

THE INFLUENCE OF THE
OHIO EDUCATION ASSOCIATION UPON THE PUBLIC SCHOOL
FOUNDATION PROGRAM IN THE STATE OF OHIO FROM ITS INCEPTION UNTIL 1955

by Paul C. Hayes

Thesis presented to the Faculty of Arts
of the University of Ottawa through the
Institute of Psychology and Education as
partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Ottawa, Canada, 1963



UMI Number: DC53419

INFORMATION TO USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleed-through, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



UMI Microform DC53419
Copyright 2011 by ProQuest LLC
All rights reserved. This microform edition is protected against
unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.

ProQuest LLC
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The thanks of the writer of this thesis are gratefully extended to the Reverend Father Raymond H. Shevenell, O. M. I., Director of the Institute of Psychology, under whose guidance it was prepared.

CURRICULUM STUDIORUM

Paul C. Hayes was born in Hueysville, Kentucky, on January 1, 1923. The B. S. in Education was obtained from Wilmington College, Wilmington, Ohio, in 1947, and the M. A. in Education from Miami University, Oxford, Ohio, in 1948.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
INTRODUCTION.	vi
I.--PRESENTATION OF THE PROBLEM.	1
1. Statement of the Problem.	1
2. Need for Research	4
3. Limitations	8
4. Definition of Terms Used.	10
5. Survey of Literature.	11
6. Survey of Related Research.	17
7. History of State School Financing in Ohio	25
8. Summary and Basic Hypothesis.	31
II.--DISCUSSION OF DATA SOURCES	35
1. The General Assembly of the State of Ohio	35
2. Organization of the Ohio Education Association	39
3. Treatment of Specific Sources of Data.	43
III.--THE ORIGIN AND ENACTMENT OF THE PUBLIC SCHOOL FOUNDATION PROGRAM	51
1. Steps that Led to a Study of School Needs	51
2. The Establishment of the Survey Commission.	57
3. The Recommendations of the Survey Commission.	69
4. The Attempts to Enact the Foundation Program	77
5. The Benefits of the Public School Foundation Program.	99
6. Summary	101

TABLE OF CONTENTS

v

Chapter	page
IV.-THE LEGISLATIVE CHANGES IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOL	
FOUNDATION PROGRAM.	104
1. The Legal Changes	105
2. The Years of Deficit Financing.	111
3. The Increase in the Program in 1943	124
4. The Increase in the Program in 1945	133
5. The Increase in the Program in 1947	150
6. The Attempt of the Association to Increase the Program in 1949.	161
7. The Increase in the Program in 1951	169
8. The Activities of the Association in the 100th General Assembly.	183
9. Summary	193
 SUMMARY	 200
 CONCLUSION.	 211
 BIBLIOGRAPHY.	 213

Appendix

1.	Copies of Letters to the Writer Indicating a Need for Research.	216
2.	A Copy of Proposed Law to Establish a Minimum Teachers Schedule as Contained in Supplemental Petition	219
3.	Copy of the News Release by the President of the Ohio Education Association as to Filing of the Initiated Petition	230
4.	Copy of the Letter from the Secretary of State on the Ruling of the Petition and His Certification Thereof.	232
5.	Abstract of <u>The Influence of the Ohio Education Association Upon the Public School Foundation in the State of Ohio from its Inception until 1955.</u>	234

INTRODUCTION

One of the major concerns of teachers' organizations is the welfare of their membership. To a vast majority of the membership of any teachers' association the improvement of teacher welfare can be interpreted as involving monetary gains. This study will be concerned with the activities of one teachers' association--the Ohio Education Association--upon the Public School Foundation Program of the State of Ohio. It is from this Public School Foundation Program that the public schools of the State of Ohio receive a significant portion of the revenues from which they operate. Included in the revenues are not only funds for the general operation of the public schools but also funds for teachers' salaries.

The hypothesis of this study states that the Ohio Education Association has positively influenced the state legislators on behalf of the public schools of the State of Ohio as they initiated, saw enacted, and sought to improve the Ohio Public School Foundation Program.

Many people, lay citizens as well as teachers, have criticized the efforts of the Ohio Education Association directed toward influencing legislation favorable to the

public schools and teachers of the state. Many questions about the values of the activities of the association in the field of influencing legislators have been raised by such critics of the association. This seems to be especially true from the ranks of the teaching profession itself when the annual drive for association membership is launched.

Opponents of the association's legislative activity cite that the State of Ohio ranks near the top of the rankings of all states in our nation in state wealth and yet ranks but 38th in the nation in providing funds for its schools. Thus, if the Ohio Education Association has influenced the legislators, why hasn't the state government achieved a far-better record of supporting the public schools of the state? The answer usually given by the proponents of association activity is that if the Ohio Education Association had not been active and to some extent influential the records of the state financing of public education in Ohio would have been far worse.

Since there has been no study made of the Ohio Education Association's activities on behalf of school legislation it cannot be determined definitely whether or not the association has been influential in effecting legislation for the

public schools. Also it cannot be precisely determined whether the efforts of the association have been beneficial or harmful to the teaching profession of the state. This thesis proposes to gather and organize data which will be helpful in answering these questions.

The membership of the Ohio Education Association consists of those people certified by the Ohio State Department of Education to work in the public schools in the state, and who have voluntarily paid their membership dues to the association. Thus, the Ohio Education Association is essentially synonymous with the public school teaching profession of the state. The association, therefore, logically has a fundamental interest in public education in the state and the welfare of public school teachers.

To assess the influences of the Ohio Education Association upon the enacted state legislation seemed to this writer to require a systematic study of the character, habits, and patterns of thought of both the Ohio Education Association and the state legislative bodies. This thesis does not undertake to study the constant and variable characteristics of the law making body or of the teaching profession. The purpose of this thesis is, rather, to set forth in an orderly manner the

activities of the Ohio Education Association that were directed toward initiating, enacting, and modifying the Ohio Public School Foundation Program. The study is then concerned with activities of the association from the inception of the Foundation Program in 1935 up to 1955. An attempt is made to indicate to what degree the association was successful in its efforts to effect legislation.

It would seem, since possibly every teachers' association in the United States is, in one way or another, engaged in attempting to influence their state legislators, that many studies of this kind would have already been made. However, this is not the case. A number of writers have indicated a need for greater research activity in this area. This need will be pointed out in Chapter I. Related studies are also presented in this chapter with appropriate appraisal of such studies. A brief history of public school financing is included to acquaint the reader with the type and kinds of aid that the State of Ohio had been giving to its public schools prior to the beginning of the period covered by this thesis.

Chapter II sketches the general characteristics of the General Assembly of the State of Ohio and the Ohio

Education Association in order to facilitate discussion later in the research report. This chapter also considers specific sources of data and discusses the reliability of such data sources as well as their particular worth and authenticity.

Chapter III relates the activities and efforts of the Ohio Education Association on behalf of the formulation and enactment of the Public School Foundation Law.

The following chapter delineates the activities of the association, its membership, and interested citizens of the state on behalf of the improvement of the Public School Foundation Program following its enactment. Efforts to rid the program of deficit financing and general improvements made in the program until 1955 are enumerated.

Finally, the last chapter presents a summary of the entire thesis along with a statement of conclusions and implications for teachers' associations based upon the conclusions.

CHAPTER I

PRESENTATION OF PROBLEM

This chapter presents the problem, the need for research, study limitations, definition of terms used, and a survey of the literature and studies related to the influence of educational associations upon public school legislation. A brief history of school finance in the state of Ohio is sketched. Finally, the related literature and research are summarized and the basic research hypothesis is stated.

1. Statement of the Problem

As long as the public schools remain relatively free to every boy and girl of school age, ways must be found to adequately finance public education. The schools in the State of Ohio differ little in this respect from their counterparts in the other states of our nation. They must depend upon both local financing and state financing. If there is not sufficient wealth in the local community for the support of the schools, localities must turn to the state for additional help.

It is generally conceded that one of the most difficult things for the state legislature to do is to raise money through taxation for public institutions such as the schools. Further, since the schools are supported through taxation, a prerogative of the taxpaying public is, therefore, the opportunity to openly criticize and evaluate the schools as they do. This prerogative is exercised especially if the public institution in consideration is close to the taxpaying public and relies on public funds to a great extent for its support. The public schools meet both of these criteria. While such criticisms are hopefully directed toward improvement, there are always those groups of people who ban together to shout "waste" and "squandering" at public operated institutions, including the schools. Who, then, is to fight for adequate financing of the public schools? A cursory survey of educational literature reveals that a great deal has been written about the role of educational associations in the influencing of favorable public school legislation.

One measure of the success of an educational association is, in fact, the degree to which it has been effective in getting espoused legislation passed for the benefit of its

membership, particularly if such legislation involves monetary considerations. Little empirical support, however, has been amassed to objectively attest to the success of educational associations in this regard. This study seeks, therefore, to assess the effectiveness of one educational association, the Ohio Education Association, in the passage of legislation relating to one legislative program, the Ohio Public School Foundation Program.

The researcher proposes to add to the general knowledge in regard to educational associations by presenting a study of what the Ohio Education Association is doing to better the financial welfare of education and thereby assist its membership in carrying out their responsibilities as teachers in the public schools of the State of Ohio. The problem upon which this study will focus can be presented in the form of a question: How, and to what extent, has the Ohio Education Association influenced legislation impinging on the Ohio Public School Foundation Program? The problem is, therefore, concerned with the activities and means used by the Ohio Education Association in promoting favorable

legislation concerning the Public School Foundation Program in the State of Ohio from its inception to 1955.

2. Need for Research

Each year shortly after school begins, a membership drive is launched by the Ohio Education Association. Some teachers and administrators are, however, reluctant to pay their membership fees; they want to know what the association is doing, or has done, for teachers and education in general before giving their support.

This researcher, a superintendent of schools for the past fifteen years, has had many experiences in trying to answer such questions to the satisfaction of a school staff. In fact, the association's officers have been asked by the researcher to furnish irrefutable data concerning this problem, and it was found that they could not, other than in terms of gross generalities. It would seem, however, that all professional organizations would desire and seek to have such information available.

The Executive Secretary of the Ohio Education Association, Walton Bliss, has evidenced interest in a study of

the association's influence upon the Public School Foundation Program in a letter¹ to the researcher stating that while the association feels that they have definitely influenced legislation and the legislature, they would welcome any documentation of the association's efforts in order to conclusively support or refute their claims. The letter also points out that any such documentation would provide a needed portion of history for the association's future use.

Tom O'Keefe, Research Director of the Ohio Education Association, wrote a similar letter² saying that while there was no doubt in his mind that the association had been most effective, he would welcome evidence so that it might be presented to the skeptics, as well as having it for his files as a historical segment of the association's activities.

To date, there has been very little documentation of the work of educational associations in the area of attempted influence upon legislators to provide legislation favorable to educators or education. Umstattd³ noted that:

1 See letter from Walton Bliss to the researcher in Appendix 1, p. 217.

2 See letter from Tom O'Keefe to the researcher in Appendix 1, p. 218.

3 J. H. Umstattd, "Teacher's Associations, Organizations and Unions", Review of Educational Research, Vol. 7, June 1937, p. 314.

PRESENTATION OF PROBLEM

6

The field of educational organizations offers a rich area for research. Profitable studies could be made of the origins and personnel of educational organizations. Comparison of their aims, activities, and achievements would be valuable. These would be filling a real void in American education.

The dearth of studies related to educational organizations or associations is difficult to understand. This is particularly true when each state association has as one of its avowed purposes, the promotion of teacher welfare. One of the major ways to promote teacher welfare is through seeing that the schools in which the teachers are employed have enough money to pay salaries commensurate with other professional workers, as well as to provide a commensurate working environment. It seems, however, that little research in this regard has been carried on in the field of education at any level.

Elsbree⁴ writes in his report on teacher organizations of 1943, that in an inquiry he made to state associations in November, 1943 concerning their fields of interest, he found the associations were more actively working on state support

4 Willard S. Elsbree, "United States", Educational Year Book, New York, International Institute of Teachers Colleges, Teachers College Columbia University, 1935, p. 545.

for education and the enactment of desirable legislation for the schools than any other association activity. These two points of emphasis did, in fact, overshadow all other activities of the associations.

It would seem that each state association, in order to satisfy its own skeptics, would desire to have its efforts documented in regard to legislative activities. The association's activities depend upon the money derived from its membership--the teachers in the field. The influence of the association's activities is also derived from the number of members that are controlled in the field. Yet, associations seemingly go on without too great of a concern about the documentation of their activities.

As late as 1951, Martin,⁵ in the National Education Association Magazine, wrote that a comprehensive study of state educational associations should be undertaken. He said that studies have been made, but fresh and up-to-date statistics are needed. State association achievements deserve a conspicuous place, according to Martin, in modern literature.

5 T. D. Martin, "Resume¹ of State Associations", National Education Association, Vol. 40, May 1951, p. 351.

The lack of studies in this field indicates a need for research so that the associations of the various states may vindicate or support themselves as is necessary. According to some writers it would seem that these state education associations are claiming to influence legislation a great deal; however, they cannot offer valid proof of their claims. It would be of great benefit to associations, as well as to the educators in the field, to have a history of what their association is doing in order to evaluate its program and to furnish an orderly record for future association members. Historical documentation of legislative activities of various associations needs to be written so that this phase of the educational process might be better understood.

3. Limitations

In the 116th year of history of the Ohio Education Association, the association has engaged in many and diverse activities. It would be hard to conceive that the association has not expended some energy in attempting to gain favorable types of legislation for its membership; however, it is beyond the scope of one researcher to make an all inclusive, detailed

study of the association's many and varied legislative activities. Therefore, the research study herein reported is limited to the work done by the association relating to the Public School Foundation Program from its inception to 1955. A study of this kind would seem to require an analysis of the activities of both the educational association and the general assembly or legislature of the state.

The thesis does not attempt to delimit all of the constant and variable characteristics of the legislative body or of the Ohio Education Association. Further, consideration is not given here to the composition, leadership, contrasting social and political philosophies, or the surrounding circumstances of legislation which, if this could be assessed, might aid in explaining the varying reception of the ideas that were proposed by the Ohio Education Association. The study seeks only to set forth in an orderly and chronological manner, the activities of the Ohio Education Association relative to the Public School Foundation Program and to ascertain the results of such activities on ensuing legislation.

4. Definition of Terms Used

The term, Ohio Education Association, as used in this thesis, is defined as the group of teachers and school administrators from the state at large who have voluntarily paid their dues to the association and the members of the association's central office service staff. Both the membership and the central association staff exercise control over the policies and practices of the association, and are active in matters that directly affect the association.

The Ohio Public School Foundation Program, as used in this thesis, refers to the minimum school program which the State of Ohio guarantees to any school district in the state that meets the minimum school requirements as established by the State Department of Education, and whose local taxes are levied on an approved basis or maintain the minimum required tax rate as specified by state law. There are two categories of disbursements from the state to local school districts according to the Ohio Foundation Program; the flat distribution, and additional aid. Flat distribution is that which is paid on a per-pupil basis from the Ohio public school fund to all

Ohio school districts that are accredited by the Ohio State Department of Education. Additional aid is that which is paid to any school district in the State of Ohio levying the required amount of local taxation and receiving the flat distribution but still unable to meet the minimum program as set up by the Ohio Public School Foundation Program.

5. Survey of Literature Relevant to the Study.

An increasingly important body in terms of influence is the state education association. As early as 1926, John Gronrud, in his study of the organization and the objectives of the state teacher's association, made the following point:

There must, therefore, be some agency which is willing to promote the public good, rather than provide ends, and which is capable of influencing public sentiment. Without such an agency progress must inevitably be desultory and haphazard. No agency is better fitted by training, interest, and experience to secure this program in public education than is the teacher's group itself. The individual teacher, however, working as an individual has little influence. In order to secure effective action in a democracy, there must be a group of individuals working together with a common purpose. The strength of numbers acting as a unit is a tremendous asset.⁶

6 John Gronrud, The Organizations and Objectives of State Teacher's Associations, New York, Teacher's College, Columbia University, 1926, p. 6-7.

He stated further that the need for a group power, working on behalf of the interest of their own members without losing sight of public betterment, was the reason for the first group of teachers to form together in a state teacher's association. An analysis of the purpose of state teacher's associations as defined in their constitutions show that without exception they have all been organized on this basis.⁷

Albert Crawford in 1932 made a similar statement in his writings.

A careful investigation of the purpose of state education associations shows conclusively that the primary purpose of the association is to further the educational interest of the state and protect and advance the welfare of the teachers.⁸

Thus, it seems from these two writers that state teacher's educational organizations are logical groups for handling the sponsorship of educational interests and have, in fact, made this one of their avowed purposes.

7 Ibid, p. 7.

8 Albert B. Crawford, Critical Analysis of the Present Statutes and Significant Ties of State Educational Associations of the United States, Bureau of School Service, IV, No. 4, June, 1932, p. 123.

Willard Elsbree,⁹ in a talk before a convention in 1935, echoed the above two writers when he said that fostering professional growth, furthering teacher welfare, supporting desirable legislation, and cultivating public welfare were the activities of primary concern to educational associations. These activities were followed in order by a number of other functions of lesser importance; but the activities of lesser importance were the activities in which Elsbree had, in fact, found education associations to be engaged.

Twelve years later, Harold Nichols¹⁰ discovered in his study that the tendency of educational associations is to better the economic status of teachers. This is sought not through the setting up of placement bureaus, or the giving of group insurance, or the establishing of credit unions, but rather, through the sponsoring of desirable legislation impinging on education which would improve the status of the teachers. From this study it appears that at least some state education associations are engaging in promoting legislation that would benefit their members.

9 Willard Elsbree, "Activities of State Associations", Educational Year Book, New York, Teacher's College, Columbia University, 1935, p. 544.

10 Harold L. Nichols, Activities of the State Educational Association, unpublished Master's thesis, presented to the School of Education, Columbus, Ohio State University, 1947, p. 45.

Willard Givens, past Executive Secretary of the National Education Association, stated a most positive position in writing in 1956 that,

Each state has a forward looking professional program which is demanding better education for all children, and better working conditions for teachers.¹¹

He continued to develop his position by pointing out that various state education associations have become increasingly significant in regard to the advancement of education and are now among the most important means by which educational conditions are being improved throughout the United States.¹²

These statements, coming from a man closely related to the workings of both state and national associations, should bear considerable weight, particularly in the area of school-community relations. If nothing else, such statements should give courage to education associations throughout the land to increase the scope and intensity of their activities.

Not all writers, however, agree that educational associations have been successful in their attempts to get favorable legislation enacted.

¹¹ Willard E. Givens, "Growth of the Association Idea", Phi Delta Kappa, Vol. 37, Jan. 1956, p. 173.

¹² Ibid, p. 174.

Clowd seemed to chide state teacher's organizations in 1932 when he stated,

The state teacher's association as it functions in the United States is a policy forming organization, but besides that it must put into operation movements which will bring about good school conditions. Those in control of its operations must inaugurate procedures which will operate for the welfare of the schools and for the teachers employed therein. It must bind the teachers of the state into a single unit to accomplish its purpose.¹³

Hanna noted in early 1944 that,

It is common knowledge that education receives far too little of the National income to permit schools to do the job as effective as the public demands. The salaries of teachers today appear near the bottom of a rank order of increases. With a tremendous increase in National income, the educational salaries remain static, while labor, agriculture, and management have gone steadily forward. Well organized groups, one after another, have successfully put through their programs, while the education profession has failed repeatedly in attaining favorable action on educational measures.¹⁴

The above statements appear to indicate that education associations may not be making sufficient gains to warrant the growing comments from some educators cited before.

13 R. W. Clowd, "Definite Benefits of National, State, and local Teachers' Organizations", National Education Association Proceedings, Vol. 70, 1932, p. 178.

14 P. R. Hanna, "In Union There is Strength", in Educational Leadership, Vol. 1, Feb. 19, 1944, p. 299.

Sexton¹⁵ seems, at least to this researcher, to sum the matter up for the great majority of writers when he observes that state teacher associations are closest to the problems of public education in America, and they have had the greatest potential influence upon the support, growth, administration, and progress of the public schools. These associations, according to Sexton, have competed successfully for adequate tenure, pay, retirement, sick leave, disability protection, and have, in innumerable ways, improved the material welfare of teachers.

However, none of the foregoing writers stated specifically how state associations go about promoting legislation, or give any definite criteria to strengthen their point of view. These men seem to be basing their beliefs and writings upon a survey of what state educational associations say they are doing, or what men in the field think is happening, rather than from a thorough investigation of what is actually taking place.

15 J. A. Sexton, "Functions of Professional Organizations of Teachers", School Executive, Vol. 68, June, 1949, p. 13.

6. Survey of Related Research

Several research studies were found to have a direct bearing on the problem under investigation. This section will discuss and give a brief analysis of each of these studies, as well as point out the relationship of the related research studies to this thesis.

A study by Curtis,¹⁶ The Influence of the Teaching Profession of Idaho Upon the Course of Legislation, is concerned with the legislative bills that the Idaho Teacher's Association has claimed to espouse. Curtis assumed a cause and effect relationship that may or may not be true. If a given bill were enacted into law, it was treated as if the Idaho Teacher's Association had a definite influence upon the adoption of the bill. Curtis at no time dealt with the background work and activities that were carried on by the Idaho Teacher's Association to encourage passage of a particular bill. The failure of a bill that was strongly supported by the Idaho Teacher's Association could well have resulted from

16 George Henry Curtis, The Influence of the Teaching Profession of Idaho Upon the Course of Legislation, unpublished Master's thesis, presented to the Department of Education, Boise, University of Idaho, 1951, 138 p.

other influences, circumstances, or pressures. Conversely, a bill that was passed could have been due to other influences, circumstances, or pressures than those of the Teacher's Association. In fact, the association could have had little, if any, impact on some enacted legislation.

In spite of this, Curtis concludes from his study that all important activities for the welfare of teachers had been centered in the Idaho State Teacher's Association. The only relationship that can be identified between Curtis' study and this one is that they both are attempting to deal with state teacher's associations' influences upon legislation in their respective states. Curtis' thesis covers the entire field of legislative activity by the Idaho Teacher's Association while this thesis deals with the influence of the Ohio Education Association on one legislative program, the Ohio Public School Foundation Program.

Walters,¹⁷ through a study of the Colorado Education Association's records, attempts to identify and define the

17 Newall Burl Walters, History of the Legislative Policy of the Colorado Education Association, unpublished Master's Thesis presented to the Department of Education, Denver, University of Denver, 1940, p. 126.

the interest and attitudes of that association relating to legislation pertinent to public education. But as was the case in the Curtis study, Walters also failed to delineate the activities of the Colorado Teacher's Association in relation to espoused legislation. Rather, he dealt with the long range policy and attitudes of the Colorado Teacher's Association that were considered to be beneficial to educational legislation. Walters mentioned certain groups that were opposed to legislation sponsored by the Colorado Teacher's Association and pointed out that such legislation was passed over and against the wishes of the opposition of the association. Within his study there are many generalities not supported with specific fact; however, he concluded that:

The Colorado Education Association which was founded in 1857 has a record of which its members, past and present, may be justly proud. It has long been in the forefront of every battle that has been fought in the state.¹⁸

Walters justified his conclusion by attempting to show that the over-all record of the interests of the Colorado

18 Ibid. p. 72.

Teacher's Association in their eighty year history has been one of continuous promotion for the school systems of that state. He was, though, unable to show concrete results of the Colorado Teacher's Association's legislative program. Also, he does not follow any one specific phase of legislation to show the activities of the association on behalf of a given school measure. Walters appears to be drawing his inference from the facts that the association has shown a definite interest in legislative matters in the State of Colorado, and that many of these matters were enacted into law.

The thesis by Walters deals with policies and attitudes, where this thesis is concerned with the activities and results of such activities of the Ohio Education Association upon a particular legislative program that is sponsored by the Ohio Education Association.

It is interesting to note in a study by Hornbostel¹⁹ that of the various groups that have influenced school financial policy in Wisconsin, the Wisconsin Teacher's Association,

19 Victor Hornbostel, The Formulation of State Public School Financial Policy in Wisconsin, 1921 to 1951, unpublished Doctor's thesis presented to the Department of Education, Madison, University of Wisconsin, 1954, p. 190.

numbered among the interested groups, was comparatively inactive. The association was, in fact, credited with originating only twenty-seven of 180 bills that he studied.

Hornbostel also noted that the bills sponsored by the Wisconsin Teacher's Association were primarily side issues in the sense that they were concerned with peripheral matters such as sick leave or minimum salaries for teachers. The association's interest in a financial bill for public education was only to see that these above provisions were placed into the bill for the teachers' benefit. Hornbostel's thesis deals with a wide range of groups who were interested in shaping the public school financial policy in Wisconsin. The Governor, the legislature, the teaching profession, the State Department of Education, and other interested groups were identified as playing a part in determining the state educational finance policy.

Battles,²⁰ in his study of the preparation, promotion, and enactment of school legislation by the Oklahoma Teacher's Association, comes nearest to approximating this

20 Edward Everett Battles, Preparing, Promoting and Enacting School Legislation in Oklahoma, unpublished Doctor's Thesis presented to the School of Education, Palo Alto, Leland Stanford Junior University, 1949, p. 294.

study. The Battles's study deals with a three year period during which a special legislative program was to be enacted. The study describes in detail the activities of the Oklahoma Teacher's Association to promote legislation, as well as the measures taken by the association to combat opposition to their program. The program with which the association was concerned was the four point constitutional amendment program, whereby the association attempted, and succeeded, in getting the four constitutional amendments on the ballot as a result of an initiated petition. For a year of this period, Battles served as the president of the Oklahoma Teacher's Association and actually worked with the association in preparing these four constitutional amendments. He concluded that state teacher's associations have startling political power and influence when they have been properly organized and have good leadership.

Battles's study would be more conclusive, however, if he could have followed the legislative program for a longer period of time, for example four or five years, to see how the amendments were modified or changed by the legislators,

including influences on such modifications or changes by the teacher's association, following their enactment.

Crossan²¹ studied the legislation proposed by the California Teacher's Association to the state legislature of California. In this study, Crossan uses only the records of the California Teacher's Association to determine what legislation was proposed. He did not go into the background of, or activities related to, these bills, but merely accepted the words of the California Teacher's Association that they had proposed such bills. He concluded that the California Teacher's Association from 1951 to 1953 had a perfect record in terms of the bills they strongly opposed, and an almost perfect record in regard to proposed legislation which they actively supported.

Crossan has also covered the entire field of legislative activities by the California State Teacher's Association. He did not attempt to follow one specific legislative program to determine the success or failure of the association over a period of years in regard to a given program. His

21 Robert D. Crossan, Legislation Proposed to the State Legislature of California Relative to Public Education from 1941 to 1953, unpublished Doctor's Thesis presented to the Department of Education, Los Angeles, University of Southern California, 1955, p. 248.

study, as was the case with the Curtis study, assumes a cause and effect relationship which may or may not have existed; however, Crossan, by the sheer number of bills that were proposed by the California Teacher's Association, could safely conclude that the association must have been somewhat effective since the majority of proposed bills were enacted into law.

In the State of Ohio, no study of the Ohio Education Association's attempts to influence legislation was found by this researcher.

Augsburger,²² in his thesis on the history of the Ohio State Teacher's Association, states that the association has helped to create public sentiment for better schools and has secured passage of many progressive school measures. Nowhere in his thesis, however, does Augsburger document the above statement by showing a direct relationship between that which was espoused by the Ohio Education Association and that which was later enacted.

22 Fred Augsburger, The History of the Ohio State Teacher's Association, unpublished Master's Thesis, presented to the Department of Education, Columbus, Ohio State University, 1928, p. 205.

Bliss²³ wrote a pamphlet enumerating what he considers to be the major accomplishments of the Ohio Education Association in regard to legislative activity from 1933 to 1949, but he made no attempt to verify the accuracy of this report. While not formal research, the effort does represent a subjective appraisal of one association's activities written for the consumption of the members of the association.

The studies reviewed in this section reveal a weakness. The forty-eight state education associations in the United States claim to have affected the course of education and to have given benefits to their members through their respective association's legislative activities. Yet, none of these associations has taken a single legislative program from its inception through its enactment and later modifications and proved conclusively that the association was at least one of the causes for passage of the legislation.

7. History of State School Financing in Ohio

In order to properly orient the reader, it is felt that a background of state school financing in Ohio should

23 Walton Bliss, Executive Secretary, Sweet Sixteen, Columbus, Ohio Education Association, 1949, p. 16.

be given. The State of Ohio has, in one way or another, been a contributor to the financing of public education since the inception of the state in 1803. The Public School Foundation Program enacted in 1935, however, changed all previous methods and patterns of state public school support; therefore, in order to understand the change, it is necessary to know something about what preceded the change.

The chief reference source for this section is Robert Jenkins's²⁴ doctoral dissertation, Financing Public Schools Education in Ohio, unless otherwise stated.

From the beginning, the people of the State of Ohio have been dedicated and committed to the principle that the education of the state's youth must be fostered. The first official proclamation was in the Northwest Ordinance of 1787 which stated that religion, morality, and knowledge, being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools, and the means of education shall forever be encouraged. To assist in and encourage education in the Northwestern

24 Robert Jenkins, Financing Public Schools Education in Ohio, unpublished doctoral thesis, presented to the School of Commerce, Columbus, Ohio State University, 1951, p. 208.

Territory, the Federal Government initiated a policy in Ohio of granting portions of public land for school support. Section sixteen of each township was set aside for educational purposes, and proceeds from the sale of this land is recognized perpetual obligation of the state to its public schools.

The Constitutional Convention of 1851 reiterated the ordinance of 1787, and the General Assembly was empowered to make provisions by taxation, or otherwise, that would establish a good efficient system of common schools throughout the state. However, the General Assembly set up machinery for administering the school lands in the sixteenth section of each township, but left the administration and financing of education in local hands.²⁵

In 1912, another constitutional convention resulted in an amendment which opened the way for a new state-school relationship. The amendment stated: "Provision shall be made by law for the organization, administration, and control of the public school system of the state supported by public funds . . ."²⁶

25 Constitution of the State of Ohio, Article IV, Section 2.

26 Ibid, Article VI, Section 3.

Prior to 1920, the public schools of the state were considered to be a local function with little help needed from, or to be assumed by, the state. There was some realization at this time of the need for aiding weak districts by the state, and in 1920 a step forward was made toward helping such districts when a tax of 1.8 mills was levied at the state level and redistributed on the basis of an enumeration of school-age youth in each district. The state also at this time set up a fund of \$500,000 for assisting weak school districts. A percentage of teacher salaries and transportation costs was paid by the State of Ohio to public schools which fulfilled minimum state educational requirements; many districts, however, failed to make use of this aid because school financing was still considered a local function.

In 1921, a state aid bill was passed which levied .15 mills for weak districts. This levy was introduced in 1923 and the funds were taken from the general state revenue. The only other state revenue in school financing at this time was the matching of Federal funds for vocational classes, and

the provision of funds for classes for handicapped children. Then in 1925, authority was granted for a tax of 2.65 mills to be levied by the county and redistributed within the county for equalization purposes. Obviously, this did nothing to effect inter-county equalization.

When further relief was deemed necessary in 1929, the legislature authorized a state aid law. Each participating district was required to levy 9.5 mills. If this did not supply sufficient funds for school needs, the state was to pay the difference from a fund provided by the cigarette tax.

The economic collapse which came in 1929 was financially disastrous to the schools. Property values dropped, taxes were in arrears, and more and more schools had to apply for state aid under the 1929 authorization. The problem was further complicated in 1933 when the voters in the State of Ohio reduced the Constitutional Limitation from 15 to 10 mills. This necessitated the repeal of the county tax used for equalization because the 9.5 mills would not fit within the new limitation. School districts were authorized at this time by

the state to issue notes for needed funds, with the state paying off the notes from the cigarette tax as fast as they received cigarette tax revenue. (It should be pointed out that this stopgap measure was continued until 1938.) In 1933, the legislature earmarked .01¢ of the liquid fuel tax to be distributed to schools on a per pupil basis. A new intangible property tax was also levied by the county and distributed by the state. Even this failed to alleviate the problem, so in 1934 the 3% sales tax was passed with 60% of its proceeds being earmarked for public schools. But, because of the decrease in local valuation and in property tax rates, this source of funds still resulted in insufficient income for the schools; it only made up for part of the loss that was incurred from the depression.

The year 1935 brought the enactment of the Public School Foundation Program Law,²⁷ and the state began taking an active part in the financing of the public schools of the state. It can readily be seen that the state had no consistent policy for the state portion of the financing of the public schools until the Public School Foundation Program was passed

27 Laws of Ohio, Vol. 116, 1935, pp. 586-592.

in 1935. Prior to this time there was no thought of establishing a state minimum program of finance for all schools, and little, if any, controls were set up to insure a minimum educational program for all of the children of the state. Except for a series of stopgap measures, the state left the matter of the financing of the public schools up to local authorities.

8. Summary and Basic Hypothesis

The survey of literature relevant to the study clearly substantiates the notion that state teacher's associations have a potential to influence and support legislative programs at the state level. It is, in fact, a recognized function of the state teacher's association to promote teacher and educational welfare through legislative related activity, but conclusions based on the evidence found in relevant literature are necessarily limited. Most of the writings in general educational literature pertaining to educational associations reveal a bias of the author and are written from a more subjective than objective perspective.

Research to date on the effect of state teacher's associations on legislation benefiting teachers and education in general has had some serious limitations. First of all, a cause and effect relationship is often assumed with little evidence that such a relationship existed. State association backing cannot be viewed as the "cause" merely due to the enactment of espoused legislation. The studies reviewed also failed to illustrate how, and in what ways, influence was exerted by state teacher's associations on desired legislation. The means and procedures used in the process of influence were not delineated let alone analyzed.

Related studies further reveal a methodological shortcoming. In only one instance was a longitudinal approach taken in the intensive researching of one legislative program. The other studies chose to examine enacted and rejected legislation over a period of time, thereby eliminating the chance for intensive study of the ways influence and support were exercised. It is beyond the scope of a single researcher to, for example, comprehensively analyze all of the legislative activity of an education association

in regard to all of the legislative programs in which they have interest for even a five-year period.

The use of only association documents, as was generally the case, limits seriously both the reliability and validity of the studies. Far more than the records of one organization need to be examined to maintain objectivity. By and large, records of the legislature were bypassed by the researchers.

One conclusion can be drawn, however, from previous research studies; state teacher's associations do actively attempt to influence state legislative programs that affect the welfare of education, and the teachers within the state.

It is now necessary to go beyond the mere facts that legislative activity is appropriate for teacher's associations, that this is a function of the teacher's associations, and that associations can affect legislation at the state level. Empirical evidence is needed to show how and in what ways legislative programs are influenced by teacher's associations. It seems to this researcher that the best way to get at this problem is through an intensive examination of what

one state association did in reference to one legislation program. Such a study would need to be concerned with the various activities of the association used in promoting the desired legislation, as well as association activity following enactment that is directed toward modification and improvement of the enacted legislation.

This study is then concerned with the question of how one state association affected a given legislative program. The basic study hypothesis can be stated in the form of a question: How, and to what extent, has the Ohio Education Association influenced legislation impinging on the Ohio Public School Foundation Program from its inception to 1955?

It is from this question that the present investigation has grown. The researcher seeks to set out in an orderly and chronological manner, the various activities of the Ohio Education Association related to the Public School Foundation Program as it was enacted, and as it was modified up to 1955.

CHAPTER II

DISCUSSION OF DATA SOURCES

Since we are concerned with the influence of the Ohio Education Association upon the legislature of the State of Ohio, it seems necessary to sketch the essential characteristics of these bodies; this could conveniently be considered as the definition of terms. Although it may be quite elementary, an understanding of the basic characteristics of these groups will facilitate discussion later in the research report.

Because all of the data used in this study will be derived from available documents, it is also necessary to examine the documents (basic data sources) closely for their authenticity and reliability, as well as to discuss their treatment in relation to the study.

1. The General Assembly of the State of Ohio

The General Assembly of the State of Ohio is composed of two houses: the House of Representatives and the

Senate.²⁸ The officers of these two houses are elected to serve for a two-year term of office. The legislative powers of the state are vested in the General Assembly; however, the people of the state reserve for themselves the right of initiative and referendum.²⁹ The laws of the State of Ohio are enacted by the General Assembly, but the people of the state may propose a law to the General Assembly by presenting to the Secretary of the State ten days prior to the meeting of the General Assembly, a petition signed by three percent of the electors upon which is written the full text of the proposed law. The Secretary of State, after verifying the signatures, then presents the law to the General Assembly. If the proposed law is not enacted, or if it is amended, it shall be submitted by the state to the electors for their approval or rejection.³⁰

Each house is required to keep a record of proceedings, and the vote of each member can be recorded at the

²⁸ The Constitution of the State of Ohio, Article II, Section 1.

²⁹ Ibid, Article II, Section 1B.

³⁰ Ibid, Article II, Section 2.

desire of any two members; however, on the passage of every bill in either house, the vote has to be taken by ayes and nays and entered in the journal.³¹ With the constitution reading as it does, when a bill is lost, the vote of individual members need not be recorded.

A record is not kept of committee hearings or open hearings by either house. In other words, anyone may speak on any bill and not have an official record made of his remarks. The sponsoring body of a bill need not keep records, and no record is made in the General Assembly of pressure groups or their tactics. The only name that is affixed to a bill is the name of the Senator or Representative sponsoring the bill in that house. All that any organization needs to do to get a bill into the hopper is to find a Representative who is willing to sponsor it for them. This, obviously, might work to the advantage of a lobbying group with a vested interest. Thus, a lobbyist could stay in the background and give financial support without making public his actions.

Bills may originate in either house and may be amended by either house or rejected by either house.³² This sometimes

31 Ibid, Article II, Section 2.

32 Ibid, Article II, Section 15.

causes a great deal of confusion, because the legislators may pass a bill back and forth from one house to the other for weeks. It is, however, the usual procedure for the two houses to appoint a committee to work out the differences and bring the bill back for a vote.

The Governor of the State of Ohio is the chief executive officer.³³ His contact with the legislature may, or may not, be important. He is required to communicate at every session of the legislature, as to the condition of the state, and make recommendations as he sees fit.³⁴ While the legislature is required to listen to the Governor, they are, of course, under no obligation to follow his recommendations. There is the veto power, however, which is given to the Governor of the state if he does not desire and/or endorse the legislation that is being passed, he may refuse to sign it when it comes to his desk for his signature. The legislature then must pass the bill again by two-thirds affirmative vote in order to override his veto.³⁵ This power of veto makes

33 Ibid, Article III, Section 5.

34 Ibid, Article III, Section 7.

35 Ibid, Article II, Section 16.

it most desirable for any group wanting a bill passed to have the approval of the Governor before the bill is presented.

2. Organization of the Ohio Education Association

The Ohio Education Association was formed on December 30, 1847. It was, of necessity, a very simple and informally structured organization. It has grown to a far more complex structure at the present time, with three important divisions: Legislation, Administration, and Research.

At the first meeting of the association in 1847, Mr. M. F. Cowdery was elected as the association's first chairman. The small group attending this meeting drew up a constitution. Article VII of the Constitution set in motion the administrative body which has to this day administered the affairs of the Ohio Education Association. This seventh article, as presented in the Centennial History of the Ohio Education Association, by Minnich,³⁶ reads as follows:

36 Harvey C. Minnich, Centennial History of the Ohio Education Association, Columbus, Ohio Education Association, 1947, p. 33.

The Executive Committee shall put into effect all orders and resolutions of the association and shall devise and put into operation such other measures not inconsistent with the objectives of this association as it shall deem best. It shall fix the time and place for holding all regular meetings of the association, and shall appoint at least one annual meeting each year, secure speakers, and arrange business to come before the association. It shall keep a full record of its proceedings, and present an annual report of the same to the association.

There are various departments and district associations that are divisions of the Ohio Education Association. Each of these divisions is represented on the Executive Committee. Through the years, the Executive Committee has grown from its original membership of seven, to its present twenty-one members. There is one phrase in the present constitution that gives this group wide and sweeping powers yet today. It states that the Executive Committee might put into operation measures not inconsistent with the interests and objectives of the association without submitting such measures to the membership for approval.³⁷

³⁷ Walton Bliss, Constitution and By Laws of the Ohio Education Association, Columbus, Ohio Education Association, 1955, p. 3.

The Representative Assembly is currently the legislative body of the association; however, until 1922 any member could attend the association's meetings and vote on any issue that was presented. After that time, the members of the association were represented by elected delegates sent to the annual meeting to represent their unit. The recognized units were the city, the county, the exempted school districts as constituted by law in the State of Ohio.³⁸

Under the operation of the Ohio Education Association before 1922 questions of special interest, places of meetings, or legislative activities, were assigned to committees. These committees were selected and appointed by the president of the association. Often these various committeemen lived in opposite sections of the state, and most of their work fell to chairmen because of the difficulty and cost involved in traveling and communication. After 1922, an educational council was established as a fact-finding body consisting of thirty members. This educational council was to solve the problems as mandated by the Representative Assembly of the

³⁸ Harvey C. Minnich, Centennial History of the Ohio Education Association, Columbus, Ohio Education Association, 1947, p. 90.

association, or it might suggest its own problems and have them approved by the association. Following a year of study, the council must report back to the Representative Assembly a recommendation or a solution to the problem, or problems, suggested.³⁹

The Ohio Education Association at the present time consists of approximately 78,000 members, with a Representative Assembly of 900 delegates. These delegates legislate for the entire association. The Executive Committee administers for the body and puts into effect the things that are suggested to them by the Representative Assembly, as well as those things that they deem necessary for the betterment of the association.

The Executive Committee also employs a full-time staff presently consisting of an Executive Secretary, an Associate Secretary, an Editor of the association's magazine, Ohio Schools, a Director of Public and Professional Relations and Staff, a Director of Research and Staff, a Director of Field Research and Staff, a full-time legal council, a

39 Ibid, p. 173-174.

legislative consultant, and a Director of Publications and Information and Staff.⁴⁰

It is to be noted that the three divisions discussed in this section seem to overlap; this, of course, is not true. The fact-finding body, which is the Educational Council, must present its findings to the Representative Assembly; the Representative Assembly must then present its wishes to the Executive Committee for execution. A problem, however, may be brought up on the floor of the Representative Assembly, action taken, and then presented to the Executive Committee for it to carry through. While all three groups may be involved in the same problem, each has a different function. It is the Executive Committee which will finally review and take action on all matters coming before the association.

3. Treatment of Specific Sources of Data

This thesis is a historical study of the attempted influence of the Ohio Education Association upon the Public

⁴⁰ Walton Bliss, Executive Secretary, O.E.A. Handbook, Columbus, Ohio Education Association, 1956, p. 38.

School Foundation Program in the State of Ohio. Thus, it is concerned with the narration of past activities of the Ohio Education Association and the state legislature as is evidenced in representative documents of these bodies. The validity and reliability of the documents and their interpretation will determine the worth of the thesis.

Primary documents of the Ohio Education Association were found and classified. The official organ of the Ohio Education Association, Ohio Schools, was used throughout the process of data collection for the thesis, particularly those articles in the magazine written by the Executive Secretary, the Research Director, and the Editor. These people were in a position to know what happened and they were required to use great care in reporting because the magazine's, and, in fact, the entire association's reputation was at stake. At the same time, this magazine was sent out to thousands of people--those who were friends of the public schools as well as those who were in opposition to many of the things that the public schools and the Ohio Education Association represented. It would have been suicide for the officials of the

association to have presented anything that could not have been verified or that could have been used against the association's cause.

The stenographic records of the Representative Assembly of the Ohio Education Association were read, and those portions pertinent to the study were used. These are direct records made of the proceedings of this group while it was in session and a problem was actually being discussed or a report was being read to the Assembly.

The Legislative Bulletin of the Ohio Education Association, which is sent out weekly during the Legislative Session by the Executive Secretary, was read and used as a primary data source. These Legislative Bulletins indicated the activities of the legislators of the State of Ohio relative to any bill that might affect the public schools or school employees in the state. There is always the possibility of bias or prejudice entering into such reports because of the interests of the Executive Secretary of the Ohio Education Association. At times he was actively seeking passage for many of these bills. At other times he even had helped

draft bills with which the legislators were dealing; however, since this bulletin goes out to thousands of people over the state, both lay and school people, it is felt by this researcher that the reporting therein must, of necessity, be accurate. If not, the opposition could take such reports and make a strong case against the best interests of the Ohio Education Association.

The minutes of meetings of the Executive Committee of the Ohio Education Association were used extensively. These minutes are a record of the transactions taken for the Ohio Education Association by the Executive Committee.

The Educational Council's report on the Ohio Education Association was also read and used as a check on the activities of the Ohio Education Association.

Interviews were held with the Executive Secretary, past presidents, Executive Committee members, and other central staff employees of the Ohio Education Association on various phases of the study for purposes of clarification.

The report of the Survey Commission on Equalizing Educational Opportunities in Ohio was read and parts of it

used as study data. This is the report that led directly to the first Foundation Program in the State of Ohio. The Ohio School Survey Commission was headed by Dr. Paul Mort of Columbia University, and was composed of Dr. Mort and sixteen prominent citizens of the State of Ohio. The report of the School Survey Commission was well documented with facts and figures, treating not only the problem of the financing of public schools in the state, but also offering solutions in regard to ways and means to finance the Foundation Program for the state.

It is unfortunate that in the State of Ohio no record is kept of the draft of an original bill unless it is actually enacted into law. The General Assembly does not keep any records of the hearings on such bills, either in committee or in open hearings in either of the houses. Also, there is no record kept as to who originated a particular bill. The bills introduced in either house carry only the name of the sponsoring legislator; however, all of the living legislators who introduced bills having to do with the Foundation Program were contacted and asked for their help in obtaining data on the

part the Ohio Education Association played in behalf of the bills they introduced into the General Assembly sessions.

The records of all of the Governors of the state were read to assess their attitude toward the financing of public education. Also, veto messages were read and the Governor of the state who used the veto against the School Foundation Program was contacted and interviewed in order to assess his basic motivations and reasons for vetoing the bill.

In instances of opposition to bills espoused by the Ohio Education Association, all of the printed materials of the opposing organizations were read and analyzed to see what the opposition proposed and what activities they engaged in against the bill. This was especially true of the major opponent of the Ohio Education Association in the legislative activity relating to the State Public School Foundation Program, the Chamber of Commerce.

There were other opposition groups which sprang up, from time to time, such as the Tax Leagues, in various counties. Such groups opposed the bills supported by the

Ohio Education Association, but by and large, these groups were short lived and did not have an organized propaganda program. Little evidence of such groups was recorded in print. Thus, in order to determine the activities of this kind of group, people who knew of their work were contacted and interviewed.

The available histories of the Ohio Education Association were read for background purposes. There are two such histories that have been written, one by Fred Augsburger, an unpublished Master's Thesis on The History of the Ohio Education Association, and one by Harvey Minnich, A Centennial History of the Ohio Education Association, published in 1947 by the Ohio Education Association.

Mr. Augsburger's thesis is well written and well documented. He gives the history of the Ohio Education Association from its inception until 1928. Mr. Minnich's centennial history is composed of personal memories of the association and was written in his advanced years. He borrowed heavily from data reported in Augsburger's thesis and freely solicited other data of his personal friends in the association.

Another dissertation, by Robert Jenkins, Financing Education in Ohio, an unpublished Doctoral Dissertation at Ohio State University, was read for background material. This source provided a well-documented account of the laws of the state as they pertain to the financing of the public schools of the state.

The laws of Ohio were consulted for a complete wording of the Foundation Program of the state, as well as the changes that have been made in the program in the past twenty years. Newspapers published during this period were read in order to check and/or verify statements made by the various groups at the time the Foundation Program bills were before the legislature.

This chapter has given a brief account of the organization of the legislature of the State of Ohio and the Ohio Education Association, as well as the major sources of data for the thesis and a brief discussion of the treatment of each of the specific data sources.

CHAPTER III

THE ORIGIN AND ENACTMENT OF THE PUBLIC SCHOOL FOUNDATION PROGRAM

This chapter will give the history of the Foundation Program in the State of Ohio from its inception until its enactment on June 12, 1935. The actions of the Ohio Education Association will be enumerated including the part the association played in establishing the survey commission which presented the findings and recommendations of their survey to the legislators that eventually led to the Foundation Program's enactment into law. Also the monetary accomplishments realized from the Foundation Program will be delineated.

1. Steps that Led to a Study of School Needs

The public schools in the State of Ohio are divided into: (1) districts consisting of incorporated areas of over 5,000, which are the city districts; (2) exempted village districts with an incorporated area of over 3,000; (3) county districts which embrace all of the area within the boundary of the county that is not a part of city or exempted village

districts. These county units are further subdivided into local districts. No set pattern, however, guides the formation of local districts within the county unit. The local districts have their own Boards of Education, but they are still under the supervision of the county unit.

Until the early stages of the depression, the school districts of the State of Ohio were almost solely financed by taxes levied on real property. During the depression with delinquent taxes and the downward trend of property values in the state, the public schools faced serious hardships.

How serious the financial plight of the public schools was, can be determined to some extent by the decrease in real property value from 1929 to 1933. In 1929 the gross tax duplicate of the State of Ohio reached a total of \$13,667,719,000.⁴¹ This was the highest mark ever reached in the history of the state up to this time. In 1933 the gross duplicate had fallen to \$8,757,439,766, a decline of almost 36 percent from the

⁴¹ Joseph T. Tracy, Auditor, Auditor's Report, Columbus, State of Ohio, 1934, p. 476.

1929 valuation.⁴² During the same period tax delinquency for the state went from approximately 52 million in 1929 to 200.6 million by 1933, an increase of 300 percent.⁴³

The decline of property valuation, which resulted in decreased revenues, along with tax delinquency and the demands of the citizens of the state for relief in property taxation, made the problem of financing the public schools in the State of Ohio very grave.

These early depression years were accompanied by a great deal of confusion, bitterness, and frustration on the part of the people of the state and the people seemed quite willing to vindicate their feelings on the public schools. Hundreds of editorials and letters to the editors of newspapers were written demanding that schools curtail what the people called needless waste. Being short of funds with little chance for obtaining additional financial support, the public schools could do little else but cut back on numbers of staff members, lower salaries, and increase teacher-pupil ratios. Also, numerous school teachers went without pay over

42 Ibid, 1934, p. 476.

43 Ibid, 1934, p. 530.

THE ORIGIN AND ENACTMENT
OF THE PUBLIC SCHOOL FOUNDATION PROGRAM

54

long periods of time; further, some school districts shortened the length of their school year to six or seven months, while others were not open at all.

In an interview with Dr. Harvey Vallance, a member of the Executive Committee of the Ohio Education Association and a principal of Indianola Junior High School in Columbus during the early years of the depression period, Dr. Vallance related that in over 50 years of active service in the schools of the State of Ohio he had never seen such chaotic conditions as existed for the public schools during this period. Everywhere people were blaming the schools for the depression, for being wasteful, for not teaching the fundamentals, and for having too many "frills" in the school program. Teachers were criticized for the clothes they wore and the cars they drove; schools were being closed, teachers were not being paid, and school staffs were being curtailed. It was indeed a black period in the history of the public schools of Ohio according to Dr. Vallance.

44

44 Harvey F. Vallance, Dean Emeritus of Miami University, in an interview at Columbus, Ohio, March 23, 1954, located in File 1, Folder 1, office of the South Western City Schools, Grove City, Ohio.

The depression, which came in 1929, was not generally felt by the schools of Ohio to any great extent until 1931. Taxes were still being paid in 1930 out of savings and by borrowing on the part of the public. However, some schools were starting to feel the pinch of the depression in the early months of 1931. An editorial in the Ohio Schools in February, 1931, seemed to indicate that for the first time the schools and school people were growing apprehensive.

Are Teacher Dollars in Jeopardy? In some places, yes; in other places, no; but in most places the issue is as yet submerged, the answer unknown. The times are troubled, and those whose taxable investments are bringing in meager returns, and those whose earnings have diminished for other reasons are disposed to look askance at the teachers' unreduced income. Misery always loves company, and any group which seems to be getting along reasonably well is a shining mark for assault in times of depression.⁴⁵

In the same year another article appeared in the Ohio Schools in which it was stated by the editor that teachers' salaries were to suffer here and there. The reductions were not seen to be in any sense universal, nor severe. Some

⁴⁵ Walton Bliss, Editor, "The Last Word on Teachers' Dollars", Ohio Schools, Vol. 9, June, 1931, p. 224.

school districts would find it necessary to suspend all increases, maintaining, of course, their basic scale; others were to retain the salary schedule but reduce the school term by two weeks; still others were to make flat reductions of from 5 to 10 per cent. The impending reappraisal of real property which would result in a general reduction of revenue for all school districts, along with increased delinquency in tax payment were then advanced as the general causes of cut-backs.

The November and December issues of Ohio Schools carried more of this same kind of articles, but with more alarming notes that more schools than anticipated would not be able to meet their payrolls. Thus, the teachers of the State of Ohio were becoming cognizant of the tightening of the depression on their lives and the schools in which they worked, whether or not they were directly affected by the depression.

It became quite obvious to educators in the State of Ohio that something must be done to prevent the total collapse of the public educational system in the state. Hence, at the annual meeting of the Ohio Education

THE ORIGIN AND ENACTMENT
OF THE PUBLIC SCHOOL FOUNDATION PROGRAM

57

Association in December of 1931, the Representative Assembly passed the following resolution:

Be it resolved that the Executive Committee be instructed to have a thorough scientific study, by a staff of competent individuals, made of the problem of financing public education in Ohio, and upon the basis of such a study, report ways and means through which the solution of the problem can be effected, such survey to be financed by the Ohio Education Association and the Sectional Association in so far as they are able.⁴⁶

This resolution set in motion a study which was to ultimately give the public schools in the State of Ohio a firm financial footing.

2. The Establishment of the Survey Commission

In this section the efforts and actions of the Ohio Education Association Executive Committee upon a mandate they received from the Ohio Education Association Representative Assembly to set up a Survey Commission to study public school finance in the state, and the organization which the

46 W. G. Wolf, President, Minutes of the Representative Assembly of the Ohio Education Association, Columbus, December 29, 1931, p. 27, on file in the office of the Ohio Education Association.

THE ORIGIN AND ENACTMENT
OF THE PUBLIC SCHOOL FOUNDATION PROGRAM

58

Ohio Education Association set in motion to publicize the results of the Survey Commission's work, are presented.

The Representative Assembly of the Ohio Education Association had mandated to the association's Executive Committee that a study be made of the financial condition of the public schools in the State of Ohio. This study was to determine the faults existing in the Ohio public school finance program and to offer solutions to problems of public school financing in the State of Ohio. The Ohio Education Association, through its Executive Committee, took under consideration this directive which had been referred to them at their first meeting in January. The first business of the Executive Committee at this meeting was to endorse the actions of the Representative Assembly.⁴⁷

It was necessary for the Executive Committee to find funds and select a staff to undertake such a study. Obtaining funds was no easy task during these depression days. The association had some moneys in their reserve, but they did

47 Frank Reynolds, Secretary Treasurer of the Ohio Education Association, Minutes of the Executive Committee, Columbus, December 29, 1931, p. 214, on file in the office of the Ohio Education Association.

THE ORIGIN AND ENACTMENT
OF THE PUBLIC SCHOOL FOUNDATION PROGRAM

59

not know how much the study would cost or how long it would take. Walton Bliss, Editor of Ohio Schools, the official organ of the Ohio Education Association, said that the Executive Committee discussed the above problem far into the evening. The Executive Committee felt somehow that they could find the necessary money because this survey represented a means of having factual information to present to the public and the legislators on the needs of the public schools. In regard to the selection of a person to head such a survey, Bliss added, that throughout the evening the name of Dr. Paul Mort of Columbia University was mentioned consistently because he had made similar surveys in other states.⁴⁸

When the Executive Committee met again on January 23, 1932, the Committee authorized the president of the association to correspond with Paul Mort and Fletcher Swift to see if they would accept the directorship of such a study.

⁴⁸ Walton Bliss, in an interview at Columbus, Ohio November 17, 1954, located in File 1, Folder 2, in the office of the South Western City Schools, Grove City, Ohio.

THE ORIGIN AND ENACTMENT
OF THE PUBLIC SCHOOL FOUNDATION PROGRAM

60

At this same meeting,

Vallance moved and was seconded by Hudson, that Governor White be approached by Dr. Skinner and a committee consisting of the President and F. M. Shelton; this committee to ascertain whether or not he would be willing to give his sanction in his official capacity to the proposed financial survey for the schools. The motion prevailed, all voted aye.⁴⁹

It seemed, at least from the above, that the Executive Committee was attempting to get all of the elected and appointed officials who would be concerned with public education to agree before they acted. Dr. B. O. Skinner, an appointee of the Governor, was the Director of Education in the State of Ohio. It was felt that if the Executive Committee could achieve the Governor's sanction, and the study group could be appointed by the Director of Education for the Governor, the study group would carry considerably more prestige than would a study group composed of a number of educators appointed by other educators to make a survey for the benefit of public education.

49 Frank Reynolds, op.cit., January 23, 1932, p. 223.

THE ORIGIN AND ENACTMENT
OF THE PUBLIC SCHOOL FOUNDATION PROGRAM

61

The Executive Committee must have felt, however, that they would have some say in the appointment of members to this study group. This seems to be borne out in the records of the Executive Committee Meeting of March 4, 1932, where the Director of Education was in attendance. Dr. Skinner appeared before this group and explained that the Governor had suggested to him that it might be well for him, Dr. Skinner, to appoint the committee to make a survey of the financial condition of the public schools in the State of Ohio.⁵⁰

Again, in the Executive Committee Meeting of April 9, 1932, Dr. Skinner appeared and reported on the progress of naming personnel to the Survey Commission. He stated that he had not at this time completed the appointments and hoped to have all of the commission members named in the very near future. The Secretary-Treasurer of the Ohio Education Association was instructed to keep in touch with Dr. Skinner and, when the commission had been appointed, to call a meeting of the Executive Committee.⁵¹

⁵⁰ Frank Reynolds, Secretary-Treasurer of the Ohio Education Association, Minutes of the Executive Committee, Columbus, Ohio, March 4, 1932, p. 226, on file in the office of the Ohio Education Association.

⁵¹ Ibid, April 9, 1932, p. 228.

THE ORIGIN AND ENACTMENT
OF THE PUBLIC SCHOOL FOUNDATION PROGRAM

62

During this same period of time, negotiations by the Ohio Education Association's Executive Committee were going on to secure a Director for the proposed study. In the February 5, 1932 minutes of the meeting of the Executive Committee, the President of the Ohio Education Association was asked to contact Dr. Paul Mort and ask him to come for an interview with the President and Director of Research of the Ohio Education Association.⁵²

In a meeting on June 14, 1932, the Executive Committee discussed their correspondence with Dr. Paul Mort pertaining to the organization of the Survey Commission, as well as his fee for serving as Director of the proposed study. The Executive Committee agreed at this time to pay the honorarium of \$6,000 asked by Dr. Mort for directing the study. They also agreed at this same meeting to set up a technical advisory committee from the universities in Ohio to work with Dr. Mort. Arrangements were made for additional office space, and Dr. Paul Mort's request for the Research

52 Ibid, February 5, 1932, p. 225.

THE ORIGIN AND ENACTMENT
OF THE PUBLIC SCHOOL FOUNDATION PROGRAM

63

Director of the Ohio Education Association, Mr. B. A. Stephens, and Mr. Walton Bliss, Editor of Ohio Schools, to spend as much time as possible with him working on the survey was granted.⁵³ Mr. B. A. Stephens was to direct and supervise the statistical work and Mr. Walton Bliss was to handle publicity for the Survey Commission. Thus, Dr. Paul Mort of Columbia University was employed to conduct a survey in conformity with the mandate of the Representative Assembly.

The Executive Committee had hired the Director of the Survey, made contact with the Governor of the State of Ohio, and received the Governor's official sanction. They also had the Director of Education in the State of Ohio reporting to them on the selection of personnel for the Survey Committee. The entire plan was in action, but the members of the Executive Committee recognized that this was not enough. If they were to succeed they must have the agreement, interest, and understanding of every member of the teaching profession. This would be no easy task, however,

53 Ibid, June 14, 1932, p. 230-231.

THE ORIGIN AND ENACTMENT
OF THE PUBLIC SCHOOL FOUNDATION PROGRAM

64

since each and every school district and school administrator in the state would have a different and distinct problem as far as the financing of schools was concerned. So, at the August 1932 meeting of the Ohio Education Association's Executive Committee, Vernon Riegel was employed to work with teachers throughout the State of Ohio and to enlist their support for the Commission study and eventually the equalization program that was to be recommended by Mort's study.⁵⁴

Mr. Riegel was an excellent choice for this task. He had been Director of Education in the State of Ohio from 1920 until 1927 and was known and recognized throughout the state by both administrators and teachers.

On September 1, 1932, Mr. Riegel started to work with the Ohio Education Association. He traveled over the state talking to various groups of teachers. He talked only to obtain support for the equalization program concept and the financing of such a program. Riegel particularly tried to persuade teachers and administrators to be loyal to the forthcoming survey recommendations. He pointed out that

54 Ibid, August 29, 1932, p. 239.

THE ORIGIN AND ENACTMENT
OF THE PUBLIC SCHOOL FOUNDATION PROGRAM

65

unless the profession itself presented a united front the gains for the schools in the legislature were apt to be nil.⁵⁵

The next step in the Ohio Education Association's Executive Committee's plans was to contact the Parents and Teachers Associations of Ohio and to secure their cooperation in furthering a program for the financing of the public schools.

Contact was made through the State President of the Ohio Council of Parents and Teachers. The State Parent-Teachers Association President responded by letter to the Executive Committee of the Ohio Education Association asking that the Executive Committee appoint a group representing the Ohio Education Association to meet and confer with the Executive Board of the Ohio Council of Parents and Teachers Organizations. The Executive Committee of the Ohio Education Association appointed two of its members to meet with the Executive Board of the Ohio Council of Parents and Teachers to see what could be done to work out a suitable program of cooperative activity.⁵⁶

55 Vernon Riegel, in a Telephone Interview, Columbus, May 15, 1958, located in File 1, Folder 3, in the office of the South Western City Schools, Grove City, Ohio.

56 Frank Reynolds, Secretary-Treasurer of the Ohio Education Association, Minutes of the Executive Committee, Columbus, November 11, 1932, p. 244.

THE ORIGIN AND ENACTMENT
OF THE PUBLIC SCHOOL FOUNDATION PROGRAM

66

Dr. Vallance, who was appointed to the committee to confer with the Executive Board of Ohio Council of Parents and Teachers, related that a strong ally was found in the Parent-Teacher Organizations. The Executive Board pledged their support to any feasible plan for the support of public education in the State of Ohio. However, no definite organization was set up at this time, except that the Executive Board agreed to send out any materials that the Ohio Education Association might want distributed to the Parent-Teacher Groups throughout the state.⁵⁷

The Ohio Education Association had built its organization for the support and dissemination of information; the Governor had been contacted for his support and sanction; Mr. Riegel was to work with the teachers throughout the state and to develop a large interested body representing the profession; the Parent-Teacher Organization had pledged their support. This was not enough, however, and it was so recognized by the Executive Committee of the Ohio Education

⁵⁷ Harvey Vallance, Dean Emeritus of Miami University, in an interview at Columbus, Ohio, November 17, 1954, located in File 1, Folder 1, in the office of the South Western City Schools, Grove City, Ohio.

THE ORIGIN AND ENACTMENT
OF THE PUBLIC SCHOOL FOUNDATION PROGRAM

67

Association. So far they had only contacted the people who under ordinary circumstances would be interested in the welfare of the public schools of the state. At the November meeting of the Executive Committee, Mr. L. L. Rummell was employed on behalf of the School Survey Commission in the capacity of Publicity Agent and Director of a Speakers' Bureau at a salary of \$500 per month, plus expenses.⁵⁸

Mr. Rummell's duty was to contact all of the organized bodies in the State of Ohio and to try to enlist their support for the public schools in the state. This, of course, would have been an impossible task for any one man to accomplish alone; Mr. Rummell, therefore, trained speakers to speak before various organizations and furnished the material for their speeches. Such material was supplied to him by the Executive Committee and the School Survey Commission.

By this time the Education Association, through the Executive Committee, had a working organization to survey, recommend, and publicize their desires for the adequate

⁵⁸ Frank Reynolds, Secretary-Treasurer of the Ohio Education Association, Minutes of the Executive Committee, Columbus, November 11, 1932, p. 244, on file in the office of the Ohio Education Association.

THE ORIGIN AND ENACTMENT
OF THE PUBLIC SCHOOL FOUNDATION PROGRAM

68

financing of public education in the State of Ohio. Each of these men, the hand-picked leaders, along with the Ohio Education Association staff, worked tirelessly on behalf of the equalization program in the State of Ohio.

An article in the Ohio Schools of March, 1933, attested to some success of the publicity campaign. The Editor wrote that among the many organizations that had endorsed the Mort Plan were the Van Wert County Farm Bureau, The Bellfontaine Kiwanis Club, The Bucyrus American Legion, The Kingsman Farm Bureau, The Milan Federation of Women's Clubs, The Bellaire Kiwanis Club, Seneca County Board of Education Members, The Farmers' Institute in Defiance County, Miami County School Board Members, The Pomona Grange and North-Western Grange in Williams County, The Glouster Kiwanis Club, Miles Exchange, The Farmers' Institute of Ridge Township, Van Wert County, The Fairmont Parent-Teacher Council, Upper Sandusky Chamber of Commerce, The Ohio Pastors' Association, The Noble County Tax Payers League, and the Noble County American Legion #252, Board of Education Members, Local Granges, 1500 Cambridge voters, and more than 1,000 Delaware County

THE ORIGIN AND ENACTMENT
OF THE PUBLIC SCHOOL FOUNDATION PROGRAM

69

Citizens. The Delaware Citizens had signed a petition favorable to the Mort Plan which was presented to Governor White on February 14, 1933.⁵⁹

As the above-mentioned article would indicate, the Public Relations Committee had been at least partially effective in publicizing the School Foundation Program as suggested by Dr. Paul Mort, Director of the Survey Commission's study.

In this section, a brief organization plan was given as set up by the Executive Committee of the Ohio Education Association, along with details of the formation of the survey commission and the hiring of its director. The section sought to show how the Executive Committee employed two people to publicize the work of the Survey Committee and to attempt to establish acceptance for the survey by the teaching profession as well as lay organizations in the state.

3. The Recommendations of the Survey Committee

The recommendations of the Survey Committee and their suggestions for financing the Public School Foundation Program

⁵⁹ Walton Bliss, Editor, "People in the Mort Plan", Ohio Schools, Vol. 2, March, 1933, p. 90-91.

THE ORIGIN AND ENACTMENT
OF THE PUBLIC SCHOOL FOUNDATION PROGRAM

70

in the State of Ohio will be enumerated in this section.

So far as the general public knew, the survey of the financial conditions of the public schools in the state started with a letter from the Governor of the State of Ohio to the Director of Education. But, it has been pointed out that action was initiated by the Representative Assembly of the Ohio Education Association and was placed in the hands of the Executive Committee of the Ohio Education Association for their execution. The Executive Committee then set in motion a chain of events that led to the Governor's letter and the establishment of a School Survey Commission along with the hiring of Dr. Paul Mort in June, 1932. The Survey Commission was composed of sixteen members selected from various parts of the State of Ohio, giving satisfactory geographical representation, as well as a wide diversity of representation in terms of commission members' occupations. This commission called upon organized school groups and state universities for assistance to help furnish data for the Survey.

In February, 1933, the Survey Commission made their recommendations to the Director of Education in the State of Ohio and to the General Assembly of the state.

THE ORIGIN AND ENACTMENT
OF THE PUBLIC SCHOOL FOUNDATION PROGRAM

71

The recommendations of the Survey Commission, made after about ten months of study, consisted of defining minimum education standards for a school district in terms of a dollar per pupil cost, and of applying local and state revenues existing at that time to the districts against the minimum cost, with any differences--in case the local revenue was insufficient--to be paid by the state in the form of equalizational aid. The special program as recommended by the Commission was as follows:

The total cost of a program amounting to \$40 per elementary pupil and \$68 per high school pupil would be computed. To this would be added certain corrections for higher cost of living and the cost of transporting pupils. The result would be the cost of the minimum program, the burden of which the state is to equalize.⁶⁰

In order to determine the amount of equalization aid a district would be entitled to receive, certain charges were to be made against the program as outlined above, and were to consist of the following:

⁶⁰ Paul Mort, Director, Equalizing Educational Opportunity in Ohio, Ohio Education Association, February, 1933, p. 10.

THE ORIGIN AND ENACTMENT
OF THE PUBLIC SCHOOL FOUNDATION PROGRAM

72

1. An amount equal to 0.35 mills on the evaluation of the property in the school district.
2. Funds received from the county 2.65 mills tax and from the distributable share of the intangible tax.
3. Present State Aid received except Federal Aid for vocational training and State Aid for Special Classes.⁶¹

The remainder, after these charges were made against the minimum program of a district, was the amount of equalizational aid to be furnished by the state. This became known as "Additional Aid" to school districts under the Public School Foundation Program.

The recommendations stated further that a guarantee of a minimum amount of \$17 per elementary pupil and \$29 per high school pupil in average daily attendance should be included in the program to satisfy the districts who were wealthier than most and would not receive additional aid. This was called the "Flat Distribution" of the Public School Foundation Program.

In the research performed by the Survey Commission it was found that the average current expenditure per

61 Ibid, p. 10.

THE ORIGIN AND ENACTMENT
OF THE PUBLIC SCHOOL FOUNDATION PROGRAM

73

elementary and high school pupil was \$60 and \$102 respectively. While these figures would have been more appropriate for use in defining the minimum operation cost per pupil in the proposed program, the additional cost of such a program was viewed as prohibitive.

The Survey Commission study found that approximately half of the school districts in Ohio were spending less and operating on a lower level than was to be recommended and a program of \$60 per elementary pupil and \$102 per high school pupil would have increased the state's expenditure by \$8,000,000. Since waste would undoubtedly result, the policy of starting at \$40 and \$68 and slowly increasing the minimum operating level over a period of years was proposed. It was also recognized that the minimum operating cost in the small districts, those with less than 179 pupils in average daily attendance, would have to be greater in their dollar amounts, since there were less pupils in average daily attendance, thus making higher operating costs per pupil in such districts. Provision was made under the proposal, however, to grant the Director of Education authority to increase

these amounts when Boards of Education could justify such a school organization.

A proposed formula for transportation was devised, based on actual Ohio practice for inclusion in the program if so desired. This formula was based upon the per cent of pupils to be transported times a cost factor per pupil, according to the density of average daily attendance per square mile. Thus, the number of pupils transported times the cost per pupil could be included in the proposed program of minimum cost for a district for equalization purposes. The Commission also recommended that control of transportation should be left in the hands of the local school districts, rather than at the state level.

In arriving at the 0.35 mill levy to be charged against the program as a theoretical local tax yield, the thinking of the Commission was along the following lines. In order to obtain equalization of the program throughout the state, assuming equalization of property tax valuations, the principle was applied whereas the state supplemented a local tax levy. The local tax levy could be cut so low, as

for example, zero, that the state would incur the full cost of supporting the minimum program, or the tax levy could be set so high, say 30 mills, that no additional aid could be granted by the state, and hence, completely defeating the purpose of the program. From this can be seen the importance of establishing a proper tax charge. In the words of the Commission;

This tax, however, must be low enough that practically every district in the state will receive aid, otherwise those receiving aid would be required to carry more than their fair share of the burden. The equalization plan demands that each district pay its fair share of the minimum program, no more, no less.⁶²

Guided by the principles set forth above, the Commission felt that three mills was the maximum charge that should be used if they were to equalize the burden of a \$40 and \$68 per pupil program. Since a 2.65 mill levy was in effect throughout the state it was thought that this should be included as a charge against the minimum program of a district, plus an additional local levy of 0.35, thus making a total of three mills.

62 Ibid, p. 29.

The Commission discovered that in 1932 96% of Ohio's School Revenue was derived from the property tax.⁶³ Thus, in order to give property owners relief from what the Commission felt was excessive taxation, they proposed several types of taxes that might be levied by the state and redistributed to local governmental units to be spent for school purposes. Among those which gained support later were the Sales Tax and the Income Tax. The sales tax was to be placed on everything that was purchased in the State of Ohio with no exemptions. The income tax was to be effective on all incomes in the State of Ohio after a minimum level had been set to yield a certain amount of revenue.

These were, however, only suggested ways for the raising of enough money to properly finance the Public School Foundation Program.

This section has presented a review of the recommendations and suggestions resulting from the School Survey Commission's study. The recommendations included a flat

63 Ibid, p. 59.

distribution Foundation Program, and an additional aid program, as well as suggested means for financing such programs.

4. The Attempts to Enact the Foundation Program

This section focuses on the attempts of the Ohio Education Association to influence legislators to enact the recommended Public School Foundation Program. It also delineates the major activities of the opposition aimed at defeating the proposed Foundation Program.

The Public School Foundation Program was presented to the legislature in February, 1933, at the General Assembly's regular session. The presentation, made by Dr. Paul Mort, was not received with a great deal of enthusiasm according to Dr. Vallance. Many of the legislators said that Dr. Mort was an outsider and they asked why the people of the State of Ohio should listen to someone from the outside telling them how to run their affairs. Others, of course, could not or would not, grasp the program as it was presented. Also, some of the legislators expressed concern that the schools would

THE ORIGIN AND ENACTMENT
OF THE PUBLIC SCHOOL FOUNDATION PROGRAM

78

be taken out of the hands of local authorities and centralized in the State Department of Education. Still others feared to take action because they felt it would mean new and more taxes.⁶⁴

A bill embroidering the recommendations of the Public School Foundation Program was introduced in the House of Representatives in February, 1933, by W. T. Roberts, a member of the Survey Commission.

The same month an article appeared in the Ohio Schools urging the support of, and work by, the school people on behalf of this bill.

Much public sentiment remains to be mobilized; many contacts of citizens with their legislative representatives must be encouraged, many letters must be written both to legislators and the Governor. Legislation commonly springs from the expressed desire of the legislator's constituents. An aroused public interest and support is the sure guarantee of effective grappling with our educational crisis. This has been the principle underlying the Ohio Education Association's efforts of the past few months to carry to the people of Ohio, through numerous public meetings and frequent newspaper releases, the story of the problem of Ohio's schools and a necessity in the change of our present taxation methods.⁶⁵

64 Harvey Vallance, Dean Emeritus of Miami University, in an interview, Columbus, October 28, 1954, located in File 1, Folder 1, in the office of the South Western City Schools, Grove City, Ohio.

65 Walton Bliss, Editor, "On the Financial Firing Line", Ohio Schools, Vol. 2, February, 1933, p. 37.

THE ORIGIN AND ENACTMENT
OF THE PUBLIC SCHOOL FOUNDATION PROGRAM

79

The Ohio Education Association leaders did an effective job in mobilizing support for the Public School Foundation Plan. According to an item in the March issue of the Ohio Schools, one of the largest crowds on record filled the hearing chambers when the Public School Foundation Program bill was heard. Such groups as the Parent Teachers Association, the Ohio Federation of Women's Clubs, the Farm Bureau, the League of Women Voters, and the American Association of University Women all spoke in behalf of the Foundation Program. According to the above article, the opposition, consisted for the most part, of the Tax Leagues which had sprung up in many of the counties. The aim and sole objective of these new Tax Leagues was to keep taxes down.⁶⁶

But even with all the support that the Ohio Education Association could muster the bill was defeated. The various reasons for the defeat of the Robinson Bill, which was the proposed State Foundation Program, were the same as those given for the cold reception when the bill was first presented

⁶⁶ Walton Bliss, Editor, "The Capital Mirror", Ohio Schools, Vol. 2, March, 1933, p. 70.

THE ORIGIN AND ENACTMENT
OF THE PUBLIC SCHOOL FOUNDATION PROGRAM

80

to the legislature. However, as stated before, the main reason was the legislature's fear of new taxes. This bill had to be financed; new sources of revenue had to be found. This, then, represented the great stumbling block for the Public School Foundation Program.

According to a Legislative Bulletin of the Ohio Education Association sent out to all schools in the State of Ohio, the legislators recessed on March 30, 1933. During the recess a special committee of 14, seven from each branch of the General Assembly were to be appointed to work on various taxation problems, and a similar committee of 14 was appointed to work on school problems.⁶⁷ The committee reports came to naught and the General Assembly of the State of Ohio adjourned without taking any action on the Public School Foundation Program or on methods of financing the program.

A special session of the General Assembly was called in the fall of 1933 to deal, among other things, with taxation and the financial support of schools. The Public

⁶⁷ Frank Reynolds, Secretary-Treasurer of the Ohio Education Association, Bulletin 13, Columbus, March 31, 1933, p. 1, on file in the office of the Ohio Education Association.

THE ORIGIN AND ENACTMENT
OF THE PUBLIC SCHOOL FOUNDATION PROGRAM

81

School Foundation Program, during this session, was incorporated in Senate Bill 37 and was sponsored by Senator Gunsett.

On Wednesday, September 13, the Senate passed the Gunsett Bill setting up the Foundation Program for the public schools, but before the program was passed an amendment was written into the bill which required the budget of the County Board of Education to have the approval of the County Budget Commission. A second amendment was also introduced at this time by Senator Gunsett, the author of the bill. This amendment was to provide \$3,000,000 from the general revenue of the state to finance the public schools of the state until January 1, 1934. The bill passed the Senate as amended 27 to nothing; it was then sent to the House of Representatives. In the House the amendments were taken out and the bill was passed without the amendments 76 to sixteen. The bill was then sent back to the Senate where the Senate failed to concur, voting 13 to eight against the bill without the amendments.

The next day in the House of Representatives, Representative Douglas of Cuyahoga County moved that the House reconsider the vote by which the Gunsett Bill had been passed. A viva voce vote was taken on this motion and the speaker declared the motion carried. Several of the members in the House of Representatives called for a division of the House. The Speaker of the House did not hear them and recognized Representative Lawrence, a Democratic leader in the House who then moved for a recess of fifteen minutes. The motion was put by the Speaker and carried as declared by the Speaker.

Many people have since accused the Speaker of the House of Representatives of high-handed tactics. The vote on the motion to reconsider the bill would have certainly looked better if there had been a division of the House of Representatives and had there been a roll call on the motion to recess.

On the same day the Senate went into session and rescinded the action it had taken the day before when it had refused to concur on the bill without the amendments that had

THE ORIGIN AND ENACTMENT
OF THE PUBLIC SCHOOL FOUNDATION PROGRAM

83

been deleted by the House of Representatives. Thus, the bill, Gunsett Senate Bill No. 37, was sent back to the House of Representatives without the amendments. The House of Representatives had reconvened following its recess and a vote was taken on the bill. The bill received 61 votes for, and 25 against; however, 68 votes were needed for passage. Friends of the bill on the floor of the House of Representatives asked that the roll call be continued so that those who had not voted, or who were out of the hall, could have a chance to vote. On the second roll call the bill received three additional votes. This made the Public School Foundation Program Bill only four votes short of passage. The Speaker did not continue the roll call and declared the bill to have failed. School people were quite disturbed over this and pointed out that on other bills the roll call had been continued as many as six times.

According to Walton Bliss⁶⁸ this legislative session was the scene of great turmoil. Never in his some thirty

68 Walton Bliss, Executive Secretary of the Ohio Education Association in an interview at Columbus, Ohio, March 28, 1958, located in File 1, Folder 2, in the office of the South Western City Schools, Grove City, Ohio.

THE ORIGIN AND ENACTMENT
OF THE PUBLIC SCHOOL FOUNDATION PROGRAM

84

years of service with the Ohio Education Association had he seen so much confusion as resulted from the second House vote on the Gunsett Bill. Before the second roll call, he and other members of the Ohio Education Association were hunting frantically for the few more House members it would take to pass the Bill, and, if given a little more time, he related that he had felt certain the additional four House members could have been secured.

The members of the Ohio Education Association were so incensed over the reputedly high-handed tactics of the Speaker that a rump session was attempted. But this session died a quick death when it was found that the Clerk of the House of Representatives had fled with the records.

B. A. Stephens,⁶⁹ Director of Research of the Ohio Education Association, summed up the feelings of the school people in an article in the October issue of the Ohio Schools:

69 B. A. Stephens, Director of Research, "Research for the Teachers", Ohio Schools, Vol. 12, October, 1933, p. 210.

As this is written the first special session of the 90th General Assembly of Ohio evidently is drawing its last breath. As in the protracted regular session, no leadership developed which was strong enough to guide the members in a constructive program of leadership. A variety of cross-currents in public opinion tested the agility of the rather large number of members whose sole purpose in statecraft is to be re-elected. Lack of recognized leadership, political opportunism, undiluted ignorance, and indifference, again rendered sterile a legislative group to which the state had looked for statesman-like service in meeting the gravest crisis of modern education.

Thus it was that the 1933 General Assembly, both in its regular and special sessions, drew to a close without the Ohio Education Association gaining their objectives. There was bitterness and grumbling on the part of members of the association. But out of this defeat came a determination to fight for a bigger and better program for the financing of the public schools of the State of Ohio.

At its annual meeting in 1933 the Executive Committee of the Ohio Education Association set up an emergency committee of five to work out a tentative legislative program and report the same back to the Executive Committee.

THE ORIGIN AND ENACTMENT
OF THE PUBLIC SCHOOL FOUNDATION PROGRAM

86

The plan was duly formulated by the emergency committee and reported to the Executive Committee at its December meeting. The Executive Committee made a few minor changes in the emergency committee's report, formulated a legislative program utilizing all of the principles of the Public School Foundation Plan, and presented the legislative program to the Representative Assembly of the Ohio Education Association on December 27, 1933.

The Representative Assembly had not heard the recommendations of the Survey Commission as a body, but had had plenty of time to talk over these recommendations before their meeting since hundreds of copies of the Survey Commission's recommendations had been circulated widely throughout the state. Thus, at their meeting on December 27, the report and recommendations of the Executive Committee were read and the Representative Assembly, following a brief discussion, approved the report and recommendations of the Executive Committee.

The only major change from the original recommendations of the Survey Commission came in regard to the minimum program.

THE ORIGIN AND ENACTMENT
OF THE PUBLIC SCHOOL FOUNDATION PROGRAM

87

The Executive Committee recommended that there be \$75.60 per pupil provided in grades nine to twelve, and \$45 per pupil for those in grades one through eight. The same clause for eligibility was incorporated and each school was to have at least 180 days of school each year to be eligible to participate in the proposed program.

The original recommendations of the Survey Commission were \$40 per elementary pupil in average daily attendance and \$60 per high school pupil. Thus, the new program of the Ohio Education Association was set at a higher support level.

Most of the school men in the state were optimistic over the passage of a Public School Foundation Bill early in the 1934 special session of the General Assembly. They could cite the Gunsett Bill, which passed the Senate and needed only four votes to pass the House of Representatives, as an example and cause for their optimism. In the Legislative Bulletin of February 8, 1934, the Secretary-Treasurer of the Ohio Education Association stated that a proposed bill for financing all the public schools in the state would probably be introduced by Senator Gunsett who had introduced

THE ORIGIN AND ENACTMENT
OF THE PUBLIC SCHOOL FOUNDATION PROGRAM

88

a similar bill the year before. Then, again, in the Ohio Education Association Legislative Bulletin No. 29, the Secretary-Treasurer mentioned the bill that Gunsett was reputed to have readied for presentation to the Senate.⁷⁰

On March 9, Gunsett introduced in the Senate a Public School Foundation Program Bill and Representative Roberts introduced a similar bill in the House of Representatives. The Gunsett Bill was heard in an open meeting and the Ohio Education Association officials, as well as many other prominent school men, spoke for this bill. Charles Haigler of the Anti-Tax League spoke against the bill emphasizing the detriment of new taxes.⁷¹

Many school people were on hand at this legislative session to see their representatives, as well as to attend the hearings on the bill. The bill was voted out of the Education Committee and the Senate voted on the bill and passed it. However, before the bill was passed it was

70 Frank Reynolds, Secretary-Treasurer of the Ohio Education Association, Bulletin 29, Columbus, February 16, 1934, p. 2, on file in the office of the Ohio Education Association.

71 Ibid, Bulletin 31, March 16, 1934, p. 1.

THE ORIGIN AND ENACTMENT
OF THE PUBLIC SCHOOL FOUNDATION PROGRAM

89

amended several times. One amendment sought to include kindergarten in the program. Another amendment dealt with delinquent taxes and how they were to be used to help finance the schools upon their collection. A third amendment introduced in the Senate was concerned with teacher salaries, while a fourth removed all reference to one, two, three, and four teacher schools from the bill. Another amendment was offered to place free tuition private and parochial schools on the same basis as the public schools. This amendment was defeated by a vote of 13 to twelve. However, the vote on this last amendment shows that there was some sentiment on the part of the legislature to aid the non-public schools.

The Gunsett Bill, as amended, was sent to the House and referred to the House Taxation Committee. A committee was set up to incorporate the amendments of the Roberts Bill, which was similar to the Gunsett Bill, thus substituting the Gunsett Bill for the Roberts Bill in the House. The Gunsett Bill died in the House. It was pushed aside because the legislators felt they must have some concrete proposal for financing the program before the bill could be enacted into law.

THE ORIGIN AND ENACTMENT
OF THE PUBLIC SCHOOL FOUNDATION PROGRAM

90

There were many proposals on the financing of the Gunsett Bill. Some legislators favored an income tax bill, some a sales tax bill, while others sought a utilities tax rate. The Ohio Education Association would have been happy to accept any of these, or any combination of them. However, the legislators expressed mixed feelings about the tax issue with no strong block supporting any one particular tax measure.

72

Frank Reynolds writes:

Whether these measures should come before the measure, finding the money or vice versa, is a question that is confronting the members of the legislature. The method of finding the money is now upmost in the minds of the legislators, and in press discussion is a sales tax. A bill which has been proposed and which was discussed most of the day after in the Committee of the Whole, seeks to levy a 4% tax on sales, the money from which is to be allocated for the support of the public schools. This is the foundation of the tax program, and in that same picture is an income tax, an increase in the utilities tax, a chain store tax, and an increase on the tax on intangibles, which it is hoped will bring in something like \$70,000,000.

With the legislators not having a definite program for financing the Foundation Program which they could support,

72 Ibid, Bulletin 35, April 6, 1934, p. 2.

each measure that was put before them, the sales tax, the gross sales tax, the income tax, and the utilities tax, was defeated.

Things, in fact, became so bogged down that Governor White found it necessary to adjourn the legislature to November 19, 1934.

It indeed must have been a pathetic group of legislators who could not even agree upon an adjournment date.

The Ohio Education Association Secretary-Treasurer summed up the "uneventful" legislative session when he wrote that prejudice, political and religious blocks, spite, inefficiency, political aspirations, bungling, stubbornness, and sometimes ignorant leadership, all combined to have made it so far impossible to enact legislation for the relief of schools and county and municipal government.⁷³

To say that this session of the legislature was aggravating to the members of the Ohio Education Association would be a gross understatement. All of the organization that the Ohio Education Association had developed seemed to

73 Ibid, Bulletin 38, April 27, 1934, p. 1.

be ineffectual in getting legislation passed for relief of the schools. The members and friends of the Ohio Education Association had button-holed representatives; they had written hundreds of letters; they had won new supporters for the cause, the chief among them being the American Legion. Yet opponents of the Ohio Education Association had, according to the results of the legislators, been far more effective than the whole organization of the association.

However, the Ohio Education Association did not give up; they knew that the coming election in November could have a very definite influence upon the existing do-nothing attitude of the legislators. The association held their summer meeting at Cedar Point, Ohio, and outlined a program of how they could bring pressure upon the legislators before they returned on November 19th. Members of the Ohio Education Association were asked to contact each legislator and assess his stand on school issues. If the legislators were not opposed to the schools and promised their support to the Foundation Program they were to be supported. If not, the members of the Ohio Education Association were to contact their friends and try

to persuade them not to support the candidate for re-election. According to Bliss⁷⁴ the membership again, at this meeting, pledged their belief in what the profession was fighting for, as well as their continued support on behalf of the Public School Foundation Program.

When the legislators of the State of Ohio met in accordance with the adjournment session they had felt the effects of the people back home and what the educators and friends of education had to say about them. This is borne out by the fact that the Public School Foundation Program was not enacted in this adjourned session while the recommended program of the Ohio Education Association was enacted in the General Assembly which convened in January of the following year. However, the legislators did, in the adjourned session, enact a sales tax law, and increased the utilities tax and the intangible tax. Thus, the school forces had accomplished one major aim in their program (the increasing of state revenue sources) but as yet they did not have a Public School Foundation Program.

74 Walton Bliss, Editor, "Testing Conditions for the Legislators", Ohio Schools, Vol. 12, October, 1934, p. 22-230.

Nonetheless, the success of enacting new taxes along with having a new Governor and practically a new General Assembly made the Ohio Education Association very jubilant. The new Executive Secretary⁷⁵ of the Ohio Education Association wrote in the Ohio Schools as follows:

The control of state-wide governmental affairs in Ohio, and this includes school affairs, of course, is now in new hands. Not only is there a new Governor, but there is practically a new legislature. Out of a total House Members of 135, eighty-seven (which is decidedly more than a majority) are new. In the Senate, 17 out of thirty-two are new Senators. The final mathematics of the situation is, that there are 100 Legislators in Columbus for the 91st General Assembly who have not been intimately conversant with recent phases of the state-wide school problem, and with the special details of the Foundation Program of school support, a bill which had extended consideration during the 90th General Assembly. This condition obviously called for a campaign of education. Fortunately considerable ground work has been laid because this plan was an object of much discussion in many county campaigns last fall.

.

We are not only fortunate in having a legislature which thus confesses predisposition in favor of such a bill, but in having a new Chief Executive who strongly endorsed such a program during his campaign.

75 Walton Bliss, Executive-Secretary, "Ohio in New Hands", Ohio Schools, Vol. 13, February, 1935, p. 37.

THE ORIGIN AND ENACTMENT
OF THE PUBLIC SCHOOL FOUNDATION PROGRAM

95

The public school forces of the State of Ohio felt that with the new General Assembly and a new Governor a Public School Foundation Program could quickly be enacted. The chief thunder of the opposing lobby groups had been the objection of new taxes. This, however, was a settled issue since the adjourned session of the legislature in 1934 had acted on securing much of the new money that would be needed to support a Public School Foundation Program. The passage of a Public School Foundation Bill was not, however, to come as easy as was generally expected in the new session of the General Assembly. One of the most powerful political forces in the State of Ohio, the Ohio Chamber of Commerce, became most apprehensive and began to work openly against the Public School Foundation Program as proposed by the Ohio Education Association.

The Ohio Education Association prevailed upon Representative Traxler to sponsor a Public School Foundation Program and the bill moved very quickly in the House of Representatives. The House of Representatives School Committee recommended the

THE ORIGIN AND ENACTMENT
OF THE PUBLIC SCHOOL FOUNDATION PROGRAM

96

passage of substitute House Bill 466, the Traxler-Kiefer Bill, 17 to nothing. This was a Public School Foundation Program Bill which had an additional provision injected into it by Representative Kiefer in order to care for existing State Aid Districts. The Bill was voted on by the House of Representatives on April 2, 1935 and was passed by a vote of 115 for, to seven against.

In a bulletin entitled Private Bulletin to Members, George Chandler,⁷⁶ Secretary of the Ohio Chamber of Commerce, reported that delegation from the Chamber met with the Governor and entered into a discussion on the state fiscal situation. In this same bulletin they mentioned that the school lobby was being headed by the Ohio Education Association. It was further stated that thus far the Chamber of Commerce was fighting a single-handed battle against the Public School Foundation Bill and the Chamber would like to have some help for the good of the cause. This bulletin set off a struggle that was to take place for a period of over

⁷⁶ George P. Chandler, Secretary of the Chamber of Commerce, Private Bulletin to Members, Columbus, April 3, 1935, p. 1-3 on file in the office of the Chamber of Commerce.

seven weeks. Both the Ohio Education Association and the Chamber of Commerce had their offices in the same building at Columbus, Ohio; both sent out many bulletins to their members and friends; both urged that its members take steps to influence Representatives on the Traxler-Kiefer Bill, and there is little doubt that each group worked very hard to influence the legislators on this bill. The Ohio Education Association in its Legislative Bulletin Number 12 made this statement:

The Senate Education Committee will hold its final hearing on House Bill 466 on Wednesday afternoon at 2 p.m. We cannot emphasize too strongly that the golden opportunity for the school forces is in these days of Senate recess; the opposition is working and it will be fatal if we lull ourselves into any false sense of security. The results in the House on this bill were not due to any dissent of the school people upon Columbus, but to careful and systematic work back home. Call to your aid individuals from the various loyal organizations which are favorable to this bill; the P.T.A., the League of Women Voters, The Legion, The Farm Bureau, The Grange, The Federated Womens' Clubs, in the 51 counties where committees of cooperation have been organized this new responsibility should be called to action. Not only the members of the Education Committee, but every other Senator should be interviewed during the next few days.⁷⁷

77 Walton Bliss, Executive Secretary, Ohio Education Association Bulletin No. 12, Columbus, April 12, 1935, p. 5, on file in the office of the Ohio Education Association.

THE ORIGIN AND ENACTMENT
OF THE PUBLIC SCHOOL FOUNDATION PROGRAM

98

On April 18, the Ohio Chamber of Commerce made a similar plea to their members.⁷⁸

Additional pleas of the same nature continued throughout the seven weeks of struggle, and successive weekly bulletins were sent out by each group. The Public School Foundation Bill finally came to a vote on May 8, 1934. The Senate voted for the passage of this bill and the House of Representatives concurred; the bill was then sent to the Governor for his signature. Before the Governor affixed his signature, however, the Ohio Chamber of Commerce had one more try at defeating this bill according to a Private Bulletin to Members by Alexander Thomas.⁷⁹ On June 3, a delegation of members from the Ohio Chamber of Commerce and several other business organizations called upon the Governor, Martin L. Davey, and presented a notarium, pointing out that the state was making additional large commitments for new taxes and

78 George P. Chandler, Secretary of the Ohio Chamber of Commerce, Private Bulletin to Members, Columbus, April 18, 1935, p. 2, on file in the office of the Ohio Chamber of Commerce.

79 Alexander Thomas, President of the Ohio Chamber of Commerce, Private Bulletin to Members, Columbus, June 20, 1935, p. 1, on file in the office of the Ohio Chamber of Commerce.

**THE ORIGIN AND ENACTMENT
OF THE PUBLIC SCHOOL FOUNDATION PROGRAM**

99

that the Governor should veto the extravagant Public School Foundation Program. The Governor did not see fit to do so and the Public School Foundation Program Bill was signed into law on June 21, 1935.

This ended the epic struggle of the Ohio Education Association to pass the Public School Foundation Law that changed the course of history for the schools in Ohio.

This section has sought to spell out the activities of the Ohio Education Association and to illustrate their political battle directed toward achieving the enactment of the Public School Foundation Program. The forces that were opposed to the program throughout a series of stages were many, but the schools in their plight made themselves heard to the legislators and after two years and five legislative session had gained their primary objective.

5. The Benefits of the Public School Foundation Program

The major benefits from the Public School Foundation Program to the public schools of the state were many. The one to which most people refer is the fact that it brought

THE ORIGIN AND ENACTMENT
OF THE PUBLIC SCHOOL FOUNDATION PROGRAM

100

financial relief to the distressed schools in the state. What had started out as a \$29,000,000 program in 1933, when it was originally proposed by the Survey Commission, became in reality, a \$48,000,000 program when the Public School Foundation Program was enacted into law in June, 1955.

However, many other benefits were derived from the enactment of the Public School Foundation Program that in all probability had as much value as the financial relief it provided for the schools. For the first time the public schools in the State of Ohio had an equalization program where each and every school district, which met the standards set up by law, could count on a definite minimum program of education for their schools. No longer, in the state, were there to be the have-not districts as opposed to the tremendously wealthy districts. Each district could now, theoretically, at least, give a reasonable program of education for the first time.

With the passage of this bill, school districts could set up better budgetary practices; they could calculate what funds would be available for the coming year, and, with a certain amount of assurance they could count upon these funds being available.

The Public School Foundation Program is significant in yet another way; it marked the beginning of a trend away from the local financing of the public schools to a state centralization of revenue sources and subsidy payments. Thus, with the advent of subsidy payments, people in general, and educators in particular, have had to become better acquainted with how the state made its laws that guide money appropriations to the various public services. Also, people who would not have ordinarily been interested in State Governmental affairs now took a look at these affairs because they saw the influence the life of their children, their schools, and their children's teachers; also seen was how much locally must be paid in taxes in order to meet the charge-off rate to qualify for aid from the state.

6. Summary

This chapter has elucidated the activity of the part of the Ohio Education Association in formulating a Public School Foundation Bill. Records indicate that it was the Ohio Education Association which initiated and supported the

THE ORIGIN AND ENACTMENT
OF THE PUBLIC SCHOOL FOUNDATION PROGRAM

102

original School Survey. The Ohio Education Association took the findings of the Survey Commission and after opposition from such groups as the Tax Payers League and the Ohio Chamber of Commerce saw that the Foundation Program was enacted into law. From the time that the first Public School Foundation Bill was proposed until its final enactment, a period of over two years transpired. During this time the Ohio Education Association was responsible for winning the support of many lay groups; first among these groups were the Council of Parent-Teachers Association, the Farm Bureau, the Grange, the American Legion, the Federation of Women Clubs, and the League of Women Voters. This was no easy task. It required diligent effort and persistent determination on the part of the Ohio Education Association.

The benefits of the Public School Foundation Program were far reaching; school systems would count on a minimum program, as well as being assured that funds would be available for the operation of public schools. The enactment of the Public School Foundation Law marked the passage of almost total local public school financing and resulted in an increased

interest on the part of the lay people and educators in what the state legislators were doing in the way of establishing criteria under which public education was to be carried out in the state.

The passage of the Foundation Program Bill also clearly indicates that an organization can win support from the lay people. The Ohio Education Association illustrated that with unity and determination, such an association can have a tremendous political influence in State Government. It might be questioned as to whether or not it is a good thing for any group with a vested interest to have so much power; however, as long as the Ohio Education Association does not fall under the total power of a few individuals, and it keeps its motives above reproach, there is no need for undue concern. Every precaution should be taken to see that the voice of lay groups and teacher groups all over the state in regard to education is heard.

CHAPTER IV

THE LEGISLATIVE CHANGES IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOL FOUNDATION PROGRAM

This chapter enumerates the major changes that have been made in the Public School Foundation Program since its inception up to 1955, and the part the Ohio Education Association played in these changes. Many changes in the Foundation Program were of a minor nature and did not involve monetary considerations, hence in such instances, the Ohio Education Association characteristically entered either a mild protest or acquiesced and went along with the revision. This was not true, however, when modification in the minimum or flat distribution rate of the School Foundation Program was made.

The first section of this chapter will give the legal changes in the Foundation Program as made by the General Assembly of the State of Ohio. The second section will present the activities of the Ohio Education Association as they worked to alleviate the problem of deficit financing of the Public School Foundation Program. The following five sections

will treat major monetary changes in the Foundation Program and will delineate the activities of the Ohio Education Association in relation to these changes.

1. The Legal Changes of the Public School Foundation Program

This section is concerned with the changes made by the General Assembly of the State of Ohio in the Public School Foundation Program from its origin until 1955.

The Public School Foundation Program was enacted on June 12, 1935, and remained virtually unchanged until 1939. It was during the 1939 session of the legislature that the earmarking of revenues for the Public School Fund was abolished; funds for the financing of the Public School Foundation Program were to be hereafter appropriated from the general revenue fund of the state.⁸⁰ Also at this time provisions for paying exempted village and city schools a flat distribution for less than a three teacher school were deleted.⁸¹ Further, the method of tuition payment was

⁸⁰ General Code of the State of Ohio, Section 4848.

⁸¹ General Code of the State of Ohio, Section 4848-1.

slightly altered,⁸² but this did not significantly affect the Public School Foundation Program.

In 1941 the practice of subtracting interest on the irreducible debt, income from land rentals, and trust funds received by the district from the amount of the district's additional aid payment was terminated.⁸³ Under this same section of law the funds due to school districts that had been withheld by the County Auditor were also erased.

In 1943 all sections of the Public School Foundation Program were recorded and assigned section numbers, 4848 to 4848-8 inclusive,⁸⁴ in a re-classification of the School Code. The first increase in the Public School Foundation Program also came at this time. However, the increase did not affect the total program. The only changes made were in the elementary school funds, in regard to both minimum and flat distributions.⁸⁵ At this time the method for determining tuition cost was again changed.⁸⁶ Further, legislative action resulted

82 General Code of the State of Ohio, Section 4848-5.

83 General Code of the State of Ohio, Section 4848-3.

84 Laws of Ohio, Volume 120, pp. 554-559.

85 Laws of Ohio, Volume 120, p. 478.

86 Laws of Ohio, Volume 120, p. 558.

in an amendment that changed the position title of Director of Education to Superintendent of Public Instruction.⁸⁷

The next increase in the Public School Foundation Program came in 1945. This increase affected the entire Foundation Program, minimum and flat distributions for kindergarten through grade twelve.⁸⁸ Rehabilitation was⁸⁹ also established at this time. The rehabilitation section of the Foundation Program legislation was enacted to help additional aid school districts remodel, construct, or repair schools in their districts. In order to encourage consolidation and more economical uses of funds, local school districts that maintained schools of less than three teachers were, as a result of legislative action in 1945, dropped from the School Foundation Program.⁹⁰

Again in 1947 additional aid was granted to the public school districts by increasing the flat distribution and the minimum Foundation Program. The operating millage required

87 Laws of Ohio, Volume 120, p. 479.

88 General Code of the State of Ohio, Section 4848-1, to Section 4848-4.

89 General Code of the State of Ohio, Section 4848-11.

90 General Code of the State of Ohio, Section 4848-11.

THE LEGISLATIVE CHANGES IN THE
PUBLIC SCHOOL FOUNDATION PROGRAM

108

for a district to receive additional aid was raised from the long standing three mills, as established in 1935, to $4\frac{1}{2}$ mills, and the millage rate charged against the Foundation Program was raised from three mills to $4\frac{1}{2}$ mills.⁹¹ Also, to help districts when their average daily attendance was affected by a severe snow storm or an epidemic, thus having few pupils in attendance at school, "average daily attendance" in the Foundation Program was changed to "average daily membership".⁹² In cases such as the above examples average daily attendance would be very low, while the average daily membership would remain fairly constant. School districts would not then be penalized for catastrophic events over which they had essentially no control.

One other noteworthy change resulting from the 1947 legislative session was the deletion of the minimum of ten mills required for all purposes in order to participate in the Public School Foundation Program.⁹³ This ten mill

91 General Code of the State of Ohio, Section 4848-3.

92 General Code of the State of Ohio, Section 4848-2.

93 General Code of the State of Ohio, Section 4848-3.

requirement had been established when the Foundation Program was enacted in 1935. It maintained very simply, that the school district, township, or village must have a combined total levy of ten mills in order for the school district to participate in the Foundation Program.

Enacted this same year by the General Assembly was Section 4848-5A which provided for the payment of tuition by political subdivisions in certain particular kinds of instances.⁹⁴ An example of such a tuition payment would be a County Welfare Department paying the tuition of a child who was at the time a ward of the county.

Another amendment in the year of 1947 stipulated that 75% of the increase in the Public School Foundation Program funds of a district must be spent for teacher salaries within the district. School districts were to prepare a single salary schedule based upon training and experience with increments showing that the districts recognized such training and experience. The single salary schedule was to go into effect

94 General Code of the State of Ohio, Section 4848-5A.

for the 1947-48 school year.⁹⁵ This schedule was further to be submitted to the State Superintendent of Public Instruction.

The 99th General Assembly in 1951 saw fit to provide further state financial assistance for the public schools. The minimum Foundation Program allowance and flat distribution rates were increased while the local millage charged against the Foundation Program was raised from 4½ mills to six mills for the year 1951-52 and to eight mills for the year 1953 and thereafter. School districts not abiding by these total millage rates for school operation in their local school district were to be excluded from participation in the School Foundation Program.⁹⁶ A state mandated minimum teacher salary schedule was enacted and incorporated in the Foundation Program in this year.⁹⁷ Tuition rates were again modified slightly at this time.⁹⁸

95 General Code of the State of Ohio, Section 4848-6.

96 General Code of the State of Ohio, Section 4848-1-2.

97 General Code of the State of Ohio, Section 4848.

98 General Code of the State of Ohio, Section 4848-5.

In the period covered by this thesis the last change in the School Foundation Program was made in 1953. This was another increase in the flat distribution rate and the minimum Foundation Program.⁹⁹

This section has succinctly delineated the legal changes made in the Ohio Public School Foundation Program from its inception until 1955. A brief word of explanation was given when a section of law was introduced for the first time. There were five basic monetary changes in the law and a number of incidental changes were made in regard to tuition payments and charge-off rates. A change was also made in the method of accounting for pupils for the Public School Foundation Program.

2. The Years of Deficit Financing for the Public School Foundation Program

The Public School Foundation Program as it was originally enacted provided a minimum program for the schools in the State of Ohio; \$22.50 was provided for kindergarten

⁹⁹ General Code of the State of Ohio, Section 4848.

pupils, \$45 for each child in grades one through eight and \$67.50 for each pupil in grades nine through twelve. It also established a flat distribution for each child in kindergarten of \$15.30, \$30.60 for each child in grades one through eight and \$45.90 for each child enrolled in grades nine through twelve. In initiating this program the state committed itself to an annual expenditure for public education of approximately \$48,000,000.¹⁰⁰

The money for the program was to come from earmarked taxes, with the newly enacted sales tax furnishing the largest portion of this amount. However, the earmarked taxes never produced enough money to adequately finance the Public School Foundation Program. Thus, a deficit was incurred from the start; this deficit financing of the program lasted for a period of eight years.

The year following the enactment of the Public School Foundation Program found the Ohio Education Association in a

¹⁰⁰ Robert Rohe, Director of Finance, Financial Report to the Director of Education of the State of Ohio, Columbus, December 31, 1936, pp. 1-5, on file in the office of the State Department of Education.

struggle to properly explain the program to the people of the state and to obtain an adequate financial base for the program.

The first threat to the financing of the Foundation Program came in the form of a Constitutional Amendment to exempt food for human consumption from the sales tax levy. According to Walton Bliss¹⁰¹ the Constitutional Amendment came by the way of a petition initiated by the Anti-Tax League in Cuyhega County. This petition was duly filed with the Secretary of State and was put on the ballot to be voted on at the General Election in November of 1936. Since the sales tax was intended to furnish the majority of money for the School Foundation Program the Ohio Education Association was quite concerned over this Constitutional Amendment. Leaders of the association knew that if the School Foundation Program was to succeed it must have an adequate revenue source.

101 Walton Bliss, Executive Secretary of the Ohio Education Association, in an interview at Columbus, April 8, 1958, located in File 1, Folder 2, in the office of the South Western City Schools, Grove City, Ohio.

Without adequate financing, the public schools of the State of Ohio would again be destitute. The calculated loss of revenue for the School Foundation Program by exempting food for human consumption from the sales tax was estimated to be about \$16,000,000.¹⁰² A special meeting of the Executive Committee of the Ohio Education Association was called on July 27, 1936, to discuss the implications of this proposed Constitutional Amendment. After considerable discussion the Executive Committee went on record as opposing the movement exempting food for human consumption from the sales tax. The Executive Committee opposed the Constitutional Amendment on two counts; (1) because of the loss of revenue involved and (2) because the Executive Committee felt it was unsound to write tax legislation in the form of an Amendment to the State Constitution.

The Executive Committee of the association met again in August and decided that a campaign was necessary to present the facts about this amendment showing its effect on

¹⁰² Hobert Bell, Editor, School Topics, Columbus, Ohio Education Association, October, 1936, pp. 1-4.

state school finance should food for human consumption be exempted from taxation. The campaign was launched in a Public Relations Pamphlet called School Topics in September of 1936. This pamphlet was sent to all of the newspapers in the state as well as to hundreds of individuals who had expressed an interest in the schools. This pamphlet stated,

The friends of Public Education in Ohio are launching a campaign to arouse public interest in the adequate and permanent financing of the School Foundation Law. It is intended that this should be made an issue in the election of Senators and of Representatives in every district of the state. It is intended that the voters should have the facts concerning the effects that the Constitutional Amendment to exempt food from the sales tax will have on the financing of the program, so that votes to remove this particular tax may be understood to be votes to provide other replacement tax.¹⁰³

The pamphlet went on to explain the Public School Foundation Program and why it was enacted. A breakdown of expected tax yield for the coming year with food being taxed and tax yield without food being taxed were also presented. The Ohio Education Association predicted a \$16,400,000 loss

103 Ibid, September, 1936, pp. 1-4.

in revenue for the School Foundation Program without the taxing of food sales. This position of the association was well publicized through the pamphlet.

The October, 1936 issue of School Topics carried about the same material as did the September pamphlet but a more thorough explanation was made regarding the loss of revenue as a result of the proposed amendment and the effects of such revenue loss upon the schools. The ballot on which the proposed Constitutional Amendment was listed was presented along with the arguments against the adoption of the amendment.¹⁰⁴

The members of the Office staff of the Ohio Education Association were busy during this period contacting the various people who were running for the legislature. They tried to get as many commitments on the part of the prospective legislators as possible in regard to how the prospective legislators stood on adequate financing for the School Foundation Program. The Executive Secretary of the Ohio Education

104 Ibid, October, 1936, pp. 1-4.

Association, Walton Bliss,¹⁰⁵ outlined what the association was expecting of their members and what the staff was doing on behalf of the "cause" in the October 1936 issue of Ohio Schools. Bliss delineated in his article a program for every school in the state to present during Education Week, which was the week preceeding the November election. Stress in the suggested Education Week program was to be placed on the contribution that the Public School Foundation Program had made to the youth in each given community.

The same lay groups were contacted that had helped the Ohio Education Association in efforts directed toward establishing the Foundation Program in previous years. It was the intention of the association to not only defeat the proposed Constitutional Amendment on sales tax exemption for food if possible, but also to elect a legislature that was committed to establishing an adequate financial base for the Public School Foundation Program.

The general election was held on November 3, 1936, and the sales tax exemption on food was passed by a large

105 Walton Bliss, Executive Secretary, "Valiant is the word for Teachers", Ohio Schools, Volume XIV, October, 1936, p. 227.

majority.¹⁰⁶ Thus, the association had lost its fight against the Constitutional Amendment. Only the next session of the legislature would tell whether or not they had helped to elect legislators that would seek adequate financing for the Ohio Public School Foundation Program.

The Ohio Education Association estimated that the deficit at the end of the 1936 calendar year for the Foundation Program would be \$6,494,700 and predicted an additional deficit at the end of the 1937 calendar year of nine to ten million dollars, or a total deficit of around \$16,000,000.¹⁰⁷ In actuality the deficit was far less than the above figure.

The association's goal for the 1937 legislative session was to get enough money to pay off any deficit and finance the Public School Foundation Program without Boards of Education having to borrow against anticipated disbursements from the state.

Throughout the 1937 legislative session in Ohio the Education Association presented and pled their case. But

¹⁰⁶ Ohio Law, Volume 116, part 2, p. 377.

¹⁰⁷ Hobert Bell, Editor, School Topics, Columbus, Ohio Education Association, October, 1936, p. 4.

their efforts fell upon deaf ears. Walton Bliss,¹⁰⁸ summed up the 92nd General Assembly, as far as the schools were concerned, when he wrote that there was no great record of accomplishment by the General Assembly in regard to the public schools. The legislators, as well as the state administration's position was that the sales tax for 1937 would yield enough money along with other taxes to adequately take care of the schools. Although the association was not satisfied with this answer they did not obtain legislation providing any new money for the Public School Foundation Program during the 1937 legislative year.

Whether the legislature was tired of the constant demands of the Ohio Education Association, or the lay people and school people were satisfactorily appeased with the School Foundation Program and the money they were getting from it for their schools, were causes of the failure to get more money approved by the 1936 or 1937 legislatures is a problem that cannot be answered directly. However, the actual

108 Walton Bliss, Executive Secretary, "The Record of the 92nd General Assembly on School Legislation", Ohio Schools, Columbus, Volume XV, September, 1937, p. 300.

cause would seem to be, rather, a combination of things. But in any event, the Ohio Education Association was not willing to let matters stand with what they had termed as the improper financing of the Public School Foundation Program.

The year 1938 was not a legislative year, but nevertheless the Ohio Education Association officials kept hammering away with public relations and news information releases throughout the year. The public relations pamphlet, School Topics, which was sent out to all newspapers in the state for their use as well as to thousands of other interested citizens, both lay and professional people, again outlined the need for an adequate financial base for the Public School Foundation Program. The pamphlet¹⁰⁹ indicated that the deficit did grow to \$17,447,243 in 1938, but the actual deficit in 1937 was \$11,597,640, so this deficit did not double as was earlier predicted by the Ohio Education Association.¹¹⁰

109 Hobert Bell, Editor, School Topics, Columbus, Ohio Education Association, April, 1938, p. 4.

110 Robert Rohe, Director of Finance, Financial Report to the Director of Education in the State of Ohio, Columbus, December 31, 1937, pp. 1-3, on file in the office of the State Department of Education.

In the legislative year of 1939 the association did realize a part of their desires. The legislators appropriated enough money direct from the general revenue fund of the State of Ohio to adequately finance the Public School Foundation Program. An additional annual appropriation of \$1,000,000 for the biennium was made by the legislators to help erase the deficit of \$17,447,243 that had accumulated over the years following the enactment of the Public School Foundation Program. When the General Assembly of 1939 passed this legislation, whereby monies to finance the Public School Foundation Program were to be appropriated from the general revenue fund of the State of Ohio, it brought about the end of the earmarking of certain taxes for the Public School Foundation Program.

However, there still was a deficit that, according to the Ohio Education Association, had to be considered. While they had effected a major change in the Foundation Program law and had set the legislators thinking about the deficit, there was still a long way to go before the deficit could be eliminated and there could be any thought of raising the flat distribution and minimum Foundation Program rate levels.

THE LEGISLATIVE CHANGES IN THE
PUBLIC SCHOOL FOUNDATION PROGRAM

122

In 1940, the Executive Committee at its March meeting outlined a six point legislative program that was to be presented to the prospective legislators who were to be elected in November of that year. Two of these points concerned the Public School Foundation Program. The Executive Committee sought the reactions of the prospective legislators on the continuation of the "pay as you go" plan of financing the Public School Foundation Program that had been established by the legislature in 1939. They also sought reactions on a continuation of the plan of appropriating a definite annual amount to retire the deficit in the State Public School Fund account, as well as reactions on the payment of the interest on this deficit. The Executive Secretary was authorized to carry out the above program and to do what was necessary to publicize information regarding the program to the local districts of each of the prospective legislators.¹¹¹

Again this year, as in the past, the Ohio Education Association used the public relations pamphlet, School Topics,

¹¹¹ Walton Bliss, Executive Secretary, Minutes of the Executive Committee, Columbus, March 15, 1940, on file in the office of the Ohio Education Association.

to carry their legislative program to local newspapers and interested citizens throughout the state. But it was 1943 before the association's goals were realized. The legislature in 1941 appropriated enough money to finance the Public School Foundation Program for 1941 and 1942, and an additional \$3,000,000 for each of these years to apply as payments against the program's deficit. Then in 1943, the legislators appropriated enough money to pay off the remainder of the deficit incurred in funding the Public School Foundation Program.¹¹²

This section has presented the activities of the Ohio Education Association on behalf of seeking an adequate financial base for the Public School Foundation Program. For a period of eight years the association brought pressure to bear on the legislators to appropriate enough money to wipe out the deficit in the Public School fund. In 1939 the association succeeded in eliminating the practice of earmarking taxes and had the Public School Foundation Program

¹¹² Robert Rohe, Director of Finance, Financial Report to the Director of Education of the State of Ohio, Columbus, December 31, 1943, p. 3, on file in the office of the State Department of Education.

financed through the general revenue of the state. By 1943, through a series of appropriations the deficit incurred in financing the program was completely eliminated. The Ohio Education Association's Legislative Program had been accomplished through persistent and diligent work. Throughout this period the greatest portion of the efforts of the association were put forth by the members of the association's full-time staff.

It would seem that the teachers and the lay people had not felt the lack of adequate revenue sources for the program in their personal lives to any great degree. Thus, they reacted more slowly in coming to the assistance of the Ohio Education Association than they did in the past when schools were being closed and salaries were being cut.

3. The Increase in the Public School Foundation Program in 1943.

In the period covered by this thesis, 1935 to 1955, there were five major monetary changes in the Public School Foundation Program, but there was not a decrease in either

the minimum or flat distribution rates during this period of adjustment for the Foundation Program.

The first eight years of the Public School Foundation Program were not properly financed by the state, and the program, therefore, carried a deficit. As has been pointed out, this deficit reached \$17,447,243 in 1938, and was not paid off completely until 1943. Thus, the Ohio Education Association did not attempt to seek an increase in the basic program during these years. Then, too, the cost of living, until 1941, remained fairly constant and there was no great need for an expanding program. However, with the advent of the Second World War and the beginning of inflation, teachers found that the salaries of other workers were moving ahead while their salaries remained relatively constant, as is generally true for people who are working on a fixed contractual salary.

The year 1943 brought the first demand of the Representative Assembly of the Ohio Education Association for a definite increase in the Public School Foundation

THE LEGISLATIVE CHANGES IN THE
PUBLIC SCHOOL FOUNDATION PROGRAM

126

Program. At their December meeting James Dunn,¹¹³ Chairman of the committee on teachers' salaries and the cost of living, reported on a program to amend the foundation law to provide increases, particularly in grades one through eight, to afford relief for teachers through increased salaries. His proposal was adopted by the Representative Assembly and turned over to the Executive Committee of the Ohio Education Association for further planning and eventual implementation. However, prior to Mr. Dunn's report, the Executive Committee had made and adopted a similar resolution to be transmitted to the General Assembly. This recommendation sought an amendment in the Public School Foundation Law whereby the minimum program would be raised to \$52 instead of \$45, and the flat distribution rate from \$30.60 to \$34.60.¹¹⁴ This recommendation dealt only with the first eight grades and there was no consideration in the proposal for kindergarten or grades nine through twelve.

113 James Dunn, Chairman, "The Report of the Educational Council", Minutes of the Representative Assembly, Columbus, December, 1942, pp. 33-34, on file in the office of the Ohio Education Association.

114 Walton Bliss, Executive Secretary, Minutes of the Executive Committee, Columbus, August, 1942, p. 124, on file in the office of the Ohio Education Association.

When the General Assembly of the State of Ohio convened in January of 1943 the staff members of the Ohio Education Association were on hand to report on legislative recommendations and to lobby for the desired changes in legislation as set up by the association through their Executive Committee and Representative Assembly.

In the first Legislative Report of the year the Executive Secretary outlined the legislative program of the Ohio Education Association and enumerated the legislative activities of the General Assembly for the first month. He admonished the school people of the State of Ohio to get behind the Ohio Education Association's Legislative Program when he wrote,

We urge upon school people and friends of the school that they actively and whole-heartedly enter into the legislative campaign for these objectives. Specific bills bearing upon these aims will be brought to your attention through this Legislative Bulletin as soon as introduced. It is important that your Senators and Representatives be contacted by you and supplied with information as to the problems and needs of the school in general, and of your local school in particular. Letters to Governor Bricker will also be entirely in order. 115

115 Walton Bliss, Executive Secretary, Legislative Report, Columbus, January 20, 1943, on file in the office of the Ohio Education Association.

The Legislative Program of the Ohio Education Association had rough going with the General Assembly of 1943. A Representative Mooney introduced a bill in the house to increase the elementary minimum foundation from \$45 to \$52.20 and the flat distribution rate from \$30.60 to \$34.65. This bill was introduced on January 27, 1943, and was not assigned to committee until about February 23. As of March 15 of the same year it had not yet been heard by the committee to which it was assigned.

This might have been the death of this bill but a Senator Creamer introduced a bill in the Senate with the same features as those presented in the Mooney Bill. The Creamer Bill was heard in the Senate Education Committee and recommended for passage. However, by March 18, neither of these bills, Mooney's or Creamer's, had been brought up for passage. Again the Executive Secretary of the Ohio Education Association made a plea to all school people to send letters to their legislators, and to get their Boards of Education and other interested citizens to write on behalf of the bills.¹¹⁶

116 Ibid, March 18, 1943, p. 1.

The Governor also represented a stumbling block for this legislation. He was opposed to the program contained in each of the bills, Mooney's and Creamer's, because he had set up a financial ceiling for the biennium and such legislation would have called for additional money over what he had determined would be necessary for the public schools during the 1943-44 biennium. Thus, since the Governor opposed the measure, the only way the Ohio Education Association could expect to get action was through pressure from local organizations and people back home writing to their legislative representatives.

The Executive Secretary of the Ohio Education Association stated in his April 1 bulletin,¹¹⁷

We know no answer except the continuation of your efforts to enlist more and more people in every Ohio community, who will write postcards or letters to the Governor, to Senator Frank E. Whittenmore, Chairman of the Rules Committee, to William E. McCullough, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to your own Senators and Representatives.

You are one of 2,600 people who get this weekly Legislative Bulletin. Suppose you wrote and got three other people to write--that would be more than 10,000 letters to the first three named. Anybody would be slow to believe that 10,000 people can be wrong, voting booths being as prevalent as they are in a democracy.

117 Ibid, April 1, 1943, p. 1.

The Executive Committee Minutes of the Ohio Education Association are silent as to what went on in their sessions in regard to legislative program. It seemed that the Ohio Education Association staff members were left to carry the ball. They did as well as could be expected under the existing circumstances. They worked in the halls of the General Assembly, maintained daily contacts with the Representatives, and wrote letters to various groups to stir up interest in behalf of the desired legislation.

The president of the Ohio Education Association, W. A. Driscoll, along with the president and vice-chairman of the Superintendent's Association did confer with the Governor during the second week of April in 1943. They asked the Governor to modify his ceiling and to permit an additional amount to be added to the Public School Foundation Program. The Governor, however, refused this request.¹¹⁸

The Creamer Bill was finally voted out of committee to be acted on by the Senate. The Senate passed this bill

118 Ibid, April 9, 1943, p. 1.

concerned with raising the elementary school foundation rate. Before passing the bill, though, it was modified downward from the original \$52.20 to \$50.40 for the minimum program, and from \$34.64 to \$32.58 for the flat distribution. Further, the Senate version as modified would grant this increase only for a single year. The Executive Secretary attempted to get this increase changed from a one year period to a two year period. However, he was informed that the Governor had agreed to this much of an increase and that the bill as amended should not be disturbed.¹¹⁹

The Creamer Bill then went to the House where it came before the House Education Committee. The Ohio Education Association's Executive Secretary was successful in getting the House of Representatives to raise the minimum program back to the \$52.20 as originally proposed and to extend the life of the new measure by six months to July 1, 1945. Before the House of Representatives voted on this bill, the members of the House all warned Mr. Deddins, the House Majority Leader, that the Governor was opposed to any increase.

119 Ibid, April 16, 1943, p. 1.

Nevertheless, the House passed the bill by a vote of 118 to nothing. Then, of course, the bill as amended had to go back to the Senate for concurrence.

The members of the Ohio Education Association staff felt that Governor Bricker would attempt to block the bill. Hurried calls were placed to all of the school superintendents in the state, asking them to wire or telephone the Senators urging support of the amended bill. When the bill was brought up in the Senate the Senators concurred by a vote of 26 to nothing.¹²⁰ It is quite evident, considering all of the time wasted from January to June on this bill which was introduced in the House of Representatives by Mooney and later in the Senate by Creamer, that the letters, telegrams, and phone calls to the legislators were effective.

This method of direct contact with the legislators was one that had been used several times in the past by the Ohio Education Association and, though the gains were modest, they broke the ice and the first increase in the Public School Foundation Program since its enactment in June, 1935, was realized.

¹²⁰ Walton Bliss, Executive Secretary, Legislative Report, Columbus, June 1, 1943, p. 1, on file in the office of the Ohio Education Association.

This section has presented the efforts of the Ohio Education Association on behalf of the first increase in the Public School Foundation Program. This was accomplished by the association through determined and constant pressure by local groups and individuals on their Senators and Representatives.

4. The Increase in the Public School Foundation
Program in 1945.

The Ohio Education Association was generally dissatisfied with the gains of 1943 and therefore prepared themselves for renewed efforts to be directed toward the 1945 assembly. The small amount gained in 1943 in no way offset the continued increase in the over-all cost of living. Hence, the association felt it mandatory to find more money for the public schools in 1945.

The Representative Assembly of the Ohio Education Association met in December, 1943 and devoted a large portion of time to a discussion of the state financial plan supporting public education and outlined a program for the coming 1945 legislative session. One of the strongest

talking points of the association was the fact that many teachers were leaving the teaching profession and going into industry where salaries were far more attractive.

As before, Mr. James Dunn was chairman of the Committee dealing with teachers' salaries. He delivered a lengthy report to the Ohio Education Association Representative Assembly on the salary conditions of Ohio teachers. Included in his report was a discussion of the treatment of the surplus in the general fund of the State of Ohio. He concluded his report as follows:

There is only one answer to the problem, other than the denial of suitable and equitable education, that is, to implore the public to provide more money for the support of its schools. I think that is the answer. These people who run away from the schools to factories, including both men and women, while in a sense they are doing a bit of patriotic work, the patriotic work of just being in the school room would have been enough. We have to say that they had other motives than that. The only way we can hit that motive is to offset it with a similar offer in your school district. So it is a case of compensation, and compensation no matter where it comes from has its rewards.¹²¹

¹²¹ James Dunn, Chairman, "Report on Teacher Salaries", Minutes of the Representative Assembly, Columbus, December, 1944, p. 40, on file in the office of the Ohio Education Association.

The Representative Assembly of the Ohio Education Association went on record at this December, 1943 meeting as desiring to seek suitable legislation to establish a minimum salary schedule for all teachers in Ohio, to amend the Public School Foundation Program in order to finance such a salary schedule, and to require in the School Foundation Program Law that Boards of Education adopt a single salary schedule and adhere to it.

The Representative Assembly's broad program of additional financial support for the public schools was passed on to the Executive Committee for this group to work out specific program details. Since 1944 was not a legislative year, the Executive Committee delayed formal action on a concrete program until September, 1944. However, there was much discussion by various groups prior to 1944, as well as the initiation of public relations work seeking to inform the people of the state of the financial plight of the state's public schools.

School Topics, which came out in April, 1944, dealt exclusively with the financial situation, engulfing public

education. A detailed analysis of the teacher shortage was presented along with an assessment of the number of properly certified teachers in the state. Also, causes for the teacher shortage were delineated and a suggested remedy for these problems was advanced. As could be expected the solution offered by School Topics was greater state financial assistance for its schools. However, no detailed program was suggested in this pamphlet at this time for increasing the Public School Foundation Program.

In September of 1944, the Executive Committee discussed the need for developing detailed recommendations on public school finance to be submitted to the 96th General Assembly:

Miss Boyd moved, seconded by Miss Shultz that the President be authorized to appoint a committee of three to act with him in preparing a plan to implement the O.E.A. Assembly's resolution calling for additional state support equivalent to 12% of the local schools operating outlay in Ohio. Motion carried. President Bunn announced the appointment of Miss Boyd, Higgins, and Shanks to this committee.¹²²

122 Walton Bliss, Executive Secretary, Minutes of the Executive Committee, Columbus, September, 1944, p. 157, on file in the office of the Ohio Education Association.

At this October meeting of the Ohio Education Association Executive Committee, President Bunn reported for the Financial Committee on the work that had been accomplished.¹²³ He mentioned that the president of the Classroom Teachers' Association, as well as the president of the Superintendents' Association had been asked to meet with the committee and they had done so. He also reported that an agreement to revise the Public School Foundation Law to establish a ratio of one to 1.2 between the elementary and high school support had been reached. Bunn also called attention to the fact that two representatives from the State Department of Education had participated in the deliberations of the committee. He further stressed the importance of having State Department of Education approval for any plan the Ohio Education Association might want to present to the legislature.

The financial committee continued their work on a detailed program and agreed to present it to the Representative Assembly of the Ohio Education Association at their December

123 Ibid, October, 1944, p. 159.

meeting in 1944. This meeting was to be held one month prior to the meeting of the General Assembly of the State of Ohio in January, 1945. In November of 1944 the committee on financial support to schools made their specific recommendations to the Executive Committee. The report incorporated the one to 1.2 ratio of support for the elementary and the high schools. The minimum program was to be increased from \$52.50 in grades one to eight to \$67.50 for a school year of 180 days. The minimum program for grades nine through twelve was to be increased from \$67.50 to \$81.00 for a 180 day school year. The committee also recommended that the flat distribution rate should be raised to \$45.00 against the old rate of \$32.58 for grades one through eight, and to \$54.00 against the old rate of \$45.90 for grades nine through twelve.¹²⁴

In this same report much was made of the fact that the above program was worked out with the cooperation of the State Department of Education, as well as the Classroom

124 Ibid, November 7, 1944, p. 161.

Teachers Association and the Ohio Superintendents Association.

The leaders of the Ohio Education Association were attempting to bring in many of the association's departments and many other groups for concurrence on their program. The more people they could involve, the better they felt the program would be understood. They also had far greater publicity and had enlisted greater general acceptance than was the case in any other legislative program of the association since the enactment of the original Public School Foundation Program. At the December meeting of the Representative Assembly of the Ohio Education Association the Executive Committee presented the above plan. It met with immediate acceptance.¹²⁵

B. I. Griffith of the Public Relations Department of the Ohio Education Association was called upon to formulate a plan to inform people in the state concerning this proposed

¹²⁵ Paul Bunn, President, Minutes of the Representative Assembly, Columbus, December, 1944, pp. 66-74, on file in the office of the Ohio Education Association.

legislative program. He reported his strategy in the June issue of Ohio Schools.¹²⁶

The basis of Griffith's approach was to carry the story of Ohio public school needs to the people of the state. The Public Relations Department of the Ohio Education Association planned a series of sixteen workers' conferences which were to start on January 15, 1945, in Columbus, and then be followed by conferences in other cities. At these conferences the Ohio Education Association staff members were to lead discussions based upon the adopted legislative program of the association. Promotional material for local leaders to use in talking with various organizations in their communities was to be prepared. This material was to be developed in the form of film strips, charts, and printed pamphlets, as well as brochure material to be passed out to individuals to take home for further perusal.

Next, there was to be formulated a committee of assistants in each of the eighty-eight counties. These

126 B. I. Griffith, Public Relations Director, "Plans for Presenting School Legislature Needs Developed", Ohio Schools, Volume XXII, January, 1945, p. 18.

county committees of assistants were to do three things:

(1) select a group of people to contact members of the legislature and present the Ohio Education Association's legislative program, (2) contact all of the organizations within their county and present the legislative program to the membership of these organizations, and (3) set up a speakers' bureau that could use the material prepared by the Ohio Education Association's Public Relations Department in speaking before the various organizations within their county.

Thus, the legislative program strategy was placed in motion and was readied for the coming battle in the 96th General Assembly. This was the most highly organized program initiated by the Ohio Education Association since that preceeding the enactment of the Public School Foundation Program.

During the week of January 15, 1945, Governor Frank Lausche read his message to the legislature. He stated in part,

THE LEGISLATIVE CHANGES IN THE
PUBLIC SCHOOL FOUNDATION PROGRAM

142

We all know that there has been an increase in the cost of maintaining and operating our public schools. I believe, and recommend that the appropriation of the last biennium should be increased.

While a large allocation of it should be made to the School Foundation and to the local government, we must keep the increase reasonable and consistent with reasonable financial needs of the government agencies.¹²⁷

The Governor recommended a total of \$108,259,208 for the Public School Foundation Program for the 1945-46 biennium.

The Ohio Education Association's proposed program was calculated to cost \$111,400,000 for the same biennium.¹²⁸

The Ohio Education Association prevailed upon Senator Daniels and Senator Creamer to introduce the association's program in the Senate. The Bill was given the number 39, and contained the figures as proposed by the Ohio Education Association. Amounts of \$45 per pupil in grades one to

¹²⁷ Frank J. Lausche, Governor, "Governor's Message to the 96th General Assembly of the State of Ohio", Ohio House Journal, Volume 121, January 15, 1945, p. 64.

¹²⁸ Walton Bliss, Executive Secretary, Legislative Report, Columbus, February 23, 1945, p. 1, on file in the office of the Ohio Education Association.

eight, \$54 for grades nine through twelve, and \$22.50 for kindergarten were used for the flat distribution portion of the Foundation Program. The minimum foundation amounts were to be \$33.75 for kindergarten, \$67.50 for grades one through eight, and \$81 for grades nine through twelve.¹²⁹ After the first hearing of Senate Bill 39, the Senate Education Committee recommended it for passage with a vote of eight to nothing.'

Walton Bliss¹³⁰ listed the groups of people who spoke on behalf of the bill at the hearings. They were the Parent and Teacher Organizations, the Federation of Women's Clubs, the American Federation of Labor, the Railroad Brotherhoods, and various other businessmen's groups, as well as school people.

The planning of the Ohio Education Association was starting to realize dividends. This is indicated by the groups above who came out to support Senate Bill 39. The

129 Ibid, January 25, 1945, p. 1.

130 Ibid, March 1, 1945, p. 1.

Senate Rules Committee placed Senate Bill 39 on the calendar to be brought up on April 1, 1945 for a vote in the Senate. The Senate passed the bill with only four dissenting votes. At this time there was no evident opposition to the bill and everything seemed to be going smoothly. Senate Bill 39 was sent to the House of Representatives and placed in the hands of the House Rules Committee. The House Rules Committee was evidently in no hurry to refer it to the House Education Committee, and Walton Bliss¹³¹ reported that stalling was apparent. He then requested that a concerted effort on the part of the school people should be made to get Senate Bill 39 moving in the House. Still, however, there was no report of organized opposition to the bill. After Senate Bill 39 was referred to the Education Committee of the House, opposition became manifest.

The main opposition stemmed from two sources, the Inter-Organization Conference and the Ohio Chamber of Commerce. There was some over-lapping of the activities of

131 Ibid, April 19, 1945, p. 1.

these two organizations and the Chamber of Commerce was composed of the very groups that made up the Inter-Organization Conferences. Both organizations drew their membership from the Manufacturers Association, the Ohio Council of Retail Merchants, the Ohio Banker's Association, the Petroleum Industry Committee of Ohio, and several other groups representing public and civic leaders. Yet each of these organizations attacked Senate Bill 39 and each favored a substitute bill introduced in the House by Representative Tarr of Hamilton County. The Tarr Bill left the minimum figure of the Foundation Program for the high school unchanged at \$45.90 and \$67.50, but raised the elementary figure for the minimum Foundation Program rate to \$56.25, and the flat distribution rate to \$38.25. The Tarr Bill was closer to the figures recommended by the Governor, and was significantly less than the suggested Ohio Education Association Program of \$67.50 for elementary and \$81.50 for the high school minimum foundation rate and \$45 for the elementary and \$54 for the high school flat distribution rates.

In the Ohio Education Association's Legislative Report of April 26, the Tarr Bill was explained along with all of its unfavorable ramifications. The Inter-Organizational Conference and the Ohio Chamber of Commerce were referred to in their attack on Senate Bill 39 as desenting, "like a wolf on the fold".¹³² In the same report the Executive Secretary of the Ohio Education Association issued a call to arms to everyone who received the report. Each of these people was requested to busy himself and to get a businessman to write to the members of the House in favor of Senate Bill 39.

On May 8, the Chamber of Commerce sent to all of its members a three-page letter that stated in part,

The Ohio Chamber of Commerce favors the enactment of the pending House Bill Number 93, Mr. Tarr. It is opposed to Senate Bill Number 39, Messrs. Daniels-Creamer.¹³³

The rest of the letter gave an explanation of the two bills and the Ohio Chamber of Commerce's reasons for opposing Senate Bill 39. The Chamber's opposition to Senate Bill 39

¹³² Ibid, April 26, 1945, p. 1.

¹³³ Herschel C. Atkinson, Executive Vice President, Private Bulletin to Members, Columbus, May 8, 1945, p. 3, on file in the office of the Ohio Chamber of Commerce.

could be boiled down to what was thought to be excessive money for the support of the public schools.

On May 14, the Governor of the State of Ohio submitted a message to the 96th General Assembly saying that what he had proposed in his budget for the public schools of the state was adequate. He cited the figure of the gross tax duplicate of the state and said that the gross tax duplicate was increasing, that the school enrollment of the state was decreasing, and, therefore, Senate Bill 39 called for more financial support of public education than reason¹³⁴ justified.

Thus, with continued opposition to Senate Bill 39 from the Governor and with the possibility of a veto, the Ohio Education Association pled for greater support from the people of the state. The staff of the Ohio Education Association worked tirelessly behind the scenes with members of the House of Representatives using every means available to them to bring Senate Bill 39 to vote.

¹³⁴ Frank Lausche, Governor, "Governor's Message to the 96th General Assembly", Ohio House Journal, Vol. 121, May 14, 1945, p. 611.

On May 14, Senators Creamer and Daniels defended the bill in light of the Governor's message before the 96th General Assembly.¹³⁵ Senate Bill 39 was brought to a vote in the House on May 29 with only two minor amendments and was passed by the House 105 to twenty. The bill was then presented to the Senate with the Senate concurring on June 6, 1945. The fight had been won in both Houses but the question still remained: Would the Governor veto this bill, and if he did, would the House and Senate pass this bill over the Governor's veto? Until this time, the Governor had made no public statement of threats of veto in regard to Senate Bill Number 39. However, it was obvious to all concerned that were he to veto the bill, he would have the support of the Ohio Chamber of Commerce and the Inter-Organization Conference.

The answer to the imposing question came on Tuesday, June 11, 1945. Much to the chagrin of the teaching profession the Governor did veto Senate Bill 39. The bill now had to go

¹³⁵ Albert L. Daniels and Virgil E. Creamer, An Answer to the Governor's Message of May 14, 1945, unpublished reply, Columbus, May 24, 1945, p. 4, on file in the office of the Ohio Education Association.

back to both Houses if the legislators were to attempt to over-ride the Governor's action. The matter came before the Senate on Wednesday, June 12, and a vote of 21 for this bill and ten against resulted, thus over-riding the veto. Nevertheless, this was a close margin since twenty votes were required for positive action on the bill. On Friday, June 14, the House voted and also overrode the veto 91 to thirty. This was, however, a clear majority in the House since only 82 votes were needed for the override.¹³⁶

There was much work done on behalf of Senate Bill 39 by the Ohio Education Association. That the association's efforts were fruitful can be seen in the results of the law enacted by the 96th General Assembly. The Ohio Education Association had furnished the basic facts and figures for proposed Senate Bill 39 and they had secured sponsorship of this bill. They had also organized a campaign to bring pressure from various organizations, as well as the teaching profession, on the legislators to get this bill passed. In fact, they even saw this bill enacted over the veto of the

¹³⁶ Walton Bliss, Executive Secretary, Legislative Report, Columbus, June 20, 1945, p. 1.

Governor of the state. The association had every right to be satisfied with their legislative program that sought to increase the State School Foundation Program in the 96th General Assembly.

5. The Attempts of the Ohio Education Association to Increase the Public School Foundation Program in 1947.

The schools of the State of Ohio were caught in a tight squeeze in the post-war years. The cost of living was continuing to rise; teachers were in short supply; the gains that had been made in state financing for public education were always behind the ever-increasing needs of the schools. As was the case in the past, the Ohio Education Association had prepared a legislative program for the 1947 legislative session. This section deals with this legislative program and enumerates the activities of the Ohio Education Association in behalf of the legislative program presented to the 97th General Assembly of the State of Ohio.

The echoes of the success of the Ohio Education Association and the 96th General Assembly had barely subsided when

the Representative Assembly of the Ohio Education Association started to initiate action seeking an increase in the Public School Foundation Program during the 1947 legislative year. In the January, 1946 annual meeting of the Representative Assembly of the Ohio Education Association, the president of the association discussed his observations of the association's gains in legislation that affected the public schools of the state. He stressed that although the Public School Foundation Program had been raised by some 38% over the original amount granted in 1935, this represented only the comparable increase in the cost of operating schools. He stressed further that the time had come for serious consideration of an all-out program to seek state aid for public education. He added that the association should stop trying to patch up the Public School Foundation Program ever so often, and should really go after adequate financing for public education.¹³⁷

In this same meeting the assembly went on record as requesting that a continuous study be made of the Public

¹³⁷ A. O. Methias, President, Minutes of the Representative Assembly, January, 1946, p. 10-11, on file in the office of the Ohio Education Association.

School Foundation Program and that recommendations for desirable improvements be made to the Representative Assembly. The Executive Committee of the Ohio Education Association, taking the cue from the Representative Assembly, started to work through its Legislative Planning Committee, immediately after the conclusion of the January, 1946 annual meeting of the association to draft a legislative program for the 97th General Assembly. On October 11, 1946 following nine months of planning and discussion, a draft of a legislative program was presented to the Executive Committee of the association. Modest increases in the State Foundation Program were included in the plan. Also the idea of using the classroom unit, instead of the average daily membership for pupils for calculating the Foundation Program, was presented for the first time.

The Executive Secretary of the Ohio Education Association, Walton Bliss¹³⁸ recorded in the minutes of the Executive Committee meeting on October 11, 1946, that the

138 Walton Bliss, Executive Secretary, Minutes of the Executive Committee, Columbus, October 11, 1946, p. 185, on file in the office of the Ohio Education Association.

committee rejected the classroom unit idea at this time and requested that the Legislative Planning Committee continue to adhere to average daily membership for purposes of calculation in the Foundation Program. The Legislative Planning Committee, which had been appointed by the Executive Committee, returned before the Executive Committee on November 15, 1946, with specific recommendations for an increase in the Foundation Program. These recommendations were as follows: (1) a recommendation of \$55 per pupil in average daily membership enrolled at the elementary level and \$66 per pupil at the high school level for the flat distribution, and (2) a recommendation of \$100 for elementary and \$125 for high school pupils in average daily membership for additional aid districts. The above recommendations were adopted by the Executive Committee without a dissenting vote.¹³⁹ When the above figures were circulated to various Ohio schools many teachers felt the program was insufficient. The Executive Committee was asked to consider a stronger and more imaginative program.

139 Ibid, November 15, 1946, p. 187.

At the December meeting of the Ohio Education Association Executive Committee requests from the members of the profession were considered. Amounts for elementary pupils were raised from \$55 to \$60, and amounts for high school pupils were increased from \$66 to \$72 for the flat distribution. For the additional aid districts the amounts were raised from \$100 to \$109 for elementary pupils, and from \$125 to \$131 for high school pupils.¹⁴⁰ These amended amounts became the basis of the legislative program of the Ohio Education Association in 1947.

The staff of the Ohio Education Association again at this time prevailed upon Senators Daniels and Creamer to introduce a bill in the Senate incorporating the above figures. This bill was introduced by Senators Daniels and Creamer on January 29, 1947.¹⁴¹ Two additional items were, however, written into the bill. The first item called for the calculations to be based upon average daily membership along with average daily attendance. The second item sought to establish

140 Ibid, December 26, 1946, p. 189.

141 Walton Bliss, Executive Secretary, Legislative Report, January 31, 1947, p. 1, on file in the office of the Ohio Education Association.

a minimum salary of \$2,000 for each teacher in the state with a four year college degree. (These items, of course, had previously been approved by the Executive Committee.) This bill was assigned a number and became known as Senate Bill Number 48.

In the first hearing on Senate Bill 48, Walton Bliss and Tom O'Keefe of the Ohio Education Association explained in length what the bill would do for education in Ohio as well as what the bill would cost.¹⁴² At the second hearing the Ohio Education Association had induced farm leaders, representative teachers, and other influential citizens to speak on behalf of the bill.¹⁴³

Senate Bill 48 followed very much the same pattern as previous bills sponsored by the Ohio Education Association. The staff of the Ohio Education Association made one concentrated effort to disseminate plans for informing local groups and lay people about the bill. But little variation from tactics used in former campaigns was evinced. The March

142 Ibid, February 7, 1947, p. 1.

143 Ibid, February 14, 1947, p. 1.

issue of Ohio Schools listed some five points to serve as guidelines for local leaders and superintendents to follow in publicizing Senate Bill 48. These five points were:

(1) securing endorsements from local groups, (2) publicizing these endorsements, (3) setting up a speakers' bureau in each county to use materials furnished by the Ohio Education Association, (4) disseminating certain public brochures and information distributed by the Ohio Education Association, and (5) contacting local members of the General Assembly.¹⁴⁴

The Ohio Education Association staff was not idle. They conferred with the Governor and all of the General Assembly members in Columbus to bring pressure on behalf of Senate Bill 48. Through publications and meetings, the tempo of the activities of the Ohio Education Association had increased to such an extent that, according to Walton Bliss¹⁴⁵ the teachers of the state had started an unsigned chain letter urging that all of the teachers in the State of Ohio

144 Hobert Bell, Editor, "Gross Roots Activity Planned in School Aid Effort", Ohio Schools, Vol. XXV, March, 1947, p. 106.

145 Walton Bliss, Executive Secretary, Legislative Report, Columbus, February 28, 1947, p. 1, on file in the office of the Ohio Education Association.

be at the Ohio State Capitol on a prearranged date for a show of strength to the General Assembly and the Governor. The Ohio Education Association staff and Executive Committee reportedly felt this action was not in the best interests of the legislative program and the attempted mass meeting was successfully aborted.

The same opponents were present to speak against Senate Bill 48 as had opposed school legislation in the past. The Ohio Chamber of Commerce and the Ohio Public Expenditures Council, an adjunct to the Ohio Chamber of Commerce, both rivals of any new bills brought forth by the Ohio Education Association, had prepared a thirty-two page booklet analyzing Senate Bill 48. This booklet, later explained by the Ohio Chamber of Commerce to the General Assembly, set forth the weaknesses of the bill and pointed out why the bill should not be enacted into law. D. H. Sutton,¹⁴⁶ Research Director for this group, flatly told the legislators that they could not support such a bill. Further, Sutton raised the question

146 D. H. Sutton, Research Director, "Analysis of Amended Senate Bill Number 48", The Ohio Public Expenditure Council, Columbus, March 1, 1947, pp. 1-32, on file in the office of the Ohio Chamber of Commerce.

of the constitutionality of a state mandated minimum salary of \$2,000 for public school teachers. He stated that in his opinion the legislature was usurping the power of local Boards of Education by establishing any form of a minimum schedule.

On March 5, 1947, the Senate Education Committee voted Senate Bill 48 out of committee. The bill was revised as follows: (1) the flat distribution was lowered from \$60 to \$55 for elementary pupils and from \$72 to \$66 for high school pupils, and (2) the amount for additional aid schools was reduced from \$109 for elementary pupils to \$105, and from \$131 to \$125 for high school students. The charge-off rate against local school evaluations was raised from the proposed four mills to 4.5 mills. Another amendment requiring Boards of Education to adopt a teachers' salary scale based upon training and experience was incorporated. The Senate Education Committee, however, removed the section directed toward establishing a state minimum salary of \$2,000 for teachers with degrees.¹⁴⁷

¹⁴⁷ Walton Bliss, Executive Secretary, Legislative Report, Columbus, March 7, 1947, p. 1, on file in the office of the Ohio Education Association.

The vote on Senate Bill 48 came on April 5, 1947 in the Senate and was passed 32 to three. The only amendment that was introduced into the bill on the floor was concerned with setting a minimum salary for teachers with six or more years of teaching experience, as well as, for those with four years of training at \$2,000.¹⁴⁸

Senate Bill 48 was then passed on to the House of Representatives Education Committee. Hearings were held here, as was the case in the Senate, with the same groups appearing before the House Committee as appeared before the Senate. On April 29 the House of Representatives Education Committee recommended Senate Bill 48 for passage but not before reducing the amount of additional aid from \$105, as recommended by the Senate Committee, to \$100 for elementary pupils, and from \$125 to \$120 for high school pupils. Also the \$2,000 minimum salary level injected by the Senate was deleted at this time.¹⁴⁹

The Ohio Education Association Legislative Steering Committee, along with the association staff held a meeting

148 Ibid, April 4, 1947, p. 1.

149 Ibid, May 1, 1947, p. 1.

and decided to try and restore these abbreviations. However, they were not successful. The House of Representatives passed the bill in its amended form and it was then sent back to the Senate. The Senate did not concur. A conference was then held between the two Houses and a compromise bill was offered and enacted. The compromise bill was strictly a compromise; it was slightly higher than the bill passed by the House of Representatives and slightly lower than the one the Senate had previously passed.

Walton Bliss,¹⁵⁰ Executive Secretary of the Ohio Education Association, reported in June, 1947 that the amounts that were included for the Foundation Program were flat distribution rates of \$53.25 per pupil for grades one through eight and \$64 for grades nine through twelve. The additional aid levels were set at \$101.75 for elementary pupils and \$122 for high school pupils. Further distribution of Foundation Program money was to be based upon the average daily membership rather than on average daily attendance.

This section has presented the activities of the Ohio Education Association in relation to the increase in

150 Ibid., June, 1947, p. 1.

the State School Foundation Program sought during the 97th General Assembly. The same tactics as used in previous legislative programs of the Ohio Education Association were again used and proved to be successful, at least to a degree. The association did not achieve everything that was proposed but they did get an increase in the basic Foundation Program amounting to \$27,000,000 annually for the next two years.

6. The Attempt of the Ohio Education Association
to Increase the Foundation Program
in the Legislative year 1949.

The Ohio Education Association was reputed to be very pleased with the gains made in the 1947 legislative year. However, the association was not content to stand on these gains. The association was well aware that the teaching profession felt the needs of education were not being fully met. The 98th General Assembly of the State of Ohio was to convene in January of 1949 and the Ohio Education Association prepared a legislative program for this session of the state legislature. This section deals with the program and the activities of the Ohio Education Association during the 98th

General Assembly on behalf of their legislative program to increase the Foundation Program of the State of Ohio.

The Ohio Education Association president had appointed a Legislative Planning Committee, and this committee reported their recommendations to the Executive Committee of the Ohio Education Association on November 12, 1948.¹⁵¹ The Executive Committee adopted the program suggested by the Legislative Planning Committee. The program set forth that teachers salaries be increased by \$225 per year for full-time teachers, in addition to any local salary increases that Boards of Education might grant. Also recommended was that \$3.50 per pupil in average daily membership be provided in the Foundation Program for raises to non-teaching employees. Further it was recommended that the Foundation Program be increased by \$3,000,000 per biennium for rehabilitation in districts with per pupil evaluations of \$7,500 or under. Other minor recommendations were made at this time to help districts buy school buses and to help the State Department of Education

151 Walton Bliss, Executive Secretary, Minutes of the Executive Committee, Columbus, November 12, 1948, p. 219, on file in the office of the Ohio Education Association.

expand their services for special schools, particularly those schools for the blind and deaf.

Based upon the legislative program of the Ohio Education Association, the Public Relations Department of this association swung into action. A documentary sound film strip was produced for use throughout the state. A speaker's guide was developed to supplement the sound film strip along with a small folder labeled Ohio School Quiz. The sound film was to be shown to local groups. Along with this presentation a speaker was to give an explanation of financial needs in his particular school district, and the pamphlet entitled Ohio School Quiz was to be passed out to the people to take home and review.

Walton Bliss,¹⁵² in his Legislative Report of January 20, 1949 reported that the Ohio Education Association's proposal to increase teachers' salaries \$225 per year, and to up the per pupil allotment \$3.50 for other increased operational costs, was drafted into a bill for presentation the following week.

152 Walton Bliss, Executive Secretary, Legislative Report, January 20, 1942, Columbus, p. 2, on file in the office of the Ohio Education Association.

The two Senators, Daniels and Creamer who had worked for an increase in the School Foundation Program in 1947 introduced the Ohio Education Association's bill into the Senate. The bill carried the figures as adopted by the Executive Committee of the Ohio Education Association and was given the number of Senate Bill 49.

Thus, the first major hurdle in introducing the Ohio Education Association's advocated legislation was overcome. Hearings were held on the bill by the Senate Education Committee on March 1, 8, and 15. The writer was present at each of these hearings and heard members of the Ohio Education Association, school superintendents, Parent-Teacher Association members, and other representatives of lay groups, speak in favor of the bill. No organized opposition to the bill was evidenced as had been the case in the past. However, the Senate Education Committee voted to defer Senate Bill 49 until such time as the bill was called up again by the chairman of the Senate Education Committee, Senator Emmett R. Guthrie.

Walton Bliss,¹⁵³ gave the following reason for the Senate Education Committee's deferment of the bill: the

153 Ibid, March 17, 1949, p. 1.

Senators merely knew there were not enough funds available to finance the bill. He reported further that a suggestion was made by the Senate Education Committee for a gross receipt tax to be substituted for the sales tax as a possible means of providing more revenue. Senator Emmett R. Guthrie introduced a bill along these lines in the Senate. The Ohio Education Association estimated that such a bill would produce a revenue of about fifty million dollars more than was provided by the old sales tax laws.¹⁵⁴ The Gross Receipts Tax Bill was given the number of 295; passage of this bill seemed to be the only hope for getting the Ohio Education Association sponsored bill, Senate Bill 49, passed.

On April 14, the Senate Education Committee recommended Senate Bill 49 for passage. By this time the two bills were inseparably linked in the minds of the legislators as well as in the minds of the teachers of the State of Ohio.

In the Legislative Report of May 6, Walton Bliss¹⁵⁵ observed that the original Senate Bill 295 had been shelved

¹⁵⁴ Ibid., March 31, 1949, p. 1.

¹⁵⁵ Walton Bliss, Executive Secretary, Legislative Report, Columbus, May 6, 1949, p. 1, on file in the office of the Ohio Education Association.

by the Senate Taxation Committee and that a substitute bill was offered in its place. He also emphasized at this time that the substitute Senate Bill 295 was the only hope for the financing of Senate Bill 49.

The Ohio Education Association's Legislative Report of May 13 carried the news that Senate Bill 49 had passed the Senate by a vote of 24 to six, despite the fact that the bill to provide financing for this bill had not yet moved out of committee.¹⁵⁶ Senate Bill 49 (the bill sponsored by the Ohio Education Association seeking to increase the Foundation Program) appeared so far as the Senate was concerned, to be a good bill. The first hearing on the bill came in the House Education Committee on June 16, 1949. The same people who spoke for the bill in the Senate presented their arguments to the House Committee.¹⁵⁷ One week later the House Education Committee voted the bill out of committee. At this time, Walton Bliss,¹⁵⁸ Executive Secretary of the Ohio Education Association, wrote in his Legislative Report:

156 Ibid, May 13, 1949, p. 1.

157 Ibid, June 17, 1949, p. 1.

158 Ibid, June 23, 1949, p. 1.

This fine action by the House Committee is a great measure; a tribute to the work of school people back home. There was also a very fine turnout of school people at the hearing. Speakers were Mrs. Raymond Rick, O.F.T.; C. R. Shultz, Cincinnati Principal's Association; Estelle Queens, Toledo Teachers Association. It is now important to continue this back-home activity with every member of the House.

Senate Bill 49, however, had to wait on the Rules Committee to be assigned a docket number before it could be brought to a vote on the floor of the House. Adjournment was set for July 15, 1949 and as of July 8, the Rules Committee had not reported Senate Bill 49 out of committee. Walton Bliss sent out a plea for all school people in the state to have various individuals representing key organizations contact members of the Rules Committee and urge them to bring out Senate Bill 49. But Senate Bill 49 was never to be assigned a docket number. The leaders of the Ohio Education Association accused the state administration of behind-the-scene activities in keeping the bill bottled up so that it could not be brought to the floor of the House for a vote.

THE LEGISLATIVE CHANGES IN THE
PUBLIC SCHOOL FOUNDATION PROGRAM

168

Senator Guthrie¹⁵⁹ emphatically stated that the Governor of the State of Ohio had brought pressure on the legislators to keep this bill from being assigned a number. The Senator was firmly convinced that if the bill had ever come to the floor of the House, it would have passed overwhelmingly. He further asserted that the Governor had threatened to veto the bill if it were ever passed.

The Legislative Report of the Ohio Education Association carried the news to the school people of the state that the Governor's opposition to the bill was in effect that new taxes would have to be found if Senate Bill 49 was ever to be enacted.¹⁶⁰ Interestingly, there had not been any vocal opposition to the bill until the Governor came out against it. Many of the professional school people had been optimistic about passage despite the slowness of Substitute Bill 295 (the bill that would have provided the

159 Emmett R. Guthrie, Senator, State of Ohio, in an interview, Coshocton, Ohio, March 15, 1955, located in File 1, Folder 4, in the office of the South Western City Schools, Grove City, Ohio.

160 Walton Bliss, Executive Secretary, Legislative Report, July 17, 1949, p. 1, on file in the office of the Ohio Education Association.

necessary funds to support desired changes in the Foundation Program) in moving through the House.

The money needed to finance Senate Bill 49 was calculated at about 27.5 million dollars and it seemed that both House and Senate were favorable to passage of such a bill had it not been bottled up in the Rules Committee and never assigned a number. Thus, seemingly by the action of the Governor of the State of Ohio, the Ohio Education Association's recommended increase for the Foundation Program, was not realized.

The leaders of the Ohio Education Association had secured a sponsor for their bill, enlisted the support of many organizations throughout the state, and made a last minute effort to bring pressure on the Rules Committee to assign the bill. All of this, however, had failed. Thus, it was a very serious blow to the Ohio Education Association staff as well as the professional teachers of the State when their fostered bill was defeated.

7. The Increase in the School Foundation Program
in the Legislative year 1951.

The leaders of the Ohio Education Association, frustrated and angry over the defeat of their legislative

program in the 98th General Assembly, began planning at once for a broader and more comprehensive Foundation Program for the 99th General Assembly. At this time they were determined not to fail. Two measures, an amendment to the constitution and an initiated petition, were proposed so that means could be provided for the people of the state to vote on the proposal and therefore bypass the legislature should this be desired and if such extreme steps became necessary. However, the initiated petition was viewed as being more acceptable and more feasible. Hence, this was the strategy adopted by the Ohio Education Association for legislative action with the 99th General Assembly of the State of Ohio.

This section deals with the activities of the Ohio Education Association on behalf of the initiated petition bill which carried their legislative proposal to establish a minimum salary schedule for teachers along with an accompanying increase in the Public School Foundation Program.

The staff of the Ohio Education Association and the Legislative Committee, which was appointed by the president of the association, started to work almost immediately after the adjournment of the 1949 General Assembly. Following

THE LEGISLATIVE CHANGES IN THE
PUBLIC SCHOOL FOUNDATION PROGRAM

171

seven months of consideration and deliberation they drafted a constitutional amendment, including a state minimum salary schedule for teachers and the establishment of a fund equal to \$120 per pupil in average daily membership in the public schools of Ohio. Also set forth in this constitutional amendment was a \$70 flat distribution rate per child.

Further, an equilization factor similar to that which had been in effect in the past was sought. This constitutional amendment was to be readied for presentation to the voters of the State of Ohio in the general election of November 7, 1950. The draft of the amendment was brought before the Executive Committee of the Ohio Education Association at their April 29, 1950 meeting. After lengthy discussion by the Executive Committee the proposal was turned down.

Immediately Mr. Cooley,¹⁶¹ a member of the Executive Committee, offered a motion that the initiated petition method of presenting a bill to the 99th General Assembly on behalf of the School Foundation Program be considered. The

161 Walton Bliss, Executive Secretary, Minutes of the Executive Committee, Columbus, April 29, 1950, p. 228, on file in the office of the Ohio Education Association.

motion, however, died for the want of a second. It seemed that the Executive Committee was not yet ready to consider such a drastic proposal along with all of the problems and complex details involved.

B. I. Griffith,¹⁶² the Public Relations Director for the Ohio Education Association, felt that part of the reason the Executive Committee would not go along with the constitutional amendment or the initiated petition method of presenting a bill at this time was the fact that the Executive Committee had not had enough time to study the proposal. Further, the staff had not sufficiently briefed the Executive Committee on the methods that were to be used to get the required signatures for the initiated petition.

Griffith also related that the central staff of the association had been so involved in producing a booklet called Problem Number 1, and were so convinced of the needs for additional funds for the Foundation Program, that they had actually failed to transmit their convictions to the Executive Committee.

¹⁶² B. I. Griffith, Ohio Education Association's Public Relations Director, in an interview, Columbus, April 18, 1961, located in File 1, Folder 5, in the office of the South Western City Schools, Grove City, Ohio.

The Legislative Committee and the staff of the Ohio Education Association did additional detail work on their proposal and again made a request to the Ohio Education Association Executive Committee for a bill to be introduced by an initiated petition to the 99th General Assembly. Their arguments were first that a bill so introduced would carry with it the weight of thousands of people which the legislators and state governmental officials could not ignore. Secondly, if the General Assembly of the State of Ohio would not pass their bill, or one that was acceptable to the Ohio Education Association, they could go back to the people through a referendum and place their issue on the ballot in the General Election of November. The Executive Committee heard the above recommendation while in session on August 25. They voted unanimously to accept the recommendations of the Legislative Committee. The staff of the Ohio Education Association, with legal assistance, then wrote a bill to be presented by the association to the General Assembly through an initiated petition.¹⁶³

¹⁶³ See Appendix 2, p. 220.

The petition and information necessary for petition carriers were developed by the Ohio Education Association staff. This information was then sent to each county, city, and exempted village superintendent in the State of Ohio, as well as to the presidents of each local teachers' association. The Ohio Education Association asked that the superintendents of each county and the presidents of each teachers association meet together and take the responsibility for dividing the task of securing the required number of valid signatures for their county. Each county in the State of Ohio came through with the necessary number of signatures and the petitions were filed by the Ohio Education Association with the Secretary of the State of Ohio on December 15, 1950.¹⁶⁴

The Secretary of State, Ted W. Brown,¹⁶⁵ notified the Ohio Education Committee that, on January 15, he had ruled and certified that the initiated petition had the constitutionally required number of signatures and that he was transmitting the initiated petition to the 99th General Assembly that day.

164 See Appendix 3, p. 231.

165 See Appendix 4, p. 233.

Leaders of the Ohio Education Association, needless to say, were pleased and expressed the feeling that they would have no trouble in getting their bill enacted. The initiated petition bill of the Ohio Education Association was assigned the number 48 in the House and 182 in the Senate. The Senate referred Senate Bill 182 to its Education Committee on February 19, 1951, while the House reported the same bill out of its Reference Committee to the House Education Committee on March 6, 1951.

On March 1, the Executive Secretary of the Ohio Education Association was reportedly beginning to become a bit uneasy about the bill. He made a special plea for more letters, phone calls, and personal visits on behalf of the Ohio Education Association's initiated petition bill. He particularly stressed that a delegation from each county in the state should come and talk with the members of the House of Representatives Education Committee.¹⁶⁶

At the first hearing of the initiated petition bill in the House, 450 people interested in this bill were in

¹⁶⁶ Walton Bliss, Executive Secretary, Legislative Report, Columbus, March 23, 1951, p. 1, on file in the office of the Ohio Education Association.

attendance. The second hearing produced an equally large crowd with many people being unable to find space in the hearing chambers. Various groups reported, at this second hearing, on their interests in the bill. Such groups as the Ohio Congress of Parents and Teachers, the Ohio Business and Professional Women's Club, the Ohio Council of Churches, and the Ohio C.I.O., were among those present.

At this second hearing, the chairman of the House Education Committee announced that the third hearing for proponents would be delayed until the House Committee could examine the bill more carefully with the Ohio Education Association staff. Walton Bliss¹⁶⁷ reported that the general attitude of the House Education Committee was favorable, but in his opinion they were not yet ready to act. He advised members of the profession to keep up their contacts on behalf of the bill and expressed his dismay over the slowness of the House Education Committee to act on the bill.

On March 28 the opponents were given a chance to be heard by the House Education Committee. The only opponent

167 Ibid, April 1, 1951, p. 1.

heard at this time was Hershell C. Atkinson,¹⁶⁸ Executive Vice President of the Ohio Chamber of Commerce. Mr. Atkinson addressed the House Education Committee and pointed out that the initiated petition bill should be allowed to go to the people of the State of Ohio by referendum in November for their decision. He also stated that this was a broad new principle being proposed in government and there was an evident lack of understanding on the part of the people of the state, as well as the legislators in regard to this new principle. Further he expressed the opinion that if the General Assembly passed this bill they would be usurping the powers of local Board's of Education and centralizing control of schools at the state level. Finally, he related that the bill would cost far more than was available through the state's present resources.

A few days prior to this hearing Mr. Atkinson had mailed a three page bulletin to all members of the Ohio Chamber of Commerce urging them to contact members of the House

¹⁶⁸ Hershell C. Atkinson, Executive Vice President, Statement on House Bill 48, Columbus, March 28, 1951, p. 5, on file in the office of the Ohio Chamber of Commerce.

Education Committee and then to contact local representatives asking them to let the initiated petition bill go to the vote of the people. He also included in the Private Bulletin to Members, of the Ohio Chamber of Commerce the adopted position of this body which reads as follows:

That the teachers minimum salary and salary increase schedule proposed in an initiated bill be not approved, since the determination of teachers salaries is a local function under conditions which vary greatly from one community to another, and which makes it inadvisable to set a state-mandated standard.¹⁶⁹

The Ohio Chamber of Commerce had taken a stand; they obviously expected the people of the state to listen. Their membership was composed of some of the most prominent men in the State of Ohio and it was not unlikely that some of the members of the General Assembly were indebted to some of these men for their election to the General Assembly. Thus, many of the legislators were apparently placed on the horns of a dilemma. If they would not listen to the Ohio Chamber of Commerce, they would offend some of their influential friends; if they did not pass the initiated petition bill,

¹⁶⁹ Hershell Atkinson, Executive Vice President, Private Bulletin to Members, Columbus, March 23, 1951, p. 3, on file in the office of the Ohio Chamber of Commerce.

people back home who had signed the petition would be angry. The obvious answer was a compromise, and compromise, the General Assembly did.

The Republicans in the Ohio House caucused and agreed to give the School Foundation Program an additional \$16,500,000. This was less than one-half of that called for by the Ohio Education Association's initiated petition bill. Walton Bliss,¹⁷⁰ referred to the Republicans offer as "crumbs from the rich man's table" and asked for increased action on the part of the school people and lay people back home. The Ohio Education Association staff, after meeting with various committees of teachers over the state, related to representatives of the House that this was not an acceptable proposal. The House of Representatives caucused again and indicated that they would offer \$20,000,000 in additional funds for the financing of the public schools.

The Senate, however, moved quickly and reported the bill out of its Education Committee calling for \$34,000,000 in additional state support. This was close to the amount

¹⁷⁰ Walton Bliss, Executive Secretary, Legislative Report, Columbus, April 13, 1951, p. 1, on file in the office of the Ohio Education Association.

THE LEGISLATIVE CHANGES IN THE
PUBLIC SCHOOL FOUNDATION PROGRAM

180

that the original initiated petition bill had proposed. The two bills were then sent to a Conference Committee but the committee failed to come to any agreement. Hence, a second set of conferees were appointed, but they also could not reach any agreement.

Both Houses had previously agreed to adjourn on June 1. This day came and passed and the legislature's adjournment was postponed week by week. Finally, on June 20 at 4:00 a.m., a compromise bill was agreed upon and was passed by both Houses. This bill added about \$26,500,000 in additional funds each year for the next biennial period.

Throughout the session, the Ohio Education Association had threatened to take it's bill to the public if the legislators could not reach a satisfactory solution. The amount of money passed by both houses was not as much as the Ohio Education Association had hoped for, and not as much as the bill had originally called for; but the association leaders decided to accept this solution, along with its many desirable features.

Throughout the entire legislative session there had been an almost continuous meeting of educational leaders from

throughout the state with the staff of the Ohio Education Association. The fact that they would get a bill passed by the legislators was never questioned by the leaders of the Ohio Education Association. The question seemed to be simply, "What would the Ohio Education Association accept?"

B. I. Griffith¹⁷¹ reported that the Ohio Education Association staff and other educational leaders had agreed to a pat answer when asked by the legislators, "For what will your group settle?" Their stock answer was, "You make your offer and we will tell you whether or not it is acceptable."

Although the Ohio Education Association was not reported to be overly enthused about the compromised bill, it nonetheless was an acceptable conclusion to a long, hard-fought campaign. The association's legislative petition bill had proposed a flat foundation figure of \$70 per pupil for those enrolled in grades one through twelve. The law enacted gave them \$57 for those in grades one through eight and \$67 for those in grades nine through twelve. The

171 B. I. Griffith, Ohio Education Association's Public Relations Director, in an interview, Columbus, March 16, 1963, located in File 1, Folder 5, in the office of the South Western City Schools, Grove City, Ohio.

law enacted gave them \$57 for those in grades one through eight and \$67 for those in grades nine through twelve. The difference between the proposed amounts and the amounts enacted affected only the richer school districts in the state. This was not considered critical by the state's educational leaders.

The additional aid schools received exactly the amount proposed in the original initiated petition bill of \$125 for pupils in grades one through eight and \$150 for those students in grades nine through twelve. The teachers minimum salary schedule was enacted as proposed but annual increments were cut. In the 0 to 2.99 years training category the \$100 increment was given for five years instead of for ten years. The category of three years training but less than a degree, was cut from sixteen \$100 increments to five \$100 increments. This was also true for the bachelor degree category as well as the five-year and master degree categories. In reality, the Ohio Education Association, through the initiated petition bill, received almost all they had hoped to receive.

8. The Activities of the Ohio Education Association
on behalf of the Public School Foundation Program in
the 100th General Assembly of the State of Ohio.

Inflation and tremendous gains in enrollment greatly eroded the purchasing power of the dollar and made it imperative that the Ohio Education Association continue to work for further increases in the State Foundation Program. This section deals with the legislative proposals of the Ohio Education Association to the 100th General Assembly and the activities of the association to promote their legislative program.

The Ohio Education Association had never had a permanent Legislative Committee in the past, but rather, had relied on appointed leaders from the profession at large to serve during a given legislative period.

In 1952 the Ohio Education Association president, Mr. Matton,¹⁷² felt that there was a need for continuity from legislative year to legislative year. He therefore appointed a permanent Legislative Committee in order to

172 A. L. Matton, President, Minutes of the Executive Committee, Columbus, March 21, 1952, p. 271, on file in the office of the Ohio Education Association.

establish some continuity over a period of years. Six members were appointed to serve for a period of one year, three members for a period of two years, and two members for a period of three years. At the expiration of each member's term of office, they were to be replaced by new appointees of the president of the association.

After their organization, the legislative committee began their work by proposing seven meetings to be held throughout the state to gather, and talk over, ideas with the members of the teaching profession in preparation for the coming legislative session. Also the Executive Committee, upon the request of the Executive Secretary, granted permission to establish a County Legislative Council in each county of the State of Ohio. County superintendents were assigned the responsibility for implementing such an organization and reporting their progress back to the Ohio Education Association Executive Secretary by December 15, 1952. The staff of the Ohio Education Association had high hopes that the county legislative councils would provide a far more effective vehicle to bring pressure to bear on legislators in the next

session of the General Assembly than was ever available in the past. With the stage set for greater participation of the profession as a whole in formulating proposed legislation and a more effective group to lobby for proposed legislation, the Executive Committee of the Ohio Education Association awaited the recommendations of its Legislative Committee.

The Legislative Committee made its formal recommendations on November 8, 1952 in a report to the Executive Committee. The Executive Committee adopted these legislative proposals without a descending vote.¹⁷³

It was recommended that the Foundation Program be raised from, the then in effect amount of \$125 per elementary pupil to \$150, and from \$150 to \$180 per high school student. The flat distribution rate was also to be raised from \$57 per elementary pupil to \$75, and from \$67 to \$90 for high school students. The charge-off rate for all districts qualifying for additional aid was to be established at 5 3/8 mills.

¹⁷³ Walton Bliss, Executive Secretary, Minutes of the Executive Committee, Columbus, November 8, 1952, p. 277.

A further recommendation was made to increase the state teachers' minimum salary by \$200 in all categories, and to restore the increments deleted in the previously amended bill enacted by the previous legislature. The Ohio Education Association published the adopted legislative program in its official organ, Ohio Schools, and all legislative chairmen in each county were contacted and encouraged to become fully familiar with the program. The chairman of each county was asked to inform that county's legislators of the proposed legislation. They were requested to further show what the proposed legislation would do for the schools of their respective counties. Chairmen were also asked to inform members of various civic groups and organizations within their counties of the program and to urge them to endorse the association's legislative program.

Packets of promotional materials were developed for each county chairman by the Ohio Education Association Public Relations Department. A film entitled, "Two for Tom" was also sent to the various television stations in the State of Ohio. Newspaper mats were made available showing enrollment growth in the state and a cost graph reflecting inflation.

A separate publication entitled School Topics was printed and distributed by the Ohio Education Association in large quantities to all counties throughout the state.

It appeared to all concerned that greater preparation was made for an intensive attack upon the legislators than ever before. Certainly there was greater participation on the part of the profession than had ever been realized before.

The Foundation Program bill, which included the recommended program of the Ohio Education Association, was written and introduced by three state senators--Pollock, Collins, and Bernard. The bill was given the number 22 and assigned to the Senate Education Committee in February, 1953.

The Senate Education Committee held their first hearing on Senate Bill 22 on March 27, 1953. At this hearing only school people appeared to speak on behalf of the bill. At a second hearing, the Ohio Education Association enlisted farmers, bankers, P.T.A. leaders, and other lay people to speak for the bill. During this second hearing, the Ohio Education Association Executive Secretary was approached by

the sponsors of the bill and informed that the Senate Education Committee could not report the bill out in its present form. They asked that an amendment be drafted to provide for an increase over the present Foundation Program expenditures of approximately \$19,000,000 per year as contrasted to the \$25,500,000 increase sought by the Ohio Education Association through their legislative program. The sponsors further requested that the teachers' salary schedule be limited to five increments instead of the sixteen as contained in the bill.¹⁷⁴

Amendments to the bill were formulated by the Ohio Education Association staff and presented to the sponsors on April 6. That same evening the bill was voted out of committee over the protest of the Senate Education Committee chairman, Senator Mosier. According to Walton Bliss,¹⁷⁵ Senator Mosier intimated strongly that those senators who passed it out over his suggestions were "puppets dancing on

¹⁷⁴ Walton Bliss, Executive Secretary, Council in Action, April 7, 1953, p. 2, on file in the office of the Ohio Education Association.

¹⁷⁵ Walton Bliss, Executive Secretary, Legislative Report, April 17, 1953, p. 1, on file in the office of the Ohio Education Association.

a string of an Ohio Education Association staff member".

(It should be noted that Senator Mosier later apologized to members of the association's committee and harmony was restored.)

Although amended Senate Bill 22 was voted out of the Senate Education Committee it languished for two months before being brought up in the Senate for a vote. The county Legislative Committees were working and were getting a great deal of publicity throughout the state on behalf of the bill. Even with all of this pressure, however, the legislators would not move on the School Foundation Program bill, the reason reportedly being that there was not enough money to pay for the proposed program without new taxes. Walton Bliss¹⁷⁶ observed on May 20, that the legislators were against any tax program to help schools. He once again asked for greater effort on behalf of the schools from the people--educators and citizens--from each county in the state. He particularly stressed that the need for additional money would have to be shown in each and every school district.

176 Ibid. May 2, 1953, p. 1.

Senate Bill 22 was never brought to the floor of the Senate. Instead, it was recommitted to the Senate Education Committee. The recommitment came after the caucus by representative Senators who set up an increased amount of \$16,000,000 for school purposes. This was \$3,000,000 less than carried in amended Senate Bill 22 and approximately 9.5 million dollars less than was originally sought by the Ohio Education Association.

The Senate Education Committee constructed a new bill identified as Senate Bill 23. The foundation figures of \$140 per elementary student and \$160 per high school student were used in this bill. The state minimum salary schedule was raised \$100 across the board for those holding a bachelor's degree or better and the charge-off rate was set at 5.45 mills. No increase was offered for the flat distribution rates.

Walton Bliss¹⁷⁷ reported that a group of urban Senators protested the bill because there was no increase made in the flat distribution. This, of course, held up the

177 Ibid, June 19, 1953, p. 1.

vote on the bill. Senate Bill 23, however, came to a vote on the Senate floor on June 22. A battle between those favoring Senate Bill 23 and those who wanted to increase the flat distribution was fought. Walton Bliss¹⁷⁸ wrote in his next report that those favoring the bill won by the bare majority of one vote.

The bill was then passed on to the House Education Committee for their deliberation. There was little question to those involved that the Senators who favored an increase in the flat distribution would try through the House to get some kind of an increase. Walton Bliss,¹⁷⁹ report of July 19 carried the news that the House would seek to increase the flat distribution. It was increased \$3 at each level--kindergarten, elementary, and high school--while the Foundation Program for the elementary students was cut by \$2.50. The House changed the charge-off rates from 5.45 to 5.5 for participation in the Public School Foundation Program. Operating millage for any school to participate in the

178 Ibid, June 25, 1953, p. 1.

179 Ibid, July 19, 1953, p. 1.

Foundation Program was also set at eight mills for 1954 and increased to ten mills thereafter.

The bill was passed by the House and sent to the Senate where it was dealt with quickly and conclusively. In the eyes of Walton Bliss¹⁸⁰ the trouble with the 100th General Assembly was that they would not face up to new taxes. He reported that the schools would get only 37% of that for which they had asked.

The increase in the Foundation Program as a result of the 100th General Assembly was not spectacular. The Ohio Education Association had written and introduced a bill in the Senate calling for approximately \$52,000,000 for the 1953-54 biennium; they had to settle, however, for approximately \$20,000,000.

The Ohio Education Association had organized a Legislative Committee in each county and these committees had provided a steady stream of letters to legislators as well as publicity circulating to citizens in most of their counties concerning the Ohio Education Association Legislative

180 Ibid, July 15, 1953, p. 1.

Program. Beyond this, they had notified various lay groups of their program and had enlisted many of these groups to visit the State Capitol and talk with the legislators concerning the proposed legislation. But evidently they were not too effective in dealing with the 100th General Assembly as attested by the legislatures' determination not to increase taxes. The finally approved bill represented indeed little evident improvement considering the efforts expended by the staff of the Ohio Education Association and the association's membership.

9. Summary

This chapter has set forth the changes that were made in the Ohio Public School Foundation Program since its inception up to 1955 and the part the Ohio Education Association played in these changes. Not all of the modifications in the Foundation Program were of major importance and not all of the modifications involved monetary considerations. The Ohio Education Association was most concerned with the more significant changes such as increasing the financial base for the support of public education, putting this financial base on a

sound footing, and improving the salary conditions of the public school teachers. On minor modifications to the program, especially those not involving financial matters, the association typically entered a mild protest or went along with the suggested revision.

That the Ohio Education Association actively sought improvements in the Foundation Program for the support of public education is obvious. That the association expended a great deal of time and effort in developing and advocating legislative programs is also evident. But not all of the goals of the association were realized. Legislators were receptive to some of the association's desires; in other instances time was required to make the public school needs of the state known to the citizens and legislators; in still other instances the desires of those most concerned with education were not realized, at least to the fullest extent.

In seeking legislative changes in the Foundation Program, the Ohio Education Association used a variety of tactics. For example, members of the association lobbied for legislative programs, committees were formed to develop

legislative programs, school administrators organized programs of public information to carry proposed legislative desires to the citizens of the state, speakers bureaus were established, information media (printed and audio-visual) were developed, supportive groups such as the P.T.A. and businessmen's groups spoke to the legislature on behalf of the state's public schools, and finally the members of the Ohio Education Association staff devoted seemingly unlimited energy to initiating and implementing legislative programs. All such activities were directed toward improving public education in the state. Not all such activities were equally successful in terms of the goals realized. Although some worked better than others at particular times, the association's ends were best achieved in instances when the legislative program was well planned and the practicing educators from throughout the state were actively involved in the implementation of the legislative program. Thus, the central staff of the association could do just so much; effecting legislation involved work at the "grass roots" as well as in the State Capitol.

Changes sought in the Foundation Program by the Ohio Education Association were of two major types. First, an attempt was made to put the program on a sound fiscal basis and to get away from the deficit financing that characterized the program in its early years. Second, an attempt was made to establish an adequate financial base of state support for public education in Ohio that could keep pace with the times. Both of these types of modifications involved legal changes in the Foundation Program.

Over an eight year period of time the association brought pressure to bear on the legislators to appropriate sufficient funds for financing the Foundation Program. By 1939 the practice of earmarking taxes was eliminated and the Public School Foundation Program was financed through the general revenue of the state. In 1943, as a result of a series of appropriations aimed toward erasing the deficit, the Foundation Program was no longer plagued by inadequate appropriations of funds. Throughout this period, however, the teachers and the lay citizens of the state had not felt the lack of adequate financing in regard to public education as they had earlier during the period when the Foundation

Program was being developed. Thus, the central staff of the Ohio Education Association carried most of the burden during this period of seeking to rid the Foundation Program of deficit financing.

Once the financial deficits were erased, five major monetary changes were made in the Foundation Program. It should be noted that no decrease in either minimum or flat distribution rates had occurred during the above period of adjustment. Since it was not deemed advisable to seek increases in the Foundation Program until the program was at least operating on a sound fiscal basis, the first requests for increasing the program came in 1943.

The first major increase in the program was realized through the 1943 legislature. Gains here were modest and involved only changes in increasing the elementary (grades one through eight) minimum Foundation Program and the flat distribution rates at all levels. In 1945 the second major change in the program was realized when increases in the minimum program and flat distribution rates were granted for all levels (kindergarten, elementary, and high school) over a Governor's veto. A compromise bill in the 1947 legislature

further increased the support of public education provided by the Public School Foundation Program and changed the distribution basis from average daily attendance to the preferred average daily membership.

Following a failure to increase the Foundation Program during the 1949 legislative year the association utilized an initiated petition bill in 1951 to realize further increases in the program. By virtue of this procedure more teachers and lay citizens throughout the state were involved and the results were quite satisfactory to the profession at large. The increases sought were realized except for some of those that would have benefited only the richer school districts in the state. Also a state minimum teacher's salary schedule based upon training and experience was established at this time.

Finally, in the 1953 legislative year the last major change of the period covered by this dissertation was effected. Although there is some evidence that the need for new taxes necessary to support the desired increases in the program was not attractive to legislators, general improvements in all

phases of the Foundation Program were realized. Improvement was slight considering the efforts of the educators during this legislative period but nonetheless, a bill providing more adequate financial support for the public schools of the state was enacted.

SUMMARY

One measure of the success of a state education association is the degree to which it has been effective in getting legislation passed for the benefit of its membership and the schools of its state. This would be particularly true of legislation involving monetary considerations and financial support.

This study sought to ascertain the effectiveness of one educational association--the Ohio Education Association--upon the passage of legislation related to one monetary legislative program--The Ohio Public School Foundation Program.

A survey of relevant literature in the field of education revealed very little documentation of the work of education associations in the area of attempted influence upon legislators to provide legislation favorable to educators or education. No documentation, in fact, was found concerning the Ohio Education Association's efforts to influence legislation in the State of Ohio.

However, related research clearly established the notion that state education associations have a potential to influence and effect legislative programs at the state level.

Research of the effects of state education associations on legislation benefiting teachers and education in general revealed some serious limitations. A cause and effect relationship was often assumed by researchers with little evidence presented to substantiate that such a relationship existed. The studies reviewed also failed to illustrate how, and in what ways, influence was exerted by state education associations on desired legislation. The writers of such research studies tended to assume that if the education association with which they were concerned indicated that it had supported a given bill being considered for enactment, and the bill later was enacted, the education association had influenced legislators positively. Further, no intensive examination of the activities of associations directed toward determining the efforts, leadership or pressures brought to bear upon legislators for the enactment of bills was evidenced in such studies.

This study is concerned with one legislative program, the Public School Foundation Program, from its inception and enactment and then through twenty years of modification. Primary documents of the Ohio Education Association provided the basic data for

this study. Such documents were collected, classified, studied, and interpreted. These documents consisted of the stenographic records of the Representative Assembly of the Ohio Education Association, the minutes of the Executive Committee of the Ohio Education Association, the weekly Legislative Bulletins of the association, and other pertinent written materials of the association.

Data was also provided by interviews held with educators who occupied key positions of the Ohio Education Association and Ohio legislators who worked directly with bills espoused and/or supported by the membership of the Ohio Education Association. In instances where opposition was manifested, documents were collected to show the opposition's stand and the efforts on the part of the opposition to obstruct the legislation sought by the Ohio Education Association.

These data sources clearly indicated that the Ohio Education Association provided the leadership, financial support, and time on the part of its central staff to institute a state-wide survey to show the need for more adequate financing on the part of the state for its public schools. From this survey a feasible financial plan was introduced in the

legislature largely through the efforts of the Ohio Education Association. The Ohio Education Association provided the leadership and financial support necessary to acquaint professional educators as well as the lay public of the State of Ohio with the facts of the Ohio school survey and the proposed legislative program based upon the survey. The association also provided leadership to organized citizen groups throughout the state. These citizens groups were formed for purposes of bringing pressure to bear upon the legislators on behalf of the proposed legislative program.

Members of the central staff of the Ohio Education Association worked tirelessly for a period of three years in the interests of this legislative program which finally was enacted as the first Public School Foundation law in the State of Ohio. These members of the association's central staff initiated a survey of state support of public education, sought public acceptance of the recommendations resulting from the survey, and sought and gained a Foundation Program that made the State of Ohio a far greater contributor to the monetary support of public education than ever before in the history of the state's participation in financing public

education. The central staff of the association met opposition during this period from the powerful Ohio Chamber of Commerce as well as from other minor tax-league groups who were opposed to higher state taxes. They also had to fight the inherent opposition resulting from the great depression of the early thirties. Further, it was necessary to overcome the natural reluctance of elected public officials in raising taxes.

The fact that the association's central staff was successful in obtaining a Public School Foundation law provides evidence that the staff had effected or influenced the state legislators on behalf of the cause of public education in the State of Ohio. After passage of the Foundation Program there seemed to be, at least for a period of time, a passive attitude on the part of the membership of the Ohio Education Association to association sponsored legislative proposals. The period immediately following the passage of the Public School Foundation Program law saw schools getting money from the state for the first time for the operation of public schools although the payments due to public schools were not made on time and Boards of Education were forced to borrow against the anticipated revenue owed to them by the state.

The Ohio Education Association attempted throughout this period to establish a sound financial basis for the Public School Foundation Program so that the program would not involve deficit financing. The association seemingly had trouble arousing interest on the part of professional school people and in gaining their support in attempts to influence legislation to overcome this deficit financing. The central staff of the Ohio Education Association was left largely to their own devices and efforts in working throughout this period of passivity on the part of educators and deficit financing of the Foundation Program. The association's staff members along with a few of the members of the Executive Committee and other educational officials did lobby from 1936 to 1939 and finally succeeded in the year of 1939 in eliminating the practice of earmarking taxes for the Public School Foundation Program. The Foundation Program, henceforth, was to be financed from the general revenue funds of the state. Further, in 1941, appropriations were made by the General Assembly of the State of Ohio to erase part of the deficits incurred by the Public School Foundation Program in its first years. Deficits were completely wiped out by such additional appropriations of the 1943 General Assembly.

Once the deficits were erased and the economy of the nation was somewhat changed as a result of World War II, the Ohio Education Association proposed to the legislators of the State of Ohio a major increase in the Foundation Program. Gains were, however, modest in this first attempt to increase the support of public education through increases in the Foundation Program in the 1943 legislative session. The only change in the program at this time was the amount paid for each child in average daily attendance for grades one through eight.

The second legislative program of the Ohio Education Association seeking to increase the Foundation Program in 1945 was more successful. Greater gains were realized in all phases of the Public School Foundation Program law through this legislature. These gains came, however, only after a bitter struggle with the legislators and over the veto of the Governor of the state.

Again in 1947 the Ohio Education Association sought further increases in the Public School Foundation Program. But this year the legislators were not quite so receptive as in 1945 and after weeks of lobbying and hearings, a compromise

bill was passed resulting in about one-half of what the Ohio Education Association had requested. During this session the association succeeded in changing the distribution basis for funds from the average daily attendance to the preferred base of average daily membership.

The following legislative year (1949) found the legislators of the State of Ohio completely immune to the demands of the Ohio Education Association and no changes were made in the Public School Foundation Program. This seemed to incense the entire teaching profession as well as the staff of the Ohio Education Association. A method of circulating an initiated petition bill to the people of the State of Ohio was devised at this time. After a sufficient number of signatures was secured, the association's demands were presented through the initiated petition to the legislators of the State of Ohio. This procedure involved the greatest number of lay and professional people ever involved through the association on behalf of a legislative program.

Hundreds of teachers and parents carried and explained the necessary petitions in each of the counties of the state so that they might place the legislative proposals of the Ohio Education Association before the 1951 General Assembly.

Constant pressure was exerted on the legislators by the Ohio Education Association through citizen groups, teachers, and school administrators as well as paid officials of the association. The efforts on behalf of the Ohio Education Association's proposed legislation paid off handsomely. The legislators granted almost everything requested in the Ohio Education Association's petition. This was a momentous gain for the association; the bitter defeat of the 1949 legislative session had been turned into a significant step forward in the 1951 legislature.

In 1953, the last legislative year covered by this dissertation, the Ohio Education Association proposed another increase for the Public School Foundation Program. The association did not get what was sought through the proposed legislation; however, some gains were made during this legislative year.

The changes and modifications in the Public School Foundation Program were all actively pursued by the Ohio Education Association. Both time and money were spent in seeking desirable changes in the Foundation Program. Not all that was sought in each legislative year was enacted into

law. The legislators of the State of Ohio were receptive to some demands; in other instances, time was required to make the problem of the needs of the public schools known to the citizens and legislators.

In seeking legislative changes in the Foundation Program the Ohio Education Association used a wide variety of tactics. Members of the association lobbied directly for proposed legislation. Committees were formed in each county to acquaint the lay public with the need for proposed legislation. Speakers' bureaus were established throughout the state and information media (both printed and audio-visual) were developed by the Ohio Education Association staff. Further, wide use was made of both newspapers and radios to disseminate the needs of the public schools to the populace. Public relations magazines were distributed from the Ohio Education Association office to thousands of people throughout the state.

All such activities of the Ohio Education Association were directed toward improving public education in general and the Foundation Program in particular. However, the intensity of the activities of the Ohio Education Association

varied as could be expected. In some years the interest of the profession seemed to be extremely high; in other legislative years it was hard to arouse the sentiments of the total profession for proposed legislation. It seemed that the association achieved the best results when great numbers of people were involved in both planning and executing proposed legislative programs. The work of the Ohio Education Association seemed less effective when the apathy of professional school people left planning and work on behalf of association espoused legislative programs almost solely to the association's staff members.

CONCLUSION

A study was made to ascertain whether or not the Ohio Education Association was meeting its avowed goals in one particular segment of contributing to the welfare of its membership through espousing desirable legislation on behalf of the membership.

The conclusions reached are as follows:

1. That the Ohio Education Association has definitely influenced legislation concerning the Public School Foundation Program in the State of Ohio.

2. That the Ohio Education Association has a potential to influence legislation favorable to the welfare of its membership when its full membership is agreed upon a program of action and is committed to the extent that there is personal involvement on the part of each member of the association.

From these conclusions, the following implications are drawn for the Ohio Education Association, the association's membership, and the teachers of the State of Ohio:

1. That the Ohio Education Association, because of its power, has a deep obligation to take into consideration

the effects of its legislative program upon the total population of the state, being especially aware of whether their demands are in the best interests only of the teachers of the state or in the best interest of education and the public in general.

2. That the Ohio Education Association's staff and officers have a charge to be constantly aware of their responsibility to involve as wide a group of the profession as possible in formulating policy and programs so that they are sure that they are speaking for the association and not for a small minority that might control the association at a particular point in time.

3. That the professional teachers of the State of Ohio must have an acute awareness of the proposals of the Ohio Education Association staff on their behalf and must accept the responsibility of being heard if and when they are in disagreement.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Augsberger, Fred, The History of the Ohio Education Association, unpublished Master's thesis, Columbus, Ohio State University, 1928, p. 205.

This is an excellent account of the founding of the association and it's activities from 1847-1928. This was an invaluable aid for background material and orientation.

Battles, Edward Everett, Preparing, Promoting, and Enacting School Legislation in Oklahoma, unpublished Doctor's thesis presented to the School of Education, Palo Alto, Leland Stanford Junior University, 1949, p. 294.

Battle's thesis covers a period of three years when the Oklahoma Teacher's Association was presenting a four point constitutional amendment to the legislators of Oklahoma. Since he was active during this period of time with the Oklahoma Teacher's Association, he described in detail the activities of the association on behalf of this legislative program. Excellent documentation of the activities of one state teacher's association for a short period of time.

Bliss, Walton B., Executive Secretary, Legislative Reports, on file in the office of the Ohio Education Association, Columbus, January, 1943 - June 1953.

These are periodic letters sent to all school administrators in the State of Ohio showing school bills that are coming before the legislature and the disposition of each. These were used as checks on modification of original bills espoused by the association.

-----, Minutes of the Executive Committee of the Ohio Education Association, on file in the office of the Ohio Education Association, Columbus, 1931-1953.

This is the recording of the official action taken by the Executive Committee on behalf of the Ohio Education Association. Invaluable source of material for this thesis.

Crawford, Albert B., "A Critical Analysis of the Present Status and Significant Trends of State Educational Associations of the United States", School Service, Department of Education, Louisville, University of Kentucky, 1932, p. 155.

This is an excellent and comprehensive treatment of state educational associations. The author has analyzed the publications, constitutions, committees, organizations, financial conditions, etc., of all the various state teacher's associations as well as giving a brief history of their origins. Very good background material.

Crossman, Robert D., Legislation Proposed to the State Legislature of California Relative to Public Education from 1941-1953, unpublished Doctor's thesis presented to the Department of Education, Los Angeles, University of Southern California, 1955, p. 248.

This thesis catalogues all of the bills that were espoused by the California Teacher's Association from 1941-1953. A record was made of bills that were passed and of bills that failed. From this, a conclusion was drawn that the California Teacher's Association was extremely effective in passing bills for the welfare of the California teachers. It's value is questionable because it lacked depth in research as to the actual activities of the California Teacher's Association.

Curtis, George Henry, The Influence of the Teaching Profession of Idaho Upon the Course of Legislation for Public Schools, unpublished Master's thesis, Moscow, Idaho, University of Idaho, 1951, p. 138.

This study is divided into four parts, (1) the territorial period, which gives an account of the schools and practices during this period, (2) the middle period, in which the Idaho State Teacher's Association was founded, (3) the period of growth of the association, (4) the writer's comments upon records which he surveyed. This is a very wide sweep of history and effects and is of very little value because of its lack of clearness and cohesiveness.

Elsbree, Willard S., "Activities of State Associations", Educational Year Book, New York, Teacher's College, Columbia University, 1935, p. 544-631.

The history of educational associations is given along with purposes and activities of these state associations. It is a general treatment throughout. Very good background information.

Jenkins, Robert, Financing Public School Education in Ohio, unpublished Doctor's thesis, presented to School of Commerce, Columbus, Ohio State University, 1951, p. 208.

This is a compilation of the laws enacted by the legislators of the State of Ohio for the financing of its public schools. This thesis supplied excellent background material.

Hornbostel, Victor O., The Formulation of State Public School Financial Policy in Wisconsin, 1921-1951, unpublished Doctor's thesis presented to Department of Education, Madison, University of Wisconsin, 1954, p. 190.

This study concerns itself with several groups who have helped shape the financial policy of the Public Schools of Wisconsin by presenting and lobbying for various bills in the Wisconsin legislature.

Minnich, Harvey C., Centennial History of the Ohio Education Association, Columbus, The Ohio Education Association, 1947, p. 193.

This is the history of the Ohio Education Association from 1847-1947 as seen through the eyes of the writer. Much of it is written from personal memory and lacks documentation as to fact. Good background source.

Mort, Paul R., Director, Equalizing Education in Ohio, Columbus, Ohio School Survey Commission, 1932, p. 149.

This was the original survey made under the direction of Dr. Paul Mort, stating the need for improving school support and a plan for equalizing educational opportunity for each school district in the State of Ohio. This is a well-documented publication that was presented to the legislators in 1932.

, Minutes of the Representative Assembly of the Ohio Education Association, on file in the office of the Ohio Education Association, Columbus, Ohio.

This is a stenographic record of the minutes of the Representative Assembly in action at their annual meeting.

APPENDIX I

**COPIES OF LETTERS TO THE WRITER INDICATING A NEED
FOR RESEARCH.**

June 18, 1955

Mr. Paul C. Hayes
122 Chestnut Street
Leetonia, Ohio

Dear Paul:

Since you and I have talked about your thesis so many times I feel that you know of my interest in your project.

We, here in the Association, know that we have been influential in promoting legislation beneficial to schools and the school people of the State of Ohio. However, we have not taken time to document these claims as you know. It would be well to have our case documented and proven conclusively one way or the other.

I feel too, that a thesis of this type would provide a needed chapter on our activities that could be preserved for future reference and use.

With kindest regards,

OHIO EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

Walton Bliss,
Executive Secretary

June 18, 1955

Mr. Paul C. Hayes
122 Chestnut Street
Leetonia, Ohio

Dear Paul:

Since one of my major responsibilities since 1947 has been the Ohio Education Association's Legislative Program, I can say without a moments hesitation that the Association has been most effective in securing beneficial school legislation. We, here at the Association have not taken time to set down all of the things that we have done, but we feel the results of our program has spoken for itself.

The type of study you are doing would be of great interest to us to prove conclusively that the Association is doing a good job. There are always skeptics who need convincing, as well as the new people coming into the Association for the first time.

We would also welcome a study of this kind as a needed history on one segment of our Association's activities.

Yours truly,

OHIO EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

Tom O'Keefe
Director of Research

APPENDIX 2

**A COPY OF PROPOSED LAW TO ESTABLISH A MINIMUM TEACHERS
SCHEDULE AS CONTAINED IN SUPPLEMENTAL PETITION.**

A COPY OF PROPOSED LAW TO ESTABLISH A MINIMUM
TEACHERS' SCHEDULE AS CONTAINED IN SUPPLEMENTAL PETITION

BE IT ENACTED BY THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF OHIO:

SECTION 1. That existing sections 4848-1, 4848-3, and 4848-4 of the General Code be amended and supplemental section 4848-4a of the General Code be enacted to read as follows:

Sec. 4848-1. There shall be paid in each calendar year to each school district of the state an amount equal to twenty-five cents a day for not to exceed 180 days for each pupil of school age in average daily membership in part-time, continuation and evening schools, and, for regular day school, an amount equal to seventy dollars for each pupil in average daily membership in grades one to 12 inclusive, an amount equal to thirty-five dollars for each pupil five years of age or over in average daily membership in kindergarten classes, during the school year next preceding such payments, except that no payment shall be made under the provisions of this section for one-teacher and two-teacher elementary schools maintained in local school districts.

The payments as herein provided shall be made only for a school year not less than 180 days, inclusive of such legal school holidays established by section 4838-1 of the General Code as occurred during regular school weeks and on which days schools were not in session; inclusive of such other days, not exceeding two approved by the superintendent of public instruction for the professional meeting of teachers when such days occurred during a regular school week and the schools were not in session; and inclusive of all days that schools were not in session because of disease, epidemic, temporary circumstances rendering the buildings unfit for school use, or other public calamity.

Sec. 4848-3. Any school district, which has a tax levy for current school operation of at least eight mills, shall be entitled to receive additional aid if it qualifies

A COPY OF PROPOSED LAW

therefor, as hereinafter provided. However, any school district which on the effective date of this act does not have a tax levy for current school operation of at least eight mills shall be eligible to receive additional aid until the first quarterly distribution, as provided in section 4848-8 of the General Code, following the next general election after the effective date of this act.

The amount of such additional aid which such a district shall be entitled to receive in any fiscal year shall be the difference between the total amount of the district's foundation program, to be computed as provided in section 4848-4 of the General Code, and an amount equivalent to a computed yield of four and one-half mills on each dollar of the taxable property on the tax duplicate of such district plus the total amount due such district under provisions of section 4848-1 of the General Code.

The superintendent of public instruction shall pay such additional aid to such district for a school year as specified in section 4848-1 of the General Code in the same manner and at the same time as the payments authorized by section 4848-1 of the General Code are made to the school districts of the state.

Except as otherwise provided by law all funds allocated to school districts under sections 4848-1 and 4848-3 of the General Code shall be used to pay current operating expenses only.

Sec. 4848-4. The total amount of a district's foundation program shall include the following amounts:

(a) An amount equal to one hundred and twenty-five dollars for each pupil in average daily membership in grades one to eight inclusive.

(b) An amount equal to sixty-two dollars and fifty cents for each pupil five years of age or over in average daily membership in kindergarten classes.

A COPY OF PROPOSED LAW

(c) An amount equal to one hundred fifty dollars for each pupil in average daily membership in grades nine to twelve inclusive.

(d) For each elementary school and each high school having an average daily membership of less than one hundred eighty pupils, such amount as will be sufficient to meet the increased cost per pupil due to small classes, to be determined as follows:

When any school having an average daily membership of less than one hundred eighty pupils, is approved by the superintendent of public instruction as an essential and efficient part of the state school system, the amount to be allowed for such school for the purpose of determining the district's foundation program of education shall be such as will enable such school or schools to operate at a reasonable level of educational efficiency. For this purpose, foundation program schedules for schools of less than one hundred eighty pupils in average daily membership shall be established by the superintendent of public instruction; but for an elementary school approved as a one-teacher school the foundation program amount shall be not less than twenty-three hundred dollars and for an elementary school approved as a two-teacher school the foundation program amount shall be not less than forty-seven hundred dollars, plus the cost in each case of maintaining approved pupil transportation and tuition foundation program, or either, as herein provided. Such schedules shall define the foundation program amount of each size and type of school with less than one hundred eighty pupils in average daily membership and such specific amount shall be used in place of the amounts specified in paragraphs (a) and (c) of this section. Provided, however, that the rate per pupil established by the superintendent of public instruction for high schools of fifty pupils shall be used in determining the foundation operating cost for all high schools with average daily memberships of less than fifty except in the case of island school districts.

A COPY OF PROPOSED LAW

Pupils in attendance in part-time, continuation, evening and summer schools shall in no case be included in the average daily membership upon which calculations are made under paragraphs (a), (c), and (d).

(e) For districts in which transportation of pupils is necessary, an amount approved by the superintendent of public instruction for this purpose. The amount approved for transportation may include such sum as the superintendent of public instruction determines is needed by the public school district for the purchase of public school busses but the total approved amount shall not exceed the maximum amount indicated by a formula established by the superintendent of public instruction for use in computing approved foundation program transportation costs for the public school districts of the state. The total amount approved pursuant to the provisions of this paragraph shall be included in the district's foundation program in addition to the amounts specified in the preceding paragraphs of this section.

The superintendent of public instruction shall prescribe regulations governing pupil transportation and shall approve a foundation program of transportation costs for each district in which transportation of pupils is deemed necessary. The effects of sparsity of population and of other conditions reasonably beyond the control of the board of education of the school district shall be considered in the determination of such transportation costs. The superintendent of public instruction shall certify each year to the clerk of the board of education of each school district the amount of the approved transportation cost for such districts.

(f) For districts with pupils in approved attendance in the schools of other districts, an amount equal to the total of the approved budget of tuition cost which shall be in addition to the amounts specified in the preceding paragraphs of this section, provided, however, that where a district of school residence maintains no schools and the

A COPY OF PROPOSED LAW

tax rate for current operating expenses of the district of school residence is less than that of the district of attendance, there shall be deducted from the budget of tuition cost of the district of school residence, an amount, equal to the computed yield of a tax on the general tax list and duplicate of the district of school residence, at a rate equal to 100 per centum of the difference in the tax rates of the respective districts.

Provided, further, that where a district of school residence maintains no schools and has pupils in approved attendance in the schools of more than one other district and where the total tax rate for current operating expenses of the district of school residence is less than the average of all the tax rates for current operating expenses of the districts of attendance, there shall be deducted from the budget of tuition cost of the district of school residence an amount equal to the computed yield of a tax on the general tax list and duplicate of the district of school residence at a rate equal to 100 per centum of such differences.

Pupils in public or private children's homes or in special classes for the physically or mentally handicapped for whom tuition must be paid shall not be included in determining tax rate differentials.

The tuition cost shall be computed as provided in section 4848-5 of the General Code.

For the purposes of this section an elementary school is defined as any school enrolling pupils in one or more of the grades from one to eight, inclusive, and a high school as any school enrolling pupils in one or more of the grades from nine to twelve, inclusive. Such schools are to be taken as separate and distinct schools even though housed in the same building or in separate buildings on the same site.

Sec. 4848-4a. There is hereby established a minimum salary schedule for teaching personnel employed in the public schools of this state as follows:

A COPY OF PROPOSED LAW

(1) Teachers with less than three years of recognized college training shall receive a beginning annual salary of \$2,000 and an annual increase of \$100 for each of the first ten years of service;

(2) Teachers with three years of recognized college training, but who have not received a bachelor's degree, shall receive a beginning annual salary of \$2,200 and an annual increase of \$100 for each of the first twelve years of service;

(3) Teachers with a bachelor's degree from a recognized college shall receive a beginning annual salary of \$2,400 and an annual increase of \$100 for each of the first sixteen years of service;

(4) Teachers with a bachelor's degree from a recognized college and an additional year of recognized college training shall receive a beginning salary of \$2,500 and an annual increase of \$110 for each of the first sixteen years of service;

(5) Teachers with a master's degree from a recognized college shall receive a beginning annual salary of \$2,600 and an annual increase of \$120 for each of the first sixteen years of service.

For the purpose of determining the minimum salary to which a teacher is entitled, only that educational training approved by the superintendent of public instruction for the issuance of teachers' certificates shall be considered.

"Beginning annual salary" shall mean the annual salary received by a teacher during the first year of employment as a teacher.

In computing years of service, credit shall be given for each school year such teacher was in service as a regular teacher in any public school system. Provided, however, each

A COPY OF PROPOSED LAW

board of education may evaluate such service for each new teacher employed by the board of education except that no new teacher shall be given credit for less than five years if the teacher has served five or more years in a public school system. Furthermore, any person employed in any public school system in Ohio who has or who may serve in the armed forces of the United States shall be given full service credit for the time spent in such armed forces. The term "armed forces" as used in this paragraph is the same as defined in section 7896-1a in the General Code.

The minimum salary schedule herein provided for shall apply to all teaching personnel employed by or in the employ of any school district in this state for the school year immediately following the effective date of this act and thereafter.

Teaching personnel employed by or in the employ of any school district of this state for the school year immediately following the effective date of this act and thereafter shall be given full credit for prior service as defined in this section. The minimum annual salary to which a teacher is entitled shall be an amount equal to the minimum beginning annual salary to which such teacher is entitled by virtue of educational attainments plus an amount equal to the total of the annual increases to which such teacher is entitled by virtue of years of service.

Each teacher who has completed training which would qualify him for a higher salary bracket shall file by September 15 with the clerk of the board of education satisfactory evidence of the completion of such additional training. The clerk of the board of education shall then immediately place the teacher in the proper salary bracket in accordance with training and experience before certifying such salary, training, and experience to the superintendent of public instruction.

Provided, however, in the event any teacher in the employ of any school district is entitled to a salary increase

A COPY OF PROPOSED LAW

under the terms of the minimum salary schedule as set forth in this section in excess of \$400, such increase may be given in annual installments of \$400 each year until the minimum salary schedule has been attained, but this shall not restrict any district from providing additional salary increases from local tax resources or from any other funds available to the school district.

The above established salary schedule shall be considered a minimum pay scale for teachers in Ohio and boards of education may establish salary schedules in excess of these pay ranges commensurate with local and state tax resources.

To assist school districts in financing said minimum salary schedule, the superintendent of public instruction shall determine the amount due a school district for supplementary salary payment to be granted in the following manner and under the following conditions:

1. Any school district which has a tax levy for current school operation of at least eight mills shall be entitled to receive a supplementary salary payment in addition to any additional aid as provided in section 4848-3 of the General Code.

2. In applying for supplementary salary payment, the board of education of each city, exempted village, and local school district shall certify to the superintendent of public instruction on or before October 1 of each year the salary, experience, and training of each teacher employed by the school district for the current school year and such other information as the superintendent of public instruction shall require. The term "teacher" as used in this act is as defined in section 4842-7 of the General Code.

3. Upon the basis of the training and experience of teachers as certified by the clerk of the board of education, the superintendent of public instruction shall compute the cost of the state minimum salary schedule for each school

A COPY OF PROPOSED LAW

district. In making such computation, he shall be governed by the limitation herein imposed that the transition of any teacher from his current salary status to his proper place on the state minimum schedule shall be in steps of \$400 annually until the minimum salary provided for in this section has been attained, but this shall not restrict any school district from providing additional salary increases from local tax revenues or from any other funds available to the school district. Where the pupil-teacher ratios are below those prescribed by the superintendent of public instruction for the type and size of school, he shall make a proportionate downward adjustment in such cost. From this adjusted cost, he shall subtract 75 per cent of the amount of the district's foundation program for the calendar year then current, including tuition for which the state is the paying agent, but excluding transportation, in order to determine the salary deficiency. For the purpose of computing the net amount due each school district for supplementary salary payment, the superintendent of public instruction shall establish a table of equalization factors based upon the assessed valuation per pupil. In developing such equalization factors for determining supplementary salary payments, the superintendent of public instruction shall provide that the supplementary salary payment shall be such as to enable each school district to operate at a reasonable level of educational efficiency. He shall apply the appropriate equalization factor to the amount of the salary deficiency of each school district and the amount thus calculated shall be distributed to the district in semi-annual payments.

The superintendent of public instruction is hereby given the power and it shall be his duty to recalculate the supplementary salary payment due any school district on the basis of the current number of teachers employed in the school district whenever it shall appear to him that the number of teachers employed has changed to such an extent as to render the original calculation either excessive or inadequate. He shall prescribe standards for determining and certifying such change in supplementary salary payment upon the basis of which such recalculation will be considered and made.

A COPY OF PROPOSED LAW

4. Any board of education which receives a supplementary salary payment under the terms of this act shall pay the teachers in its employ not less than the respective amounts required by the provisions of the state minimum salary schedule, subject to the prescribed limitation with respect to maximum annual increases, or by the provisions of the salary schedule heretofore or hereafter adopted by the board of education, whichever is the greater. The superintendent of public instruction shall be without authority to pay money under the terms of sections 4848-1, 4848-3, and 4848-4a of the General Code to any district which fails or refuses to comply with this requirement or to pay teachers uniform salaries in accordance with training and experience except as provided in section 4842-7 of the General Code.

SECTION 2. That existing sections 4848-1, 4848-3, and 4848-4 of the General Code of Ohio be and the same are hereby repealed.

APPENDIX 3

**COPY OF THE NEWS RELEASE BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE
OHIO EDUCATION ASSOCIATION AS TO FILING OF THE INITIATED
PETITION.**

YOU'RE IN THIS PICTURE, TOO!

231



Minimum salary schedule petitions were filed with the Secretary of State, Dec. 15, by the official committee, l. to r., George C. Beery, Columbus; John D. Blackford, Mariemont; Carl H. Shanks, Wilmington and Merrill F. Cooley, Warren.

Your petitions for the Ohio teachers minimum salary schedule bill are among those piled on the table above. Your efforts as a district captain, coupled with those of other workers, made it possible for the OEA to exceed its goal with a total filing of 206,508 signatures.

You will be pleased to know that sufficient signatures were obtained in each of the 88 counties to meet the minimum constitutional requirements. After the signatures are verified by county boards of elections, the bill will be submitted to

the General Assembly by the Secretary of State. This will come a very few days after the opening session on January 1, 1951.

Without your personal interest and your willingness to give your time and energy in behalf of this petition campaign, the goal would have never been reached. May I, as OEA President, take this opportunity to express my personal thanks for your efforts. In so doing, I am also expressing the gratitude of the entire membership of the Ohio Education Association.

George C. Beery

President, Ohio Education Association, 1950

APPENDIX 4

**COPY OF THE LETTER FROM THE SECRETARY OF STATE ON
THE RULING OF THE PETITION AND HIS CERTIFICATION THEREOF.**



233

January 15, 1951

Mr. George C. Beery, 184 East Frambes Avenue, Columbus, Ohio,
Mr. John D. Blackford, 3906 East Lane, Mariemont, Cincinnati, Ohio,
Mr. Merrill F. Cooley, 1100 Youngstown Road, S. E. Warren, Ohio,
Mr. Carl H. Shanks, R. R. 1, Sabina, Ohio,

as the Committee designated to represent the petitioners in the initiative petition proposing a law relative to establishing a minimum teachers' salary schedule, providing for a minimum school year of 180 days as a basis for distributing funds under the foundation program, increasing the state's financial assistance to all school districts, providing for a local tax levy of at least eight mills as a prerequisite for additional state aid, and providing for state financial assistance to school districts which are unable to finance the minimum salary schedule from other available revenues.

This is to notify you that I have this day determined, ruled and certified that the initiative petition above mentioned is sufficient and will be transmitted by me to the 99th General Assembly of the State of Ohio on January 15th, 1951. A copy of such determination, ruling and certification is enclosed herewith.

Yours very truly,

TED W. BROWN
Secretary of State
of the
State of Ohio

APPENDIX 5

**ABSTRACT OF THE INFLUENCE OF THE OHIO EDUCATION
ASSOCIATION UPON THE PUBLIC SCHOOL FOUNDATION PROGRAM IN
THE STATE OF OHIO FROM ITS INCEPTION UNTIL 1955.**

APPENDIX 5

ABSTRACT OF

The Influence of the Ohio Education Association
Upon the Public School Foundation Program
in the State of Ohio from its Inception until 1955.¹

A fundamental concern of state educational associations is affecting legislation for the benefit of its membership and the schools of its state. Little documentation of the effect of educational associations in this regard has taken place. Relevant studies do, however, establish the notion that state educational associations have a potential to influence and effect legislative programs at the state level.

The problem for study was: How, and to what extent has the Ohio Education Association influenced legislation impinging on the Ohio Public School Foundation Program? It was hypothesized that this association had influenced the state Public School Foundation Program from its inception to its enactment and through modifications following its enactment.

The basic research design used was the historical survey. Data was gathered from a variety of sources including

¹ Ph.D. Thesis presented by Paul C. Hayes, in 1963, to the Faculty of Arts of the University of Ottawa, 237 pages.

printed records and documents, official proceedings, various reports and news releases, and formal and informal interviews. Both data sources related to the association and the state legislature were utilized. The presentation of data was in the form of a narrative report. First the origin and the enactment of the legislation was described and then efforts to improve the legislative program were delineated.

Study data provided support of the basic research hypothesis. Revealed in the study data was the influence and effect of the Ohio Education Association on the enactment and modification of the Ohio Public School Foundation Program. The association had initiated and supported a study directed toward improving the financing of the state's public schools. Through the efforts of the association a legislative program based upon this survey was enacted into law. This law made the state a far greater contributor to the financing of public education than ever before. Over a period of years other association efforts were instrumental in establishing a sound financial base for the Foundation Program and, in expanding the program to provide additional benefits for the public schools in the state.

Not all of the association's desires were met; in fact, frustration and disappointment were frequently encountered by the association leaders. However, when the association involved interested lay citizens and professional educators in seeking legislative action, they were more successful than when the association staff alone lead the professional cause.

The study conclusions were that (1) the Ohio Education Association had definitely influenced legislation concerning the state's Public School Foundation Program and (2) the Ohio Education Association has a potential to influence legislation favorable to the welfare of its membership when its full membership is committed to a program of action.