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TO: THE HONORABLE PRESIDING OFFICERS AND MEMBERS OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

The Committee created under Concurrent Resolution No. 2166, passed during the 1956 regular session of the General Assembly of South Carolina to study, evaluate and make recommendations with respect to certain aspects of public education and report thereon to the General Assembly at the 1957 session respectfully submits the following Report:

PROLOGUE

The Committee is composed of three members of the Senate and three members of the House. It met regularly following its organizational meeting early in September.

It was charged with the consideration of the following Fiscal Survey Commission recommendations contained in Report No. 1:

1. That the General Assembly give serious consideration to the recommendation of the Task Force for a substantial increase in the State schedule of teacher pay.

2. That any increase in teacher pay be effected by rewriting the salary schedule and not by granting a percentage increase on the 1951 salary schedule.

3. That the General Assembly consider the desirability of making incentive scholarship loans available to prospective teachers.

4. That the teacher certification program be revised so as to reduce emphasis on method courses and to facilitate the employment of persons of superior educational attainment who may be short on method training by present certification standards.

5. That the 8th grade be incorporated in the High School and that the number of credits required for graduation be increased from 16 to 20.

6. That steps be taken to raise the standards of South Carolina High Schools in both the vocational and the college preparatory fields.
7. That students intending to go to college be enabled and encouraged to complete 30 units of work, largely of college preparatory nature, in grades 8 through 11, and to enter college at the end of the 11th year.

8. That reference to the State Board of Education be eliminated from the State Constitution and that the Board be reconstituted with a view to making it a more effective instrument for educational progress in South Carolina.

9. That the General Assembly consider, as a long range project, the desirability of consolidating the reconstituted State Board of Education, the Educational Finance Commission and the Schoolbook Commission.

The Committee grouped these recommendations into the following composite categories:

(A) Teacher Pay Increase. (Embracing 1 and 2)
(B) Teacher Scholarship. (Recommendation 3)
(C) Recertification Program (Recommendation 4)
(D) Study of 13th Grade (Embracing 5, 6 and 7)
(E) Consolidation of Board of Education, State Educational Finance Commission and Schoolbook Commission (Embracing 8 and 9)

The Committee gratefully acknowledges the many interested, public spirited individuals and socially conscious groups, both lay and professional, whose contributions to the cause of public education in South Carolina by appearances during its deliberations at their own expense have greatly facilitated the project. Their names are inscribed and preserved, in testimony of appreciation, as Exhibit “A”, in the Appendix to this Report.

The Committee based its inquiries on the premise that both the general public and the General Assembly are fully aware of the inadequacies existing in our teachers’ pay, prompting a continuing stream to desert the profession for higher pay in greener fields, leaving our system of public education near the bottom of literacy and illiteracy ratings.

The Committee believes that the awareness of the general public and the General Assembly to these inadequacies is surpassed only by a common desire to improve immediately the situation and eventually solve the problem.

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

(A) Teacher Pay Increase

The proposal of the State Board of Education and the South Carolina Education Association providing a minimum for Class III-A teachers of $2,450.00 per annum appears to be a reasonable basis looking to a solution of this major problem. We, therefore, with certain modifications, as indicated in attached Exhibit “B”, recommend it to your favorable consideration.

At the same time, this Committee felt that to have all the facts and then to recommend to the General Assembly that the teachers be given a pay increase, without definite recommendations as to financing such proposals would merely be the reiteration of already known facts.

To implement the salary schedule proposed by the State Department and South Carolina Education Association would have required approximately 11 millions of dollars per annum; however, the Committee, with no impairment to the teachers or the educational processes, has pared this requirement down to $9,149,000.00, or a reduction of over 1 1/2 millions of dollars of that initially requested.

Only three sources of revenue each alone nets a figure in excess of this sum: the Sales and Use Tax, the State Income Tax and the Beer and Liquor Tax.

The Sales and Use Tax presently affords about 52 million, and the excess created by a 1% increase, in addition to solving this problem, could well be used to further alleviate our overcrowded facilities in this field. On the other side of the ledger, however, a 4% Sales and Use Tax would be the highest State Sales and Use Tax in the nation. Such increase the Committee does not recommend.

To raise the entire amount from the State Income Tax would place our tax structure seriously out of line with neighboring states and in solving one problem, we would create another. We presently realize about 29 millions of dollars from this source.

To raise the necessary sum from the Beer and Liquor Tax would be out of the question as this source derives less from each than the amount required. We presently realize about $6 1/2 millions from beer and $9 1/2 millions from liquor.
It is therefore apparent that a combination of sources must be resorted to in order to provide the revenue to finance the proposed pay program. After careful consideration of many suggested resources, we recommend:

1. Increasing the personal Income Tax 1% in all brackets.
2. Raising Corporate Taxes one-half of 1%.

Following such a course, revenues should approach very nearly the sum required. Initial deficiencies should be taken from the general fund, and the scope and scale adjusted as experience dictates. Income Taxes should provide from 7 to 8 millions; restoration of the Gross Profits Tax ¾ to 1½ millions, and the Withholding Tax from ¾ to 1 million.

Living as we do in a period of spiraling prices, with tremendous demands upon the State Treasury for additional services, the Committee hastens to recommend further, with a long-range view to this aspect of our seeming dilemma, that the various counties be encouraged (by legislation if necessary) to assume part of the financial responsibility for the educational program.

The counties should be encouraged to preserve some vestige of their autonomy. As the State assumes the burden, it inevitably demands more control. As a beginning, the Committee recommends starting with a 4% supplement and then increasing at the same rate each year until, over a five-year period, each county is supplementing its teachers’ pay 20%.

In the field of the pay schedule generally as submitted by the State Department of Education and the South Carolina Education Association (attached as Exhibit “B”, with changes) the Committee by and large adopts the recommendations therein contained, but a few changes including alterations in the system of automatic increases and the method of computing same, have been found desirable.

In such schedules a Class V Grade “C” beginning teacher would receive a 6.7% increase the first year, while a Class III, Grade “A” teacher would receive a 2.9% increase. This is less than half of the increase for the better trained teacher and a reward for mediocrity, which should be immediately discontinued. It appears much fairer to the Committee that every teacher should be given a certain per cent increase every year. 2.5% compounded annually would be not only more equitable, but one which would be a constant incentive to all teachers to improve their ratings.

The Committee also recommends that an increase of 5% should be given for 25 or more years of experience. At present a teacher cannot expect better pay after teaching 14 years without additional education. For many this is impossible, and it is clear that a teacher does not cease to improve after 14 years. This increase should be given only at the completion of 25 years of service.

This Committee would like to make it most clear that it believes that the State should make every effort to meet this problem of adequate teachers’ salary first, even to the curtailing of capital expenses in all phases of state government.

(B) Teacher Scholarship

The Committee recommends that the teaching profession first, by adequate pay, be made attractive enough to compete with business, industry and the payrolls of other educational systems in adjoining states; then, within the framework of available funds, provide other inducements to attract deserving young men and women to secure the necessary education that will enable them to enter the profession. Until the pay scale is made attractive, the lure of scholarships will hardly solve our problem. This is a matter of distinguishing the necessary from the desirable.

(C) Certification Program

The teacher certification requirements in South Carolina conform fundamentally with the certification requirements in the various states. The Committee feels that some areas of our program in this aspect are more effective in protecting the interests of students, teachers and the State generally than most, and, therefore, recommends that the present certification program remain essentially intact.

The fact that the percentage of the teaching profession in South Carolina with less than a bachelor’s degree has dropped
from 40% in 1946 to 13 1/4% in 1956 attests to and proclaims the advantage of the present program.

Due to the acute shortage of teachers in specialized areas, the Committee recommends that special temporary certificates be issued to trade, industrial and other specialists in order that same may be used on an hourly basis in the senior high schools. If the individual so certified is used as much as three or more hours per day, he should be given a regular Trade Certificate, thus enabling the school to receive Federal Aid. The areas in which such specialists are so permitted should be approved by the State High School Supervisor’s office to insure proper accreditation. This certificate should be issued only at the request of the superintendent of the school and approved by the appropriate County or District Board of Education.

When a request is made by a superintendent, the size of the class, number of classes, length of class period, field in which required, and statement of qualifications should be required. It should also bear a recommendation by at least two laymen in the community as to the character and ability of the applicant. Such certificates should not be issued for more than one year at a time and should bear the approval of the State Board of Education.

The Committee believes that the proposed recommended change should be made as a matter of policy by the State Board of Education and not by the General Assembly, as such are matters of administration and not law-making. The Committee believes that the administration should be given clearly defined powers and duties and be free and unimpeded by other sources to do the job for which it was designed.

(D) Study of the 12th Grade

The Committee recognizes the tremendous scope of any effort to evaluate the twelve grade system of public schools. It is fully cognizant that any generalization of its value over an eleven grade system would likely be rather nebulous in character. The Committee feels that some of the criticism advanced by Task Force Number Two definitely applies to particular situations and that these situations need correcting. It is believed, however, that this is a matter of local concern. Where deficiencies occur locally they should be studied and corrected by the Local Board, as well as the administrative staff, teachers and lay personnel. Much has been said about the exclusion of educational personnel from Task Force membership. Nevertheless, lay participation has been lacking in previous studies of local educational situations. The Committee believes that joint lay-professional studies should be encouraged.

The sources used as a basis of criticism of the twelve grade system, though valid, have not been sufficiently broad in scope to warrant all of the conclusions reached. The Supplement to the State Superintendent’s Report, a prominent basis for critical conclusion, is a rather inadequate source due to the manner in which data is collected and the type of data required. It was pointed out that, although a large metropolitan district only had an average of 50.7 per cent passing all subjects in the freshman year, a breakdown reveals that 90.7 per cent of the subjects were passed. It is felt that any greater percentage might indicate “social promotion” on the college level. If considerable revision and increased usage of this Report is not made, it may be feasible to dispense with it at a considerable savings of state funds.

The Committee feels that there are a small number of eleventh grade pupils whose level of achievement is such that they could safely “skip” the twelfth grade, providing adequate measurement and guidance indicated this was advisable. We are encouraged to note State Department of Education action toward that end since publication of the Task Survey Report. The promotion of this procedure is discouraged somewhat by the practice of not allowing these pupils to receive some type of “Merit Diploma” for excellent achievement on their part. The use of the word diploma here is necessary to distinguish from a lower grade of achievement recognition now called a State High School Certificate.

Further encouragement for superior children might be arranged by use of scholarship funds. Should any scholarships be available for superior pupils, it is recommended that eleventh graders be eligible to receive them. Not only would this provide an incentive for this group, but it would also advance the time of training one year, thus giving the State more teachers and other professional personnel sooner.

The necessity of supplying adequate training to the vast majority of the pupils of a non-superior nature makes the continua-
tion of a twelve grade system imperative. The attitude of industry in preferring areas where a twelve grade program is in force is additional cause to retain this program. The industrialization of South Carolina will cause further pressure on the schools to provide advanced technical training. Such a program could be more adequately achieved in a twelve grade system than in one of eleven grades.

The argument that any grade is duplicated or ineffective is based upon subjective observation rather than fact. It must be realized that credit giving *per se* does not insure learning. Therefore, any changing of the credit giving system would have little merit and only tend to confuse the interpretation of the records of South Carolina pupils as well as increase the clerical tasks of already overburdened teachers.

The fact that measurable improvement is evidenced in all grades where adequate testing is done seems to give merit to a recommendation that such testing should be encouraged in all systems and then evaluated by the Local Boards, administrative staffs and lay people in an effort to determine whether adequate growth has taken place. Perhaps a statewide appropriation to defer the expenses of the operation of such a program should be considered by the State Department of Education.

(E) Consolidation of Board of Education, Educational Finance Commission and Schoolbook Commission

South Carolina has three separate and distinct Boards or Commissions, dealing with its public school system. In addition, there are several other Boards with fringe functions dealing with elementary education.

The Education Committee of both the Senate and the House of Representatives should give immediate consideration to the problem, towards working out a system where the actual duties of the State Department of Education are clearly defined.

In the opinion of this Committee, we should immediately take steps to remove the constitutional requirement, making the head of the Department of Education a Constitutional officer, and make provision to allow all of South Carolina’s public schools to be placed under one department, having one person with power to regulate and control South Carolina’s public school administration. This would mean the power to set up and require minimum standards in all schools, to enforce, if necessary, those rules and regulations and to eliminate costly and unnecessary duplication of functions now existing under our present setup.

CONCLUSIONS

All of the findings and recommendations included herein are not the unanimous thoughts of the Committee members. It is rather a compromise that has been worked out, presenting all of the combined views, with alternate views in some instances, but rather than present a Report with several minority views, the committee has tried to combine all of our thoughts with a firm belief that the committee is offering to the General Assembly, not only the problems that exist, but a way to correct them if not in whole, then in part.

In general, the Committee believes that the members of Task Force Number two should be commended for its critical analysis in all levels of our public schools, but also believes that through more adequate use of objective test information of school achievement a continuing study of this problem could be made of much greater value in the future. May South Carolina never experience a time when her educational system is beyond constructive criticism and improvement.

These are merely a few of the vexations and complex aspects of public education in South Carolina. It is an education merely to survey the problems presented. Generations of Assemblies and Committees will wrestle with these problems, ever seeking and often failing in encountering and effecting appropriate measures and solutions to meet the constantly changing needs of our society.

South Carolina should be grateful for the system we presently enjoy; for the highly efficient personnel of our Boards and Commissions and for the teachers who find compensation beyond the pay envelope.

This Committee is not unaware of the political significance contained in proposing new taxes, but is confident in the firm conviction that the people of South Carolina will support legislators who sincerely seek to define and solve their problems however unpleasant and who labor for the long-sighted best interests of our children and future citizens. We can only state, as a conclusion, what has been said many times before: Better
education for our children, better pay for our teachers, will cost more money. If South Carolina is willing to pay the cost, it can be done!

Respectfully submitted,

CHARLES C. MOORE,
Chairman

PRESTON S. MARCHANT,
Vice-Chairman

Albert W. Watson,
Secretary

W. Bruce Williams
James E. Leppard, Jr.
E. LeRoy Nettles

APPENDIX

EXHIBIT "A"

LIST OF PERSONS APPEARING BEFORE THE COMMITTEE

EXHIBIT "B"

PROPOSED TEACHERS' PAY SCHEDULE
EXHIBIT “A”

List of Persons Appearing Before the Committee

1. Mr. James A. Spruill, Jr., Counsel for The Fiscal Survey Commission
2. Mr. Henry Savage, Jr., Chairman, Task Force No. 2 writing Report No. 1.
3. Dr. Jesse T. Anderson, State Superintendent of Education
4. Dr. E. R. Crow, Director, State Educational Finance Commission
5. Mr. P. C. Smith, Asst. Director, State Educational Finance Commission
6. Mr. J. D. Robison, Director, State Schoolbook Commission
7. Mr. H. C. Quarles, Asst. Director, State Schoolbook Commission
8. Mr. J. Carlisle Holler, Director, Division of Instruction, Dept. of Education
9. Mr. S. David Stoney, State High School Supervisor, Dept. of Education
10. Senator P. Bradley Morrah, Jr., Chairman of Committee to Study the Teacher Certification Program and Teacher Pay Schedule and members:

11. Senator J. D. Mars
12. Senator W. A. Lawton
16. Mrs. Maude Marcom, President, S. C. Education Association
17. Miss Lillian Grant, President, S. C. Class Room Teachers’ Association
18. Mr. P. M. Coble, Ex. Secretary, S. C. Education Association
19. Mr. Joe McCracken, Superintendent, Spartanburg Schools
20. Mr. C. B. Busbee, Superintendent, Brookland-Cayce Schools
21. Dr. G. T. Myers, Area Superintendent, Lancaster Schools
22. Mr. Lynn Kalmbach, Director, Special Services, Columbia City Schools
23. Dr. W. F. Loggins, Chairman, Committee of the S. C. E. A.

24. Dr. C. A. Wright, Committee of the S. C. E. A.
25. Dr. George D. Griece, President, College of Charleston
26. Prof. Louis G. Williams, Chairman, Committee of S. C. Academy of Science To Study Teacher Pay
27. Prof. H. Willard Davis, Member of above committee, of University of S. C.
28. Prof. Harry Freeman, Member of above committee, of University of S. C.
29. Mr. J. Cliff Hubbard, Auditor, Springs Cotton Mills, Lancaster, S. C.
30. Mr. J. Paul Truluck, Superintendent, Lake City Schools
31. Mr. Murray McLendon, Member School Board, Lake City
32. Mr. Walter Bonner, Area Superintendent, Moncks Corner
33. Mr. H. A. Wood, District Superintendent, Cheraw
34. Mr. J. C. Hatchett, Superintendent District No. 5, Eastover
35. Mr. Edward L. Wright, Superintendent District No. 2, Dentsville
36. Mr. Otis W. Livingston, Chairman, S. C. Tax Commission
37. Mr. John R. Turbeville, Director, Sales and Use Tax Division
38. Dr. W. C. McCall, Testing Officer for the State and University of S. C.
39. Mr. E. T. Kirkland, Agent, Textile Workers Union of America
40. Mr. C. H. Leesene, Jr., Ex. Asst. A. G. C., Inc., Carolinas Branch
41. Mr. Earle R. Britton, President, S. C. Federation of Labor
42. Mrs. Henry L. Jones, President, S. C. Federation of Women's Clubs
43. Miss Ruth Williams, Ex. Secretary, S. C. Federation of Women's Clubs
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CLASS I</th>
<th>CLASS II</th>
<th>CLASS III</th>
<th>CLASS IV</th>
<th>CLASS V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A B C D</td>
<td>A B C D</td>
<td>A B C D</td>
<td>A B C D</td>
<td>A B C D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probationary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Advanced Professional and Permanent
Professional Certificates are not issued in Classes IV or V. Class IV Advanced, however, carries a final State Aid increment after 14 years, while no increment is provided after six years for Class IV Regular and Class V.*

1st Figure—Salary for one month.
2nd Figure—Salary for nine months.