

Division	TOTAL COST OF MINIMUM PROGRAM COL2 X \$400	LOCAL SHARE
000	1,444,400	1,575,442
000		571,000
0.M. 70-71		808,190
		490,000
		1,786,174
		676,000
		1,148,671
		505,000
		866,355
		425,000
		1,535,268
		594,000
		182,503
		133,100
		807,889
		342,200
		2,483,628
		987,200
		10,838
		4,335,200
		60,000
		78,970
		118,455
		93,230
		128,645
		127,900
		185,850
		5,800
		375
		86,661
		63,649
		198,171
		375,429
		193,452
		64,548
		187,500
		481
		1,057
		882
		6,220,000
		624,000
		411
		768,000
		20,6
		1,800,000
		101,40
		11,916,000
		587,000
		772,000
		1
		1,752
		30
		60
		7
		5
		1

for the Distribution of Funds
for Virginia's Public Schools

Developed to Assist All Divisions
in Providing Quality Education

- 1- PETTYSYLVANIA
- POWHATAN
- PRINCE EDWARD
- PRINCE GEORGE
- PRINCE WILLIAM
- PULASKI
- RAPPANANNOCK
- RICHMOND
- ROANOKE
- ROCKBR
- ROCK

000
000
0.M. 70-71
VISION

-2- 4,425
1,699
4,100
5,750

15.

-3- 1,770,000

679,600

1,640,000

2,300,000

569,907

321,377

879,653

1,920

4,960

29,700

9,000

58,000

258,000

272,000

2,534

10,140

5,050

8,158

75,4

64,548

84,401

523,689

98,527

7,692

10,200

38,010

152,100

75,300

-4- 1,176,600

255,000

903

67

2

2

1

29

5

3

3

3

3

3

3

3

3

3

3

3

3

3

3

3

3

3

3

3

3

A NEW PLAN

**REPORT OF THE
COMMISSION CREATED TO STUDY
THE FORMULA FOR STATE AID
TO PUBLIC SCHOOLS**



HOUSE DOCUMENT NO. 20

1970

Commonwealth of Virginia
Department of Purchases and Supply
Richmond
1970

MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION

GEORGE N. MCMATH
Chairman of the Commission
House of Delegates
Onley, Virginia

W. W. ROBINSON
Vice-Chairman of the Commission
Superintendent, Shenandoah
County Schools
Woodstock, Virginia

HERBERT H. BATEMAN
Senate of Virginia
Newport News, Virginia

THOMAS B. NOLAND
City Manager
Martinsville, Virginia

MARK I. BURNETT
Chairman, Board of Supervisors
Mecklenburg County
Buffalo Junction, Virginia

J. SARGEANT REYNOLDS
Lieutenant Governor-Elect of Virginia
Richmond, Virginia

F. J. COPENHAVER
Chairman, School Board
Smyth County
Marion, Virginia

WILLIAM R. SAVAGE, JR.
Superintendent, Suffolk
City Schools
Suffolk, Virginia

CLIVE L. DUVAL, II
House of Delegates
Fairfax, Virginia

W. H. SEAWELL
Professor of Education,
University of Virginia
Charlottesville, Virginia

CHARLES W. GUNN, JR.
House of Delegates
Lexington, Virginia

W. ROY SMITH
House of Delegates
Petersburg, Virginia

J. CLIFFORD HUTT
Member, Board of Supervisors
Westmoreland County
Montross, Virginia

STANLEY C. WALKER
House of Delegates
Norfolk, Virginia

J. HARRY MICHAEL, JR.
Senate of Virginia
Charlottesville, Virginia

WOODROW W. WILKERSON, Ex officio
State Superintendent
of Public Instruction
Richmond, Virginia

December 20, 1969

THE HONORABLE MILLS E. GODWIN, JR.
Governor of the Commonwealth of Virginia

THE HONORABLE A. LINWOOD HOLTON
Governor-Elect of the Commonwealth of Virginia

Members of the General Assembly of Virginia

Dear GOVERNOR GODWIN, GOVERNOR-ELECT HOLTON and Members of the Assembly:

House Joint Resolution Number 89, which was passed by the 1968 Session of the Virginia General Assembly, created a Commission to study the formula for State aid to public schools. It is with pleasure that I transmit the Commission's report to you.

The need for quality education throughout the Commonwealth cannot be disputed. The method of distributing funds to aid in achieving this goal, however, has been the source of much controversy. It is this subject of an appropriate formula which the Commission has been directed to study.

The Commission realized that its study was related to some matters which would be considered during the 1969 special session of the General Assembly and a subcommittee was appointed to report on these subjects. The subcommittee consisted of Senator Herbert H. Bateman, Chairman, Mr. J. Clifford Hutt, Vice-Chairman, Delegate Clive L. DuVal, II and Delegate Charles W. Gunn, Jr. The report of the subcommittee was distributed during the special session as an interim report of the Commission and is printed as a part of our final report under the chapter heading "Recommendations On The Revision Of The Constitution."

During the early days of the Commission, a public hearing was held in Richmond. This was well attended and the comments received have been of great value. Throughout the eighteen months of the study, there have been numerous meetings of the full Commission and three special regional sessions. The Chairman also traveled to meetings of school superintendents to summarize findings and seek further advice. We have examined in detail recommendations received, and when the principle of a proposal was found to have merit, tabulations were made to determine its effect on statewide quality education.

The Commission is of the opinion that the plan we recommend represents a sound approach for the distribution of school aid funds. We feel it is equitable, easily understood, and meets many concepts which we believe should be included in a good formula.

The development of this plan has required the cooperation of many persons. Whenever information was needed from the Department of Education, it was always forthcoming. Our special thanks go to Dr. Woodrow Wilkerson, Superintendent of Public Instruction, who served as an ex-officio member of the Commission and continually offered his assistance. The Division of Statutory Research and Drafting was available to help in coordinating our work, and our gratitude goes to Mr. Wild-

man S. Kincheloe, Jr., Assistant Director of the Division, who served as the Commission's secretary. To the Members of the General Assembly, members of school boards, superintendents of schools and local officials, the Commission expresses its appreciation. Their comments and recommendations have had great effect on the preparation of this report.

The Commission members have served with distinction and I personally am indebted to them for their untiring efforts to resolve the questions before us. They have contributed their ability, knowledge and insight to our assigned task, and they are deserving of the gratitude of the State for the service they have rendered.

I am grateful for the opportunity of participating in the study and trust that this report on A NEW PLAN will be of assistance to the Commonwealth in providing in each school division an educational program of high quality.

Sincerely,

GEORGE N. MCMATH
Chairman

INDEX

I	MEMBERS OF COMMISSION	iii
II	LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL	iv
III	PURPOSE OF STUDY	1
IV	RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE REVISION OF THE CONSTITUTION	2
V	COMPLEXITIES OF THE EXISTING FORMULA	9
	Salary Scale	9
	Teacher-Pupil Ratio	9
	Average Daily Attendance	10
	Other Operating Costs	10
	Local Ability	10
	Special Funds	12
	Conclusions on Existing Formula	12
VI	CONCEPTS OF A GOOD FORMULA	13
VII	A NEW PLAN	14
VIII	FUNDS FOR CAPITAL OUTLAY	17
IX	CHARTS	18
	Estimated State School Funds, 1969-70	19
	Basic State School Aid Fund—Estimates for 1970-71	26
X	THE TRANSPORTATION FUND	34
XI	FURTHER RECOMMENDATIONS	35
XII	CONCLUSION	38

III

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The State Board of Education recommended to the 1968 Session of the General Assembly that the method of distributing school aid funds during the past be continued throughout the present biennium. By up-grading several factors, the State's share of the minimum program was to be increased by several million dollars. These revisions resulted, however, in twenty-five school divisions being scheduled to receive a decrease in funds.

The General Assembly accepted the recommendations of the State Board, but added to the formula a base so that no division would receive less money in 1968-69 than it received in 1967-68. During the course of discussions held throughout the session, it became apparent that the legislators had serious questions about the existing formula. Some thought it was unfair—others thought it was unnecessarily complex. The Assembly members seemed to share the opinion that if the State's formula was the right one, they wanted to be reassured. If it was not the right one, they wanted to pursue the adoption of a new formula.

As a result of these discussions during the 1968 Session, House Joint Resolution Number 89 was approved, creating a Commission to study the formula for State aid to public schools. The resolution called for the Commission to be composed of fifteen members. Three of these were appointed by the president of the Senate from the membership of the Senate. Five were appointed by the Speaker of The House of Delegates from the membership of the House and seven were appointed by the Governor from the State at large. The resolution called for the Superintendent of Public Instruction to be an ex-officio member.

This report is a result of a study of the present formula, a study of possible revisions to the present formula and a study of new approaches for the distribution of funds. In its work the Commission realized it was not enough to achieve simplicity alone. The State's formula for the distribution of funds must be based on sound principle and aid in the Commonwealth's efforts to provide quality education throughout Virginia.

IV
RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE REVISION OF
THE CONSTITUTION

House Joint Resolution No. 89 adopted at the 1968 Session of the General Assembly created a Commission to study the formula for State aid to public schools. The Commission was charged to study all aspects of the present formula for distribution of funds for State aid to the public schools with a view toward their more equitable apportionment. This, the study Commission has proceeded to do. Its members have met numerous times and have compiled a great deal of background material bearing upon the evolution to the present formula and the precepts which should control the equitable distribution of State funds in aid of public education.

In anticipation of the report of the study Commission on Constitutional Revision a subcommittee of this study Commission was appointed to evaluate the terms of our present Constitution and the impending recommendations of the Constitutional Revision Commission as they concern the relative responsibility of the State and localities with respect to public education. This subcommittee has formulated recommendations to the full study Commission. It is felt that it might be helpful to His Excellency and the members of the General Assembly if the Commission studying the distribution of funds for public education were to set forth its recommendations as they relate to the proposed revision of Article IX, Education and Public Instruction, of the Constitution of Virginia. Thus this interim report and recommendations.

A
SHOULD THERE BE A CONSTITUTIONAL MANDATE
FOR A STATEWIDE QUALITY EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

Section 129 of our present Constitution¹ appears at first blush to constitutionally require "an efficient system of public free schools throughout the State." This proviso is not self-executing and the courts, in light of other sections of the Constitution, have construed it to require nothing more than the enactment of the administrative system or machinery for a potentially efficient system.² Except for the Constitutionally created "Literary Fund"³ and the minimum sums which must be applied (interest on the Literary Fund)⁴ to public schools, it has been held that Section 129 falls short of requiring an operating, functioning school system of any quality in all or even any school district.⁵ Nowhere are the local political subdivisions of the Commonwealth required to levy any tax or to appropriate any funds for public schools.

It is in the perspective of our present Constitution, its construction by our Virginia Supreme Court of Appeals and our history, especially of recent years, that we evaluate Article VIII of the proposed revised Constitution and especially Section One and Section Two of proposed Article VIII.

The Constitutional Revision Commission has recommended, as is clearly manifest from their Commentary to the proposed revision, that a meaningful, obligatory Constitutional mandate for a Statewide quality system of public education should be adopted.⁶ This Commission endorses, indeed applauds, the Revision Commis-

¹ "Section 129. Free schools to be maintained. The General Assembly shall establish and maintain an efficient system of public free schools throughout the State."

² *School Board v. Griffin*, 204 Va. 650, (1963).

³ Section 134, Constitution of Virginia.

⁴ Section 135, Constitution of Virginia.

⁵ *School Board v. Griffin*, *ibid.*

⁶ Report of the Commission on Constitutional Revision, p. 258-59. See proposed Section 15, Article I, Report of the Commission on Constitutional Revision, p. 32 and commentary thereon, p. 99.

sion's recommendation to elevate what in present practice is constitutional policy to a constitutional mandate. In no other way can the Jeffersonian exhortation on behalf of an effective system of public education, which the Revision Commission suggests be added to the Bill of Rights, be meaningful.

The support this study Commission gives to the proposed constitutional mandate for quality public education throughout the Commonwealth, is given with full knowledge of the far-reaching legal and policy implications inherently involved. We realize it is not enough to articulate a constitutional mandate for public education. At least in broad terms, it is essential that the Constitution be more clear in how the mandate is to be implemented and that the means by which it shall be implemented be reasonable and appropriate.

Firmly and enthusiastically the recommended constitutional mandate for a "Statewide system of free public elementary and secondary schools open to all children of school age" is endorsed by this Commission. Having done so, we would address the attention of all Virginians to the more difficult questions of how that mandate should be executed and upon whom the burdens rest and whom the rights and responsibility for operating the public education system should lie.

B

HOW SHOULD A STATEWIDE SYSTEM OF HIGH QUALITY PUBLIC EDUCATION BE INSURED

Section One of proposed Article VIII, Education,⁸ as supplemented by proposed Section Two,⁹ contemplates that the Statewide system of free public education must be a program of high quality and asserts that the General Assembly shall provide for the system and ensure its quality. Specifically, proposed Section Two asserts the General Assembly shall ensure funds necessary for a high quality educational program are provided each school division. Then it states, "it shall take care that the cost . . . is divided equitably between the localities, wherein rests the primary responsibility for the public schools, and the Commonwealth. In the context of proposed Section Two the parenthetical clause indicates primary responsibility relates to the burden of cost, not just to control of the school system.¹⁰ Yet the Revision Commission points out the range of State general fund appropriations in aid of public education presently vary from twenty per cent in some wealthier localities to approximately eighty per cent in some poorer areas.¹¹ If a high quality, Statewide program of public education is to be required, it is essential we be realistic as to upon whom the financial burden should rest. Realistically, if some or most localities cannot bear the primary or larger part of the financial burden, then an effective Constitutional mandate for quality public education in every political subdivision of the Commonwealth cannot be predicated upon a primary financial responsibility of each and any locality. While this Commission disagrees with what seems implied by the language and Commentary of the able and distinguished Revision Commission, we agree with their underlying objective.

It is our belief that consistent with an effective mandate for a quality program of public education better, more realistic language, can be devised and employed in execution of that mandate. At the outset it must be assured that the terms of the Constitution itself not only manifest the nature of the mandate for public education, but does so in a manner that is clear and realistic. Such language, in our view, should not, in the face of ultimate fiscal realities, recite that the costs of implementing the mandate for a high quality educational system, must always and everywhere be primarily sustained by localities, when in point of fact many cannot bear the

⁸ Report of the Commission on Constitutional Revision, p. 61, and Commentary, p. 258-59.

⁹ Report of the Commission on Constitutional Revision, p. 61, Commentary, p. 259-63.

¹⁰ Report of the Commission on Constitutional Revision, p. 61, Commentary, Section 2, p. 260-261.

¹¹ Report of the Commission on Constitutional Revision, Commentary, p. 260.

primary financial burden of such a program. We must be mindful that it is a Constitution which is to be revised. It must say what it means and mean what it says. If it is unrealistic to Constitutionally require that there must be a high quality educational program and that the primary responsibility for its costs rests upon the locality then we must choose different Constitutional language in keeping with reality. The alternatives appear to be to lessen the mandate, which we would oppose - or to make the financial burden of the mandate more realistically relate to the ability of the State and locality to discharge the mandate. In simple terms some localities can fairly afford to do more than others, but the children of every locality should be able to enjoy an educational program which would not be allowed to fall below an acceptable level of quality. We believe that the level of quality should be high, but clearly it cannot be uniformly high.

We recommend that the revised Constitution contain a mandate for a quality educational program, but we recommend with equal fervor that the responsibility for its costs be fairly and soundly rooted in reality and equity. To the extent of its reasonable capability each political subdivision must bear the primary responsibility for the costs of a basic quality public educational program. Asking more of the locality would be both unrealistic and unfair. No political subdivision, however, should be permitted to jeopardize the future of its young people and the well being of the Commonwealth by doing less than they can fairly be expected to do, if the result is less than a quality program of public education.

There is doubt in our minds that the language suggested by the Revision Commission makes these matters sufficiently clear. The appendix to the interim report offers alternative language which we believe clearly enunciates the mandate for quality public education but does so in terms which are realistic.

Though we advocate Constitutional language which is realistic in terms of local capability to provide a guaranteed quality public school system in light of the financial limitations of some localities, we are equally concerned that every locality be required to do as much as it can fairly be expected to do. Reluctantly, therefore, we must recommend a different approach from that which the Revision Commission indicates in its Commentary on Section Two of proposed Article VIII.¹² The Revision Commission commends the concept of local control of the school systems throughout the Commonwealth. With this view we are in complete agreement. Local interest, participation and concern are fundamental to a sound educational system. The system must dare to permit differences and stimulate continuing dedication of the people served to the goal of an educational system of increasingly superior quality.

History and present realities indicate, however, there are localities whose lack of zeal and willingness to fairly support public education, deserve for them the description "recalcitrant" which the Revision Commission applies to them.¹³ What the Revision Commission suggests as a remedy for the problem of the "recalcitrant" locality is paradoxically self defeating from the perspective of prevention and cure.

The remedy which the Revision Commission by its Commentary suggests follows from the language of Section Two of proposed Article VIII, is that the State withhold ". . . all State funds from a locality that does not meet its support obligation. . ." If we assume that a given locality is by a fair, and objective standard failing to assume its equitable share of the costs of an acceptable quality educational program, is withholding of all State funds a sound and realistic remedy? We think not. The remedy inherently requires that to solve one problem the State would create a variety of others. If all State funds are withheld as a sanction to coerce a fair level of local support of education, the health, welfare, road system and many other areas of public service would be indiscriminately and adversely affected. Public education may be the primary area of public concern, but advancement of public

¹² Report of Commission on Constitutional Revision, Commentary, p. 260-261.

¹³ Report of Commission on Constitutional Revision, Commentary, p. 260.

education need not and should not needlessly be accomplished at the price of embarrassing every other aspect of local government. Other means of ensuring fair local participation in the execution of a Constitutional mandate for public education are available. For this reason we believe the suggested remedy for "recalcitrant" localities is untenable. We also hold to the view that the nature of the cure invites the spread of the disease.

The Revision Commission Commentary clearly indicates that there are many localities where the costs of supporting the school system is the greater portion of public expenditures, and that the State presently bears more than half the costs of public education. It follows that there are numerous political subdivisions of the Commonwealth who would come out ahead financially if the State, pursuant to a Constitutional requirement, assumed the entire burden for public education, even if the State withheld all State funds otherwise distributable to that locality. Assume that some political subdivision has an annual budget of \$1,000,000 of which seventy-five per cent is expended for public education, and that the total of all State funds allocated to that subdivision is \$250,000. Based on this assumption, that locality would profit by \$500,000 if it did nothing for public education and the General Assembly pursuant to Section Two of proposed Article VIII provided funds for a high quality public educational system, and all State funds were withheld from the locality. Present experience indicates the assumption made is consistent with fact. How then does withholding of all State funds remedy the evil? Does it not create an incentive for less local effort and tend to increase the incidence of "recalcitrant" localities? Yet the chief reliance of the Revision Commission for avoiding the failure of localities to equitably support public education is the withholding of all State funds.

The objective should be to devise an approach which would discourage the evil contemplated and would in its implementation, where essential, produce a cure with minimum side effects. We believe that there is an alternative approach which would more nearly fulfill both aspects of the objective.

If a locality ceases to participate in the costs of operating and maintaining its school system, or fails to make a reasonable effort to support it, what would be the proper remedy for the State? In answering this question we bear in mind and adhere to the view of the Revision Commission that the General Assembly must insure a quality public educational program in that locality and provide sufficient funds for that purpose.

The remedy should be to require that the locality reimburse the Commonwealth for the difference between its reasonable and fair costs of a public educational system of acceptable quality and whatever funds it had actually provided. This approach would permit the Commonwealth, in fairness to its taxpayers throughout the State, to recoup the difference between the Commonwealth's equitable share of the costs of the public educational program of acceptable quality in the locality in question and what the State's fair share of the cost should have been. In the words of the Mikado, "the punishment should fit the crime." While providing an ample remedy, requiring the "recalcitrant" locality to reimburse the State for the sum it had unreasonably failed to provide, would not interfere with or jeopardize all aspects of local government, as would withholding of State funds to the locality for other programs such as roads, welfare and health services.

Not only would the suggested alternative remedy be more adequate, its availability would tend to discourage the conditions to which it would be applied. The fact localities would profit from a failure to reasonably support public education, which would be the case under the Revision Commission's suggested remedy, induced our search for a practical, but effective alternative. One alternative which we do not recommend would be to preempt in whole or in part the localities' exclusive right to impose a tax on real property. The underlying premise of this alternative would be to provide a vehicle by which the State treasury could recoup the difference between what it had to pay in support of a local public school system and what it

should have had to pay if the locality had discharged its fair share of the financial responsibility. Though preferable to the remedy suggested by the Revision Commission as inherent in Section Two of proposed Article VIII, we feel this alternative unnecessarily drastic. The normal distribution of the power to impose certain types of taxes as contemplated by our present Constitution and proposed Article X should not be lightly set aside or varied. Local monopoly as to taxation of real estate is the very essence of strong, effective local government and should be protected. These considerations lead us to recommend that the Constitution create a debt payable to the State treasury to the extent of the difference between reasonable local effort and actual local effort in support of a public educational system of acceptable quality. This Constitutional debt would be a first lien or claim against the revenues of a "recalcitrant" locality. Suggested language as an alternative to Section Two of proposed Article VIII is set out in the appendix.

C

WHAT IS THE NATURE OF THE CONSTITUTIONALLY REQUIRED STANDARD OF PUBLIC EDUCATION AND BY WHOM AND HOW SHOULD IT BE DETERMINED AND PRESCRIBED

The Revision Commission in Sections One and Two of proposed Article VIII speaks in terms of a Statewide system of "high quality" public education. It provides by Section Two that the State Board of Education ". . . subject to revision only by the General Assembly" shall determine and prescribe standards of quality. Section Five of the Revision Commission's proposed Article VIII contemplates the State Board of Education shall have the ". . . primary responsibility and authority for effectuating the educational policy . . ." including the determination of standards of quality. By Section Five the Revision Commission seeks to provide the means for executing the mandate for a "high quality" program asserted in Sections One and Two.¹⁴

No member of this Commission takes any exception to the intent or design of the Revision Commission in employing the term "high quality" in reference to the Constitutional mandate for public education throughout Virginia. Nor do we disagree that the State Board of Education is the appropriate body to define standards of quality, subject to revision by the General Assembly as the elected representatives of the people. Fully aware that Section Two speaks in terms of standards, not a standard to be set, we feel some concern that the language of Section One of the proposed Article VIII read in light of Section Two, both employ the term "high quality," as the standard against which the Constitutional mandate for public education is proposed to be measured.

Even without the proposed terminology there are those who argue before the courts that failure of the State to support a level of public education contended for amounts to a denial of equal protection of the laws as guaranteed in the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States. We understand there are several such suits pending in Federal Courts throughout the country, one of which arises out of Bath County in our Commonwealth.¹⁵

No one could seriously propose that every school district in Virginia can operate and maintain an educational program of uniformly high quality. There is no doubt that requirement of a high quality program throughout the Commonwealth should not contemplate a uniformly high quality. Some localities because of superior ability and willingness to employ it can and will do more than others in operating and maintaining a public school system. Since this is the intent and the reality we recommend that it be entirely manifest in the language of the Constitution. It should not be left with the hope or expectancy that if called upon in the future a court would construe the terms of proposed Sections One and Two as we today might feel

¹⁴ Report of the Commission on Constitutional Revision, Commentary, p. 267.

¹⁵ Robert P. Burruss, et al. v. Woodrow W. Wilkerson, Superintendent of Public Instruction, et al., Civil Action No. 68-c-13-h in the United States District Court for the Western District of Virginia.

it should be construed. In this regard we are much impressed by the warning sounded by Governor Mills E. Godwin, Jr. in his address to the General Assembly on February 26, 1969. Governor Godwin pointed out:

“In its meritorious enthusiasm for a full-scale state commitment to education, the Commission advocates major changes of direction, both in theory and in practice.

“I hope it is unnecessary for me to say that I am in full accord with the Commission’s purpose of providing high quality education. As a consequence, I am distressed that duty requires me to point out certain hazards.

“If the sole responsibility were yours and mine, my reservations would fade away, but your actions here will be subject to review by courts which have served ample notice that it is possible to stretch drastically the boundaries of traditional judicial restraint and to overturn time-honored legal concepts.

“In the present particular, the Commission would have the State guarantee, and I quote, ‘an educational program of high quality’ throughout the Commonwealth, a laudable aim, I agree.

“In the Commission’s view, public school standards would be determined by the State Board of Education, subject to revision only by the General Assembly.

“The definition of the term ‘high quality’ is so subjective as to invite any citizen who disagreed with the State Board of Education or the General Assembly to bring suit. It poses the gloomy prospect of endless litigation, and very possibly endless expenditure of public funds to fulfill the courts’ decrees.

“Therefore, I would suggest that whatever your final disposition of this section, you exercise the utmost caution in drafting the revision.”

The appendix hereto sets out language which we believe could minimize the risk of undue judicial intrusion into determination of standards of quality for education. At the same time we believe the recommended alternative language still clearly preserves the new Constitutional mandate for a Statewide system of quality public education.

CONCLUSION TO SECTION IV

Members of the Commission for the Study of the Basic School Aid Formula have opinions regarding various aspects of the proposed revision of our Constitution. These opinions we do not express except as they directly relate to the subject we are charged to study. To this extent we feel constrained to speak.

The Revision Commission deserves and has our commendation for its clarion call for a quality public educational system as a Constitutional right of the people and duty of Virginia governmental institutions. Few more significant recommended changes have been suggested by the Revision Commission than those which create and would execute the Constitutional mandate for quality public education.

With full accord with the Revision Commission objective and intent we recommend change in their proposed Constitutional language so as to spell out in broad terms the manner in which localities would be required to provide their equitable share of the financial burden, and to more clearly spell out what is contemplated in terms of standards of quality.

APPENDIX TO SECTION IV

Section 1. Public Schools of acceptable quality to be maintained.

The General Assembly shall provide by law for a Statewide system of free public elementary and secondary schools open to all children of school age, and shall ensure that an educational program of acceptable quality is established and maintained in every political subdivision of the Commonwealth.

Section 2. State and local support of public schools, standards of quality, how implemented.

The General Assembly shall ensure that funds necessary to establish and maintain an educational program in keeping with the provisions of Section One hereof are provided and shall establish the measure of the reasonable minimum financial participation of each political subdivision of the Commonwealth, based upon its ability, so that the cost of an acceptable program of public education may be equitably apportioned between the Commonwealth and its political subdivisions. An acceptable standard of quality shall be determined and prescribed from time to time by the State Board of Education, subject to revision only by the General Assembly, but each school district shall in no way be limited to such acceptable standard of quality.

In the event any county, city or town fails or refuses to provide its equitable share of the costs of an educational program which conforms to an acceptable basic standard of quality as above determined, the General Assembly shall provide the funds which represent the difference between the portion of the costs actually provided by such locality and its equitable share of the costs, which sum shall be in addition to the sum regularly appropriated and allocated as the Commonwealth's equitable share of the costs. Any sum so provided by the General Assembly for a local school district by virtue of the failure of a county, city, or town to contribute its equitable share of the costs of the educational program of the school district shall be a debt of such county, city or town, payable into the Treasury of the Commonwealth out of the first revenues collected by such locality, following receipt by the governing body of such locality of a statement of the amount of such debt.

V

COMPLEXITIES OF THE EXISTING FORMULA

In studying the distribution of State school aid, the Commission felt the best place to start was with the existing formula. This formula, which had been a subject of discussion for many years, can be described in this manner.

A teacher-pupil ratio is established. This ratio currently is one teacher for each thirty pupils in average daily attendance in grades kindergarten through seven, and one teacher for each twenty-three pupils in average daily attendance in grades eight through twelve. The number of teaching positions is applied to the minimum salary scale. "Other Operating Costs" is determined by multiplying the average daily attendance by a prescribed dollar figure which is \$115 for this year. The Total Cost of the Minimum Program is found by adding the Total Cost of Salaries and Other Operating Cost. The Local Share is represented by 60 cents per \$100 of the true values of real estate and public service corporations. The basic State Share is 60% of the Total Cost of Salaries. By adding the Local Share to the Basic State Share and subtracting the total from the Total Cost of the Minimum Program, the resulting difference is the Supplementary State Share. When the Basic State Share is added to the Supplementary State Share, the result is the Total State Share.

The present formula has been the subject of much criticism. Some of this criticism has come from educators, some has come from the public, and some has come from members of the General Assembly. Part of the criticism has been directed at the formula in general. Part of it has been directed at particular factors in the formula.

Due to the controversy over the present method of distributing funds, the Commission feels that the various factors of the formula should be examined separately.

SALARY SCALE

The General Assembly during the 1968 Session approved the recommendation of the State Board of Education that the minimum salary scale be increased by \$300 during each of the two years of the present biennium. This brings the minimum salary during this, the second year of the biennium, to \$5,000.

During the school sessions of 1967-68, 1968-69 and the current school year of 1969-70, all school divisions have had schedules which exceeded the State minimum. This year 120 out of 130 localities have starting salaries of at least \$6,000, or \$1,000 more than the State minimum. Of the ten localities under \$6,000, one has a salary scale starting at \$5,500, two at \$5,700, one at \$5,800 and six at \$5,900.

There is a sizable increase in the cost of the State share under the present formula whenever the minimum salary scale is increased. This is because the basic State share is equal to 60% of the cost of salaries. One method used in the currently structured formula to increase State appropriations is to increase the minimum salary schedule. The schedule, however, is unrealistic, and today is \$500 below the lowest schedule of any school division.

TEACHER-PUPIL RATIO

At the Commission's public hearing, and in written statements presented to the study group, one of the most frequent complaints of the present formula is that the teacher-pupil ratio is too high. The existing formula defines a State aid teaching position as one position for each thirty pupils in average daily attendance in the grades kindergarten through seven, and one position for each twenty-three pupils in grades

eight through twelve. Based on comments made to the Commission, we believe that if the present basic formula were continued, and if funds were available, the sentiment in Virginia would be to establish a ratio of one teacher for each twenty-six students in the grades kindergarten through seven and one teacher for each twenty-one students in the grades eight through twelve.

By lowering the teacher-pupil ratio, the number of teaching positions in the formula is raised and the State cost is increased. Thus, as in the case of the salary schedule, the teacher-pupil ratio can be adjusted to increase or decrease State appropriations without necessarily reflecting the real or ideal situation.

AVERAGE DAILY ATTENDANCE

The present formula uses average daily attendance in its calculations, but the Commission has found strong sentiment throughout the State for use of membership, rather than attendance.

Those who favor "attendance" suggest that it may offer an incentive to have larger numbers present when the daily roll is called. Those who favor "membership" reason that whether a student is present or is not present, classroom space is still reserved for him, his teacher's salary goes on and other educational costs continue. It also is argued that bad weather conditions can affect attendance more in some areas than in others.

Some have suggested that it would be easier to get an accurate attendance figure than it would be to arrive at an accurate membership figure. This, they comment, is due to possible confusion as to when students are dropped from the roll. The Commission believes, however, that this can be resolved through regulations promulgated by the State Board of Education.

After weighing all considerations, the Commission is of the opinion that in principle there is more justification for using average daily membership than average daily attendance in the State's distribution formula.

OTHER OPERATING COSTS

A factor in the existing formula which accounts for much of the State cost of a minimum program is listed as "Other Operating Costs." This is determined by multiplying a dollar figure by Average Daily Attendance. For the current year, the figure used is \$115 per pupil. If this were raised to \$120 for the first year of the next biennium, it would have the effect of adding in excess of \$5,000,000 to the cost of the minimum program.

At our public hearing and in written statements, everyone commenting on this subject suggested that there be a considerable increase in the dollar figure. One city recommended that it be "increased to a minimum of \$130 per pupil". Another city suggested that appropriations be increased to "\$150 per pupil". The chairman of a county school board wrote "The State's share under the formula is too low - way too low. It should be changed to, at least, \$220".

The Commission finds that there is a great divergence of opinion as to the amount which should be allowed per student for other operating costs. It also finds that the dollar figure can be increased as a means of increasing the total State appropriation, but the new figure may not necessarily represent the amount of money which should be spent.

LOCAL ABILITY

The present formula for distribution of school funds uses only one measure as a means of determining local ability. This is to apply 60 cents per \$100 of true values of real estate and public service corporations.

This factor in the formula is responsible for most of the losses, which occur to individual school divisions. When a locality has an increase in true values, its local share increases; and unless the cost of the minimum program has increased proportionally, the basic State share will decrease.

The Commission asked the Department of Taxation to provide an explanation of the method used in the preparation of the Department's biennial estimate of true values. The full statement, dated July 19, 1968, is printed below.

"The 1966 estimated true (full) value of real estate was arrived at by making a detailed study, by county and city, of the ratio of assessed valuations to selling prices of real estate. In making the study, the selling prices of real estate sold in 1965, as evidenced by deeds admitted to record in 1965, were compared with the assessed valuations of those parcels sold as shown on the 1966 land book. Only those real estate transfers representing bona fide bargain and sale transactions between willing buyers and willing sellers were used. The sum of the assessed valuations of the parcels sold was divided by the sum of the selling prices of the parcels sold, and the resulting percentage was considered to be the average ratio of assessed value to true (full) value of all real estate in the locality in which the study was made. The true (full) value of all real estate in the locality was then computed by dividing the total 1966 assessed value of all real estate in such locality by the average assessment ratio for that locality.

"The following kinds of sales were excluded from consideration in making the study:

1. Forced sales to and foreclosures by banks, insurance companies, building and loan associations, etc.
2. Sales to or from Federal, State, and local governmental units (school boards).
3. Sales to public service corporations for rights of way.
4. Sales by receivers, special commissioners, and other court officers; or sales at public auction.
5. Transfers for convenience (such as transfers between co-tenants).
6. Transfers for "love and affection". All sales between persons having the same family name were excluded unless it was known locally that such sales were bona fide.
7. Sales of timber in which the grantor retained ownership of the land.
8. Sales of cemetery lots.
9. Sales conveying an unspecified or undivided interest.
10. Sales from one corporation to another when the relationship was that of parent and subsidiary, or when there was knowledge of interlocking directorates.
11. All other sales which on their face revealed that they were not voluntary sales at market value made between a willing buyer and a willing seller.

"If the number of bona fide transactions in any locality was not more than 1,200 all such transactions were used in the study for that locality. If the number of such transactions was in excess of 1,200, only 1,200 transactions were used; this was because of the fact we had found from previous studies that the use of 1,320, 1,440, 1,560, etc., transactions produced the same ratio as the use of 1,200 transactions.

"The 1966 estimated true (full) value of the physical property of public service corporations was arrived at by dividing the total 1966 assessed value of such property in each county or city by the 40% assessment ratio used generally by the State Corporation Commission throughout the State.

“The procedures used in making the 1966 study of the estimated true (full) value of real estate are currently being used in making the 1968 study.

“Because of the enactment of § 58-512.1 of the Code of Virginia by the General Assembly of Virginia at its regular 1966 session, relating to the assessment of the physical properties of public service corporations by the State Corporation Commission, a procedure different from that used in making the 1966 study of the estimated true (full) value of such properties will have to be used in making the 1968 study.”

We are confident that the Department of Taxation is conscientious in its effort to fairly determine the true values of all localities. We do find, however, in some areas where there has been major highway construction the true values for the locality have greatly increased. We must question whether these increases have resulted from acreage sold near the site of construction or whether they represent sales throughout the area. One tabulation for the 4-year period of 1962 to 1966 reveals that 12 counties and one city had an increase in estimated true values of 50% or more. One of these counties had an increase during the 4-year period of 75%.

The real estate tax is the source of greatest income for the local support of education and it therefore should be a major factor in determining the ability of our school divisions. Our Commission is concerned, however, over true values being the only measurement of ability in the present formula and feels this is a major fallacy.

Property value alone is not an adequate indicator of local wealth. There is need for devising a broader base to determine a locality's ability to support education.

SPECIAL FUNDS

Through the years there have been a number of special grants established. We see no reason for continuing some of them as separate funds.

We specifically refer to Guidance Counselors, Local Supervision, Special Education and Twelve-month Principles. These funds should be made a part of the general appropriation for basic school aid.

This would be a step in the direction of simplification regardless of what formula is used.

CONCLUSIONS ON EXISTING FORMULA

For some years the present formula has served as a method for the distribution of school aid funds. It is rightfully based on the three desirable characteristics of need, ability and effort, but we find that certain factors, which add to the complexity of the formula, can be adjusted in order to obtain desired increases in State appropriations. Unfortunately, in most instances these factors are totally unrealistic, and if they were to be accepted as State policy, the policy would be woefully inadequate.

After careful consideration of all aspects of the present formula, the Commission finds that it is unable to recommend its continued use.

VI

CONCEPTS OF A GOOD FORMULA

After studying the formulas used by this State and other states, and after reviewing the opinions of many who are familiar with the subject, the Commission has concluded that there are certain concepts which are basic to all good methods of distributing school funds, and that these should be included in the Commonwealth's school aid formula. These we list below.

The formula should:

1. Recognize the State's responsibility of sharing in the cost of providing quality education.
2. Be fair and equitable to all school divisions.
3. Place final responsibility in the hands of the General Assembly in determining the basic amount to be spent per child for public education.
4. Establish need, determine ability and require local effort.
5. Include an adequately broad base in determining a locality's ability to support public education.
6. Use membership, not attendance, when tabulations are based on number of students.
7. Be flexible so that adjustments can be easily made to reflect increases in cost and the pursuit of higher goals.
8. Include funds for as many areas of special endeavors as seems appropriate.
9. Leave to general law or State Board action specific guidelines which are related to the achievement of quality education.
10. Be readily understood by all who have need to understand it.

It has been these concepts that have been used in judging the value and feasibility of the numerous formulas considered by the Commission.

VII

A NEW PLAN

During the course of the study, numerous formulas were considered. One of these has been approved by the Commission and is recommended to the Commonwealth. The Commission strongly suggests that it be adopted by the General Assembly during the 1970 session and that it be put into use beginning with the school session of 1970-1971. The formula is defined as follows:

The cost per student of a basic program of education is to be established by the General Assembly. One-half of the total state-wide cost is to be paid by the State and one-half is to be paid by the combined localities of the State, subject to such State additions as may be necessary to avoid any individual losses. The local share per student is determined by multiplying an index of the division's ability by the figure which is equal to one-half the cost per student of the basic program. The State guarantees to pay at least one-third of the cost of the basic program in each division and each locality is required to pay at least one-third of the cost. The total local share is found by multiplying the local share per student by average daily membership. This local share must be paid by the division out of local funds. The State share is determined by subtracting the local share from the total cost of the basic program. Unless there is a decrease in membership, the State share is guaranteed to be in an amount at least equal to the State share for the previous year. In addition, as a part of the formula, funds would be appropriated to each division for capital outlay.

The Commission recommends that the initial cost per student for the basic program be \$400. It should be emphasized that we are speaking in terms of a basic program which we trust will be far exceeded by the various school divisions in the State. We suggest that the \$400 figure be raised as soon as possible to an amount which is closer to the State's average expenditure per student. In the meantime, the acceptance of this recommendation would result in a large increase in State appropriations. Due to other suggestions we are making, it would be unrealistic to recommend a higher figure for the coming year.

A more detailed explanation of the formula follows:

1. The General Assembly determines the cost per student for a basic program of education and as noted above, the Commission is recommending for the present that this figure be \$400.

2. On a State-wide basis the cost of the minimum program would be divided between the State and combined localities subject to such State additions as may be necessary to avoid any individual losses. This means in theory it would cost the State an average of \$200 per student and it would cost the combined localities an average of \$200 per student.

3. To determine the local share per student multiply \$200 by the school division's index of wealth. Since the locality is expected to pay a minimum of one-third of the cost of the basic program, the local share will be at least \$133 per student. It is also true that since the State pays at least one-third of the cost, the local share cannot go above \$267. This means that if the General Assembly followed the Commission's recommendation and initially established \$400 as the cost per student of a basic program, the local share would range between \$133 and \$267. The total local share is found by multiplying the local share per student by average daily membership.

4. The State share in each division would be determined by subtracting the local share from the total cost of the basic program.

To be even more specific, the new plan establishes the following definitions and procedures:

1. The formula substitutes the term "Basic Program" for "Minimum Program."
2. The General Assembly is required to establish the cost per student of a basic program of education. In effect, this replaces the salary scale, the teacher-pupil ratio and other operating costs, all of which the Commission feels have been unrealistic. The Commission is convinced that it is far better to follow the new procedure of adopting a single figure than it is to use several specific factors in a formula which can be misleading.
3. The salary scale and teacher-pupil ratio would be determined, as suggested in one of the basic concepts, by general law or action of the State Board of Education.
4. Average daily membership is to be used in the proposed formula instead of average daily attendance.
5. It is intended on a State-wide basis for the State and the combined localities to equally divide the total cost of the basic program. This would be the case unless the State has to make additional payments to individual divisions in order to bring them up to their previous year's level.
6. To determine local share, multiply an index of ability (wealth) by one-half the cost per student of the basic program. In the case of \$400 equaling the cost per student, the index would be multiplied by \$200. The \$200 figure is used because of the basic premise that localities pay one-half of the total cost.
7. Each school division would be required to spend for public education from local funds an amount at least equal to the local share as represented in this formula.
8. Local ability is calculated by adding the 1% sales tax, based on point of sale, to the figure obtained by taking 60 cents per \$100 of true values of real estate and public service corporations. In effect, we suggest broadening the base in determining local ability by adding the sales tax to the factor already being used. This serves the purpose of more accurately determining the wealth of a school division and its ability to pay for education. The 1% sales tax at point of sale is recommended as it represents local money which can be used for educational purposes. If a locality has not enacted the one percent sales tax, then the figure used for purposes of the formula is to be one-third of the three percent State sales tax. Consideration also was given to using personal income as is done in some states to assist in determining wealth. Even though we found some merit in the suggestion that "The higher the income, the higher real estate taxes can be," the Commission concluded that this factor should not now be included in the formula.
9. Once local ability has been determined by adding the 1% sales tax to the 60 cents per \$100 of true values, we can proceed in determining the index of wealth. Divide the number of students in the school division into the local ability (wealth) and the result is the locality's wealth per child. If the same thing is done for the State totals (total membership into total ability) the result is the State's wealth per child. The index is found by determining the percentage of local wealth to the State wealth. If the local wealth per child is equal to the State wealth per child, the local index would be equal to 100%. If the local wealth per child is one-half of the average State wealth per child, the local index would be equal to 50%.
10. The State guarantees that it will pay at least one-third of the cost of the basic program but not over two-thirds of the cost. This is the same thing as saying the State is expected to pay at least one-third of the cost and the locality is expected to pay at least one-third of the cost. Using the figure \$400 per student as the cost of the basic program, the State share would range from a minimum payment of \$133 to a maximum payment of \$267.
11. Once the local share has been determined per student, multiply it by the number of students. The result is the total local share.

12. The total cost of a division's basic program is determined by multiplying the cost per student (\$400 recommended) by the number of students in the division.

13. To find the State share, subtract the local share from the total cost of the basic program. The State share, however, must be at least equal to the amount received during the previous year unless there has been a decrease in students.

14. The funds distributed to the localities in this basic formula include payment for Guidance Counselors, Local Supervision, Special Education, and 12-month Principals. These special funds would be eliminated. Where advisable, the General Assembly or the State Board of Education should establish appropriate regulations in these areas.

The Commission is making two additional recommendations for the expenditure of State funds. One, the capital outlay fund, is a part of the proposed formula. The other is for a revision of the transportation fund which should remain a separate fund. Both of these are discussed on the following pages.

VIII FUNDS FOR CAPITAL OUTLAY

The increase in population and the continuing need of providing better facilities are both requiring the construction of new schools throughout the State. This is dramatically illustrated by the fact that Virginia has 37,000 more students attending classes this year than last year.

Modern education requires modern classrooms, but unfortunately, with construction costs on the rampage and interest rates soaring, school divisions are finding it difficult to secure funds to meet their building needs. If the problem is not solved, the momentum toward obtaining quality education throughout Virginia could well be thwarted. Inadequate and insufficient classrooms are not conducive to attaining or retaining high standards of performance.

Traditionally, the cost of construction has been met with local funds and only once in modern Virginia history has the State assisted school divisions in paying for the erection of new structures.

The State has its Literary Fund which has been of help to localities in securing funds on a loan basis. This program in itself, however, is not adequate for meeting the needs of the day.

The time has come for the Commonwealth to take another bold step in the field of education and commit itself to the granting of financial aid to localities for capital outlay.

The Commission recommends that a capital outlay fund be established by the General Assembly and that initially it be in the amount of \$10 per student per year. This should be a definite part of the State's basic school aid formula. The cost for the first year would be \$11,016,590.

The Commonwealth should assist local school divisions in meeting their construction and equipment needs and to enact such a program will indeed be a significant contribution to education in Virginia.

The funds should be available to localities for the payment of new construction, for the purchase of new equipment, and for debt retirement on construction contracts entered into after January 1, 1970. The money should not be accumulative and should be available to the localities only during the year for which it is appropriated.

IX

CHARTS

On the following pages the Commission presents two charts which are pertinent to our recommendations.

Chart I is a summary of the most recent expenditure figures that are available. Included for each school division is the estimated basic State school fund and the special funds which we recommend be consolidated with the basic school fund. These State costs are presented so they can be compared with the Commission's proposals for the coming year.

The second chart contains a tabulation of the proposed formula. Included in it for each division are the figures of membership, total cost of basic program, 60¢ per \$100 on 1968 true values, local 1% sales tax, local ability (wealth), index of local ability, local share per student, local share, State share for 1969-70, State share for 1970-71, capital outlay funds, total State share and proposed increases for 1970-71.

It should be noted that in addition to increases proposed in Chart II, each Division would receive increases from the Commission's recommendations on the transportation formula.

CHART I

ESTIMATED STATE SCHOOL FUNDS, 1969-70

1 COUNTY, TOWN, OR CITY	2 BASIC STATE SCHOOL FUND		3 SPECIAL FUNDS				4 BASIC FUNDS + TOTAL	
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	
	1969-70	LOCAL	SPECIAL	TWELVE MONTHS	TOTAL COLUMNS	SPECIAL FUNDS TOTAL	COL 2 + COL 3	
		GUIDANCE	SUPERVISION	EDUCATION	PRINCIPALS	A THRU D		
		1968-69	1968-69	1968-69	1968-69			
ACCOMACK	1,381,257	23,100	12,600	10,890	8,130	54,720	1,435,977	
ALBEMARLE	1,203,670	18,840	16,800	47,790	4,842	88,272	1,291,942	
ALLEGHANY	621,933	4,200	8,100		2,460	14,760	636,693	
AMELIA	384,524	7,170	3,900	10,230	1,554	22,854	407,378	
AMHERST	1,028,172	11,610	12,300	3,920	4,104	31,944	1,060,116	
APPOMATTOX	456,996	3,720	4,200		2,316	10,236	467,232	
ARLINGTON	3,817,960	49,680	46,200	181,605	28,938	306,423	4,124,383	
AUGUSTA	2,024,075	24,300	16,140	27,960	8,328	76,728	2,100,803	
BATH	138,166	4,200		3,720	1,518	9,438	147,604	
BEDFORD	1,424,376	15,210	12,510	7,710	7,896	43,326	1,467,702	
BLAND	266,390	4,200		3,630	1,680	9,510	275,900	
BOYDEQUART	822,619	7,800	8,220	5,100	5,040	26,160	848,779	
BRUNSWICK	875,222	12,600	4,200		5,658	22,458	897,680	
BUCHANAN	2,017,236	19,620	3,900	3,090	7,944	34,554	2,051,790	
BUCKINGHAM	508,934	8,100	8,400	3,900	3,324	23,724	532,658	
CAMPBELL	2,223,718	22,860	20,700	7,650	10,488	61,698	2,285,416	
CAROLINE	738,145	7,590		6,420	4,896	18,906	757,051	
CARROLL	1,178,328	7,110	12,300	2,520	5,634	27,564	1,205,892	
CHARLES CITY	461,202	3,900	4,200		2,406	10,506	471,708	
CHARLOTTE	674,430	4,050	4,020		1,626	9,696	684,126	
CHESTERFIELD	5,890,318	61,920	32,940	62,340	17,064	174,264	6,064,582	
CLARKE	228,466	8,100	8,400		2,502	19,002	247,468	

CHART I—Continued
ESTIMATED STATE SCHOOL FUNDS, 1969-70

1 COUNTY, TOWN, OR CITY	2 BASIC STATE SCHOOL FUND		3 SPECIAL FUNDS			4 BASIC FUNDS + TOTAL	
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
1969-70	1968-69	LOCAL SUPERVISION 1968-69	SPECIAL EDUCATION 1968-69	THIRTEEN MONTHS PRINCIPALS 1968-69	TOTAL COLUMNS A THRU D	SPECIAL FUNDS TOTAL	COL 2 + COL 3
CRAIG	169,223	4,200			804	5,004	174,227
CULPEPER	737,844	14,580	12,300	3,180	4,014	34,074	771,918
CUMBERLAND	366,072	8,100	4,200		1,680	13,980	380,052
DICKENSON	991,263	11,910	12,600		4,164	28,674	1,019,937
DINHIDDIE	1,244,978	4,065	19,950	26,910	4,914	55,839	1,300,817
ESSEX	317,293	3,660			1,680	5,340	322,633
FAIRFAX	24,691,135	248,190	46,200	436,770	29,328	760,488	25,451,623
FAUQUIER	846,329	12,000	7,740	5,490	5,880	31,110	877,439
FLOYD	489,688	4,200	8,130		2,400	14,730	503,418
FLUVANNA	252,097	8,220	4,200		1,536	13,956	266,053
FRANKLIN	1,385,928	11,820	8,400	2,910	5,040	28,170	1,414,098
FREDERICK	1,312,266	11,580	8,100	4,200	1,680	25,560	1,337,826
GILES	581,875	15,630	12,510		4,164	32,304	614,179
GLOUCESTER	392,965	7,800	4,200	6,540	3,852	22,392	415,357
GOOCHLAND	338,001	8,100			2,430	10,530	348,531
GRAYSON	654,709	4,200	12,600		3,072	19,872	674,581
GREENE	222,356	3,570	4,020		780	8,370	230,726
GREENSVILLE	991,962	7,770	8,400	8,100	1,518	25,788	1,017,750
HALIFAX	1,787,250	13,112	8,100	2,520	4,962	28,694	1,815,944
HANOVER	1,722,710	19,380	12,600	8,550	7,284	47,814	1,770,524
HENRICO	5,955,032	74,160	44,820	128,370	28,770	276,120	6,231,152
HENRY	2,735,756	26,730	21,000	16,170	13,098	76,998	2,812,754

CHART I—Continued
ESTIMATED STATE SCHOOL FUNDS, 1969-70

1 COUNTY, TOWN, OR CITY	2 BASIC STATE SCHOOL FUND		3 SPECIAL FUNDS				4 BASIC FUNDS + TOTAL	
	1969-70	A	B	C	D	TOTAL		
						LOCAL	SPECIAL	TWELVE MONTHS
		GUIDANCE 1968-69	SUPERVISION 1968-69	EDUCATION 1968-69	PRINCIPALS 1968-69	A	THRU D	COL2 + COL3
HIGHLAND	81,030	3,900				840	4,740	85,770
ISLE OF WIGHT	946,990	16,200	12,420			3,360	31,980	978,970
JAMES CITY	697,127	3,570					3,570	700,697
KING GEORGE	398,119	4,200	4,200			1,644	10,044	408,163
KING QUEEN	166,300	3,900				1,536	5,436	171,736
KING WILLIAM	197,124	8,100				1,518	9,618	206,742
LANCASTER	296,215	4,050	2,055	3,930		1,680	11,715	307,930
LEE	1,423,720	12,300	4,200			5,040	21,540	1,445,260
LOUDOUN	1,158,581	19,080	16,500	24,330		2,520	62,430	1,221,011
LOUISA	634,246	8,100	3,930			4,086	16,116	650,362
LUNENBURG	638,506	7,800	4,110			4,140	16,050	654,556
MADISON	316,981	4,200	4,200	15,120		1,572	25,092	342,073
MATHEWS	170,750	3,900				732	4,632	175,382
MECKLENBURG	1,666,362	7,815	12,600			5,772	26,187	1,692,549
MIDDLESEX	245,086	8,100				2,520	10,620	255,706
MONTGOMERY	1,725,536	22,950	12,600	7,200		8,322	51,072	1,776,608
NANSEMOND	2,217,247	19,410	16,530	14,550		1,680	52,170	2,269,417
NELSON	600,370	8,400	4,200	6,540		1,680	20,820	621,190
NEW KENT	169,414	3,720		3,630		1,554	8,904	178,318
NORTHAMPTON	707,085	3,645	8,400	11,340		5,040	28,425	735,510
NORTHUMBERLAND	333,994	6,356	2,055			1,680	10,091	344,085
NOTTOWAY	767,766	11,460	8,100			2,520	22,080	789,846

CHART I—Continued
ESTIMATED STATE SCHOOL FUNDS, 1969-70

1 COUNTY, TOWN, OR CITY	2 BASIC STATE SCHOOL FUND	3 SPECIAL FUNDS				4 BASIC FUNDS + TOTAL	
	1969-70	A GUIDANCE 1968-69	B SUPERVISION 1968-69	C SPECIAL EDUCATION 1968-69	D TWELVE MONTHS PRINCIPALS 1968-69	TOTAL COLUMNS A THRU D	SPECL FUNDS TOTAL COL2 + COL3
ORANGE	505,360	8,100	4,200	16,440	4,878	33,618	538,978
PAGE	668,790	7,710	8,220		3,174	19,104	687,894
PATRICK	780,590	4,200	12,300		2,520	19,020	799,610
PITTSYLVANIA	3,476,595	27,330	12,600	42,330	19,686	101,946	3,578,541
POWHATAN	233,584	4,020	3,660		1,608	9,288	242,872
PRINCE EDWARD	222,726	4,200		7,530	1,680	13,410	236,136
PRINCE GEORGE	1,172,895	15,630	12,510	17,100	3,234	48,474	1,221,369
PRINCE WILLIAM	5,694,788	59,040	24,900	116,010	15,618	215,568	5,910,356
PULASKI	1,571,943	16,200	12,330	11,400	8,004	47,934	1,619,877
RAPPAHANNOCK	139,286	3,180	3,990		786	7,956	147,242
RICHMOND	285,205	2,100	5,290	2,160	1,680	11,230	296,435
ROANOKE	4,273,062	49,830	33,600	63,060	20,766	167,256	4,440,318
ROCKBRIDGE	770,928	8,400	12,210	8,640	5,022	34,272	805,200
ROCKINGHAM	2,195,477	33,150	20,640	37,530	12,222	103,542	2,299,019
RUSSELL	1,056,367	15,660	8,400		7,260	31,320	1,087,687
SCOTT	1,414,117	11,400	8,400	2,910	4,140	26,850	1,440,967
SHENANDOAH	874,284	11,670	12,600	13,590	6,462	44,322	918,606
SNYTH	1,590,254	15,810	16,800	2,910	7,428	42,948	1,633,202
SOUTHAMPTON	975,969	4,050	8,400	3,900	1,590	17,940	993,909
SPOTSYLVANIA	784,657	8,310	8,400		4,734	21,444	806,101
STAFFORD	1,078,283	11,490	11,580	12,261	3,324	38,655	1,116,938
SURRY	155,760				840	840	156,600

CHART I—Continued
ESTIMATED STATE SCHOOL FUNDS, 1969-70

1 COUNTY, TOWN, OR CITY	2 BASIC STATE SCHOOL FUND		3 SPECIAL FUNDS				4 BASIC FUNDS + TOTAL	
	1969-70	A	B	C	D	TOTAL COLUMNS A THRU D	SPECL FUNDS TOTAL COL2 + COL3	
		GUIDANCE 1968-69	LOCAL SUPERVISION 1968-69	SPECIAL EDUCATION 1968-69	TWELVE MONTHS PRINCIPALS 1968-69			
SUSSEX	718,190	4,200	8,040		2,520	14,760	732,950	
TAZEWELL	2,586,454	28,080	8,130	13,440	13,548	63,198	2,649,652	
WARREN	403,387	6,900	7,980	15,780	3,234	33,894	437,281	
WASHINGTON	1,904,823	15,780	9,600	3,900	11,232	40,512	1,945,335	
WESTMORELAND	475,001	8,100	10,580	5,400	2,322	26,402	501,403	
WISE	2,619,982	23,880	16,500	27,090	10,740	78,210	2,698,192	
WYTHE	1,070,537	16,050	16,800	15,090	5,754	53,694	1,124,231	
YORK	1,566,970	18,960	16,800	25,519	7,146	68,425	1,635,395	
**COUNTY TOTALS	133,376,682	1,487,443	951,660	1,588,825	523,986	4,551,914	137,928,596	

1 COUNTY, TOWN, OR CITY	2 BASIC STATE SCHOOL FUND		3 SPECIAL FUNDS				4 BASIC FUNDS + TOTAL	
	1969-70	A	B	C	D	TOTAL COLUMNS A THRU D	SPECL FUNDS TOTAL COL2 + COL3	
		GUIDANCE 1968-69	LOCAL SUPERVISION 1968-69	SPECIAL EDUCATION 1968-69	TWELVE MONTHS PRINCIPALS 1968-69			
ARINGTON	209,845	4,200			840	5,040	214,885	
CAPE CHARLES	79,071						79,071	
COLONIAL BEACH	63,908				840	840	64,748	
FRIES	53,894	4,200		3,900		8,100	61,994	
POQUSON	254,842	3,840			696	4,536	259,378	
SALTVILLE	93,900	3,900			1,254	5,454	99,354	
WEST POINT	100,140	2,910			750	3,660	103,800	
**TOWN TOTALS	852,600	19,050		3,900	4,680	27,630	883,230	

CHART I—Continued
ESTIMATED STATE SCHOOL FUNDS, 1969-70

1 COUNTY, TOWN, OR CITY	2 BASIC STATE SCHOOL FUND		3 SPECIAL FUNDS			4 BASIC FUNDS + TOTAL	
	A	B	C	D	TWELVE MONTHS	TOTAL COLUMNS A THRU D	SPECL FUNDS TOTAL
	1969-70	LOCAL SUPERVISION 1968-69	SPECIAL EDUCATION 1968-69	PRINCIPALS 1968-69			COL2 + COL3
ALEXANDRIA	2,437,320	37,350	28,860	84,750	15,672	166,632	2,603,952
REDFORD CITY							
BRISTOL	737,557	12,300	12,600	15,630	4,200	44,730	782,287
BUENA VISTA	329,587	4,200			1,536	5,736	335,323
CHARLOTTESVILLE	958,398	16,800	11,490	68,490	7,074	103,854	1,062,252
CHESAPEAKE	3,620,403	72,900	41,640	124,710	24,750	264,000	5,884,403
CLIFTON FORGE	199,278	3,000			1,602	4,602	203,880
COLONIAL HEIGHTS	753,245	11,760	8,220	9,630	1,572	31,182	784,427
COVINGTON	386,955	4,200	8,400	7,800	1,680	22,080	409,035
DANVILLE	2,055,980	19,680	24,900	43,620	13,146	101,346	2,157,326
EMPORIA							
FAIRFAX CITY							
FALLS CHURCH	290,794	3,840		11,490	3,360	18,690	309,484
FRANKLIN CITY	440,465	4,200	3,930	6,990	3,288	18,408	458,873
FREDERICKSBURG	363,337	8,220	12,600	7,110	3,126	31,056	394,393
GALAX	256,634	4,200		3,900	1,680	9,780	266,414
HAMPTON	7,129,076	55,620	33,600	61,410	29,646	180,276	7,309,352
HARRISONBURG	366,576	8,400	8,100	22,650	3,342	42,492	409,068
HOPEWELL	1,069,963	16,200	12,210	11,370	4,200	43,980	1,107,943
LEXINGTON	199,166	3,840			3,090	6,930	200,096
LYNCHBURG	2,331,980	28,650	20,550	68,526	12,882	130,608	2,461,688
MARTINSVILLE	890,004	12,030	12,600	12,870	5,040	42,540	932,544

CHART I—Continued
ESTIMATED STATE SCHOOL FUNDS, 1969-70

1 COUNTY, TOWN, OR CITY	2 BASIC STATE SCHOOL FUND	3 SPECIAL FUNDS				4 BASIC FUNDS + TOTAL	
	1969-70	A GUIDANCE 1968-69	B LOCAL SUPERVISION 1968-69	C SPECIAL EDUCATION 1968-69	D TWELVE MONTHS PRINCIPALS 1968-69	TOTAL COLUMNS A THRU D	SPECL FUNDS TOTAL COL2 + COL3
NEWPORT NEWS	5,833,180	50,100	28,200	123,690	20,370	222,360	6,055,540
NORFOLK	10,271,416	115,650	46,020	235,980	48,072	445,722	10,717,138
NORTON	311,510	4,200	3,660	2,910		10,770	322,280
PETERSBURG	1,828,952	16,200	25,200	38,985	9,204	89,589	1,918,541
PORTSMOUTH	6,165,317	66,090	40,560	130,680	21,504	258,834	6,424,151
RADEFORD	483,455	4,200	4,200	8,640	3,324	20,364	503,819
RICHMOND	6,595,506	99,750	44,970	351,630	37,440	533,790	7,129,296
ROANOKE CITY	3,438,269	43,740	32,730	109,770	24,360	210,600	3,648,869
SALEM							
SOUTH BOSTON	308,667	2,878			822	3,700	312,367
STAUNTON	875,270	15,360	8,400	20,550	3,876	48,186	923,456
SUFFOLK	280,821	8,010	8,400	12,000	2,466	30,876	311,697
VIRGINIA BEACH	9,196,708	56,250	28,620	102,420	30,030	217,320	9,414,028
WAYNESBORO	723,618	8,400	16,230	21,510	2,520	48,660	772,278
WILLIAMSBURG	115,099	3,900	4,200	26,910	3,912	38,922	154,021
WINCHESTER	396,313	8,130		12,510	1,608	22,248	418,561
**CITY TOTALS	73,627,919	830,248	531,090	1,759,131	350,394	3,470,863	77,098,782
**STATE TOTALS	207,860,201	2,336,741	1,482,750	3,351,856	879,060	8,050,407	215,910,608

CHART II

BASIC STATE SCHOOL AID FUND—ESTIMATES FOR 1970-71

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
COUNTY, TOWN, OR CITY	A.D.M. 1970-71	TOTAL COST OF MINIMUM PROGRAM \$400 X ADM	60 CENTS PER 100 ON 1968 TRUE VALUES	LOCAL SHARE					STATE SHARE		CAPITAL OUTLAY \$10 X ADM 1970-71	TOTAL STATE SHARE COL11+COL12 1970-71	STATE SHARE INCREASE COL13-COL10 1970-71
				LOCAL SALES TAX 1968-69	INDEX OF COL7 X		LOCAL \$200 OR MIN 133 MAX 267	STATE SHARE COLUMN 4 OF CHART I A	STATE SHARE COL3 - COL9C BUT NOT LESS THAN COL 10 1970-71				
					LOCAL ABILITY COL4 + COL5	LOCAL ABILITY PER CHILD				LOCAL SHARE COL2XC0L8			
ACCOMACK	6,550	2,620,000	802,758	263,974	1,066,732	75.81	152	995,600	1,435,977	1,624,400	65,500	1,689,900	253,923
ALBEMARLE	8,186	3,274,400	1,890,636	231,972	2,122,608	120.47	241	1,972,826	1,291,942	1,301,574	81,860	1,383,434	91,492
ALLEGHANY	2,080	1,232,000	411,222	29,954	441,176	66.51	133	409,640	636,693	822,360	30,800	853,160	216,467
AMELIA	1,835	734,000	272,568	46,731	319,299	80.93	162	297,270	407,378	436,730	18,350	455,080	47,702
AMHERST	5,159	2,063,600	602,814	166,905	769,719	69.30	139	717,101	1,060,116	1,346,499	51,590	1,398,089	337,973
APPOMATTOX	2,274	909,600	329,436	95,124	424,560	86.98	174	395,676	467,232	513,924	22,740	536,664	69,432
ARLINGTON	26,040	10,416,000	11,320,620	3,090,027	14,410,647	257.21	267	6,952,680	4,124,383	4,124,383	260,400	4,384,783	260,400
AUGUSTA	10,040	4,016,000	1,555,062	341,763	1,896,825	87.91	176	1,767,040	2,100,803	2,248,960	100,400	2,349,360	248,557
BATH	1,120	448,000	198,648	97,057	295,705	122.79	246	275,520	147,604	172,480	11,200	183,680	36,076
BEDFORD	7,660	3,064,000	1,196,682	219,104	1,415,786	86.05	172	1,317,520	1,467,702	1,746,480	76,600	1,823,080	355,378
BLAND	1,067	426,800	116,550	19,880	136,430	59.53	133	141,911	275,900	284,889	10,670	295,559	19,659
BOTETOURT	4,195	1,678,000	731,760	114,904	846,664	93.95	188	788,660	848,779	889,340	41,950	931,290	82,511
BRUNSWICK	3,525	1,410,000	523,602	135,081	658,683	86.98	174	613,350	897,680	897,680	35,250	932,930	35,250
BUCHANAN	8,640	3,456,000	1,111,872	273,563	1,385,435	74.42	149	1,287,360	2,051,790	2,168,640	86,400	2,255,040	203,250
BUCKINGHAM	2,650	1,060,000	419,460	77,427	496,887	87.44	175	463,750	532,658	596,250	26,500	622,750	90,092
CAMPBELL	10,700	4,280,000	1,274,430	319,259	1,593,689	69.30	139	1,487,300	2,285,416	2,792,700	107,000	2,899,700	614,284
CAROLINE	3,568	1,427,200	511,020	82,953	593,973	77.21	154	549,472	757,051	877,728	35,680	913,408	156,357
CARROLL	5,040	2,016,000	569,814	125,578	695,392	64.19	133	670,320	1,205,892	1,345,680	50,400	1,396,080	190,188
CHARLES CITY	1,955	782,000	193,512	12,220	205,732	48.84	133	260,015	471,708	521,985	19,550	541,535	69,827
CHARLOTTE	3,224	1,289,600	387,528	77,199	464,727	66.98	134	432,016	684,126	857,584	32,240	889,824	205,698
CHESTERFIELD	33,291	13,316,400	4,941,228	1,122,313	6,063,541	84.65	169	5,626,179	6,064,582	7,690,221	332,910	8,023,131	1,958,549

CHART II—Continued
BASIC STATE SCHOOL AID FUND—ESTIMATES FOR 1970-71

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
COUNTY, TOWN, OR CITY	A.D.M. 1970-71	TOTAL COST OF MINIMUM PROGRAM \$400 X ADM	60 CENTS PER 100 ON 1968 TRUE VALUES	LOCAL SALES TAX 1968-69	LOCAL			LOCAL SHARE COL2XC0L8	STATE SHARE COL11+COL12 1970-71	STATE SHARE COL3 - COL9C BUT NOT LESS THAN COL 10 1970-71	CAPITAL OUTLAY \$10 X ADM 1970-71	TOTAL STATE SHARE COL11+COL12 1970-71	STATE SHARE INCREASE COL13-COL10 1970-71
					INDEX OF COL 7 X								
					LOCAL ABILITY PER CHILD MIN 133 MAX 267	LOCAL ABILITY OR MIN 133 MAX 267	\$200 OR MIN 133 MAX 267						
CLARKE	1,845	738,000	497,652	76,048	573,700	144.65	267	492,615	247,468	247,468	18,450	265,918	18,450
CRAIG	838	335,200	87,228	17,130	104,358	58.14	133	111,454	174,227	223,746	8,380	232,126	57,899
CULPEPER	4,425	1,770,000	924,342	252,270	1,176,612	123.72	247	1,092,975	771,918	771,918	44,250	816,168	44,250
CUMBERLAND	1,699	679,600	224,838	31,151	255,989	70.23	140	237,860	380,052	441,740	16,990	458,730	78,678
DICKENSON	4,100	1,640,000	795,834	107,279	903,113	102.33	205	840,500	1,019,937	1,019,937	41,000	1,060,937	41,000
DINWIDDIE	5,750	2,300,000	579,870	91,684	671,554	54.42	133	764,750	1,300,817	1,535,250	57,500	1,592,750	291,933
ESSEX	1,780	712,000	309,372	100,913	410,285	106.98	214	380,920	322,633	331,080	17,800	348,880	26,247
FAIRFAX	141,974	56,789,600	23,782,428	6,387,190	30,169,618	99.07	198	28,110,852	25,451,623	28,678,748	1,419,740	30,098,488	4,646,865
FAUQUIER	6,837	2,734,800	1,859,418	314,855	2,174,273	147.91	267	1,825,479	877,439	909,321	68,370	977,691	100,252
FLOYD	2,190	876,000	253,482	52,611	306,093	65.12	133	291,270	503,418	584,730	21,900	606,630	103,212
FLUVANNA	2,000	800,000	511,986	43,971	555,957	129.30	259	518,000	266,053	282,000	20,000	302,000	35,947
FRANKLIN	6,600	2,640,000	744,396	225,424	969,820	68.37	137	904,200	1,414,098	1,735,800	66,000	1,801,800	387,702
FREDERICK	7,125	2,850,000	1,088,904	355,496	1,444,400	94.42	189	1,346,625	1,337,826	1,503,375	71,250	1,574,625	236,799
GILES	3,875	1,550,000	756,192	181,996	938,188	112.56	225	871,875	614,179	678,125	38,750	716,875	102,696
GLOUCESTER	3,110	1,244,000	577,500	134,150	711,650	106.51	213	662,430	415,357	581,570	31,100	612,670	197,313
GOOCHLAND	2,450	980,000	601,818	60,171	661,989	125.58	251	614,950	348,531	365,050	24,500	389,550	41,019
GRAYSON	3,120	1,248,000	346,878	65,895	412,773	61.40	133	414,960	674,581	833,040	31,200	864,240	189,659
GREENE	1,234	493,600	145,812	26,411	172,223	65.12	133	164,122	230,726	329,478	12,340	341,818	111,092
GREENSVILLE	4,000	1,600,000	505,572	214,775	720,347	83.72	167	668,000	1,017,750	1,017,750	40,000	1,057,750	40,000
HALIFAX	7,897	3,158,800	828,858	155,715	984,573	58.14	133	1,050,301	1,815,944	2,108,499	78,970	2,187,469	371,525
HANOVER	9,323	3,729,200	1,356,936	302,340	1,659,276	82.79	166	1,547,618	1,770,524	2,181,582	93,230	2,274,812	504,288

CHART II—Continued
BASIC STATE SCHOOL AID FUND—ESTIMATES FOR 1970-71

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14					
COUNTY, TOWN, OR CITY	A.D.M. PROGRAM 1970-71	TOTAL COST OF MINIMUM PROGRAM \$400 X ADM	60 CENTS PER 100 ON 1968 TRUE VALUES	LOCAL SALES TAX: 1968-69	LOCAL ABILITY PER COL4 + COL5	LOCAL ABILITY OR PER MIN 133 MAX 267	LOCAL SHARE COL2XC0L8	STATE SHARE COLUMN 4 OF CHART I A 1969-70	STATE SHARE COL3 - COL9C OF BUT NOT LESS THAN COL 10 1970-71	CAPITAL OUTLAY \$10 X ADM 1970-71	TOTAL STATE SHARE COL11+COL12 1970-71	STATE SHARE INCREASE COL13-COL10 1970-71	LOCAL SHARE INDEX OF COL7 X \$200 COL7 X					
														PER CHILD	STATE	STATE	TOTAL	STATE
														SHARE	SHARE	SHARE	SHARE	SHARE
HENRICO	33,691	13,476,400	5,994,804	2,784,523	8,779,327	121.40	243	8,186,913	6,231,152	6,231,152	336,910	6,568,062	336,910					
HENRY	12,390	4,956,000	1,472,922	464,124	1,937,046	72.56	145	1,796,550	2,812,754	3,159,450	123,900	3,283,350	470,596					
HIGHLAND	580	232,000	131,328	14,935	146,263	117.21	234	135,720	85,770	96,280	5,800	102,080	16,310					
ISLE OF WIGHT	5,020	2,008,000	862,422	145,270	1,007,692	93.49	187	938,740	978,970	1,069,260	50,200	1,119,460	140,490					
JAMES CITY	3,720	1,488,000	536,418	109,161	645,579	80.93	162	602,640	700,697	885,360	37,200	922,560	221,863					
KING GEORGE	2,140	856,000	295,440	35,728	331,168	72.09	144	308,160	408,163	547,840	21,400	569,240	161,077					
KING QUEEN	1,080	432,000	189,216	15,034	204,250	87.91	176	190,080	171,736	241,920	10,800	252,720	80,984					
KING WILLIAM	1,290	516,000	226,692	65,906	292,598	105.58	211	272,190	206,742	243,810	12,900	256,710	49,968					
LANCASTER	2,080	832,000	459,060	133,964	593,024	132.56	265	551,200	307,930	307,930	20,800	328,730	20,800					
LEE	5,075	2,030,000	435,288	134,915	570,203	52.09	133	674,975	1,445,260	1,445,260	50,750	1,496,010	50,750					
LOUDOUN	9,900	3,960,000	2,375,976	502,722	2,878,698	135.35	267	2,643,300	1,221,011	1,316,700	99,000	1,415,700	194,689					
LOUISA	3,413	1,365,200	498,096	95,370	593,466	80.93	162	552,906	650,362	812,294	34,130	846,424	196,062					
LUNENBURG	2,790	1,116,000	318,996	87,475	406,471	67.91	136	379,440	654,556	736,560	27,900	764,460	109,904					
MADISON	2,018	807,200	289,578	72,829	362,407	83.72	167	337,006	342,073	470,194	20,180	490,374	148,301					
MATHEWS	1,350	540,000	256,638	62,708	319,346	110.23	220	297,000	175,382	243,000	13,500	256,500	81,118					
HECKLENBURG	7,375	2,950,000	797,928	334,264	1,132,192	71.63	143	1,054,625	1,692,549	1,895,375	73,750	1,969,125	276,576					
MIDDLESEX	1,447	578,800	299,802	63,922	363,724	116.74	233	337,151	255,706	255,706	14,470	270,176	14,470					
MONTGOMERY	8,305	3,322,000	1,134,798	485,537	1,620,335	90.70	181	1,503,205	1,776,608	1,818,795	83,050	1,901,845	125,237					
NANSEMOND	9,890	3,956,000	928,464	213,782	1,142,246	53.49	133	1,315,370	2,269,417	2,640,630	98,900	2,739,530	470,113					
NELSON	2,890	1,156,000	391,800	56,703	448,503	72.09	144	416,160	621,190	739,840	28,900	768,740	147,550					
NEW KENT	1,280	512,000	232,644	33,726	266,370	96.74	193	247,040	178,318	264,960	12,800	277,760	99,442					

CHART II—Continued
BASIC STATE SCHOOL AID FUND—ESTIMATES FOR 1970-71

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
COUNTY, TOWN, OR CITY	A.O.M. 1970-71	TOTAL COST OF MINIMUM PROGRAM \$400 X ADM	60 CENTS PER 100 ON 1968 TRUE VALUES	LOCAL SALES TAX 1968-69	LOCAL ABILITY COL4 + COL5	LOCAL ABILITY PER CHILDO	\$200 OR MIN 133 MAX 267	LOCAL SHARE COL2XC0L8	LOCAL	STATE	STATE	TOTAL	STATE
									SHARE	SHARE	SHARE	STATE	SHARE
									COL4	COL3 - COL9C BUT NOT LESS THAN COL 10 1970-71	COL3 - COL9C BUT NOT LESS THAN COL 10 1970-71	COL11+COL12 1970-71	COL13-COL10 1970-71
NORTHAMPTON	3,195	1,278,000	421,620	207,350	628,970	91.63	183	584,685	735,510	735,510	31,950	767,460	31,950
NORTHUMBERLAN	2,163	865,200	349,620	52,790	402,410	86.51	173	374,199	344,085	491,001	21,630	512,631	168,546
NOTTOWAY	3,175	1,270,000	401,214	150,492	551,706	80.93	162	514,350	789,846	789,846	31,750	821,596	31,750
ORANGE	3,507	1,402,800	748,104	164,935	913,039	120.93	242	848,694	538,978	554,106	35,070	589,176	50,198
PAGE	3,650	1,460,000	585,012	176,593	761,605	97.21	194	708,100	687,894	751,900	36,500	788,400	100,506
PATRICK	3,600	1,440,000	450,786	94,608	545,394	70.23	140	504,000	799,610	936,000	36,000	972,000	172,390
PITTSYLVANIA	15,550	6,220,000	1,752,606	261,306	2,013,912	52.56	133	2,068,150	3,578,541	4,151,850	155,500	4,307,350	728,809
POWHATAN	1,569	627,600	272,928	33,246	306,174	90.70	181	283,989	242,872	343,611	15,690	359,301	116,429
PRINCE EDWARD	1,920	768,000	402,798	203,967	606,765	146.98	267	512,640	236,136	255,360	19,200	274,560	38,424
PRINCE GEORGE	4,500	1,800,000	614,130	152,000	766,130	79.07	158	711,000	1,221,369	1,221,369	45,000	1,266,369	45,000
PRINCE WILLIA	29,790	11,916,000	4,003,542	1,026,792	5,030,334	78.60	157	4,677,030	5,910,356	7,238,970	297,900	7,536,870	1,626,514
PULASKI	6,930	2,772,000	801,150	342,202	1,143,352	76.74	153	1,060,290	1,619,877	1,711,710	69,300	1,781,010	161,133
RAPPAHANNOCK	1,125	450,000	302,496	22,439	324,935	134.42	267	300,375	147,242	149,625	11,250	160,875	13,633
RICHMOND	1,523	609,200	233,982	91,934	325,916	99.53	199	303,077	296,435	306,123	15,230	321,353	24,918
ROANOKE	21,194	8,477,600	2,675,928	1,135,814	3,811,742	83.72	167	3,539,398	4,440,318	4,938,202	211,940	5,150,142	709,824
ROCKBRIDGE	4,105	1,642,000	598,656	94,312	692,968	78.60	157	644,485	805,200	997,515	41,050	1,038,565	233,365
ROCKINGHAM	10,838	4,335,200	1,542,684	312,988	1,855,672	79.53	159	1,723,242	2,299,019	2,611,958	108,380	2,720,338	421,319
RUSSELL	6,735	2,694,000	1,144,326	167,057	1,311,383	90.70	181	1,219,035	1,087,687	1,474,965	67,350	1,542,315	454,628
SCOTT	5,710	2,284,000	548,034	160,524	708,558	57.67	133	759,430	1,440,967	1,524,570	57,100	1,581,670	140,703
SHENANDOAH	4,900	1,960,000	904,704	247,106	1,151,810	109.30	219	1,073,100	918,606	918,606	49,000	967,606	49,000
SKYTH	6,760	2,704,000	610,056	307,770	917,826	63.26	133	899,080	1,633,202	1,804,920	67,600	1,872,520	239,318

CHART II—Continued
BASIC STATE SCHOOL AID FUND—ESTIMATES FOR 1970-71

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
COUNTY, TOWN, OR CITY	A.D.M. 1970-71	TOTAL COST OF MINIMUM PROGRAM \$400 X ADM	60 CENTS PER 100 CN 1968 TRUE VALUES	LOCAL SALES TAX 1968-69	LOCAL ABILITY COL4 + COL5, CHILD	LOCAL ABILITY PER MIN 133 MAX 267	LOCAL	LOCAL SHARE COL2XCOL8	STATE	STATE	CAPITAL OUTLAY \$10 X ADM 1970-71	TOTAL STATE SHARE COL11+COL12 1970-71	STATE SHARE INCREASE COL13-COL10 1970-71
							INDEX OF		SHARE	SHARE			
							COL7 X		COLUMN 4 OF	COL3 - COL9C THAN COL 10			
SOUTHAMPTON	5,050	2,020,000	783,150	88,179	871,329	80.47	161	813,050	993,909	1,206,950	50,500	1,257,450	263,541
SPOTSYLVANIA	4,250	1,700,000	713,412	120,233	833,645	91.16	182	773,500	806,101	926,500	42,500	969,000	162,899
STAFFORD	5,940	2,376,000	717,576	123,156	840,732	66.05	133	790,020	1,116,938	1,585,980	59,400	1,645,380	528,442
SURRY	1,331	532,400	324,174	25,723	349,897	122.33	245	326,095	156,600	206,305	13,310	219,615	63,015
SUSSEX	3,422	1,368,800	467,058	93,853	560,911	76.28	153	523,566	732,950	845,234	34,220	879,454	146,504
TAZEWELL	9,872	3,948,800	982,200	482,972	1,465,172	68.84	138	1,362,336	2,649,652	2,649,652	98,720	2,748,372	98,720
WARREN	3,330	1,332,000	859,320	242,198	1,101,518	153.95	267	889,110	437,281	442,890	33,300	476,190	38,909
WASHINGTON	8,725	3,490,000	1,005,606	311,602	1,317,208	70.23	140	1,221,500	1,945,335	2,268,500	87,250	2,355,750	410,415
WESTMORELAND	2,534	1,013,600	401,964	87,947	489,911	89.77	180	456,120	501,403	557,480	25,340	582,820	81,417
WISE	10,140	4,056,000	698,820	358,653	1,057,473	48.37	133	1,348,620	2,698,192	2,707,380	101,400	2,808,780	110,588
WYTHE	5,050	2,020,000	615,252	267,056	882,308	81.40	163	823,150	1,124,231	1,196,850	50,500	1,247,350	123,119
YORK	8,158	3,263,200	1,177,488	124,863	1,302,351	74.42	149	1,215,542	1,635,395	2,047,658	81,580	2,129,238	493,843
**COUNTY TOTAL	699,936	279,974,400	112,379,244	29,785,721	142,164,965		17,167	126,924,291	137,928,596	155,592,106	6,999,360	162,591,466	24,662,870

CHART II—Continued
BASIC STATE SCHOOL AID FUND—ESTIMATES FOR 1970-71

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
							LOCAL SHARE PER CHILD INDEX OF COL 7 X		STATE SHARE COLUMN 4 OF CHART I A	STATE SHARE COL 3 - COL 9C BUT NOT LESS THAN COL 10	CAPITAL OUTLAY \$10 X ADM	TOTAL STATE SHARE COL 11+COL 12	STATE SHARE INCREASE COL 13-COL 10
COUNTY, TOWN, OR CITY	A.D.M. 1970-71	TOTAL COST OF MINIMUM PROGRAM \$400 X ADM	60 CENTS PER 100 ON 1968 TRUE VALUES	LOCAL SALES TAX 1968-69	LOCAL ABILITY COL 4 + COL 5	LOCAL ABILITY PER CHILD	LOCAL \$200 OR MIN 133 MAX 267	LOCAL SHARE COL 2 X COL 8	STATE SHARE COLUMN 4 OF CHART I A 1969-70	STATE SHARE COL 3 - COL 9C BUT NOT LESS THAN COL 10 1970-71	CAPITAL OUTLAY \$10 X ADM 1970-71	TOTAL STATE SHARE COL 11+COL 12 1970-71	STATE SHARE INCREASE COL 13-COL 10 1970-71
ABINGDON	1,015	406,000	154,284	35,531	189,815	86.98	174	176,610	214,885	229,390	10,150	239,540	24,655
CAPE CHARLES	285	114,000	39,066	8,559	47,625	77.67	155	44,175	79,071	79,071	2,850	81,921	2,850
COLONIAL BEACH	500	200,000	99,510	13,829	113,339	105.58	211	105,500	64,748	94,500	5,000	99,500	34,752
FRIES	230	92,000	23,232	5,119	28,351	57.21	133	30,590	61,994	61,994	2,300	64,294	2,300
POQUSON	1,434	573,600	173,808	24,363	198,171	64.19	133	190,722	259,378	382,878	14,340	397,218	137,840
SALTVILLE	645	258,000	168,564	24,888	193,452	139.53	267	172,215	99,354	99,354	6,450	105,804	6,450
WEST POINT	680	272,000	157,590	30,009	187,599	128.37	257	174,760	103,800	103,800	6,800	110,600	6,800
**TOWN TOTALS	4,789	1,915,600	816,054	142,298	958,352		1,330	894,572	883,230	1,050,987	47,890	1,098,877	215,647

CHART II—Continued
BASIC STATE SCHOOL AID FUND—ESTIMATES FOR 1970-71

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	
COUNTY, TOWN, OR CITY	A.D.M. 1970-71	TOTAL COST OF MINIMUM PROGRAM \$400 X ADM	60 CENTS PER 100 ON 1968 TRUE VALUES	LOCAL SALES TAX 1968-69	LOCAL ABILITY COL4 + COL5	LOCAL ABILITY PER CHILD	LOCAL	STATE SHARE COL11 + COL12	STATE SHARE COL13 - COL10	STATE SHARE COL9 BUT NOT LESS THAN COL 10	CAPITAL OUTLAY \$10 X ADM 1970-71	TOTAL STATE SHARE 1970-71	STATE SHARE INCREASE COL13-COL10 1970-71	
							INDEX OF							STATE
							COL7 X							COL3 - COL9C
							\$200 OR MIN 267 MAX 267	LOCAL SHARE COL2XC0L8	CHART I A 1969-70	1970-71				
ALEXANDRIA	18,750	7,500,000	6,376,020	2,570,826	8,946,846	221.86	267	5,006,250	2,603,952	2,603,952	187,500	2,791,452	187,500	
BEDFORD CITY														
BRISTOL	3,487	1,394,800	442,722	357,236	799,958	106.51	213	742,731	782,287	782,287	34,870	817,157	34,870	
DUENA VISTA	1,634	653,600	176,718	71,149	247,867	70.70	141	230,394	335,323	423,206	16,340	439,546	104,223	
CHARLOTTESVIL	7,425	2,970,000	1,691,328	1,139,910	2,831,238	177.21	267	1,982,475	1,062,252	1,062,252	74,250	1,136,502	74,250	
CHESAPEAKE	26,290	10,516,000	2,918,322	635,166	3,553,488	62.79	133	3,496,570	5,884,403	7,019,430	262,900	7,282,330	1,397,927	
CLIFTON FORGE	1,165	466,000	187,476	98,598	286,074	114.42	229	266,785	203,880	203,880	11,650	215,530	11,650	
COLONIAL HEIG	3,695	1,478,000	477,318	158,302	635,620	80.00	160	591,200	784,427	886,800	36,950	923,750	139,323	
COVINGTON	2,110	844,000	365,688	205,325	571,013	126.05	252	531,720	409,035	409,035	21,100	430,135	21,100	
DANVILLE	10,535	4,214,000	1,384,902	987,020	2,371,922	104.65	209	2,201,815	2,157,326	2,157,326	105,350	2,262,676	105,350	
EMMORIA														
FAIRFAX CITY														
FALLS CHURCH	2,046	818,400	767,862	626,186	1,394,048	316.74	267	546,282	309,484	309,484	20,460	329,944	20,460	
FRANKLIN CITY	2,010	804,000	223,866	153,058	376,924	87.44	175	351,750	458,873	458,873	20,100	478,973	20,100	
FREDERICKSBUR	2,803	1,121,200	595,122	591,755	1,186,877	196.74	267	748,401	394,393	394,393	28,030	422,423	28,030	
GALAX	1,641	656,400	240,564	226,450	467,014	132.56	265	434,865	266,414	266,414	16,410	282,824	16,410	
HAMPTON	33,320	13,328,000	3,466,506	1,589,710	5,056,216	70.70	141	4,698,120	7,309,352	8,629,880	333,200	8,963,080	1,653,728	
HARRISONBURG	2,746	1,098,400	595,548	517,386	1,112,934	188.37	267	733,182	409,068	409,068	27,460	436,528	27,460	
HOPEWELL	5,607	2,242,800	771,996	324,950	1,096,946	91.16	182	1,020,474	1,107,943	1,222,326	56,070	1,278,396	170,453	
LEXINGTON	1,160	464,000	217,248	159,245	376,493	151.16	267	309,720	200,096	200,096	11,600	211,696	11,600	
LYNCHBURG	12,000	4,800,000	1,816,368	1,537,144	3,353,512	129.77	260	3,120,000	2,461,688	2,461,688	120,000	2,581,688	120,000	

CHART II—Continued
BASIC STATE SCHOOL AID FUND—ESTIMATES FOR 1970-71

														LOCAL SHARE														
														PER CHILD INDEX OF COL7 X														
														STATE SHARE														
														STATE SHARE														
														COL3 - COL9C BUT NOT LESS														
														CAPITAL OUTLAY														
														TOTAL STATE SHARE														
														STATE SHARE INCREASE														
COUNTY, TOWN, OR CITY	A.D.M. 1970-71	TOTAL COST OF MINIMUM PROGRAM \$400 X ADM	60 CENTS ON 1968 TRUE VALUES	LOCAL SALES TAX 1968-69	LOCAL ABILITY COL4 + COL5	LOCAL ABILITY PER CHILDO	\$200 OR MIN 133 MAX 267	LOCAL SHARE COL2XC0L8	STATE SHARE COLUMN 4 OF CHART 1 A 1969-70	STATE SHARE COL3 - COL9C THAN COL 10 1970-71	\$10 X ADM 1970-71	TOTAL STATE SHARE COL11+COL12 1970-71	TOTAL STATE SHARE COL13-COL10 1970-71	TOTAL STATE SHARE COL13-COL10 1970-71														
MARTINSVILLE	4,719	1,887,600	826,542	538,349	1,364,891	134.42	267	1,259,973	932,544	932,544	47,190	979,734	47,190															
NEWPORT NEWS	30,869	12,347,600	4,542,170	1,880,695	6,423,865	96.74	193	5,957,717	6,055,540	6,389,883	308,690	6,698,573	643,033															
NORFOLK	59,751	23,900,400	7,950,504	5,108,729	13,059,233	101.86	204	12,189,204	10,717,138	11,711,196	597,510	12,308,706	1,591,568															
NORTON	1,347	538,800	116,586	114,937	231,923	80.00	160	215,520	322,280	323,280	13,470	336,750	14,470															
PETERSBURG	8,853	3,541,200	1,054,092	905,077	1,959,169	102.79	206	1,823,718	1,918,541	1,918,541	88,530	2,007,071	88,530															
PORTSMOUTH	27,700	11,080,000	2,459,268	1,448,176	3,907,444	65.58	133	3,684,100	6,424,151	7,395,900	277,000	7,672,900	1,248,749															
RADFORD	2,160	864,000	309,942	192,572	502,514	108.37	217	468,720	503,819	503,819	21,600	525,419	21,600															
RICHMOND	41,486	16,594,400	7,745,400	5,533,604	13,279,004	148.84	267	11,076,762	7,129,296	7,129,296	414,860	7,544,156	414,860															
ROANOKE CITY	19,686	7,874,400	3,129,912	2,656,625	5,786,537	136.74	267	5,256,162	3,648,869	3,648,869	196,860	3,845,729	196,860															
SALEM																												
SOUTH BOSTON	1,929	771,600	221,316	184,400	405,716	97.67	195	376,155	312,367	395,445	19,290	414,735	102,368															
STAUNTON	5,052	2,020,800	792,360	482,702	1,275,062	117.21	234	1,182,168	923,456	923,456	50,520	973,976	50,520															
SUFFOLK	2,010	804,000	418,752	261,914	680,666	157.67	267	536,670	311,697	311,697	20,100	331,797	20,100															
VIRGINIA BEAC	45,200	18,080,000	5,380,158	1,891,767	7,271,925	74.88	150	6,780,000	9,414,028	11,300,000	452,000	11,752,000	2,337,972															
WAYNESBORO	3,971	1,588,400	755,226	372,275	1,127,501	132.09	264	1,048,344	772,278	772,278	39,710	811,988	39,710															
WILLIAMSBURG	830	332,000	539,448	475,260	1,014,708	568.84	267	221,610	154,021	154,021	8,300	162,321	8,300															
WINCHESTER	2,947	1,178,800	647,502	474,407	1,121,909	177.21	267	786,849	418,561	418,561	29,470	448,031	29,470															
**CITY TOTALS	396,934	158,773,600	59,605,752	34,470,905	94,076,657		7,520	79,876,406	77,098,782	84,129,176	3,969,340	88,098,516	10,999,734															
**STATE TOTAL	1,101,659	440,663,600	172,801,050	64,398,924	237,199,974		26,017	207,695,269	215,910,608	240,772,269	11,016,590	251,788,859	35,878,251															

X

THE TRANSPORTATION FUND

Virginia's current transportation fund provides for partial reimbursement to localities of their cost of transporting pupils to and from schools. It has been suggested that funds be provided during 1970-72 on the basis of \$7.00 per pupil transported, 7¢ per mile and \$300 per bus. These funds would be available only to those school divisions which operate a school bus system.

The Commission endorses the present method of reimbursement but feels that it should be expanded. The grant per pupil (\$7.00) should be made available to every school division on the basis of average daily membership. It should be noted that the Commission is recommending that funds be appropriated for transportation purposes to each school division regardless of whether the division actually operates a bus system. This would be a major change in the transportation fund. The effect of the adoption of this suggestion would be to assist the cities in meeting transportation costs and to provide additional funds to the areas now operating school bus systems. The latter results from making the money available on the basis of membership rather than pupils transported.

This money must be applied only to transportation expenses with the refund going direct to the school division. Regulations and procedures should be established by the State Board of Education for the implementation of the recommendation.

XI FURTHER RECOMMENDATIONS

A

Participation in this study has brought home to members of the Study Commission the complexity of meeting the obligation of the Commonwealth to provide a state-wide system of quality education. We are more aware of the fact that there is a great disparity in the nature and quality of the educational program in being throughout the Commonwealth. Realistically a state as diverse as Virginia cannot expect a state-wide system which is completely uniform as to nature or quality. Local control over the educational system which we certainly endorse, of its nature prevents a uniform, homogeneous program throughout the state. Yet, the disparity in educational opportunity for Virginia children is too great and we believe it is of critical importance that the quality of the educational program available in the poorer and weaker divisions be brought up in relation to the program in more rich and stronger divisions.

It goes without saying that this objective should be reached without undermining or diminishing the quality of the programs in the better public school systems.

The recommended new formula is a step in the direction of avoiding disparity of educational opportunity in that it, among other things, more fairly measures local ability and gives more state aid to localities who need it most, while enforcing to a greater extent a level of local support. Due to the complexities involved in formulating recommendations of a new basic school aid formula, and the limitation of time this Commission has not been able to give to the problem of disparity of education opportunity all the attention that vital question deserves. Solution of this problem may well be affected by the recommendation of the on-going study of consolidation of small school divisions. Whether the proposed amendments of the Constitution of Virginia are finally adopted may have a bearing upon the solution of this problem. Whether a special educational equalization fund should be created as a vehicle for upgrading the program in weak school systems or whether this should be accompanied by inclusion of additional funds in the basic school aid formula deserves further exploration.

This Study Commission, because of the critical importance of this matter, recommends that the 1970 session of the General Assembly create a study commission charged with the duty to formulate recommendations on the sound and best approaches to reducing the disparity of educational opportunity available to Virginia children.

B

There is one other matter which this Commission believes should be considered in depth by a study commission, which we recommend be created. Again, complexity of our assigned study and limitations of time have made it impossible for this Study Commission to recommend the specific nature of the best solution to this problem. It is essential, however, that this be done through thorough examination. The problem to which we have reference is the challenge to our public educational system of the disadvantaged and culturally deprived student. It is of paramount importance that public education eliminate the disadvantage and cure the cultural deprivation of the student in the public school system. It is also imperative that in doing so, the quality of education afforded the non-disadvantaged and non-culturally deprived child not be diminished. Educational enhancement for some is absolutely indispensable, but should not be procured at the sacrifice of the quality of education provided others.

It is easy for our concern to be misunderstood or misconstrued. Despite the risk of this, we feel compelled to give voice to our concern over the challenge of the disadvantaged child and its impact upon the quality of the total educational program in the public schools.

Nothing we say here is in any way intended or implies opposition to integration of the public schools, nor advocacy of integration of public schools. No member of the Commission is motivated by any notion that race, creed, national origin or economic status are natural or inherent determinants of ability or merit. Each member of this Commission has an abiding belief in the dignity and worth of the individual human personality and his right to be judged on the basis of his individual worth and merit, free of extraneous considerations such as race.

We are aware that poverty, discrimination, unequal opportunity and poor cultural advantages do in fact present a challenge to public schools which challenge is increased in relation to the incidence of the disadvantaged or culturally deprived child in school. These challenges must be identified, defined and met by proper programs, personnel and facilities.

The people of Virginia must appreciate the fact that the influx of disadvantaged students into schools which were attended by predominantly advantaged students will lower the quality of education in such schools, unless steps are taken to avoid it. As Negro students come into heretofore predominantly white schools as a result of integration of the schools of the state, the level and quality of education in those schools will decline if nothing is done. Again this is not because of the Negro student's color except to the extent that because of color, his economic, social, cultural and therefore educational opportunities have been lower. As the pace and extent of public school integration accelerates, and who can say that it will not, the impact on the existing quality of many public schools will increase. In our view, all who face the question will agree that this is a fact.

If the quality of our public school system declines, we must expect a flight from the public schools by the children of the parents who are financially capable of placing them in private schools. Not only can we expect it, it has already happened to a known and demonstrable extent. Unless something is done, it will continue and it will accelerate. The parents who take their child out of public schools are not necessarily doing so because of racial considerations, though this is a factor in some cases. The chief reason, we believe, is not racial; it is the natural desire of parents to see that their children get the best education available to them.

If there is a continued flight from the public schools of Virginia, it will be a calamity of major proportions. The better and most stimulating students, whose presence in the classroom enhances the educational process, will be gone and public education thereby suffers. Will the taxpaying parents who may be struggling and making great financial sacrifices to send their children to a private school be willing to continue to bear the same burden of taxation in order to support a public school system their children no longer attend? We think it is doubtful they will.

A private school system, operating under community pressures to keep the tuition and other costs of education low enough for parents of limited income to be able to send their children, is going to be a weak educational program. Private schools operating in this context will result in a sort of Gresham's Law becoming operative in Virginia. The members of this Commission are not anti-private schools. We recognize that private schools have tended to drive upward the quality of education in the public schools. We are, however, unashamedly pro-public school and most of all pro-education by whatever system operates. Virginia's private secondary and elementary schools are an asset and we should preserve them but not permit them to become a refuge for a quality public educational program to the detriment of education in both private and public schools.

Segregation in the public schools is not the solution to this problem even if it were lawful and constitutional. But there is a problem, and we must face it and seek a solution. Money alone will not solve this or any other problem in education. Yet, unquestionably, the solution does require money—more money and especially more money where the problem exists. The disadvantaged, culturally deprived child with less educational opportunity needs more remedial educational programs, a.

lower teacher-pupil ratio, more guidance and better equipped teachers. These require more money.

Somewhere in the ultimate determination of how the State's funds appropriated for public education will be distributed these concerns must be considered and must affect the distribution of school funds. The number or percentage of educationally disadvantaged children in a school system must be taken into consideration either in the basic school formula or by appropriation of supplemental funds for public education to be distributed by the State to the localities based upon these considerations.

It is this matter which we believe deserves full and exhaustive study, if the public schools are to serve the disadvantaged child without significant detriment to the educational opportunity of the non-disadvantaged child. The insight into this problem arising from our study compels us to urgently recommend further and special study of this challenge to public education in Virginia. It is our considered opinion that a failure to do so will jeopardize the future of quality public education in Virginia.

XII CONCLUSION

The Commission believes that its recommendation of a new plan for the distribution of State school aid measures up well to the concepts which should be a part of a good formula. We think its principle is sound and that it is equitable. We particularly are pleased with the formula's flexibility, its elimination of an unrealistic salary scale, its removal of the teacher-pupil ratio and other operating costs from the formula, its substitution of membership for average daily attendance, its combining of special funds with the basic formula, its inclusion of another factor in determining local ability, its recognition of the need for the State to provide funds for capital outlay, its ease of comprehension and its built-in commitment for the State to share in the cost of providing quality education for students throughout the Commonwealth.

By acceptance of the Commission's plan of making capital outlay funds a part of the basic formula, every school division in the State would receive an increase in appropriations. This we think is right; this we think is necessary.

The proposed amendment to the transportation formula is of extreme importance to those areas which are now being denied these funds. This is money which directly will affect students and their parents by causing a reduction of their transportation costs to and from school.

In our section on "Further Recommendations", we suggest that a commission be created by the General Assembly to formulate recommendations on the best way to reduce the disparity of educational opportunity and to study in depth the proper method of coping with the challenge to our public educational system of the disadvantaged and culturally deprived student.

Virginia has made great progress in the field of education and Virginians are proud of the record. We must not lose the momentum, and should renew our determination to provide the fullest educational opportunity for all those who answer to the call of the school bell.

Virginia properly has set her sights on quality education and the members of the Commission hope that this report will be of service in reaching that goal.

Respectfully submitted,

GEORGE N. McMATH, *Chairman*

*W. W. ROBINSON, *Vice-Chairman*

*HERBERT H. BATEMAN

MARK I. BURNETT

F. J. COPENHAVER

CLIVE L. DuVAL, II

CHARLES W. GUNN, JR.

J. CLIFFORD HUTT

J. HARRY MICHAEL, JR.

THOMAS B. NOLAND

*J. SARGEANT REYNOLDS

*WILLIAM R. SAVAGE, JR.

W. H. SEAWELL

*W. ROY SMITH

*STANLEY C. WALKER

***CONCURRING STATEMENT OF SENATOR HERBERT H. BATEMAN, IN
WHICH LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR-ELECT J. SARGEANT REYNOLDS
AND DELEGATE STANLEY C. WALKER JOIN**

Participation in this significant and difficult study has been a very enriching experience. It has afforded an opportunity to investigate the status of public education in Virginia and the proper measure of the responsibility of the state to the students in our educational system. The membership of the Commission has brought an unusual degree of dedication, as well as knowledgeability to this inquiry, the subject of which has long concerned Virginia educators and public officials.

This statement will attest to my belief that the Study Commission has not only applied itself assiduously to its task of finding an improved school aid formula, but has done so logically and intelligently. I also evidence my concurrence with the concept that underlies the Commission's recommended new formula.

By this statement I do wish to express some reservations which, depending upon further information and developments, may affect a judgment as to whether the recommended new formula will be as equitable, practical and realistic as all members of the Commission wish it to be.

The formula recommended has the merit of avoiding much of the complexity and lack of reality which is inherent in the existing formula for distributing state school aid.¹ This is a major factor in my concurrence with the Commission's recommendation. I believe the Commission is correct in its determination that the new plan would continue to allocate state school funds on the basis of need, ability and local effort. Broadening the indicia of local ability to include the one per cent local sales tax revenues retained by the locality is a logical proposal. It is beyond question that the amount of local revenue is an appropriate consideration in determining local ability to support public education. I therefore express no reservation on inclusion of local sales tax revenue.

The reservations which dictate this separate statement is the failure of the proposed formula, as well as the present formula, to consider negative factors bearing upon local ability to provide money for public education.

The true measure of local ability on behalf of public education is not merely the total number of dollars actually or potentially available. It is this sum *less the competing and, to a large degree, inescapable demands upon this sum represented by vital public services other than education.* To illustrate, if communities A and B each have the same revenue potential, but A must pay a significant amount of that revenue for police and fire protection, while B does not, the ability of community A, to support public education, is less than that of community B. Neither the present nor the proposed formula take the disproportionate costs of other essential governmental services into consideration. To the extent the formula does not, there is a risk of inequity to some localities. Adding local sales tax revenues as a measure of local ability, without regard to offsetting and unavoidable demands upon them, may create inequities. If those localities with substantial local sales tax revenue are also the localities which have the larger burden of funding other governmental services, inclusion of this revenue, while excluding the demands upon it, can produce a measure of ability which is more unrealistic than that presently being used.

The effect of the relative costs of other and indispensable costs of public services such as law enforcement and streets and roads not having been considered in the proposed formula, as it relates to the measure of local ability, I feel that my concurrence with the proposed formula should be given with some reservation. Thus, this separate statement.

¹ Having participated in the deliberations out of which the recommended formula evolved, I agree that it is less complex than the present one. As articulated in the Commission's Report, however, the greater simplicity of the recommended formula is not so apparent as would be desired.

Lastly, I must express reservations as to the propriety of the Commission calling for a State-wide minimum salary scale to be set by the General Assembly or the State Board of Education. Having recommended a formula which does not involve salary scales, this Commission goes beyond the subject matter that the resolution creating it contemplated when it makes such a recommendation. Whatever merit the General Assembly or other State agency setting minimum salaries on a State-wide basis may have, which I might add this Commission's Report does not set forth; it is beyond our proper sphere.

*CONCURRING STATEMENT OF WOODROW W. ROBINSON

As indicated by Senator Herbert H. Bateman, Lieutenant Governor-Elect J. Sargeant Reynolds and Delegate Stanley C. Walker, participation in this study conducted by this commission has been an enriching experience. The commission has diligently attempted, under an able chairman, to improve the method of distribution of basic state school funds to the end that the disparity in educational opportunity among the various school divisions may be reduced. The amount of reduction in this disparity as afforded by the formula proposed in this report may be somewhat less than was hoped for, however, no simple formula can provide for an extremely high degree of equality of educational opportunity.

The new formula as proposed by the report of this commission, and which incorporates the sales tax at the point of collection along with true values of real estate and personal property as the two components of the ability factor, and which provides for a required local effort along with a simplified approach, has much to recommend it. Therefore, I wish to concur in this report with the following reservations, recommendations and concerns.

1. In view of the new accreditation standards for elementary schools and the new revised standards for secondary schools and also in view of the absorption of certain special funds in the basic formula, the amount of state funds projected by this formula for 1970-71 may not be sufficient to prevent undue hardships on certain school divisions.

2. This formula based on an ability factor derived only from true values and the one percent sales tax at the point of collection does not give a completely true picture of a locality's ability to support public education. Therefore, the ability factor as proposed by this formula may be made more equitable by including per capita income along with true values and optional sales tax in the determination of the final index figure for each locality. The urban areas contend that the cities have additional expenditures for fire and police protection, welfare, etc. The rural areas have these same costs and in some cases to an equal degree with the cities. The rural areas have had the problem of welfare and the problem of a high ratio of disadvantaged children for a long period of time. Since a large proportion of the optional sales tax paid by the rural inhabitants is received by the urban areas, this leaves the rural areas with a reduced income to deal with their own problems. Since the per capita income is generally higher in the urban and metropolitan areas than in the rural areas, it could be used as an additional leveling factor in making the ability index more equitable.

3. Federal funds under P.L. 874 and P.L. 815 ("impact" funds) provide some school divisions with a considerable amount of money which is not considered in the distribution of state funds. This tends to widen the gap in educational opportunity. A legal method should be found to correct this inequity. One simple method would be for the federal government to treat all children alike in the support of public education regardless of where their parents work.

*CONCURRING STATEMENT OF WILLIAM R. SAVAGE, JR.

I concur in this Report, with the following reservations:

1. Having the Commission recommend that the cost per student for the Basic Program for the 1969-70 school year be in the amount of \$400 appears entirely unrealistic and misleading, especially when it is remembered that the average opera-

tional cost per pupil in ADA for the entire state for the 1968-69 school year was in the amount of \$571, and the average expenditure for the same period for cities in Virginia was in the amount of \$592. It is conservatively estimated that the expenditure per pupil for the current school year will be in excess of \$625. It seems regrettable, therefore, that people may be led to assume that a Basic Program of public education might be attainable for \$400 per pupil per year.

2. The Commission's proposed new formula would indicate that the Basic Program would cost the same anywhere in Virginia; in other words, it assumes that every county or city can purchase the same commodity for \$400 as all other localities, whereas it is known that cost of living and availability of instructional personnel varies considerably from place to place in Virginia. It becomes more apparent with each passing year that a given standard of educational quality would be far more expensive in certain areas of the state than in others. It might be pointed out that many cities and counties in Virginia have school divisions with a high percentage of culturally and economically deprived children and where all of these diverse kinds of pupils are being integrated into a completely unitary school system, it poses very severe problems concerning the needs of these people; and in order to deal with these needs effectively, it requires much higher expenditures than for those school divisions having pupil populations where the culturally and economically deprived pupils are in lower numbers.

3. The proposed new formula does not take into account, when measuring local ability and effort, the disproportionate cost of other essential governmental services that have to be borne by cities. When it is remembered that many cities in Virginia—sometimes with a high concentration of culturally-deprived people living in slums and representing serious demands on all kinds of services including education—are compelled to assume very high costs for public safety, fire protection, street maintenance, and other essential services not borne by the state, it becomes clear that such political subdivisions find it increasingly difficult to provide an adequate share of the local tax dollar for education. It should be hoped that a new state formula for the distribution of school aid would take this into account.

4. There is no provision in the proposed formula for an incentive program. The possibility of providing an incentive fund for those school divisions which go beyond "the call of duty" in their local tax effort for schools should be considered in any new formula as recipients of additional funds, perhaps on a matching basis, for the provision of services or materials desired by that school division to enhance the quality of education and, such incentive funds to be determined by considering the percent of local effort that goes beyond the state average effort and multiplying the result by a pre-determined figure; or, by offering matching funds to the local division that exceeds the standards of state-wide approved basal programs on a 50/50 basis.

5. The proposed formula recommends that one percent of the state sales tax be included in the determination of the local wealth or ability factor. Since the General Assembly has already earmarked one percent of the State Sales Tax to be returned to the locality on the basis of school population for schools, it seems to be of small merit that the Commission ignore a fund already earmarked for schools and recommend the use of a fund that the General Assembly provided for its return on the basis of point of collection.

***CONCURRING STATEMENT OF W. ROY SMITH**

I concur in this Report, with the following exceptions:

- (1) I do not favor the proposed plan for the State to participate in a capital outlay fund which would provide ten dollars per pupil with a requirement that the money be spent during the year in which it is appropriated, or forfeited. If the State is to embark on a new program of this magnitude the subject should, in my opinion, be the object of a detailed and careful study.
- (2) I do not favor the changes proposed in the Transportation Fund.

STATEMENT OF WOODROW W. WILKERSON

The Superintendent of Public Instruction served as an ex officio member of the Commission created to study the formula for State aid to the public schools. In submitting its budgetary requests for the 1970-72 biennium, the State Board of Education recommended a program based on the present formula and the upgrading of several key factors. Accordingly, the State Superintendent did not participate in formulating the specific State aid plan recommended by the Commission.

WOODROW W. WILKERSON

Superintendent of Public Instruction

