiring extensive school and college preparation, such as medicine, law, and engineering, recognize today, more than at any previous time in history, the basic importance of education.

Each improvement in the elementary and secondary schools ultimately produces better doctors, lawyers, scientists, teachers, and—not the least of all—better citizens.

Basic Beliefs

1. The State should guarantee a minimum salary level for each teacher in the Texas public school system at a level to justify the amount of preparation and experience required. School systems should be able to compete successfully with business and industry in the recruitment of professional personnel.

2. The State salary schedule should provide annual increments which will permit a teacher to move from the minimum to the maximum salary in a reasonable period of time.

3. Each teacher should be provided opportunities for professional improvement throughout his professional career. Tangible recognition of work completed beyond the baccalaureate degree should be reflected in the salary schedule.

4. The State should insure that programs of teacher education maintain an appropriate balance between subject matter fields, professional education, and general education.

5. Provision should be made for the recognition of outstanding teaching.

6. The selection, employment, and assignment of teacher personnel should be the responsibility of local Boards of Education.

Background

For the past five years the public school population in Texas has been growing at an average rate of 74,685 pupils per year. As one result of this rapid growth local school officials are faced with a serious problem of recruiting professional personnel to meet the requirements of the schools.

A survey questionnaire was sent to all Texas school superintendents by the Texas Education Agency in 1958 asking for teacher supply and demand data for 1956-57, the most recent school year on which complete tabulations could be made. The summary of returns on this questionnaire shows that 6,830 public school teachers who taught in 1955-56 did not make themselves available for employment in 1956-57.

It also shows that 3,529 new positions were created in the schools to care for the increase in pupil enrollment. The addition of those figures verified the need for 10,359 teachers to fill vacancies that existed in 1956-57. To fill these posi-
tions, school officials were able to employ 8,245 certified teachers. Rather than leave the remaining 2,114 positions vacant, the positions were offered in most cases to holders of emergency teaching permits. In some instances, the vacancies were not filled and this resulted in the overloading of the fully qualified teachers.

The 4,103 teachers who were graduated from college in 1956 and went directly into teaching represent approximately 67 per cent of the graduates of that year who had teaching certificates. When the 1,066 teachers who were graduated from college in a prior year and entered teaching in 1957 are added to the 1956 graduates, it is found that colleges are preparing only approximately 50 per cent of the new teachers needed. It has been necessary, therefore, to intensify the recruitment of experienced teachers who have left the profession and to fill the remaining gap with teachers from out of the State and with emergency permit holders. Assuming that 1956-57 is a typical year, the colleges will need to increase the number of persons certified to teach from 6,531 in 1957 to approximately 9,200 each year.

There has been a slight increase in the percentage of men in the total number of classroom teachers since 1952-53. In that year 22.1 per cent of the classroom teachers were men as compared to 23.5 per cent in 1956-57. Reports from school officials show that twice as many men as women leave teaching to enter other professions.

The local school officials reported that in 1956-57 a total of 4,030 teachers change school districts, which when added to the number leaving teaching in Texas schools gives a total turnover in personnel of 10,860. Analysis by county of this personnel turnover does not indicate that it follows a geographical pattern. Analysis also shows that population density has little effect on the problem of teacher turnover.

Study by counties of the emergency teaching permits issued during 1956-57 shows that some regions of the state were affected more than others. The southwest section of the state was affected to the greatest degree; however, the Panhandle and far west areas of the state also had spotted concentrations of emergency permits issued.

Teacher recruitment has been the main objective of the state-wide television series begun by the Texas Education Agency in September, 1956. Co-sponsored by the Texas Association of School Administrators, the third year in this recruitment series is now in progress. It is supported by the Texas television industry and the Fund for the Advancement of Education and is presented in cooperation with Texas schools and colleges. Although 712 students were officially registered in the telecourse during the first two years and 391 of these have gone into teaching, these figures actually reflect only a small part of the state-wide emphasis which this project has given to teacher recruitment through the combined efforts of schools, colleges, professional and lay groups, and 20 Texas television stations. Fifteen hundred has been cited as a very conservative estimate of the number of degree teachers now employed in Texas schools who probably would not be there if the project had never been undertaken.

The Texas Legislature passed a new certification law in 1955 and the State Board of Examiners for Teacher Education has assisted the State Board of Education in designing teacher education standards which will guarantee quality in teacher preparation programs.

Beginning next year virtually all new teacher education graduates will be products of institutions which have substantially raised the standards for teacher education. This means that all new teachers will have approximately 40 per cent of their college work in their teaching field, 40 per cent in general education courses (mathematics, natural sciences, English, social sciences, etc.) and 20 per cent in education courses designed for the professional teacher.

**Proposals for Legislative Action**

**PROPOSAL I**

1. The State salary schedule should provide a minimum annual salary of $4,000 for a teacher with a bachelor's degree based upon ten months of service and a minimum annual salary of $3,800 based upon nine and one-half months of service. Increments in the amount of $10 per month for each year of teaching service should be added to the bachelor's degree minimum to attain a $5,000 maximum for ten months of teaching based upon ten years of service and a $4,750 maximum for nine and one-half months of teaching based upon ten years of service.

2. The State salary schedule should provide a minimum annual salary of $4,200 for a teacher with a master's degree based upon ten months of service and a minimum annual salary of $3,990 based upon nine and one-half months of service. Increments in the amount of $10 per month for each year of teaching service for the first 12 years and increments of $20 per month for each year of teaching service for each of the next three years should be added to the master's degree.
minimum to attain a $6,000 maximum for ten months of teaching based upon 15 years of service and a $5,700 maximum for nine and one-half months of teaching based upon 15 years of service.

PROPOSAL II

Provision should be made by law to grant sick leave to professional personnel without financial loss to such personnel. The minimum program should provide not less than five days of sick leave during each school year, with each individual being allowed to accumulate unused leave from year to year until a maximum accumulation of 30 days is acquired. Strict legal requirements should be written into the law to prevent any possible abuse in the use of sick leave.

PROPOSAL III

The State should provide for the utilization of retired teachers on a modified service basis.

PROPOSAL IV

Provision should be made for increment credit on the salary schedule for a maximum of five years of military service for persons qualified to teach prior to going into service.

The Hale-Aikin Committee made a careful study of the salary recommendations made by the 254 county committees. They were concerned primarily with the retention of teachers in the profession, and also with the question of what salary schedule would attract qualified young people today to the selection of teaching as a career. The local committees indicated that a minimum salary of $4,000 is needed and that the maximum should exceed $6,000. The salary schedule included in the above proposal substantially meets the recommendations of the county committees and also provides for the implementation of recommendations for lengthening of the school term.

Other Proposals
The following proposals do not necessarily require legislative action.

PROPOSAL V

A state-wide program of recruitment should be developed which will insure a steady flow of qualified personnel into the teaching profession.

PROPOSAL VI

Incentives should be developed at both the State and local levels which will promote the retention of qualified personnel and improve teaching as a professional career. These incentives might include:

1. A program of salary increments to be developed and administered at the local level whereby outstanding teachers can be rewarded for excellence in their profession.

2. Working conditions in the teaching profession that will attract young people to choose teaching as a career. This might include satisfactory tenure provisions, contractual relations, opportunities for advancement, improved leave programs, equalized workloads, better training facilities, and a favorable climate for professional development.

3. Opportunities for the advancement of qualified teachers within the school system.

PROPOSAL VII

Utilization of teacher personnel should be improved by action at both the State and local levels to attain better use of teachers' skills in the daily program and greater employment stability among the teaching profession on an annual basis.

1. To the extent possible, professional personnel should be assigned primarily professional duties. This can be achieved by the use of student help, the employment of clerical assistants, and the utilization of teacher aides.

2. Steps should be taken to equalize the workload assigned to professional personnel.

3. To the extent possible, all teachers should be assigned to duty in their major fields of preparation.

4. School programs should be reorganized to promote better utilization of professional personnel. This might be achieved
through improvements in the scheduling of classes, the elimination of study halls, a de-emphasis on extracurricular activities, and grouping of students in such a way that fast learners will not be retarded in their education program by the presence in their classes of slow learners.

5. School districts should be reorganized to the extent necessary to achieve optimum utilization of professional personnel and a minimum educational program for the students of each district. This can be achieved by consolidation of school districts, by transfers of students to school districts having a more adequate program of instruction, by cooperative arrangements between school districts for administrative services, and by use of the county unit system.

PROPOSAL VIII

Professional excellence of professional personnel should be improved by strengthening preparatory requirements and by instituting a coordinated program of in-service training.

1. Preparatory educational requirements for teaching should be continuously evaluated.

2. General educational requirements in the preparatory field should be such as to provide each teacher with a broad general educational background to supplement training received in the specialized field of subject matter to be taught.

3. Participation in the in-service training program should be required of every teacher in the school system.

While making the above proposals, the Hale-Aikin Committee of 24 has had the benefit of all the county reports. They contained many valuable suggestions, some of which will be mentioned here.

The reports left no doubt but that salary is considered to be the main holding strength of the teaching profession. However, a clear majority of all the county reports sanctioned the use of six other methods whereby more teachers might be made available. These methods and the number of counties reacting favorably to them are as follows:

1. Recruit liberal arts graduates who lack one or more required courses in teacher education. .................. 192

2. Try to increase interest in teaching in high schools and colleges. .............. 235

3. Better utilization of teachers through use of clerical assistants .............. 184

4. Better utilization of teachers of small classes through school organization . 143

5. Allow laymen to teach one or more classes. ........................................ 147

6. Employ certified teachers on part-time basis. ................................... 151

Scholarships for teacher education students, provision of opportunities for high school students to do some teaching, improvement of teacher education programs, and calling on the teaching profession to quit running down their own profession were mentioned by a sprinkling of counties.

Scattered suggestions for better utilization of teachers of small classes included the use of vocational teachers on the same basis as other teachers.

The reports from 40 counties indicated that qualified laymen might be used successfully as teachers in specialized fields. Fifteen county reports stated that laymen should be used only as resource people, while 21 expressed the feeling that laymen should be used only in cases of emergency. Seven county reports suggested that retired teachers be permitted to fill teacher vacancies.

Satisfactory utilization of teachers “to the fullest extent” was reported by 195 counties, but the remaining reports indicated that some improvement in utilization could be made.

SCHOOL FINANCE

The provision of an adequate program of public school education for every child in Texas is a responsibility shared by State and local authorities. The development of a high degree of local autonomy in the administration of Texas schools results from actions of the Legislature in delegating its authority to the communities. Proposals contained in this report are designed to foster a continued high degree of local control of public schools.

The Committee believes:

1. The State should continue its support of a minimum foundation program of public school education, redefining this program as needed to guarantee that adequate educational opportunities are available to every child of school age.

2. Support of the minimum program should be borne jointly by State and local authorities with a fair share being assigned to each school district.
3. The State should continue to guarantee the availability of funds with which to finance its share of the minimum program.

4. Each school district should accept the responsibility for operating a program at the minimum level or above and levy a tax sufficient to pay its full share of the minimum program cost; the State should establish flexible standards which respect the autonomy of local districts but which will make it impossible for any school district to fall short in meeting its obligation of providing at least the minimum program.

5. The amount assigned to each district as its share of the minimum program cost should leave unencumbered local taxing authority that will enable a district, by making its maximum effort, to: (1) operate a school program above the minimum level, and (2) provide necessary school facilities.

6. The State should establish policies that will insure changes in local patterns of school organization and management whenever these patterns directly or indirectly deny any child his right to 12 years of public education in an accredited school. State action should be taken now and in the future to correct any inequity or denial of opportunity which may occur as the result of the failure of a district to make available a full 12-year program for the resident scholastics of that district.

7. No recommendation of the Hale-Aikin Committee shall be interpreted to give to the State Board of Education, the State Commissioner of Education, the State Department of Education, or anyone whomsoever, the power to close, to consolidate, or cause by regulation or rule to be closed or consolidated, any independent or common school district in this state. It is the express purpose of this Committee that the General Laws as they now exist in regard to consolidation or otherwise closing of school districts of this state shall continue in full force and effect.

**LOCAL-STATE SUPPORT**

Texas public schools are supported by local and state revenues with a small percentage of support coming from the Federal Government. As the number of children increases, additional revenue must be made available. Each new need for school support raises the question of whether the support is to come from local, state or federal sources.

The Texas Minimum Foundation Program provides a system of automatic financing which guarantees to local school districts that state funds will be available to pay the cost of the minimum school program defined in law. School support comes from:

1. The State Available School Fund
2. The Minimum Foundation School Program Fund
3. Local School Taxes

Classroom teacher units are allocated on the basis of the average daily attendance of the preceding school year. Basically, one classroom teacher unit (CTU) is allocated for each 26 pupils in average daily attendance, although this ratio varies somewhat following the formula of the statutes. The allocation of other professional units (principals, supervisors, counselors, etc.) is tied directly to the number of classroom teacher units. Although changes are recommended elsewhere in this report, these allocations under present law are made as follows:

1 special service teacher to 20 CTU’s
1 supervisor or counselor to each 40 CTU’s
1 full-time principal to each 20 CTU’s

The program provides $350 or $400 operational allowances for each CTU. One superintendent is allocated to each district having a four-year accredited high school. Also, the costs of operating special education, vocational education, and school transportation programs are provided through the Minimum Foundation Program in accordance with special formulas established by the State Board of Education.

When the Minimum Foundation Program was established, local fund assignments were set at a total of $45,000,000, which was 25 per cent of the Gilmer-Aikin Committee’s estimated cost of the Program for the 1949-50 school year.

Local school districts now are assessed 20 per cent of the state-wide operating cost of the Foundation Program as estimated by the State Board of Education for the immediately preceding year. After the amount of the local districts’ share of the cost has been determined, the proportionate share of the amount to be borne by each county and district is calculated through the application of an economic index. Pay rolls, mineral production, agriculture, manufacturing, assessed property valuations and scholastic population data are used as provided in the statutes for the calculation of the economic index.

The amount assigned to each school district is then adjusted by deducting:

1. An amount equal to $100 times the number
of professional units for which the district is eligible under the Minimum Foundation Program.

2. The per cent that the combined area of university, prison, military, or Federal forest lands in a district bears to the total area of the district.

These deductions from the local fund assignment are absorbed in the State's cost of the Foundation Program, thereby reducing the local district's participation in the Foundation Program cost from 20 to 16 per cent. In 1957-58, these reductions amounted to $8,640,477.

Analysis of the exempt land provisions of the Foundation Program Act indicates that there is little or no correlation between the ability to support public education and the relationship that exists between the area of public lands within the school district and the area of a school district. Also, the allowance of $100 deduction (from the local funds assigned) for each professional unit is reducing the assessment of some districts in the state to the point that no local payment whatsoever is made toward the cost of the Foundation Program. If an allowance is made for each professional unit, it would be more appropriate to include such allowances as a part of the cost of the Foundation Program.

**PROPOSAL I**

Although the Legislature has indicated on several occasions that the combined payments of local school districts to the Minimum Foundation Program should be 20 per cent, deductions from local fund assign-

ments have resulted in an increasing percentage of the program cost being borne by the State. To restore and maintain the 80-20 ratio between State and local support of the Foundation Program, it is proposed that the Foundation Program Act be amended to repeal the provision for exemptions based on the location of certain public lands in a district as well as the provisions allowing $100 deduction from the local funds assigned for each professional unit of eligibility in a district.

The schools will continue to be operated in accordance with sound business principles if local interest in the management of the schools is stimulated by the fact that a substantial amount of local tax funds is included in the school budgets. The responsibility of the state-local partnership is felt more keenly by the local taxpayer who realizes that any unnecessary expense of state revenue also places a direct burden on the tax resources of the local district. Perhaps even more important is maintenance of local control over the school system. It is axiomatic that control follows the purse strings.

Since sound management principles should require that every district, regardless of its size, make some contribution to the cost of the Foundation Program, it is suggested that the ultimate goal might be to reconstitute the organization of school districts in such a way that every district becomes a contributing partner to the cost of the Foundation Program. This should, of course, be accomplished without violating the equalization principle.

**STATE FUND DISTRIBUTION**

At the present time the State share of the Foundation School Program cost is paid from the State Available Fund and the Foundation School Fund.

The Constitution of Texas, Article 7, Section 5, provides "...And the Available School Fund herein provided shall be distributed to the several counties according to their scholastic population and applied in such manner as may be provided by law." The Legislature, through statutes, has defined a scholastic to be a child between ages of six and seventeen inclusive residing in a school district.

It is provided also that a census of all children of scholastic age will be taken annually and that the Available School Fund will be distributed am-

ong the several counties of the state according to the scholastic population of each. Before making the distribution, a county administration per capita rate is determined in each county and a sufficient amount of money is deducted from the Available School Fund apportionment of each county to pay the cost of county administration. The result is that the State pays all but a very small portion of the cost of county administration.

The cost of the Foundation School Program is determined on the basis of average daily attendance in each school district. After the cost of the program is determined and the local funds assigned, the amount of the State per capita apportionment
and the county per capita apportionment are subtracted from program cost to determine the eligibility of each district for Foundation School Program funds.

Distribution of the State Available School Fund on a resident-scholastic basis is in conflict with the equalization principle on which the Foundation School Program is based.

**Proposal II**

1. The statutes should be amended to redefine a scholastic as a pupil within scholastic age in average daily attendance the next preceding scholastic year in the public elementary and high school districts wholly within or under the jurisdiction of a county of this state.

2. Provision should be made for a biennial census on even numbered years under rules and regulations to be set by the State Board of Education.

3. Provision should be made for financing county school administration from local sources, and the abolition of county school administration in all counties where there is no longer need for such administration.

**The Permanent School Fund**

The Texas Permanent School Fund was established in Article 7, Section 2 and Section 5 of the Texas Constitution.

*Section 2*—“All funds, lands, and other property heretofore set apart and appropriated for the support of public schools . . . one half ($1/2) of the public domain of the State, and all sums of money that may come to the State from the sale of any portion of the same shall constitute a perpetual public school fund.”

*Section 5*—“The principal of all bonds and other funds, and the principal arising from the sale of the lands hereinafter set apart to said school fund, shall be the Permanent School Fund; and all interest derivable therefrom and the taxes herein authorized and levied shall be the available school fund, to which the Legislature may add not exceeding one per cent annually of the total value of the Permanent School Fund . . .”

All income derived from the sale of public school land, royalties, bonuses and mineral leases is deposited in the Permanent School Fund, which had a value of $383,816,184 on July 1, 1958. During the year of 1956-57, the capital assets of the Permanent School Fund increased $28,442,614. Rentals and bonuses from mineral leases accounted for $12,936,907 of this increase, and $15,505,707 was derived from land sales and royalty payments.

The Permanent School Fund is administered by the State Board of Education as an investment trust fund under investment rules set forth in the statutes.

Generally, these statutory requirements provide that the Permanent School Fund may be invested in Texas municipal bonds or U. S. government securities. Income derived from the investments of the Permanent School Fund, which during 1956-57 amounted to $9,355,826.31 is deposited to the Available School Fund and distributed to the public schools of the state each year in proportion to the number of scholastics in each district.

**Proposal III**

1. The State Board of Education should be given authority to broaden the investment program of the Permanent School
Fund to include corporate stocks and bonds. This authority would be granted under the same conditions and limitations expressed in the constitutional amendment which authorized the purchase of corporate stocks and bonds for the Permanent University Fund.

2. Delay rentals from mineral leases should be deposited in the Available School Fund.

3. The Permanent School Fund investment program should continue to furnish a market for school districts whose bonds have a limited demand.

An analysis of bond purchases by the State Board of Education indicates a current average return of about 2.91 per cent on all investments. A recent constitutional amendment has enabled the Permanent University Fund to receive a return of from 4.16 per cent to 5.25 per cent on investments in corporate bonds, preferred stocks, and common stocks while during the same period the State Permanent School Fund purchased municipal bonds at rates ranging from 3½ per cent to 4½ per cent.

The Permanent School Fund was established at a time when it was the only source of state support for public education in Texas. The interpretation of the constitutional provision which transferred mineral leases, bonuses, and rentals into the Permanent Fund was reflecting the intent of the framers of the State Constitution to guarantee the continued support for education in the only way which seemed feasible at the time.

Those responsible for establishing the Permanent School Fund actually expressed the hope that the income from it might provide forever, into perpetuity, all the support that would be needed to guarantee the continuance of the public schools.

The distribution of revenue from delay rentals through the Available School Fund would be consistent with the aims and purposes of the founders of the Permanent School Fund. Their intent was to find some way to dedicate a portion of the state revenue so that it would be available always for the public schools, and this is being accomplished today through the automatic financing provisions of the Gilmer-Akin laws. The Minimum Foundation School Program, which has a guarantee from current revenues, actually makes a much larger dedication of state funds than the framers of the Constitution could possibly have visualized.

The Permanent School Fund frequently provides the only market for certain school bond issues, particularly bond issues of small school districts. More than 20 per cent of the bonds purchased for the Permanent School Fund during the last three years have been from school districts which have received no other bid for their bonds.

**FEDERAL AID**

At the present time Texas public schools are receiving Federal funds in connection with certain phases of vocational education and the school lunch and milk programs. Also, some districts which are affected by Federal activities receive Federal allotments for maintenance and operation and building construction.

During 1956-57 the total cost of vocational education in Texas was $13,456,000. Of this amount, $1,828,000 came from Federal funds which were used primarily for: (1) Vocational teacher travel expenses; (2) portions of salary costs in budget balance districts; and (3) adult vocational education.

The school lunch and milk programs are financed primarily from income derived from the sale of meals. In some districts a small portion of the cost is paid from local tax sources. In 1956-57, the overall cost of the school lunch and milk programs was $29,786,937.26, with $4,727,528 of this amount (approximately 16 per cent) being received from Federal sources.

The Federal aid for maintenance and operation costs and for building costs in school districts affected by Federal activity amounted to $12,494,604 in 1956-57. These funds are paid directly to the affected school districts by the Federal Government under rules and regulations prescribed by the Texas Education Agency. These funds are appropriated by the Congress to pay that portion of a school's cost brought about by Federal activity in the district.

**PROPOSAL IV**

Public education is the legal responsibility of the several sovereign states. This committee believes that control of public education by the states is essential to the proper functioning of education in a democracy.

This committee believes that financial assistance by the Federal government to public education in vocational education and school lunch and milk programs and those
contemplated under the National Defense Education Act would be of material assistance in developing those programs and would not violate the principle of state control of public education.

Also, it is believed to be appropriate for the Federal government to pay its fair share of the cost of education in communities in which Federal activities have placed an additional financial burden on public schools.

**TRANSFERS**

Present statutes provide that a pupil may be transferred from the school district in which he lives to another school district in the same county or to a contiguous district in an adjoining county by order of the county school superintendent upon written application of the child's parent or guardian. If the transfer of the pupil is protested by either the school district of the child's residence or the district receiving the transfer, the county board of school trustees either approves or rejects the transfer.

During the 1957-58 school year 49,481 pupils were transferred. Of the 232 counties reporting on the question, "Under What Conditions Are Pupils Denied Transfers?", 121 counties reported that transfers were denied for various reasons. Many school districts charge tuition on transferred pupils. The tuition charged is usually the difference between the actual per pupil cost of instruction and the amount of this cost which is borne by the State. In a number of instances, elementary districts which are required to operate under State and county valuations find it impossible to pay the tuition on transferred pupils and at the same time finance the operation of their own educational program. In such instances, the cost of tuition must be paid by the parent or guardian of the transferred child.

The effect of present statutes and practices on pupil transfers between school districts is the denial to some children of their opportunity to attend an accredited high school or, in some instances, to attend any high school without the payment of tuition. This is in violation of the guarantees written into law by the Minimum Foundation School Program which have sought to assure each child of the availability of 12 years of public school education.

**PROPOSAL V**

The Legislature should make provision for each school age child who is a resident of the State of Texas to attend school in any school district in the state when approved by the receiving district and have his attendance count toward the district's eligibility for state financial assistance.

**REALLOCATION OF TAXING AUTHORITIES**

In developing a program for financing governmental services specified tax sources must be available to each level of government. As a practical matter, the tax resource most accessible to local subdivisions of government is the ad valorem tax levy on real and personal property.

The State of Texas in 1950 relinquished provisions for a state-level ad valorem tax levy for general purposes, leaving this tax resource for use by local subdivisions of government. However, the State retained the ad valorem levy of not to exceed thirty-five (35c) cents on $100 valuation for school purposes. The income from this levy is paid into the State Available School Fund and such part of this as is necessary is dedicated by constitutional provision to the purchase of free textbooks for the public schools. An additional State ad valorem tax is levied for Confederate pensions and to finance the acquisition of buildings for the State-supported colleges.

**PROPOSAL VI**

1. The State should make additional tax resources available to counties and to local school districts by withdrawing completely from the field of ad valorem tax levy.

2. Provision should be made for financing the cost of the public school textbook program from tax resources of the Available School Fund other than the ad valorem tax levy.
LOCAL SCHOOL BUSINESS MANAGEMENT

Texas school districts spend a substantial sum of money for materials and supplies. Each school district purchases these materials and supplies in accordance with rules and regulations established by the local board of school trustees. As a result of this practice, there is no uniformity throughout the state in purchasing procedures.

It has been established, through practice, that purchasing procedures calling for competitive bids result in the purchaser securing materials and supplies at fair prices. Suppliers usually quote better prices on quantity purchases than they can quote on small purchases. Many school districts in this state purchase their supplies in small quantities and do not have policies calling for competitive bids. It is quite likely that a higher unit price is being paid for materials and supplies than would be the case if purchases were made in larger quantities under a system of competitive bidding.

PROPOSAL VII

Provision should be made for each school district to be required to purchase materials, supplies, and contracted services under a system of competitive bidding. Consideration should be given to some means of quantity purchasing for groups of school districts.
THE CITIZENS OF TEXAS RECOMMEND THROUGH 254 COUNTY COMMITTEES, A PUBLIC SCHOOL PROGRAM TO MEET THE NEEDS OF THEIR CHILDREN.
In compliance with the provisions of HCR 105 requesting that the State Hale-Aiiken Committee involve the citizenship of each and every county in this state, the Committee in its first meeting approved the creation of a Hale-Aiiken Committee in each county.

On November 7, 1957, a letter was sent to one person in each county requesting that he act as temporary chairman to arrange for a county meeting at which a permanent chairman would be elected.

Every one of the 254 counties selected a permanent chairman, organized a committee, made a study, and filed an official report with the State Committee.

The membership of the County Committees consisted of 11,112 persons. The ratio between laymen and teachers was approximately four to one with laymen predominating.

The county chairmen reported that 42,966 other citizens participated directly in the studies either as members of local district committees or in an advisory capacity to the County Committee. In addition, literally hundreds of thousands of Texans participated through completion of questionnaires or attendance of discussion meetings.

The coverage of this study by press, radio, and television was the most thorough in the history of the state. The cooperation of these media of communication with the Local Committees and the publicity given to their work contributed materially to the 100 per cent participation at the county level.

The County Committees followed the pattern of the State Committee by dividing into four subcommittees to direct particular attention to each of the four areas of the study; namely, school construction, school program, teacher supply, and school finance.

An analysis of the County Reports indicate the thoroughness of the county chairmen and their committees in preparing a carefully worded and easily interpreted report.

The Study Guides which had been prepared by the State Committee were employed and the suggested report form used in almost every instance, but the county groups felt free to add additional materials and to make recommendations which were not encompassed in the suggested report form.

It would require reams of paper to report in detail the numerous recommendations which were made by the 254 County Committees. However, in general, a clear pattern developed in each area of the study and the summarization of the County Reports was not too difficult.

A brief summary of these reports follows:

**SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION**

Reports on school construction needs were received from 254 county Hale-Aiiken Committees. These reports reflect that 113 counties have a sufficient number of classrooms to house current enrollment, 138 counties have a current need for 3,373 classrooms and three counties failed to report on current need.

The current need for additional classrooms is classified according to the following reasons:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increased enrollment</td>
<td>2,043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional program changes</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes in administrative organization</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obsolescence</td>
<td>1,024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3,373</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Projecting classroom needs for the five-year period, 1958-63, the County Committees reported a need for 17,284 additional classrooms. This projected need plus the current shortage of 3,373 indicates a need for 20,657 classrooms during the next five years. These reports show an estimated cost of $876,008,338 for these classrooms, or an average cost of $18,495 per room. To finance the cost of these additional rooms will require $75,201,000 for each of the next five years.

The total need for classrooms for the period, 1958-63, is classified according to the following reasons:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increased enrollment</td>
<td>18,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional program changes</td>
<td>592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes in administrative organization</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obsolescence</td>
<td>1,858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20,657</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Forty-three County Committees reported that one or more school districts within their counties would be unable to finance the construction of needed classrooms under present legal authority. Sixteen of these counties named the districts that, in their opinion, would be unable to provide sufficient financing, 25 reports merely indicated that one or more districts would be unable to finance needed construction and one county indicated that some of the districts could not finance needed construction but gave no cost estimates from which the districts could be identified.
SCHOOL PROGRAM

The state summary of the School Program section was developed from the tabulations and summaries of each of the 20 items for School Program. Each item includes individual report questions grouped or blocked together on the basis of common areas of inquiry.

Certain areas need more careful attention than others. Some of these are:
1. Statutes affecting the curriculum.
2. Personnel as related to increased enrollment, teacher-pupil ratio, extent to which combined grades will be permitted, administrative and clerical assistance.
3. Pre-service and in-service preparation of teachers.
4. Ways to insure adequate libraries, laboratories, and other instructional materials.
5. Courses and subjects to be added, deleted, or strengthened.
6. Providing for an adequate guidance program.
7. Special programs (driver education, vocational education, education for the gifted and for the handicapped).
8. The status of auxiliary services.
10. State responsibility for educational television, films, and tape recordings.

Summary of Items Regarding Program

1. Reports from 117 counties indicated that present statutory requirements were being met or combined with other subjects. There were 131 counties reporting “non-conformity” because parts of present requirements are “outmoded,” “obsolete,” “not applicable to present day needs,” etc.

   There were suggestions from 35 counties that all statutory requirements be deleted. Twenty-two of these recommended that this responsibility be transferred to the State Board of Education.

   Foreign languages were suggested by 35 an additional requirement. Thirty-one suggested driver education and 23 mentioned science. There were scattered suggestions for 18 other additions, but in each instance there were fewer than 10 counties reporting.

   Fifty counties would delete present statutes regarding kindergartens, although 11 of these would retain the present statute if the State gave financial support to kindergartens.

2. Ninety-five counties reported that they had no school districts teaching only elementary grades. Of the 164 counties reporting elementary schools, 150 reported that high school education was provided by transferring pupils to neighboring districts. This practice seemed acceptable from the pupils’ point of view in 104 counties. Ninety-three counties reported this practice acceptable to the home district as it “relieved them of financial responsibility” while 66 counties reported it acceptable to the receiving district because it brought additional ADA. Fifty-one counties reported that the practice resulted in a financial burden for the receiving school.

   The following suggestions were made in regard to the problem:

   Continue transferring .................. 76
   Consolidation .......................... 28
   County-wide district .................. 4

3. Reports of counties in which elementary grades are combined showed satisfaction with the practice in 81 cases and dissatisfaction in 31 cases.

   The following table summarizes the reports concerning the adequacy of the elementary program:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Adequate</th>
<th>Inadequate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spelling</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arithmetic</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Crafts</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. One hundred and thirty-six reports indicated that the high school program was adequate, except in 22 cases where it was pointed out that there were small schools in the county which could not provide the program. Seven reports did not answer the question.

   There are 108 counties in which the high school program is regarded as inadequate. Forty-three of the reports did not specify the reason for inadequacy; 44 reported that elective offerings need to be increased or broadened; 18 stated that required courses need to be increased or strengthened; and 10 indicated that provisions for individual differences of pupils should be increased, particularly for the gifted. Some reports indicated weakness in more than one of these areas.

   Forty-six replies indicated that additional funds and/or personnel would solve the problem. Of this number, 27 did not specify the source for additional funds; 16 wanted additional State aid; and three
recommended that more local funds were needed. Twenty-one reports suggested that increased State-level guide lines are needed, such as:
- Requiring standard or uniform and sequential course offerings for all high schools.
- More specific and detailed curriculum guides.
- Increased requirements for graduation.
- Establishment of a “two-track” curriculum with two diplomas.
- Other recommendations for improvement were:
  - Consolidation—15
  - Transfer of high school students—2
  - Co-operative agreement for sharing teachers—6
  - Alternating courses—1

5. Reports indicated that 220 counties have schools able to meet accreditation requirements, while 21 stated that some high schools do not.

One hundred and thirty-two counties want additional required courses such as driver education (58), foreign languages (50), fourth year English (40), “more mathematics” (34), “more science” (35), speech (26), more social studies (19), and other scattered suggestions.

Reports show 156 counties believed the content of high school courses is now adequate, while 63 reported that the content is inadequate.

The following suggestions were made for improvement: ability grouping and enriched program for the gifted (59), improved facilities (51), upgrading student performance (44), more state and county supervision (21), improved sequence of subjects (18), longer periods (10).

6. One hundred and eighty-four counties said no high school courses needed to be deleted. There were some scattered requests for deletions as follows: driver education (6), ancient and medieval history (6), home economics (5), Negro history (2). There were also scattered requests for additional courses: advanced mathematics (12), advanced science (8), high school spelling (3), and Russian (3).

In answer to the question, “Can schools in your county meet the requirements as to course offerings that will become effective in 1959?”, the following replies were received:

Can meet them .................. 152
Will not be able to meet them ........ 98

7. One hundred and eighty-eight reports indicated that all 12-grade schools in the county meet the accreditation standards as to the number of teachers required in a 12-grade system, and 33 stated that there were schools in the county not meeting the standards.

In answer to the question, “What needs to be done in your county to insure that every child attends a school meeting the minimum standards for accreditation?”, 137 believed that standards were being met and they had no problem. Fifty suggested consolidation; 11 said pupil-teacher ratio should be lowered to 20 pupils; 10 wanted liberal transfer laws; eight suggested changing district lines; five wanted to retain small districts “as the democratic way of life.” Five said raise local taxes, and five suggested abolishing unaccredited schools.

8. Two hundred and four counties reported membership in the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools to be valuable, eight said it is of limited value, and 47 reported no particular value to membership since the State accreditation standards are higher.

9. Almost every county report suggested the need for more time to permit the student to take more courses or delve deeper into his studies. Some specific suggestions were made including the following:

- Increase school year ............... 40
- Lengthen school day ................ 13
- Increase number of school years ...... 5
- Develop special intensive summer school programs .................... 18

10. One hundred and forty-four reported that all four standardized tests (achievement, mental ability, aptitude, interests and vocational preferences) were used to some extent, while only 31 said all four tests were used extensively.

One hundred and sixty-six reports indicated that the pupil personnel accounting and reporting system was adequate. Eighteen of these felt health records were not as good as others, and 15 said some improvement is still possible. Thirty-nine reported grossly inadequate systems.

Fifty-nine per cent of the counties reported that schools have a systematic procedure for interpreting tests results to pupils and parents, while 35 per cent reported that schools do not.

Almost every county made some suggestion for developing a more effective guidance program. The majority of these reported the need for more counselors and that they be provided by revising the present State formula.

11. Two hundred and fourteen counties reported that vocational education was available and 24 additional ones said it was available to some extent.

One hundred and seventy-four counties made reports that were favorable to present vocational offerings, while 63 reported that offerings were not satisfactory.

One hundred and fifty-five counties reported that there were satisfactory alternatives for pupils that did not want to take vocational courses. The reports named 79 specific schools where every student was forced to take vocational courses in order to graduate, and ten counties said this situation existed in every school in the county.
Eighty-five counties felt that no change was needed in vocational instruction in the light of present economic conditions. Others made the following suggestions:

Add industrial and mechanical courses ............ 40
Revise or change present vocational program .......... 34
Additional emphasis on vocational program needed .... 23
Add industrial arts courses ....................... 16
Change or enlarge vocational programs to make them more flexible .... 15

The following suggestions were made concerning State and local action to insure adequate vocational instruction:

One hour classes for vocational agriculture 42
Allow vocational teacher to teach other subjects .......... 36
Present program considered adequate—No recommendations .......... 32
Need more and better surveys of vocational needs .......... 51
Leave the administration, supervision, and improvement to local schools .......... 26

There were scattered suggestions recommending additional financial aid from the State.

12. One hundred and sixty-two counties reported that the needs of handicapped children are not adequately provided for. Twenty-eight counties reported there are partial provisions, and only 55 felt that they were adequately meeting the needs.

The following table shows the response to the question regarding the responsibility of local districts and the State in providing for the handicapped.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Adequate</th>
<th>Inadequate</th>
<th>To Some Extent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joint</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present plan satisfactory</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State should assume the total cost</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State should increase funds</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State should establish special schools</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leave to local districts</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. The tabulation of reports shows that only 15 counties believe that their schools are now meeting the needs of the gifted child. One hundred and seventeen reported that the needs are met in a "limited way," and 116 stated that needs are not being met.

The following suggestions were made concerning development of programs for the gifted child.

State should provide special teachers ............ 50
provide special consultants .................. 53
provide funds to develop a program .......... 46
lower teacher-pupil ratio .................... 23
Local districts should add courses and assign extra work .......... 52
develop the program ......................... 35

Thirty-four counties thought local districts and the State should cooperate to improve the testing program.

14. Two hundred and twenty-three counties reported that driver education should be provided in every high school, and 22 answered that it should not.

One hundred and seventy-five wanted driver education with some form of State aid; 18 wanted driver education without State aid; 16 wanted it but did not suggest how it should be financed; and 20 wanted it but felt it should be placed outside the regular school curriculum.

15. Thirty-nine counties reported acceptable opportunities in adult education. Ninety-seven reported a limited program, and 106 reported that there were no programs.

One hundred and sixteen counties reported a definite need for a program of adult education; 35 indicated no need; 53 reported little need or demand; and 22 felt that local junior colleges were meeting the need.

Reports indicated that counties believe the responsibility for adult education should be as follows:

Joint .................................. 70
Local .................................. 63
Agencies other than public schools .......... 23
State .................................. 16
Tuition fees ........................... 8

16. The following table summarizes reports concerning school personnel:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personnel</th>
<th>Adequate</th>
<th>Inadequate</th>
<th>To Some Extent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of general admin-</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>isterative personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of administrative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>staff in each building</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of teachers</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional preparation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of teachers</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher load meets standards</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health services</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One hundred and twenty reports showed classes that were too small to make effective use of the teacher's time. One hundred and nine said there were no classes of this type in the county.

Suggestions for improvement of:

Administrative Personnel
Need additional principals .................. 95
Need administrative assistants .......... 38
Need clerical help ........................ 42

Teaching Personnel
Lower teacher-pupil ratio .................. 68
Raise salaries ............................ 44
Raise certification standards ............ 16
Special Service Personnel

Increase number ..................................... 109
Increase number of counselors .................. 25
Need more co-operative units ................. 14
Increase number of nurses ....................... 11

17. Replies regarding the adequacy of instructional materials, aids, and facilities are summarized in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adequate</th>
<th>Inadequate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number and quality of textbooks .149</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economy in providing textbooks .183</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary school libraries .......... 125</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school libraries ............... 132</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laboratories ......................... 108</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of educational films .121</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional materials ............. 110</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One hundred and seventy-nine replies indicated some use of instructional tapes and 59 reported no use.

The following table summarizes the responses concerning the role of the State and local district in paying for instructional supplies:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Pay</th>
<th>Local District Pay</th>
<th>Co-operative Payment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Textbooks .205</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Films* .132</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Tapes** .133</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*45 said regional film libraries should be established.
**27 said regional tape libraries should be established.

18. One hundred and six counties reported use of educational radio, and 77 indicated use of educational television. Sixty-two indicated no use of these media.

There were 15 varied suggestions concerning ways to use radio and television, ranging from special events to social studies. No more than 15 suggestions were received in any one category.

One hundred and seventy-seven indicated that the State has a responsibility for continuing to develop statewide educational television. Twenty-six replies indicated television is not needed or believe that this is the responsibility of the local schools.

19. Replies indicated most schools place the $350-400 teacher allotment in the maintenance and operation fund. Two hundred and ten counties reported that they spend more than the $350-400 allocation while only four spend less.

20. Two hundred and ten counties reported an adequate school lunch program, while 23 reported some inadequacy. Thirty-six asked for increased reimbursement.

One hundred counties said that school transportation should not be provided within city limits where adequate public transportation is not available. Eighty-nine counties reported that it should be furnished.

Eighty-eight counties wished to have the transportation formula revised. There was a variety of suggestions as to what improvements should be made in the formula.

---

TEACHER SUPPLY

1. What is the need for teachers?
—present need to fill vacant positions, relieve over-crowded classrooms, and provide necessary educational services not now offered ................. 4,343
—for replacement of teachers who are not qualified and teachers on temporary assignment ....................... 3,349
—for future need for next five years to meet larger school enrollments, to replace teachers who leave the profession, and provide for added essential instructional programs and educational services .................. 46,165

2. What are the sources of present teacher supply?
Using 1956-57 as a sample year

—graduates of Texas colleges the previous year .................. 3,472
—inexperienced graduates of Texas colleges prior to the previous year . 1,286
—experienced Texas teachers who did not teach the previous year .................. 1,846
—teachers who taught in another Texas district the previous year ........ 3,986
—teachers from other states .................. 1,456

3. Are teachers now employed utilized to the fullest extent?
This question was answered in the affirmative by 195 County Committees and in the negative by 31.

4. Why do teachers resign their positions?
REASONS TEACHERS RESIGNED POSITIONS FROM 1955-1957

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason Given</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Personal and family reasons</td>
<td>669</td>
<td>6,031</td>
<td>6,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Accept employment in another</td>
<td>2,367</td>
<td>3,516</td>
<td>5,883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>public school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Accept employment outside</td>
<td>1,146</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>1,664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Retirement</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>663</td>
<td>827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Other</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4,558</td>
<td>10,404</td>
<td>14,962</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. What are the factors in retention of teachers in the profession?
   —better salary .................. 153 counties
   —better living conditions ...... 59 counties
   —better working conditions .... 88 counties

6. What state salary schedule would hold teachers in the profession?

MINIMUM STATE GUARANTEED SALARY FOR TEACHERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Recommended minimum</td>
<td>$4,094</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>$3,204 to $6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for state salary schedule (N-241)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Recommended minimum</td>
<td>$4,245</td>
<td>$4,200</td>
<td>$3,204 to $6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>salary figure which</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>would attract young</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>people to choose teaching as a career</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N-240)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MAXIMUM STATE GUARANTEED SALARY FOR TEACHERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Recommended maximum</td>
<td>$6,770</td>
<td>$6,500</td>
<td>$3,852 to $12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>salary for state salary schedule</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N-221)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Recommended maximum</td>
<td>$7,255</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
<td>$4,404 to $15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>salary figure which</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>would cause young</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>people to choose teaching as a career</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N-220)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Six counties favored no limit for the maximum salary in category 1 or 2.

In proposing the minimum salary for the state salary schedule, only 58 counties recommended a figure less than $4,000 while 90 counties recommended $4,200 and above. When looking at the minimum salary as an attraction to career teaching, only 43 counties recommended a minimum salary of less than $4,000 while 117 counties recommended $4,200 and above including 34 counties recommending a minimum of $5,000 and above.

In proposing the maximum figure for the state salary schedule, only 48 counties recommended a figure less than $6,000, while 94 counties recommended a maximum salary of $7,000 and above. In proposing a maximum salary figure as an attraction to career teaching, only 28 counties recommended a figure below $6,000, while 58 counties recommended $8,000 and above including 23 counties recommending $10,000 and above.

There seemed to be a general desire to lessen the number of years in which a teacher would advance from the minimum salary to the maximum.

County Committees were overwhelmingly in favor of retaining the bases of “years of experience” and “college degree” upon which to build the salary schedule. Only 17 counties felt that these bases were improper. Sixty-one counties felt that there were or should be ways to relate the salary schedule to teaching performance. Forty-four of these counties felt that some ways of relating teaching performance to salary should be employed in addition to the basis of “years of experience” and “college degree.” One hundred and forty-four counties felt that there were no realistic ways to relate teaching performance to salary.

SOUND BASIS FOR SALARY SCHEDULE (N-249)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basis</th>
<th>Number of Counties Reporting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. “Years of experience” and “college degree”</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Realistic ways to relate salary to teaching performance</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. What are the most important factors in recruitment?

—when asked if salary was the most important factor in recruitment of young people to career teaching, 183 counties said “Yes”; 13 counties said “No.”
—when asked if present working conditions in schools would attract young people into career teaching, 126 counties said “Yes”; 86 said “No.”

—when asked if present living conditions would attract young people into career teaching, 108 counties said “Yes,” and 99 said “No.”

8. What salary schedule would attract young people to career teaching?

—median minimum .................. $4,200
—median maximum .................. $7,000

9. How may we improve teacher education?
—In-service teachers should be required to participate in in-service education programs or show professional growth in some other way ........ 142 counties

—the State should offer an incentive to encourage teachers to go beyond the baccalaureate degree (this incentive should be increased salary was reported by 198 counties) ........ 231 counties

Teacher education programs should be improved by:
—more emphasis on subject-matter specialization .................. 135 counties
—more emphasis on improved general education .................. 93 counties
—more emphasis on improved professional education .................. 86 counties

A state-level continuing study of teacher education should be instituted involving public school teachers, laymen, and college personnel .................. 133 counties

FINANCE

Local Support

The County Committees predicted that local funds for current operation of schools through the school year 1962-63 will be $70,089,220 short of the additional funds required.

An analysis shows that 63 counties, or 25 per cent, recommended that the available funds be raised locally by raising tax rates or valuations; 113 counties, or 44 per cent, recommended state sources for additional funds; nine counties favored Federal aid, while 17 counties recommended statewide equalization authority.

Suggestions made by the County Committees:

Local source: Increase rates and valuations
State source: Increase state taxes, sales tax and/or income tax, and use portion of Permanent School Fund.

Thirty-five County Committees, or 14 per cent, recommended sales tax and/or income tax.

State Support

Available School Fund: One hundred and twenty-one County Committees reported that the present method of distributing the State Available School Fund was a hindrance. One hundred and eleven County Committees reported that the distribution of this fund was not a hindrance.

One hundred and thirty-six County Committees favored distribution of the fund on average daily attendance; 68 County Committees favored average membership; and 19 County Committees recommended enrollment.

One hundred and twenty-nine County Committees favored discontinuing the present method of distribution, and 103 voted to continue the present method.

One hundred and thirty-three County Committees recommended distribution on ability to finance Foundation School Program, and 101 voted not to distribute on ability.

Foundation School Fund: It was estimated by the County Committees that the cost of the allocation for Foundation School Funds on current ADA rather than the prior year’s ADA basis would be about $6,600,000.

One hundred and forty-four County Committees, or 57 per cent, reported that the allocation of the fund on current ADA would present a problem, and 66 counties reported that it would not be a problem.

A majority of the County Committees voted against distribution of the Foundation Program Fund on basis of current ADA. Vote was 122 against, 108 for.

Local-State Fund Distribution

The present 80-20 ratio of state and local distribution was given a majority vote, 170 counties recommended that it be retained and 26 recommended less local support.

One hundred and seventy-eight county committees favored the continuance of the $100 deduction.

The Permanent School Fund

Two hundred and one County Committees, or 88%, said that there should be no limit placed on
the growth of the Permanent School Fund, while 27 counties, or 12%, indicated that the growth should be limited either now or at some future date.

The remarks of the Dallas County Committee appears to express the thought of those commenting on their opposition to a limit—"The fund should be allowed to increase and grow, as the State grows, without a maximum limit being established. The growth of the State and its scholastic population is not subject to limitation. The fund should be permitted to grow with the State."

Of the 27 counties favoring a maximum limit only five indicated a specific limit, ranging from $365,000,000 to $500,000,000. The remaining committees did not determine a limit, with a few stating that they favored using a percentage of the increase to the fund, thereby slowing down its growth rather than setting a maximum limit.

Seventy-three County Committees, or 31% of those replying, favored earning all interest possible; 75 counties, or 33%, favored earning all interest possible consistent with safe and sound investment practices; 84 counties, or 36%, stated that earnings should be secondary.

The majority of counties that stated earnings should be secondary did not indicate what they felt should be the primary consideration. A relatively small minority indicated that they felt the primary consideration should be: (1) need, (2) purchase of bonds to help schools, (3) purchase of school bonds at a uniform interest rate to all districts, (4) the maintenance of a reserve for hardship cases, and (5) emergency needs.

It appears that the consensus is expressed in the comments of Rains County—"The Permanent School Fund is a trust fund; conceived, established and developed for the purpose of contributing to the educational opportunities of each generation. It should be guarded and administered zealously, and no administration has the moral right to take from or in any way impair the purpose for which it was established. It should be invested for the purpose only of securing the best yield that is consistent with safety."

Ninety-six counties, or 41% of those replying, stated that it would be desirable to purchase bonds at below market rates while 138 counties, or 59%, stated that it would not be desirable.

Those favoring the purchase of bonds below the market, favored such action only to assist small or needy districts, or in times of high interest rates. Those not favoring the purchase of bonds below the market, felt that such action resulted in unfair competition, or was not good business practice.

One hundred and fifty-four counties, or 67% of those replying, opposed the use of any percentage of the annual Permanent School Fund principal increase, while 76 counties, or 33%, favored the use of a fixed percentage of the increase.

Of the 76 counties favoring the use of a part of the increase, 55% felt that it should be used to increase the "Foundation Fund," 35% to increase the Available School Fund, while only 10% felt that it should be used for grants for school construction. Some of the counties checked more than one use, which accounts for the more than 100% total.

A significant number of counties expressed their opposition to the transfer of one percent of the principal of the Permanent School Fund.

One hundred and eighty-nine counties, or 83% of those replying, were satisfied with the present method of administering the Permanent School Fund while 39 counties, or 17%, were not satisfied. Of those not satisfied with the present method of administration, the majority felt that the fund should be used: (1) to aid school districts, (2) to purchase school bonds at low or uniform rates, and (3) to aid more directly in the financing of present needs of public education.

**Federal Participation**

One hundred and eighty-eight counties voted not to assume the total cost of the presently operated Federal programs.

One hundred and forty-five counties favored the program as it is now being operated.

**The High School Transfer Problem**

The county reports indicate that 49,481 pupils were transferred for the 1957-1958 school year. Approximately 23,721 of this total were children whose grades were taught in the sending district.

**Denial of Transfers:** The county reports show that 111 counties seldom, if ever, deny transfer requests. There are 55 counties where transfers are not made if the home district can provide educational opportunities and transportation. County boards of 21 counties reported that all transfers protested by the home district were refused. Twelve reports stated transfers were not made of in-grade pupils if the loss of ADA would mean teacher unit loss in the sending district.

**Reasons for In-grade Transfers:** The most frequently mentioned reasons given for in-grade transfers are: Convenience to pupil and parents; better facilities and course offerings; transportation; geographical; parental preference.

**Tuition on Transfers:** The county reports do not indicate the problem as widespread as might be thought. Fifty counties reported that there were either no transfers or no tuition charge made. One hundred and sixty counties showed that all districts
were able to pay the tuition cost as charged by individual districts within the county. About 16 counties reported that there were districts within the county that could not raise sufficient funds to pay the cost of instruction charges made by receiving districts.

TEA Participation in Re-Districting: One hundred and ninety-eight counties indicated transfers caused no particular problem and required no particular solution. Seventeen counties recommended that there be district reorganization to place all children in 12-grade accredited school districts.

One hundred and seventy-five counties stated that the Texas Education Agency should continue its present policy of staying out of district reorganization. Nineteen counties stated that the Agency should be more active in reorganization.
A LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM IS REQUIRED TO ACTIVATE RECOMMENDATIONS OF CITIZENS TO PROVIDE A PUBLIC SCHOOL PROGRAM TO MEET THE NEEDS OF THEIR CHILDREN.

A PROPOSED LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM
PROPOSED LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM TO ACTIVATE CITIZEN RECOMMENDATIONS TO IMPROVE PUBLIC SCHOOL PROGRAM

The Minimum Foundation Program enacted into law in 1949 and amended in 1951, 1954, 1955, and 1957 guarantees to each child of school age a minimum educational program and provides for the state and local districts to share in the financing of this Minimum Program.

Texas schools have made outstanding progress since 1949 because the foundation established by law has permitted citizens of local districts to add to this base in accordance with their desires for their own children. The need for strengthening the entire educational system to meet the demand of the atomic age requires that the minimum base be improved to guarantee all children better educational opportunities, and local districts may then continue to build beyond this base if it is their wish to do so.

To place into operation the recommendations of Texas citizens as expressed in the County Reports and in the report of the Committee of 24 requires that the Foundation Program (Gilmer-Aikin) laws be amended. These amendments should include the following:

I. Provide a school year of at least nine and one-half months. Students would be provided 180 days of instruction. Five days would be designated for in-service education of teachers and the remaining five days of the 190-day school calendar would provide for certain special days, holidays, or for other purposes approved by the local Boards of Education.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Days of Instruction</th>
<th>Holidays</th>
<th>Days for In-service Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>25-30</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>2-Classes begin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>180</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools close May 29</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Local Boards of Education would have full authority to establish a schedule to meet the particular needs of their own communities in providing the minimum program.

Benefits of Longer School Year—The minimum nine and one-half-month program would:
1. Provide at least five days for in-service education which will offer teachers an opportunity to improve themselves through securing information from consultants, planning with other teachers, proper orientating of new teachers, establishing objectives for year, and learning of new developments in their teaching fields.

With more than 10,000 teachers on new jobs each year such planning is most valuable to these new teachers and will under proper local leadership and planning stimulate and inspire all teachers to contribute to the improvement of the total school program.

The provision of more time for instruction should result in these improvements:

See Proposal I — Page 9 — Hale-Aikin
See Item 9 — Page 28 — County Summary

A typical nine and one-half-month school calendar would include:
1. More time can be given to the necessary fundamentals and more subject material can be presented to students.

2. Some adjustment in length of periods may be made to permit students to carry more than the traditional four subjects. This is particularly important in order that students may meet graduation requirements in science, math, foreign language, English, and social studies, and also have opportunity to take courses in commercial and vocational fields, and the fine arts.

3. Each student should receive more individual attention, and needs of all students including the academically talented could more fully be met.

4. The average length of the school year is now 180 days of instruction in the schools of the nation now credited with having the outstanding programs. The inclusion of additional days in the school calendar is a national movement.

II. Allot professional units provided under the Foundation Program on the basis of the current year's attendance.

IV. Provide one special service teacher for each 17 CTU's and include driver education teacher as special service unit.

See Proposal II — Item 3 — Page 11 — Hale-Aikin

See Item 14 — Page 29 — County Summary

A district may now receive one such special service person for each 20 CTU's. Choices may be made among five services—namely, librarian, visiting teacher, itinerant teacher, nurse, and physician. Driver education would be added as a sixth service and each district would choose the units desired including teachers for driver education. Districts too small to qualify for a full unit may join with other such districts in a cooperative program to provide these services to their students.

V. Provide a full-time principal for first 16 CTU's and one other for each additional 24 CTU's.

See Proposal II — Item 5 — Page 11 — Hale-Aikin

See Item 16 — Page 29 — County Summary

The law now provides a full-time principal for first 20 CTU's and one other for each additional 30 CTU's. Need for improving guidance, supervision and administration is the basis for this change.

VI. Provide assistant superintendents to school districts requiring such administrative personnel on the following formula:

1. for 150—299 CTU's
2. for 300—499 CTU's
3. for 500—999 CTU's
1 additional for each additional 1,000 CTU's

See Proposal II — Page 11 — Hale-Aikin

See “Administrative Personnel” — Page 29 — County Summary

A district or group of districts would develop a plan which upon approval by the Texas Education Agency would entitle them to an additional teacher or teachers needed to service such program.

Under the present program each school district within which a four-year accredited high school operates is allotted a superintendent unit. Whether a district has ten teachers or 1,000 teachers only one unit is provided. The addition of assistant superintendents for large systems would strengthen the Foundation Program materially.
VII. Provide a salary schedule designed to hold good teachers in service and to recruit from among the most capable of our college graduates the new teachers needed for Texas' rapidly increasing scholastic population.

The schedule proposed would provide $3,800 for a beginning teacher with BA degree with increment of $95 for each year of teaching service until $5,035 annual salary has been attained. Provided, however, that an increment of $190 should be given for the fifth year of service.

The beginning salary for an MA teacher would be $4,009 to which $95 per year would be added for each year of teaching service until an annual salary of $6,004 has been attained. Provided, however, that for the fifth, tenth, and 15th year of service the annual increment should be $190.

See Proposal I — Page 15 — Hale-Aikin
See Page 31 — County Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MINIMUM SALARY SCHEDULE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Years of Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 (Double)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Why Should Salary Increases be Provided?

- Hale-Aikin Committee of 24 recommends $3,800-$5,000 for bachelor's degree and $4,000-$6,000 for master's degree.
- 254 County Committees recommend average $4,000-$6,500 minimum salary range.
- Texas needs 4,000 additional teachers each year to teach additional students enrolling in public schools.
- 4,500-5,000 teachers leave the profession annually.
- A minimum of 45,000 teachers will be needed as replacements and additions in the next five-year period.
- Employment Commission reveals that all other groups employed by business and industry receive average salaries exceeding those paid classroom teachers. The groups reported included workers in oil, manufacturing, construction, transportation, and finance and real estate.
- Every one of the 254 County Committees stated that the most effective action to recruit capable young people into the teaching profession and to hold in service the qualified teachers who now leave would be to provide a more adequate salary.

VIII. Increase present annual allotment per school bus by $380.

See Proposal VI — Item 1 — Page 13 — Hale-Aikin
See Item 20 — Page 30 — County Summary

To meet increasing costs of operating and purchasing buses this adjustment is necessary. The present allotment is based on 1949 costs.

IX. Provide $600 per professional unit for maintenance and operation. Remove provision for $100 deduction on local fund assignment now provided for each professional unit.

See Proposal IV — Page 12 — Hale-Aikin
See Item 19 — Page 30 — County Summary

These adjustments would make available an average increase of approximately $100 per professional unit. This allotment is used to pay the operating costs of the school including repairs, custodial care, teaching supplies, janitorial supplies, insurance, utilities, library materials—in short, everything except teacher salary.
These amendments to the Gilmer Aikin Law will strengthen this minimum educational program materially by:

1. Making available more time for teaching
2. Providing opportunities for the gifted
3. Expanding special services to include driver education
4. Strengthening administration
5. Allotting units on basis of current need
6. Improving teaching salary
7. Meeting more adequately costs of transportation
8. Providing more realistic maintenance and operation allotment.

Other laws needed to implement citizen recommendations include:

1. Provide in statute the framework for a public school curriculum that will meet the needs of Texas children.
2. The statutes of the State should require each public school system to provide adequate instruction in:
   - English, spelling, reading, writing and arithmetic in the primary and elementary grades
   - The Constitutions of the United States and Texas (Article 2663b—1 Sec. 1)
   - Citizenship, the American heritage and patriotism (Article 289—Penal Code)
   - The history and geography of Texas, the United States, and the world (Article 2911)
   - Use of the English language (Article 2911 and Article 288 of the Penal Code)
   - Pre-school orientation in basic English for non-English speaking children
   - Mathematical concepts and skills
   - Scientific knowledge
   - Health and physical fitness, including the harmful effects of alcohol and narcotics
   - Such other instruction as may be required by the State Board of Education or by local school boards as determined to provide for the varying needs of all pupils in the district, both terminal and college bound. This instruction should include vocational education and foreign languages.

2. Special program should be provided for non-English speaking children.

See Proposal II — Item 6 — Page 11 — Hale-Aikin

3. Regional libraries for films and other audio-visual aids should be created and financed on a matching basis by the state and local districts.

See Proposal IV — Item 3 — Page 12 — Hale-Aikin
See Item 17 — Page 30 — County Summary

4. Provide for the distribution of the State Available Fund on an average daily attendance basis and provision be made for a biennial census to be taken in even numbered years.

See Proposal II — Items 1 and 2 — Page 20 — Hale-Aikin
See "State Support" — Page 32 — County Summary

5. A. Every child's attendance should be eligible toward earning Foundation Program benefits.
   B. A method of transfer involving approval of sending and receiving district Boards of Education should be established.

See Proposal V — Page 22 — Hale-Aikin
See "High School Transfer" — Page 33 — County Summary

6. A sick leave policy providing a minimum of five days for each year cumulative to a minimum total of 30 days should be made available for all teachers.

See Proposal II — Page 16 — Hale-Aikin
Placing into operation the recommendations suggested by the citizens of Texas for improving the public school program will involve additional expenditures of state and local funds. The amendments suggested for the Foundation Program would require increased expenditures estimated as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Lengthening the school year. This would involve very little additional cost, since items listed below would require approximately the same funds on a nine-month basis.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Allotment of units on a current attendance basis</td>
<td>$11,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Provide special teacher units for academically talented</td>
<td>1,030,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Provide driver education and reduce allotment of special service teachers to ratio of 1-17</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Liberalize principal allotment</td>
<td>2,800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Provide assistant superintendents</td>
<td>980,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Provide salary schedule</td>
<td>65,900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Increase bus allotment</td>
<td>3,800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Increase maintenance allotment to $600</td>
<td>7,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Establish program for non-English speaking children</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Establish regional film libraries</td>
<td>250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$95,760,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The state would pay 80% of this total.
The 55th Legislature created a Texas State Tax Study Commission to explore the tax structure of the state and to present factual surveys showing possible sources of tax revenue.

A verbatim excerpt from this report is presented to indicate some of their findings:

Selectives Sales Taxes Not Used By Texas

Texas already levies the selective sales taxes which are the most common and productive, and also taxes some sales which are not usually singled out for selective taxation.

On the other hand, a few states have selective sales taxes on items untaxed in Texas. As part of its comparison of the Texas tax system with that of other states, the research staff has developed the following information covering all selective sales taxes not now used by Texas.

Tobacco Products

Eleven states, in addition to taxing cigarettes, tax other forms in which tobacco is used: cigars, smoking and chewing tobacco, and snuff.

Oklahoma taxes small cigars one cent per 10 cigars, larger cigars at $5.00 per 1,000 for those intended to sell at 3.3 cents or less, and at $10.00 for those selling at more than 3.3 cents. Smoking and chewing tobacco is taxed at 20 per cent of factory list price. Snuff is not taxed.

It is estimated that the Oklahoma tax on these articles would produce about $4,500,000 annually if imposed in Texas.

Oleomargarine

Several states, including Texas, have taxes on oleomargarine designed solely to exclude the sale of oleo made from certain types of oil. These taxes produce no revenue. Six states, however, do receive some revenue from oleo taxes. With similar tax rates (10 cents per pound), these revenues vary from five cents per capita in Minnesota to 78 cents per capita in Idaho.

The wide variation in yield experienced by the states using the oleo tax makes it impractical to venture a prediction of what such a tax would produce in Texas. Actually, these taxes are intended to discourage the consumer from using oleo rather than being imposed to produce significant public revenues.

Soft Drinks

Three states—South Carolina, West Virginia, and Louisiana—have selective sales taxes on soft drinks. South Carolina taxes bottled soft drinks at the rate of one cent per 12 ounces, fountain syrup at 76 cents per gallon, and fountain drinks at one cent for each five cents of selling price. West Virginia’s tax is comparable. Louisiana’s tax is one-eighth of a cent for each five cents of selling price and ten cents per gallon on syrup.

It is estimated that either the South Carolina or West Virginia soft drinks tax would produce $15,000,000 annually in Texas. The Louisiana tax would produce about $3,400,000 in Texas.

Hotel and Motel Rooms

Pennsylvania imposes a tax known as “Hotel Occupancy Tax,” at the rate of three per cent of the cost of lodging.

A similar tax in Texas would yield about $3,-500,000 annually.

Restaurant Meals

Massachusetts imposes a five per cent sales tax on restaurant meals costing more than $1.00.

A similar tax in Texas would yield about $10,-000,000 annually.

Lubricating Oil

Two states tax lubricating oil: Louisiana at 8 cents per gallon and Alabama at 2 cents per gallon. Exemptions effectively restrict the tax to oil used on motor vehicles, and both states consider this a highway-user tax and spend it accordingly.

At the Louisiana rate, a lubricating oil tax would produce about $5.9 million in Texas; the Alabama rate would yield an estimated $1.5 million in this state.

Kerosene

Louisiana imposes a one-cent-per-gallon tax on kerosene. A similar tax in Texas should produce about $600,000 annually.

Pari-Mutuel Betting

Twenty-four states now derive revenue from taxes on pari-mutuel betting, collecting $224 million from this source in 1957. However, only six states raised as much as $10 million, and these accounted for 77 per cent of the total. Louisiana collected $2.7 million, Arkansas, $1.3 million, and New Mexico, $65,000.
Texas Tax Study Commission Report

The real issue here is not the tax itself but the legalization of gambling, an issue outside the purview of this study. Under present circumstances, it is impossible to estimate the yield of such a tax in Texas.

General Taxes On Individuals Not Used In Texas

The Texas tax pattern, in relation to individuals, is traditionally that of reliance upon selective taxes as discussed in this report.

The Texas tradition is almost unique among the states. Most states, while making some use of selective sales taxation, also employ more general taxes levied upon individuals. Some form of general sales tax is used by 33 states; in 28 of these states it is the largest single revenue producer in the state tax system.

Personal income taxes are imposed by 29 states, and in 9 of these it is the top revenue producer for the state. The 29 states mentioned do not include New Hampshire and Tennessee which impose limited personal income taxes applying only to income from investments.

Characteristically, these two taxes are both very productive and both are fairly economical to administer. Beyond these qualities, on which most tax authorities agree, there is difficulty finding areas of agreement between those who favor one or the other of these taxes, or oppose one or the other.

Because of the importance of these taxes in American state government, the staff has prepared estimates of their probable yield in Texas. On the following pages the staff estimates are given, together with the details of the assumptions involved.

A Retail Sales Tax

Although there are several forms of the general sales tax, the one that most tax students tend to favor is that known technically as a "retail" sales tax. By this is meant a tax which is levied at only one—and that the final or retail—stage in the process of moving goods from original producer to consumer. This is the type of tax for which estimates have been made. It is assumed that the tax would be imposed on the sale of tangible personal property at retail, with sales to governmental and charitable institutions and sales of property which becomes an integral part of a manufactured article intended for ultimate retail sale being exempt.

Factors Affecting the Yield

1. The rate: as examples, rates of one and two per cent are shown.

2. Exemptions: in the first estimates only articles already subject to selective sales taxation—specifically; motor fuel, cigarettes and alcoholic beverages—are assumed to be exempt. In the second estimates food for human consumption and prescription drugs are also exempted.

3. Taxes abolished and incorporated into the sales tax: in all estimates it is assumed that the present selective sales taxes on motor vehicles, radios and television sets, cosmetics and playing cards would be abolished and these taxes taxed under the general tax.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESTIMATED YIELD IN TEXAS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revenue in Texas from a Retail Sales Tax with no Major Exemption:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At the Rate of 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Annual Revenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less: Motor Vehicle &amp; Luxury Taxes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Annual Revenue</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue in Texas from a Retail Sales Tax with Food Exempt:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At the Rate of 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Annual Revenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less: Motor Vehicle &amp; Luxury Taxes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Annual Revenue</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A Personal Income Tax

Factors Affecting The Yield

1. THE DEFINITION OF INCOME: in all of the following estimates it is assumed that the federal definition of adjusted gross income would be followed.

2. PERSONAL EXEMPTIONS: three of the estimates are based on taxes modeled after those in effect in California, New York and New Mexico and the personal exemptions assumed are the same as in those states.

3. ALLOWABLE DEDUCTIONS: the estimates assume that the federal rule would be followed—that is, that where deductions are not itemized a ten per cent deduction would be permitted subject to a maximum of $1,000. Federal income taxes are deductible before computing the state tax in 16 states and partially deductible in four others. The New Mexico-type tax estimate assumes federal deductibility as in that state. Experimentation indicates that federal tax deductibility will reduce the yield of an income tax by something like 35 per cent.

4. THE RATE SCHEDULE: the rate schedules used in making these estimates conform as closely as our date would permit to those in effect in the three states used as models. The estimate for a flat rate income tax is not modeled after either of the
states using a flat rate because of certain features of their laws which do not seem applicable in Texas.

5. COMMUNITY PROPERTY: since Texas has strong community property laws, it was assumed that the taxpayer would have the privilege of splitting his income for tax purposes and that he would avail himself of this privilege whenever it was to his advantage to do so. The effect of this varies with the rate schedule and the personal exemptions granted. There is no advantage to income splitting with a flat rate tax.

**Estimate 1** A Personal Income Tax Modeled After That of New Mexico.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal Exemptions</th>
<th>Rate Schedule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single $1,500</td>
<td>First $10,000—1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married $2,500</td>
<td>Next $10,000—2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependents $200</td>
<td>Next $30,000—3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Over $50,000—4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Federal income taxes ARE deductible.

*The New Mexico tax does not hit the top rate (4%) until $100,000 of net income is reached rather than at $50,000 as used in estimate.

**Estimate 2** A Personal Income Tax Modeled After That of California.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal Exemptions</th>
<th>Rate Schedule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single $2,000</td>
<td>First $5,000—1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married $3,500</td>
<td>Next $5,000—2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependents $400</td>
<td>Next $5,000—3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Next $5,000—4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Next $10,000—5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Over $30,000—6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Federal income taxes NOT deductible.

*California tax reaches top rate (6%) at $25,000 rather than $30,000 as used in estimate.

**Estimate 3** A Personal Income Tax Modeled After That of New York State.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal Exemptions</th>
<th>Rate Schedule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single $1,000</td>
<td>First $1,000—2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married $2,500</td>
<td>Next $2,000—3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependents $400</td>
<td>Next $2,000—4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Next $2,000—5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Next $2,000—6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Over $9,000—7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Federal income taxes NOT deductible.

Estimated Annual Revenue in Texas—$149 million.

**Estimate 4** A Flat Rate Tax on Income.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal Exemptions</th>
<th>Rate Schedule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single $1,000</td>
<td>Rate: 1% flat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married $2,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependents $1,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Deductions: This estimate assumes NO deductions other than those granted as personal exemptions.

Estimated Annual Revenue in Texas—$48 million.

---

**Business Taxes Not Used In Texas**

The Value-Added Tax

Michigan adopted a value-added tax in 1953. This tax is unique to Michigan. The only similar tax being used is in France.

The value-added tax is levied on the excess of selling price over the cost of purchases from other firms. Essentially, therefore, the value-added tax rests on a base of payrolls and profits.

Michigan has in practice modified the pure value-added theory. First, a minimum deduction of 50 percent of gross sales was permitted for taxpayers whose value-added would be greater than half their gross receipts. Second, an additional deduction is permitted for taxpayers whose payroll exceeded 50 percent of gross receipts. Third, a $10,000 annual exemption is permitted for each taxpayer.

The result of the first and third modifications has been to exempt effectively from the tax all businesses with gross receipts of $20,000 or less. Against the value-added tax base, Michigan levies a tax of 0.65 percent, except that public utilities are taxed at the rate of 0.15 percent.

*Estimate*: The staff estimates that with a three factor allocation formula and the Michigan rates, a value-added tax would produce $50 million annually in Texas. With the gross receipts allocation factor of the present Texas franchise tax and with the Michigan rates, a value-added tax would produce $27 million annually in Texas.

**Gross Income Taxes**

Six American states apply classified gross income or gross receipts taxes to a broad base of business activity.

Arizona, New Mexico and Mississippi use selective gross income taxes to supplement or broaden retail sales taxes by reaching services and extractive industries. They require no gross income tax payments from retail merchants other than a 2 percent sales tax in Arizona and New Mexico or 3 percent sales tax in Mississippi. Arizona and Mississippi do not tax manufacturers receipts and Arizona also does not tax wholesalers.

The three remaining states—Washington, West Virginia, and Indiana—apply broader gross income taxes to reach all classes of business and thus may be described as the major gross income tax states. Retail sales taxes and gross income taxes are classified as separate taxes upon retail transactions in Washington and West Virginia. Indiana is the only gross income tax state which does not have a retail sales tax.

Gross income taxes are not the same in any two states. There are also variations in how the tax is levied—in Washington and West Virginia, for example, the entire production of manufactures with-
in the state is taxed, whereas Indiana taxes only sales delivered within the state.

**Estimate:** In Texas a one mill—0.1 percent—tax on gross receipts of all incorporated or unincorporated business—with the exception of businesses already subject to gross receipts taxes—would produce $32 million annually.

**Income Taxes**

The most widely used general tax on business is the income tax. There are, again, great variations in the coverage and rates of such taxes among the states. Most states apply it only to incorporated businesses and use a companion tax on personal income to reach the earnings of unincorporated firms. New York has a special unincorporated business net income tax and Connecticut imposes a special gross receipts tax on unincorporated business as a partner to its corporation income tax.

No state using the corporation income tax applies this tax to insurance companies subject to a gross premiums tax. For this reason the estimates below anticipate that insurance companies in Texas would be exempt from an income tax. In some states other businesses subject to selective taxation (most frequently public utilities) are exempt from income taxation. The extent of selective business taxation in Texas is so great that the staff has not presumed to speculate on which, if any, selectively taxed businesses would be exempt if Texas were to adopt an income tax. The estimates, therefore, assume that all income of selectively taxed business, other than insurance, would be taxable.

Other factors affecting the yield of an income tax on business and the staff estimates for what such a tax would produce in Texas are shown below.

**The Type of Rate Utilized:** Of the 34 states taxing corporation income, 28 use a flat rate. Six (including neighboring Arkansas) use a graduated rate.

**Federal Tax Deductibility:** State corporation income taxes rest on net income before federal income taxes in 18 states and on net income after federal taxes in 15 states. Wisconsin limits deduction of federal tax to ten percent of net income. (All neighboring states except Arkansas levy on income AFTER federal taxes.)

**Allocation of Income:** Allocation formulas vary considerably, but the three-factor formula is generally considered the best and has the widest acceptance. Revenue estimates are presented using both the present Texas franchise tax formula and a three-factor formula.

**Minimum Taxes:** Some states have integrated franchise taxes measured by net income. These states usually require the corporation to pay the greater of a tax based on net income or a tax based on capital. Other states—including all Texas neighbors—require payment of both a franchise and an income tax. In each case the theory is the same—a corporation should pay some tax whether it shows a profit or not.

**Estimate:** For a tax levied BEFORE federal income taxes, the staff estimates these yields:

A corporation net income tax using the present Texas allocation formula would produce $16 million for each one percent of tax.

A corporation income tax using a three-factor allocation formula would produce $24 million for each one percent of tax.

A graduated corporation income tax using the present Texas allocation formula with rates of one percent on the first $25,000; two percent on the next $25,000 and three percent on all income over $50,000 would produce $43 million.

**Estimates:** For a tax levied AFTER federal income taxes:

Using the present allocation factor—$10 million per one percent.

Using a three-factor allocation formula—$14 million per one percent.

Graduated income tax as described above—$24 million.
WHEREAS, the Gilmer-Aikin Program, placed into operation in 1949, has provided material improvements in the educational opportunities of Texas boys and girls; but

WHEREAS, the scholastic population of the State of Texas is now increasing at an unprecedented rate; and

WHEREAS, the demands for an enlightened citizenship to meet and solve the problems created through the complex developments of this atomic and rapidly expanding technological age places a tremendous responsibility upon the public schools; and

WHEREAS, at a time when thousands of additional teachers are needed to teach additional pupils enrolling in the public schools, thousands of experienced teachers are leaving the profession; and

WHEREAS, despite the most valiant efforts by local citizens to provide the funds needed to construct schoolhouse facilities there still exists financially embarrassed districts which are unable to cope with the unusual building emergency thrust upon them; and

WHEREAS, the future of the boys and girls of this State and the welfare of this State and Nation depend upon the solution of these dire and pressing problems; and

WHEREAS, it is imperative to provide a long-range public education program that will meet the demands of the citizenship of this State;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the House of Representatives, the Senate concurring, that a committee composed of twenty-four (24) members be immediately constituted to coordinate and complete a comprehensive study involving the citizenship of each and every county of this State; that said commission shall survey the needs of the public school system as related to curriculum, teacher supply, classroom facilities, and other related areas including adequate financing of the public school program; and that the Texas Education Agency shall work cooperatively with the commission to provide professional assistance, clerical help, and necessary printing.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall appoint three (3) members of the House of Representatives and three (3) additional members of said committee, the Lt. Governor shall appoint three (3) members of the Senate and three (3) additional members of the Committee, the Governor shall appoint six (6) members of said committee and the State Board of Education shall appoint six (6) members of the committee, and that those members of the House of Representatives and Senate who serve on the committee shall receive living and travel expenses while away from home in attendance of meetings of said committee, such travel and expenses to be paid from the Contingent Fund of the 55th Legislature; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that said committee is empowered to effect its own organization and adopt such procedure and operate as may be necessary to carry out fully the purposes herein described and shall make such recommendations to the Governor, the 56th Legislature, and the people of the State as it may determine the facts and conditions to warrant. Copies of each and every recommendation shall be filed with the Governor, Speaker of the House of Representatives, Lt. Governor, given to the press, and all statewide educational organizations within the state.
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Anderson—Quanah Price, Frankston, Texas
Andrews—Jack Shepherd, 707 N.W. Tenth, Andrews
Angelina—T. J. Wilroy, Box 6, Lufkin
Aransas—Charles A. Roe, Jr., Rockport
Archer—J. H. Gerron, Box 277, Archer City
Armstrong—Mrs. Grace Wiegman, Claude
Atascosa—L. L. Wittler, Pleasanton
Austin—Dr. James B. Harle, Bellaire
Bailey—Glenn Williams, Box 188, Muleshoe
Banderas—Dan Alanis, Bandera, Texas
Bastrop—Valton L. Veight, Elgin
Baylor—Clyde Whiteside, Seymour
Bell—H. B. Langford, Jr., Box 72, Pettus
Bell—Dr. Truman Davis, 1112 North 13th, Temple
Bexar—Carlos Coon, Route 11, Box 54, San Antonio
Blanco—R. K. McKinney, Johnson City
Borden—John R. Anderson, Gilchrist
Bosque—Joe White, Box 185, Meridian
Burnet—Rep. George McCoppin, 2011 Walnut Street, Texarkana
Brazoria—Mrs. Ralph Gray, 410 Circle Way, Lake Jackson
Brazos—Ed J. Burkhardt, Varisco Building, Bryan
Bremer—Jim Glasscock, Editor, ALPINE AVALANCHE, Alpine
Briscoe—Mrs. Amelia Johnson, Quitaque
Brooks—J. O. Jones, 807 West Allen Street, Falfurrias
Brown—Harley H. Black, Courthouse, Brownwood
Burleson—Jennings Hill, Somerville
Burnet—Joe D. Evans, 220 South Pierce, Burnet
CalDWELL—M. W. Glosserman, Lockhart
Callahan—W. F. Tanner, 217 West Wilson, Port Lavaca
Callahan—Hugh Ross, Jr., Baird
Cameron—L. R. Baker, 222 E. Van Buren, Harlingen
Camp—Dr. R. K. Pendergrass, 131 Quiltman, Pittsburg
Carr—Clarence C. Williams, Box 368, Panhandle
Cass—Guy E. Goosby, Hughes Springs
Castro—M. E. Cleavinger, Jr., Dimmitt
Chambers—Joe Dick McClung, Anahuac
Cherokee—Morris W. Hassell, Box 196, Rusk
Childress—Wade Kirkhomme, Childress
Clay—Harold C. Reynolds, Superintendent of Schools, Bellevue
Cochran—Davis E. Benham, Route 2, Morton
Coke—D. K. Glenn, Bronte
Colley—Lee Williams, Gravizo
Collin—Clifford Carpenter, Farmersville
Collingsworth—J. D. Wilson, Wellington
Colorado—Lessi Crane, Rt. 1, Box 4, Garwood
Comal—Mrs. Roland Zipp, 259 N. Seguin, New Braunfels
Comanche—James F. Fanning, Comanche
Concho—Carl Peck, Box 86, Paint Rock
Cooke—R. R. Kirby, Route 4, Gainesville
Corrull—Lovett Ledger, Corporas Cove
Cran—Wallace S. Johnston, 506 South Sue, Crane
Crocket—L. B. T. Sikes, Superintendent of Schools, Box 8, Ozona
Crosby—J. C. McNeill, 111, Crosbyton
Culberson—Herbert D. Smith, Box 898, Van Horn
Dallam—Newton Foster, 1020 Conlen, Dalhart
Dallas—Ed Gossett, 308 S. Akard, Dallas
Dawson—P. K. Humes, County Superintendent, Lamesa
Deaf Smith—Robert Wagner, 115 Centre Street, Hereford
Deaf—Theron Dale Stockton, Enloe
Denton—H. O. Harris, Box 854, Denton
DeWitt—W. F. Hancock, 105 McLeod Street, Cuero
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Dickens—Moyne L. Kelly, Dickens
Dimmitt—Herman Sullivan, Superintendent of Schools, Carrit Springs
Donley—Homer Estillack, Clarendon
Duval—Dr. A. N. Saenz, Drawer BB, Benavides
Eastland—Mrs. Joseph M. Perkins, Eastland
Ector—T. B. Harris, Jr., 309 North Lee, Odessa
Edwards—Paul E. Bar, Superintendent of Schools, Rocksprings
Ellis—Fred M. Shaw, Ferris
Erath—E. C. Johnson, Box 103, Stephenville
 Falls—Robert Burton, Box 43, Marlin
Fannin—J. W. Mouton, Superintendent of Schools, Bonham
Fayette—Robert Schafer, Schulenburg
Fisher—Nelson Smith, President, Rotan School Board, Roby
Floyd—H. H. Nicholas, Box 428, Lockney
Foard—Mike D. Bird, Crowell
Fort Bend—W. L. Angel, Richmond
Franklin—Hermon Connelly, Mount Vernon
Freestone—H. C. Goosby, Teague
Frio—Dr. Wendell E. Beall, Box 668, Pearsall
Gaines—Richard Jackson, Box 522, Seminole
Galveston—Joe Bowser, 2603 Houston Drive, W., La Marque
Garza—Dean A. Robinson, Box 366, Post
Gillespie—Alfred Crenwelge, 110 South Acorn, Fredericksburg
Glasscock—W. A. Wilson, Superintendent of Schools, Garden City
Goliad—Robert L. Moore, Superintendent of Schools, Goliad
Gonzales—Leland H. Dickson, Smiley
Gray—Audrey L. Steele, 221 North Gray, Pampa
Grayson—Byron Davis, Sherman
Gregg—Henry L. Foster, 607 North 3rd, Longview
Grimes—Gub Carter, Box 511, Navasota
Guadalupe—C. H. Donegan, Jr., Seguin
Hale—R. E. Payne, Hale County State Bank, Plainview
Hall—Miss Mary Foreman, Box 925, Memphis
Hamilton—R. B. Jackson, Hico
Hansford—H. R. Hartman, Superintendent of Schools, Spearman
Hardeman—Nolen L. Jones, 605 West 8th, Quanah
Hardin—E. M. Prewitt, Sibbee
Harris—W. L. Wheeler, 12674 Coulson Drive, Houston 15
Harrison—Gaines Baldwin, Box 329, Marshall
Hartley—John Bookout, Hartley
Haskell—Dale Graham, Rochester
Hayes—Mrs. Geo Scrutchins, 816 Belvin, San Marcos
Hempfling—Woodie E. Beene, Superintendent of Schools, Canadian
Henderson—Mrs. Wayne Justice, Crestway Drive, Athens
Hidalgo—Lloyd Lohridge, 301 East 10th, Mission
Hill—Loyd Forrest, Itasca
Hockley—Eddie Paxton, Levelland
Hood—Glenn C. Bowman, Granbury
Hopkins—Henry George Smith, Sulphur Springs
Houston—J. Marcus Mason, Box 450, Crockett
Howard—Dr. W. A. Hunt, President, Howard County Junior College
Big Spring
Hudspeth—James C. Cage, Box 98, Fort Hancock
Hunt—Jesse L. Miller, Box 993, Greenville
Hutchinson—M. W. Graves, County Superintendent, Stinnett
Irion—M. H. Carr, Sherwood
Jack—Ernest B. Whitaker, County Superintendent, Jacksboro
Jack—Gifford W. Hodges, 201 Central Drive, Edna
Jasper—Johnnie McLeod, Box 6018, Jasper
Jeff Davis—J. E. Grubb, Jr., Fort Davis
Jefferson—Dr. Joe Stoeltie, Box 672, Beaumont
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Jim Hogg—James G. Cole, Jr., Box 97, Hebbronville
Jim Wells—C. A. Thomelton, County Superintendent, Alice
Johnson—Willard Baker, 909 Forest, Cleburne
Jones—Otto Sosebee, Box 189, Anson
Karnes—Roy Freeman, Kenedy
Kaufman—Edward Nash, Box 400, Kaufman
Kendall—John W. Belsey, Comfort
Kenedy—Mrs. Mabel Tate, Principal, Novies School, Armstrong
Kent—R. E. Cooper, Superintendent of Schools, Jayton
Kerr—James Whelan, Jr., Ingram
Kimble—Grady Rogers, 212 Cenizo Street, Junction
King—Herman E. Walton, Box 1, Guthrie
Kinney—Marion H. Wills, Superintendent of Schools, Box 458, Bracketville
Kleberg—John S. Gillett, Box 871, Kingsville
Knox—Maricq McGaughey, Box 7, Benjamin
Lamar—Rosser E. Mason, County Courthouse, Paris
Lamb—Dr. Ralph Schilling, Box 1072, Littlefield
Lampasas—Mrs. Penrose Hirst, Lampasas
La Salle—Helen Storey, Box 246, Cotulla
Lavaca—W. A. Ellers, Box 284, Hallettsville
Lee—R. J. Heitmancik, County Superintendent, Giddings
Leon—J. S. Winn, Box 277, Centerville
Liberty—Lloyd E. Gilbert, Superintendent of Schools, Dayton
Limestone—Mrs. T. W. Wehley, Kosse
Lipscomb—Robert L. Green, Superintendent of Schools, Darrouzzet
Live Oak—William J. Van Klee, George West
Llano—Eloy M. Mayer, Llano
Loving—L. H. Welch, Principal, Loving School, Mentone
Lubbock—Dr. J. Davis Armstead, 1613 Avenue Q, Lubbock
Lynn—Mrs. Ruth Jolly, Box 878, Tahoka
Madison—R. M. Henderson, President, Farmers State Bank, Madisonville
Marion—W. J. Francis, 102 West Austin Street, Jefferson
Martin—Jess Miles, Route 1, Stanton
Mason—Carl Schmidt, Mason
Matagorda—John H. Cherry, Box 631, Bay City
Maverick—E. L. Walter, 330 Blanco Street, Eagle Pass
McClennan—Glen W. Rollins, 2620 Proctor, Waco
McMullen—Thomas A. Richey, County Superintendent, Tilden
Medina—E. G. Burges, Box 206, Castrovilla
Menard—Mrs. M. S. Leggett, Menard
Midland—J. Holt Jowell, 708 North Pecos, Midland
Milam—Hinton Pruett, Box 32, Cameron
Mills—John L. Patterson, Box 395, Goldthwaite
Mitchell—Charles C. Thompson, City National Bank, Colorado City
Montague—Henry W. Johnson, Box A, Montague
Montgomery—Tom W. Smith, County Superintendent, Conroe
Moore—E. A. Wootten, Dumas
Morris—Noble H. Moore, Daingerfield
Motley—Vance H. Gilbreath, Matador
Nacogdoches—Henry P. Schmidt, Box 928, Nacogdoches
Navarro—Mrs. Mildred Griffin, Frost
Newton—Aussie A. Miller, Burkeville
Nolan—Caffey Welch, Box 669, Sweetwater
Nueces—E. J. Wranscos, Route 4, Box 270, Corpus Christi
Ochiltree—Mrs. Max Boyer, Perryton
Oldham—Truman R. Har, Box 5371, Wildorado
Orange—Julian P. Greer, Superintendent of Schools, Vidor
Palo Pinto—B. H. Martin, Box 66, Palo Pinto
Panola—E. B. Morrison, Assistant Superintendent of Schools, Carthage
Parker—Bob Bergman, W. D. Dewberry Insurance Co., Weatherford
Parmer—Dillie M. Kelly, Box 607, Friona
Pecos—Paul Counts, County Superintendent, Fort Stockton
Pelt—Luther C. Moore, Box 706, Livingston
Potter—H. O. Williby, 30 Worldwide, Amarillo
Presidio—Roy H. Godbold, Marfa
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Rains—Carl W. Waddle, Superintendent of Schools, Emory
Randall—Dr. J. B. Roberts, 2406 Sixth Avenue, Canyon
Reagan—E. J. Compton, Texon
Real—W. B. Sentom, County Superintendent, Leakey
Red River—Kerritt Wommack, Superintendent of Schools, Detroit
Reeves—M. P. Withers, Box 722, Pecos
Refugio—W. F. Abney, Woodsboro
Roberts—J. W. Thompson, Box 235, Miami
Robertson—Leon Wilson, Hearne
Rockwall—J. A. Wilkerson, Rockwall
Runnels—W. E. Elkins, Box 597, Ballinger
Rusk—Homer L. Bryce, Box 870, Henderson
Sabine—John Lindsey, Pineland
San Augustine—Rep. George Goetz, San Augustine
San Jacinto—Walter T. Carter, Box 24, Coldspring
San Patricio—T. A. Harbin, Box 177, Mathis
San Saba—Jack B. Miller, San Saba
Schleicher—A. M. Whitis, Superintendent of Schools, Box 5728, Eldorado
Scurry—Orville Hess, Rt. 1, Lorraine
Shackelford—A. V. Jones, Jr., Box 206, Albany
Sherman—Jimmy Jones, Dads & Lads Shop, Center
Sherman—R. W. Standfield, Jr., Box 698, Strafford
Smith—A. Earl White, 1201 Peoples Bank Bldg., Tyler
Somervell—Mrs. Inez Ernst, Glenrose
 Starr—Arnulfo S. Martinez, 307 West Main Street, Rio Grande City
 Stephens—John Culwell, Superintendent of Schools, Breckenridge
Sterling—Jack Douthit, Editor, NEWS RECORD, Sterling City
Stonewall—Ralph Riddell, Aspermont
Sutton—Armer Earwood, Sonora
Swisher—Claude T. Shelton, Box AA, Tulia
Tarrant—Clyde R. Ashworth, 116 West Abram, Arlington
Taylor—Bobby Sayles, Tuscola
Terrell—Jack Hayre, Sanderson
Terry—H. L. King, 404 East Reppato, Brownfield
Throckmorton—Mrs. N. L. B. Davis, Throckmorton
Titos—Jerry Jones, Talco
Tom Green—Mrs. Ray Willoughby, 1123 Montecito Dr., San Angelo
Travis—Walter R. Koch, c/o Irby Carruth, Austin Public Schools
Trinity—L. F. Guseman, Groveton
Tyler—T. E. Howell, Box 457, Woodville
Upshur—Jesse K. Denson, Box 539, Gilmer
Upton—Norman Elrod, Rankin
Uvalde—F. E. Beecroft, Box 668, Uvalde
Val Verde—W. P. Wallace, Jr., Del Rio
Van Zandt—Clyde Elliott, Jr., Canton
Victoria—R. C. Pickett, Box 233, Victoria
Walker—Dr. Suler E. Ryan, 2110 Avenue M, Huntsville
Waller—Mrs. H. J. Boettcher, Waller
Ward—Charles Potts, Grandfalls
Washington—B. P. Greenwade, 316 Kober Street, Brenham
Webb—Elmore H. Barchers, Box 268, Laredo
Wharton—A. T. Leveridge, Jr., Attorney at Law, East Bernard
Wheeler—T. M. Britt, Wheeler
Wichita—Floyd L. Randel, 601 Lamar Street, Wichita Falls
Willbarger—Byron Phillips, Route 1, Vernon
Wilbarger—Rev. Franklin Hagberg, Lyford
Williamson—Gilbert Conoley, Box 249, Georgetown
Wilson—A. T. Hoelscher, Box 638, Floresville
Winkler—New H. Williams, Sr., WINKLER COUNTY NEWS, Kermit
Wise—Fred R. Nickles, Chico
Wood—J. D. Wolsey, Box 46, Winnsboro
Yoakum—A. B. Carpenter, Plains
Young—R. E. Thornton, Olney
Zapata—Leopoldo Martinez, Jr., Box 158, Zapata
Zavala—Lewis A. Pari, La Pryor