DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 082 341 EA 005 454

AUTHOR	Marland, S. P.
TITLE	Issues in School Finance. A Discussion Paper.
INSTITUTION	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	16 Mar 72
NOTE	23p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Court Litigation; *Educational Finance; Educational Legislation; *Equal Education; *Federal Aid; Fiscal Capacity; Nonpublic School Aid; Property Taxes; *School District Autonomy; *School Taxes; Tables (Data); Urban Schools
IDENTIFIERS	Efficiency (Education); Equity (Education); *Federal Role

ABSTRACT

In this document, the author identifies the principal issues in school finance that need to be confronted and resolved. The text proposes no answers; but, rather, stimulates broad discussion and understanding of the issues as a first step toward consensus on an appropriate federal role. The author examines traditional sources of school funds and considers recent court decisions on educational finance. Most of the presentation focuses on the issues raised by such educational finance goals as providing property tax relief, providing a fair and adequate system for financing education, and preserving local control over local schools. Tables illustrate the scope of disparities in school expenditures within and among states. (Author/DN)

ISSUES IN SCHOOL FINANCE

A Discussion Paper

In his State of the Union Message of January 20, 1972, President Nixon pledged that he would make revolutionary recommendations later this year to deal with the financial crisis facing the Nation's schools. In response to his challenge, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has established a Task Force to develop alternative approaches to the problem of school finance.

As an initial step, the Task Force has prepared the attached paper designed to identify the principal issues which need to be confronted and resolved. The brief document does not propose answers: rather, its purpose is to stimulate broad discussion and understanding of the issues as a first step toward consensus on an appropriate Federal role. We expect that it will undergo periodic revision as we obtain comments and suggestions for sharpening our analysis of this complex and fundamentally important problem. We urge you to send your comments to: Dr. H. Reed Saunders, Director, Task Force on School Finance, U.S. Office of Education, D/HEW, 400 Maryland Avenue, S.W., Code 527, Washington, D.C. 20202.

S. P. Marland, Jr.
U.S. Commissioner
of Education

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, D. C.

March, 1972

3/16/72

ISSUES IN SCHOOL FINANCE

A Discussion Paper

> We long have looked in this Nation to the local property tax as the main source of financing for public primary and secondary education.
>
> As a result, soaring school costs, soaring property tax rates now threaten both our communities and our schools. They threaten communities because property taxes--which more than doubled in the ten years from 1960 to 1970--have become one of the most oppressive and discriminatory of all taxes, hitting most cruelly at the elderly and the retired; and they threaten schools, as hard-pressed voters understandably reject new bond issues at the polls.
>
> The problem has been given even greater urgency by four recent court decisions, which have held the conventional method of financing schools through local property taxes discriminatory and unconstitutional.

Thus in his State of the Union Address on January 20, 1972, did President Nixon describe a problem of national scope and urgency. The problem is not simply fiscal. It has broad and compelling implications for the character and quality of education throughout the United States, for the level of resources available to a school district have an important impact on the educational services available to the district's pupils. Furthermore, differences in the levels of resources available to different districts create differences in the educational services available to the pupils of those districts, which often lead to unacceptable differences in educational opportunities.

The solution of these problems will require the best thinking of every citizen.

PAST AND PRESENT

Sources of school funds

We currently spend nearly $50 billion annually to support the public elementary and secondary schools. Of this total, 41 percent comes from the States, 7 percent from the Federal Government, and 52 percent from local sources. Almost all of the local share is raised by property taxes.

The heavy reliance on local financing and on the property tax as the chief local source of school funds has profound implications for addressing school financial issues. First, there is the question of the revenue source, itself - the suitability and acceptability of the property tax. Second, the emphasis on local sources for school finance, coupled with the large number of local school districts, creates the possibility of widespread disparities in the level of support among the Nation's schools and, more importantly, in the level of educational services and opportunities.

Property taxes pro and con

Heavy reliance on the property tax to support the public school, which goes back to the Nation's beginnings, has its advantages. Property taxes are a stable source of revenue. Avoiding taxation is difficult. Most of the services the property tax finances flow directly and visibly to the local community. And the property tax is familiar.

However, the local property tax has serious shortcomings. It represents a heavy burden on so basic a necessity as housing. It discourages the rehabilitation of deteriorating areas, especially in the highly populated sections of central cities where rehabilitation is most critically needed. It affects decisions by private industry as to where a new plant or factory will or will not be located. Property tax revenues expand more slowly than the needs they finance. The property tax is also "regressive"--that is, it places a relatively heavy burden on those least able to pay: the elderly and others on fixed incomes and the urban poor and middle classes. And, because the taxable value of local property varies so widely, it results in wide variations in the amounts of revenue available to different school districts, irrespective of how willing local citizens may be to tax themselves.

Scope of disparities

Wide variations in school expenditures exist within States and among States. These variations often result from the differences in financial resources available to different communities. They may also depend on the degree of support different communities choose to provide for education. Although research has not demonstrated the precise relationship between the amount of money a community spends on education and the quality of its schools, it is assumed that larger expenditures generally produce better education.

During the 1969-70 school year, estimated expenditures per pupil in average daily attendance in public elementary and secondary schools ranged from a low of $503 in one State to a high of $1,420 in another (see Table I). Fifteen of the States and outlying areas spent more than $1,000 per pupil while 21 spent less than $800.

Within the States, disparities are even greater. In a representative western State, the wealthiest district spends $2,414 per pupil, the poorest district $569. In a mid-western State, the range is $2,295 to $391; in a northern State, $1,281 to $515; in a southern State, $1,036 to $593. In most States, the highest spending districts outspend the lowest by 100 percent or more (see Table II).

Disparities exist not only between geographical regions but also within individual areas. These differences in educational finance are particularly striking within individual SMSA's. The center cities are characterized by having a higher proportion of disadvantaged students than do their suburban counterparts--with a corresponding higher cost for providing education. While center cities have a relatively higher tax base per ADA to finance education, and hence a relatively low tax rate for education, their tax base must also finance local services such as welfare assistance, drug prevention programs and police protection, which are higher in center cities than in suburban areas. In addition, significant disparities exist across the suburban areas surrounding a center city. These disparities and the situations causing them must be explicitly considered in considerations of allocation formulas.

Studies of the Problem

As property taxes climb, citizens are increasingly unwilling to pay for the necessary costs of education. In recent years, over half of local referenda on increasing property tax rates and school bond issues have failed at the polls.

Recently, several major studies have searched for more equitable and efficient approaches to school finance. The work of three groups has been of particular importance--the long-established Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, the National Educational Finance Project supported primarily by the U.S. Office of Education, and the President's Commission on School Finance appointed by President Nixon in March of 1970.

Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations (ACIR)

As a result of its study on State aid to local government in 1969, the ACIR recommended that the States assume substantially all fiscal responsibility for financing the public schools, with local districts given (a) limited authority to add on enrichment expenditures, and (b) assurance of continued policy-making authority. According to ACIR, such a plan would help attain quality of educational opportunity and ease the substantial and growing pressure of the school tax on owner's property.

The ACIR reaffirmed this position at their 1971 Conference on the Public Schools:

> "Lifting the burden of school financing from local units of government would, the Commission feels, be the best way to assure equality of educational opportunity and at the same time ease the pressure of the property tax."

National Educational Finance Project (NEFP)[1]

Another major study, conducted for the Office of Education by a large group of finance experts, also concluded that:

1/ An independent study, funded by the U.S. Office of Education, but directed by Dr. Roe L. Johns of the University of Florida.

"Great inequities exist in the availablity of funds for education in the school districts of nearly every State. These variations are primarily the result of the tremendous differences in the abilities of local districts to finance education and the methods used by the States to allocate their revenues for school support. The time has come to seek new directions in the processes of raising and allocating revenues if we are to achieve the goal of equality in education."

The President's Commission on School Finance

The final report of this group cites and indicts the inequities of our present system of educational finance:

"Significant disparities in the distribution of educational resources have developed among school districts. Though every State has made some effort over the years to reduce these disparities, the results have been only partially successful at best. That, we believe, is because the States have relied on local district funding for the bulk of educational revenues. Major structural reforms in current systems of school financing can increase the ability of the Nation to serve the educational needs of all citizens."

In consequence, the Commission recommended State financing of substantially all non-Federal outlay for public elementary and secondary education, the development and use by the States of criteria of educational need and indices of educational cost in the distribution of State funds, and Federal incentives to encourage the States to increase their financial shares.

The Courts Step In

The entire school finance problem has been put in particular focus by the August 30, 1971, decision of the California Supreme Court in Serrano vs. Priest. In that case, the court determined that the California public school financing system, with its substantial dependence on local property taxes and resulting wide disparities in school revenue, is discriminatory and violates the equal protection clause of the 14th Amendment, because it makes the quality of a child's education a function of the wealth of his parents and neighbors. Because the California court was deciding preliminary issues and remanded the case to a lower court for trial, the decision has not been appealed to the United States Supreme Court.

On October 12, 1971, the Federal District Court for the District of Minnesota, in Van Dusartz vs. Hatfield, adopted generally the reasoning of the California Supreme Court, held it applicable to Minnesota, and denied a motion to dismiss.

In a third case, Rodriguez vs. San Antonio Independent School District, a three judge Federal district court in Texas determined on December 23, 1971, that the current system of financing public education in Texas discriminates on the basis of wealth by permitting citizens of affluent districts to provide a higher quality education for their children, while paying lower taxes. Holding that this constituted a denial of equal protection under the 14th Amendment, the court ordered the reallocation of funds available for financial support of the school system within two years. The decision will be appealed to the Supreme Court.

The most recent case, Robinson vs. Cahill, was decided by a New Jersey State trial court on January 20, 1972. The court held that the State's system, based heavily on local property taxes, violated equal education and protection guarantees in the State Constitution as well as the equal protection provisions of the U.S. Constitution.

The foundation of this case on State constitutional grounds means that there is no legal basis for appeal to the U.S. Supreme Court, if the decision is upheld by the State Supreme Court, as expected in New Jersey.

As a result, the decision would become the law of the State, regardless of the ultimate fates of the California case and two similar Federal cases in Texas and Minnesota.

Observers of the New Jersey case report other unique aspects of the case:

- The first to address itself directly to problems of race, poverty, and the municipal financial overburden of central cities;

- The first to be decided after a complete trial; and
- The first in which cities, rather than individuals, were plaintiffs.

Similar actions are pending or are about to be filed in at least 20 other States.

The potential impact of these decisions on school finance is very far-reaching. Not the least of the unanswered questions which have been raised concerns the future ability of local school districts to provide and fund educational programs above the basic level of education established by a State.

Promise of Action

Thus the signs of impending crisis mount, and President Nixon has issued a call for action. He has indicated that as a first step he will set forth some basic recommendations. In his State of the Union Message, January 20, the President said:

> Later in the year, after I have received the report of both the President's Commission on School Finance and the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, I shall make my final recommendations for relieving the burden of property taxes and providing both fair and adequate financing for our children's education--consistent with the principle of preserving the control by local school boards over local schools.

BASIC GOALS

Whatever form his recommendations may take, the President noted that they will be addressed to three basic goals:

1. Providing property tax relief.
2. Providing a fair and adequate system for financing education.
3. Preserving local control over local schools.

Straightforward and desirable as such goals might seem, achieving them will be a complex and demanding matter. Millions of people and thousands of jurisdictions will be directly affected, and long-established practices will be challenged. Moreover, each of these goals can be achieved in numerous and various ways, and the pursuit of one may interfere substantially with the accomplishment of the others. Fundamental and far-reaching issues will have to be dealt with.

THE ISSUES

The tax relief issue

Property taxes currently provide about $40 billion in annual revenues, primarily at the local level. Roughly half of this amount is derived from taxes on residential property and most of the remainder from taxes on commercial property. Of the $40 billion total, approximately one-half goes for the support of education. These facts raise certain important questions.

<u>Should relief be aimed only at the portion of the property tax spent for education or at all expenditures financed by these taxes?</u>

Although funds from property taxes are usually thought of in connection with support of education, they are also used to cover the costs of such other services as welfare assistance and police and fire protection. In some instances funds from property taxes are earmarked for particular purposes, but often (especially in many cities) the money thus collected is lumped together with all other revenues of the county or municipality. If relief extended only to those property taxes devoted to education, local or State governments would be tempted to reinflate the property tax in response to the heavy demand for the other public services. Tax relief could thus be brief and ephemeral, and in the long run the tax burden on property owners might grow back to present levels.

<u>Should relief be granted only for local property taxes or should it be extended to cover property taxes levied at all levels within the State?</u>

A major alternative facing many States is to finance education and perhaps other public services by enacting a State-wide property tax. This approach would contribute to making educational expenditures more equal among the individual districts within the State, and to making property tax burdens more equal among the taxpayers of the State. In many States, it could also contribute to property tax relief because Statewide rates would not have to be as high as the current highest local rates, nor would Statewide rates of that magnitude be politically feasible.

<u>Whatever form of property tax relief might be adopted, should the Federal Government seek to mandate it?</u>

Many observers contend that property tax relief will not materialize unless appropriate legislation requiring it is enacted at the Federal level. Yet such a mandate by the Federal Government would limit the flexibility of the States and localities to develop their own revenue plans to cover what they see as their particular educational and general expenditure requirements.

One alternative under our Federal system would be for the national government to provide incentives for property tax relief but not formally require it by law.

<u>If the local property tax burden were lifted, where else would the schools get the revenues they require</u>?

Our schools cannot do without the money now received from the local property tax. Moves to eliminate this source of funds thus carry with them the obligation to provide replacement revenues--and to do so in ways that impose less of a burden than the property tax on the poor, the elderly, citizens on fixed incomes, and in general on all taxpayers of modest means who bear the most onerous part of the property tax load. At the same time, sound policy dictates that such replacement revenues be raised in a manner that is easily and fairly administered and that has the potential to adjust--as the property tax does not--to cover future requirements.

Several revenue sources are available, including higher rates of Federal or State income taxes, new or expanded sales taxes, and the value-added or "transactions" tax now used by many industrial nations. Once again, the choice is not a simple one, since each principal alternative can in turn be developed in several different and conceivably conflicting forms. It would in any case seem clear that the characteristics of the source of replacement revenue--its relative freedom from regressivity, its flexibility, and whether it will be collected at the Federal, State, or local level--will have important effects on decisions as to how the money that is raised should be subsequently spent.

The "fair and adequate" issue

Many observers see property tax relief as being one element in a necessary reform of our system of educational finance. This proposition provokes some fundamental challenges. The new system would of course have to be "fair and adequate," as the President has specified. There would have to be a clear and acceptable definition of the roles to be played by Federal, State, and local governements in school support and operations. Such matters are as difficult and entangled as those having to do with the relief of property tax, and they raise such issues as these:

How and to what extent should Federal policy seek to diminish the disparities arising from the varying levels of affluence among districts within a State?

This issue has been given particular urgency by the recent court rulings in several States saying that present educational finance systems are unconstitutional. The Federal response to these rulings could be the enactment of legislation that supports and supplements them--or it could be Federal legislative restraint, either allowing the judicial system to clarify the constitutional requirements and to adjudicate solutions proposed by individual States and localities or leaving remedial legislation to State initiative prior to court action. However, any such judicial solutions would doubtless be slow to come and might very well be tied to particular State and local proposals calling for only minimal compliance with the basic law.

To come at the matter from another direction, States and localities can be expected to seek special additional resources to achieve intrastate equalization, and these resources may be available only at the Federal level.

If equalization within the States is to be based on Federal authority and resources, the question again arises: should such equalization be required under new legislation or should it merely be encouraged until the courts have made more definitive rulings?

Assuming the desirability of equalization within States, is the necessary consequence a removal of primary educational finance responsibility from local districts?

Reports from the National Educational Finance Project and the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations both recommend that responsibility for educational finance rest primarily with the States rather than with local districts. One of their arguments is that such concentration would be necessary to achieve and sustain equalized expenditures. A counter argument holds that State assumption of responsibility for educational finance would inevitably diminish the effective control of local educational authorities (and the proposition has in fact been opposed or defeated on such grounds in the past). Defenders of the proposed transfer respond that control over funds and control over educational policy are separate matters and that local districts could therefore retain control over the important policy decisions. Indeed it is argued that local school boards could perform their essential functions better if freed from the responsibility of revenue raising.

Would intrastate equalization permit local districts to provide additional supplementary funds?

Some of those who have studied the educational finance picture have suggested that local school districts should have the liberty to devote extra funds over and above the equalized State average in order to promote exemplary and innovative practice. Others have said that unless such extra spending is permitted, parents in affluent districts may simply opt out of the public school system and purchase the services they desire in private schools.

Opponents of extra spending point out that unless safeguards were carefully spelled out, the mathematical fact is that such supplementary funds would disequalize expenditures among the districts and create another wealth-discriminatory pattern of educational support.

<u>Again assuming that equalization among districts should be pursued, should educational finance reform also encompass equalization among the States?</u>

Though not as exaggerated, disparities are as common from State to State as they are among districts within the States. Some of these differences are attributable to costs differentials and some result from differing levels of educational services. A considerable portion, however, is due to differences in basic wealth. Interstate equalization is frequently justified on grounds that education has a significant spillover effect--that a child educated in one State may spend his adult life in another. On the other hand, even partial equalization among the States would almost certainly require additional total revenues, thus cutting into the goal of overall tax relief.

<u>How can central city school districts obtain their fair share of the resources they need to deal with their special educational and financial problems?</u>

Any new system of educational finance that seeks to be truly fair and adequate must take account of the special problems of our central cities. America's urban centers are beset by eroding tax bases, higher costs, and large numbers of poor people needing an array of welfare and related services. Outsiders often ignore this "municipal overburden" and conclude that the cities must be relatively wealthy because of the level of revenues they receive. With appearance at odds with reality, a flat per-pupil equalization scheme would not help the cities much at all. In fact, they might even lose some of the revenue they now have. In any case, the central cities present a special problem in any search for fair and adequate equalization.

How should a revamped school finance system make provision for aid to non-public schools?

Non-public schools educate approximately ten percent of the Nation's elementary and secondary school children. Many of these schools are in serious danger of being forced to close. The problem is especially acute in urban America where well over half of the non-public school students are enrolled.

In New York and Chicago about a fourth of all elementary and secondary school students attend non-public schools, and in Philadelphia one-third. In ten of the Nation's largest cities, non-public school enrollments account for almost 20 percent of the total (see Table IV). Obviously, if the central city non-public schools were to close in sizable numbers, the public school system would be hard pressed.

Federal constitutional requirements may tightly constrain the degree and character of public aid to non-public schools. Assistance to parents and teachers in private schools might legally be expanded by methods such as those employed in Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Another possibility would be Federal incentives to States to assume greater responsibility for non-public schools, and a third option would be compensating families of students attending non-public schools through vouchers or tax credits.

The "local control" issue

Local control of education is among the most fundamental of American traditions. Local districts have long been given a large degree of discretion in setting the level of support for their schools and in determining such aspects of educational policy as hiring, salaries, transportation, and most portions of the curriculum.

Would local control disappear with the onset of equalization and State assumption of school financing?

Some observers contend that the degree of local control would necessarily be severely diminished. They equate financial responsibility with administrative responsibility, arguing that the two cannot be separated. On the other hand, several independent researchers have submitted findings that indicate there is very little correlation between financial and administrative responsibility. These studies strongly imply that State financial responsibility and meaningful local control are not at all mutually exclusive.

It has in fact been suggested that with the acquisition of responsibility for financing, the States might feel impelled to relax certain presently established controls over the curriculum and to grant incentive awards in order to encourage competition and innovation among districts.

Enforcing non-discrimination guarantees

Federal law requires that no school district receiving Federal financial assistance shall discriminate against the intended beneficiaries of that assistance on the grounds of race, color, or national origin. For the most part, Federal education programs have involved direct relationship between the Federal Government and local school districts. What are the implications for the enforcement of non-discrimination guarantees in any large-scale restructuring of the methods of financing elementary and secondary education?

Effect on existing programs

Finally there are the inevitable questions about the effect of new methods of educational financing on existing programs supported by the Federal Government. These effects will be fairly obvious and straightforward in some instances, but in others considerable analysis will be required. Some obvious questions in this area are:

Should ESEA, Title I, which provides special support for disadvantaged school children, be incorporated in any new plan of educational financing or retained as a separate program?

Is there any further justification for the SAFA program, providing special assistance to school districts affected by Federal installations, if State equalization payments and large-scale Federal support are provided for all districts?

THE ROAD AHEAD

Such are some of the complex, difficult issues that must be dealt with if school financing is to be reshaped in accordance with the standards President Nixon has set forth--that is, that it provide property tax relief in a manner that assures a fair and adequate system of support of the schools while preserving local control.

TABLE I

Estimated Expenditure Per Pupil in Average Daily Attendance in Public Elementary and Secondary Day Schools, by State: 1969-70

STATE	TOTAL	CURRENT	CAPITAL OUTLAY	INTEREST ON SCHOOL DEBT
			EXPENDITURE PER PUPIL	
1	2	3	4	5
United States . . .	$ 926	$ 763	$115	$28
Alabama	503	438	51	14
Alaska	1,416	1,083	299	34
Arizona	915	766	129	20
Arkansas	632	534	74	24
California	1,067	922	113	32
Colorado	798	695	80	23
Connecticut	966	882	54	30
Delaware	1,106	793	261	52
District of Columbia	1,372	1,023	349	--
Florida	923	710	196	17
Georgia	688	600	71	17
Hawaii	964	851	103	10
Idaho	706	629	64	13
Illinois	959	803	126	30
Indiana	847	624	197	26
Iowa	1,037	890	128	19
Kansas	920	721	175	24
Kentucky	693	612	63	18
Louisiana	746	620	99	27
Maine	816	685	113	18
Maryland	1,137	882	217	38
Massachusetts	874	753	79	42
Michigan	1,019	842	137	40
Minnesota	1,105	883	177	45
Mississippi	534	476	50	8
Missouri	842	714	107	21
Montana	982	822	137	23
Nebraska	649	527	103	19
Nevada	877	764	61	52
New Hampshire	856	692	135	29

TABLE I (CONTINUED)

STATE	TOTAL	CURRENT	CAPITAL OUTLAY	INTEREST ON SCHOOL DEBT
1	2	3	4	5
New Jersey	1,108	963	111	34
New Mexico	835	724	102	9
New York	1,420	1,237	141	42
North Carolina	675	609	54	12
North Dakota	764	621	121	22
Ohio	804	680	102	22
Oklahoma	617	540	68	9
Oregon	1,022	891	112	19
Pennsylvania	1,066	876	133	47
Rhode Island	1,010	904	78	28
South Carolina	645	555	78	12
South Dakota	775	657	107	11
Tennessee	636	560	56	20
Texas	709	581	103	25
Utah	716	600	101	15
Vermont	1,034	934	75	25
Virginia	822	691	110	21
Washington	880	743	105	32
West Virginia	706	626	71	9
Wisconsin	968	875	85	28
Wyoming	931	810	100	21
Outlying Areas:				
American Samoa	634	634	---	--
Canal Zone	1,065	966	99	--
Guam	676	591	85	--
Puerto Rico	312	286	26	--

Source: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, Fall 1969 Statistics of Public Schools; and unpublished data.

TABLE II

Variation in State Expenditure Per Pupil
1969-70

STATE	High District Expenditure	Low District Expenditure	High to Low Rates	Ranking by Amount of Dispersion
Alabama	581.	344.	1.789	43
Alaska Revenue/pupil	1,810.	480.	3.771	16
Arizona	2,223.	436.	5.799	07
Arkansas	664.	343.	2.025	30
California	2,414.	569.	4.243	08
Colorado	2,801.	444.	6.359	05
Connecticut	1,311.	499.	2.729	22
Delaware	1,081.	633.	1.808	42
District of Columbia	---	---	---	--
Florida	1,036.	593.	1.847	40
Georgia	736.	365.	2.016	31
Hawaii	---	---	---	--
Idaho	1,763.	474.	3.818	14
Illinois	2,295	391.	5.970	06
Indiana	965.	447.		24
Iowa	1,167.	592.	2.071	29
Kansas	1,831.	454.	4.03[illegible]	10
Kentucky	885.	358.	2.97	32
Maine	1,555.	229.	1.818	41
Maryland	1,037.	635.	1.733	44
Massachusetts	1,281.	515.	2.422	26
Michigan	1,364	491	2.87	33
Minnesota	903.	370	2.444	25
Mississippi	825.	283.	2.915	21
Missouri	1,699	213.	7.977	02
Montana/Avge of groups	1,716.	539.	3.184	17
Nebraska " " "	1,175.	623.	1.98	46
Nevada	1,679.	746.	2.25	36
New Hampshire	1,191	311	3.93	18
New Jersey 1968-69	1,485.	400.	3.813	15
New Mexico	1,183.	477.	2.418	28
New York	1,889.	669.	2.918	20
North Carolina	733.	467.	1.670	45
North Dakota County Avges				

TABLE II (CONT'D)

Ohio	1,685.	417.	4.047	11
Oklahoma	2,566.	342.	7.682	04
Oregon	1,317.	630.	2.728	23
Pennsylvania	1,401	484.	2.995	19
Rhode Island	1,206.	531.	2.27	35
South Carolina	610.	397.	1.63	48
South Dakota	1,593.	350.	4.222	09
Tennessee	766.	315.	2.421	27
Texas	5,334.	264.	20.24	01
Utah	1,515.	533.	2.9	37
Vermont	1,517.	357.	4.24	12
Virginia	1,126.	441.	2.66	38
Washington	3,406.	434.	7.948	03
West Virginia	615.	438.	1.41	49
Wisconsin	1,432.	344.	4.16	13
Wyoming	1,018.	596.	1.70	47

Source: President's Commission on School Finance (unpublished data collected from published reports of State education agencies.)