

CITIZENS LEAGUE REPORT

No. 196

**Minneapolis Public Schools
1967 Financial Needs**

July 1966

CITIZENS LEAGUE
REPORT ON
1967 MINNEAPOLIS SCHOOL FINANCIAL NEEDS

Approved
Citizens League Board of Directors
July 27, 1966

Citizens League
545 Mobil Oil Building
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402
Phone: 338-0791

Citizens League
545 Mobil Oil Building
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402

TO: Members, Board of Directors

FROM: Minneapolis School Finance Committee, Earl F. Colborn, Jr., Chairman

SUBJECT: Findings and recommendations on the proposed 16-mill increase in maximum mill authority for the Minneapolis School Board and evaluation of proposed expenditures in 1967.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1. *We support the proposed 16-mill increase in the maximum mill authority for the operating budget of the Minneapolis School Board. However, we make a clear distinction between the increase in the maximum mill authority and the actual amount which the Board should levy for its 1967 budget within this maximum. We do not at this time support an increase of the full 16 mills in the 1967 levy. The key decision to be made by the School Board in connection with the 1967 budget is how many mills it will levy for that budget within the maximum mill authority.*

Since the establishment of the Independent School District in Minneapolis in 1959, the School Board has increased its maximum mill authority every two years. We find that the proposed increase will be more than adequate to meet the needs of the school system in 1967 and probably will be enough for 1968 also. Making the 16 mills a two-year program would be consistent with that practice.

2. We have reviewed the various components of the 16-mill increase from the standpoint of the need to increase the maximum mill authority and the need for actually levying the amount in 1967. We find as follows:

(a) TAX EQUALIZATION - Approximately 6.4 mills, or \$2,500,000, is proposed to offset the effect of court-ordered property tax equalization brought about by the Donaldson Case. This is beyond the School Board's control. The School Board needs to increase its maximum mill authority and its 1967 levy by this amount.

(b) SALARY INCREASES ALREADY GRANTED - Approximately 2.9 mills, or \$1,116,000, is proposed for salary increases in 1967 which already have been granted. The School Board has made a commitment to its employees in granting these increases which must be met. Therefore, the maximum mill authority and the levy in 1967 must be raised by this amount. We have undertaken an intensive review of the compensation levels for teachers, including the raises which recently were granted. We conclude that compensation levels for Minneapolis teachers are competitive, at the present level, with suburban teachers'.

(c) ADDITIONAL SALARY INCREASES - Approximately 1.3 mills, or \$500,000, is proposed as a lump sum to finance additional salary increases which would be granted in the last half of 1967. The School Board has not yet decided how this money will be allocated. The amount would be sufficient to give raises comparable to those which were given this year. We do not object to an increase in the maximum mill authority for this purpose and do not see how the Board can avoid levying the full amount, or almost as much, for 1967.

We are quite concerned, though, because the School Board lacks an overall policy to guide the granting of increases, particularly in the

case of teachers, who make up by far the largest group of employees. Lack of an overall policy has resulted in an undue emphasis on salary increases among certain categories of teachers. (For example, increases at the bachelor's maximum level appear abnormally high. Such increases do not provide incentive for teachers to take additional training to improve themselves, but only serve as a reward for longevity.) To prevent such undue emphasis from being repeated in the future, we urge the School Board to undertake promptly a detailed study of teachers' compensation, taking into account such factors as the value of the retirement plan, incentives for teachers to take additional college training, and the question of different salary levels for teaching different types of subjects. With this study, the Board should adopt an overall policy to guide future increases. This policy needs to be adopted before increases for the last half of 1967 are granted.

We are also quite concerned with the attitude of Minneapolis' two teacher organizations - the City of Minneapolis Education Association and the Minneapolis Federation of Teachers - on the question of the amount needed for salary increases. We believe their comments about the adequacy of the salaries and their proposals for action are unjustified.

(d) INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM STRENGTHENING - Approximately 3.1 mills, or \$1,102,204, is proposed for instructional program strengthening in 1967. We commend the School Board and administration for proposing new programs. We have criticized the School Board in the past for its lack of such programs. As an overall policy matter, therefore, we support the proposed increase in the maximum mill authority for new programs. We are not at all satisfied, though with the amount of planning which has taken place so far for some of the new programs. In a year such as this when so much is at stake in the millage increase, the School Board has an obligation to document fully, in advance of any referendum, any proposed new programs. We urge the School Board to pledge not to levy in 1967 for programs which cannot be spelled out in detail by the time the levy is certified to the County Auditor, about three months from now, or October 10, if there is no referendum. The program most lacking in documentation today is the proposal to add 140 new professionals in the fall of 1967.

(e) YEAR-END BALANCES - Approximately 2.3 mills, or \$898,048, is proposed because the School Board at this time officially does not expect a year-end balance at the end of 1966 to carry over to 1967, nor a balance at the end of 1967 to carry over to 1968. We do not challenge the increase in the maximum mill authority for this purpose. We seriously question, though, whether there will be a need to levy this entire amount for 1967. Unofficially, some responsible school officials have told us that they are hoping for a carryover of \$800,000-\$1,200,000 at the end of 1966, or 2-3 mills. We understand that by the time the School Board certifies its 1967 levy to the County Auditor, approximately three months from now, a more realistic estimate of the 1966 year-end balance will be possible. We do not question the desirability of a year-end balance, but we urge the School Board to pledge not to levy an amount equal to whatever this balance is estimated to be.

SCOPE OF THE REPORT

This report concerns (a) an evaluation of the proposal by the Minneapolis School Board to increase its maximum mill authority by 16 mills and (b) an evaluation of proposed expenditures by the School Board in 1967.

COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

The Citizens League's Board of Directors in May of this year authorized the establishment of the committee. Earl F. Colborn, Jr., who was chairman of the School Millage Committee in 1964, was named chairman of this committee.

Other members were Earl Alton, Lawrence Benson, Frank Berman, Robert Black Jr Samuel Bloom, James Campbell, Edward N. Delaney, Eugene Eidenberg, Wilbur Ensign, Harold D. Field, Jr., Mrs. Ralph Forester, Donald Freeman, Arthur J. Helland, James L. Hetland, Jr., William R. Kresl, C. Michael Piper, John W. Pulver, George F. Reilly, Willis B. Shaw, Emil Shipka, Tom Vasaly and J. D. White. The committee was assisted by Paul A. Gilje, Citizens League Research Director.

COMMITTEE ACTIVITY

The committee maintained a very intensive meeting schedule between June 15, which was the day after the Minneapolis School Board announced its proposed millage increase and budget for 1967, and July 25, when the committee made final revisions in a draft of the report and recommended it to the Board of Directors. The full committee met six times. Four of these meetings were three-hour evening sessions. In addition, a subcommittee met three times to gather additional information and provide direction for the staff in preparing a draft.

Officials of the Minneapolis Public Schools were most cooperative throughout our deliberations. Donald R. Wahlund, Director of Financial Affairs for the school system, met twice with the full committee and once with the subcommittee, and, in addition, was in almost daily contact with the Citizens League staff, providing additional information and answering questions. Supt. Rufus A. Putnam and A. W. Eckert, Assistant Superintendent in charge of Business Affairs, met twice with either the full committee or the subcommittee. The committee also met with Stuart W. Rider, Jr., Chairman of the Minneapolis Board of Education; Dr. Rodney Tillman, Assistant Superintendent in charge of Elementary Education; Nathaniel Ober, Assistant Superintendent in charge of Secondary Education; Donald Bevis, Supervisor of Special Federal Projects; Robert Black, Jr., Executive Director of the Minneapolis Education Association; Earl Larson, President of the Minneapolis Federation of Teachers; and Charles Boyer, Executive Secretary of the Federation of Teachers. Two officials of the Minneapolis Public Schools, Chester Sorensen, Director of Census Research and Attendance, and Loren Cahlander, Director of Personnel, provided extensive information for the League staff.

INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

We have been invited by the Minneapolis Board of Education to appear at its public hearing July 29, 1966, on a tentative budget of \$46,571,684 for the 1967 calendar year and a proposed increase in the maximum mill authority of the School Board for operating purposes of 16 mills.

We have been informed that the School Board will meet on August 2, 1966, to establish an official increase in the maximum mill authority. According to the special state law which governs procedures of the Minneapolis School Board, the Board has the option of officially establishing the increase at 16 mills or some lower figure. The Board cannot set a figure higher than 16 mills.

After the Board sets the official increase in the maximum mill authority, voters of Minneapolis have 60 days in which to petition for a referendum on the increase. If at least 5,000 valid signatures are obtained during this period and submitted to the Board, the Board will be required to call a referendum, which would be held on November 8, 1966, the date of the regular Minnesota general election. The timetable does not permit the referendum to be held on September 13, the date of the Minnesota primary election. If not enough valid petitions are submitted to the School Board within the 60 days, the increase automatically goes into effect. If an election is held, a 53% affirmative vote of those voting on the question is necessary for approval.

The School Board has the option of submitting the increase in the mill levy maximum to the voters without petitions, but members of the Board have said they would not intend to do so.

In the event of an election, the School Board would wait until after the election on November 8 to certify the 1967 levy to the County Auditor. Although the date of certifying the levy is supposed to be October 10, according to law, the Auditor has indicated to school officials that the delay would be allowed.

It must be clearly understood that the official mill levy maximum as established by the School Board does not necessarily have to be the levy which is certified to the County Auditor. The maximum is only a ceiling above which the Board cannot go. The actual levy can be, and sometimes is, less.

The current proposal to increase the mill levy maximum is the fourth such proposed increase since voter approval of the legislative act establishing a special independent school district for Minneapolis in June, 1959.

The first was a proposed 5-mill increase in 1960, with a pledge that only a part of the 5 mills would be levied in 1960 and the balance in 1961. A referendum was held on this increase and it was approved. In the first year the levy was increased 3.4 mills and the next year the balance of the 5 mills was levied.

The second was a 6-mill increase proposed in 1962, again with the pledge that the full 6 mills would not be levied during the first year. Petitions were circulated but were found to be insufficient in number to require a referendum. This increase went into effect without an election, with 3 additional mills being levied the first year and the full 6 mills the second year.

The third was a 3.4 mill increase in 1964, of which 2.9 mills were levied for the 1965 budget and the balance for the 1966 budget.

The current maximum mill authority for the Minneapolis Public Schools is 62.0 mills for the operating budget. In addition to this is 1 mill for employee group insurance, 10.07 mills for debt service, 9.36 mills for pensions for certificated personnel (Minneapolis Teachers Retirement Fund Association) and 2.65 mills for pensions for other school employees (Minneapolis Employees Retirement Association.) This is a total of 85.08 mills.

The School Board is required by state law to levy whatever amount is needed to provide the pension benefits as authorized in state law for the Minneapolis Teachers Retirement Fund Association. Benefits received are tied to salaries granted by the School Board. To this extent the Board exercises control over benefits. This is also true of the pension benefits under the Municipal Employees Retirement Association for the school civil service employees. The one mill for employee group insurance may be increased by Board action within limits of benefits as set by law.

The School Board exercises control over the debt service millage to the extent that it decides on how much in bonds to float. There is no legal maximum to the millage for this purpose, except that the total debt limit is 10 per cent of the City's assessed valuation.

In addition to millage, the operating budget of the School Board is financed also by state and federal aid. State aid is approximately \$10 million annually, and federal aid \$4 million. During 1966, about 68.8 per cent of the revenue for the operating budget is from millage. This percentage is expected to be 72.4 per cent in 1967.

The property tax is the only source of revenue over which the School Board exercises some control.

THE 1967 BUDGET

The Minneapolis School Board has approved a tentative budget for 1967 which calls for total spending of \$46,571,684, a 6.2 per cent increase over the estimated expenditures of \$43,866,536 for 1966.

In 1965 the total expenditures were \$37,881,246. The main reasons for the substantial increase (15.8%) between the 1965 and estimated 1966 figures are special federal projects in connection with the Elementary and Secondary Act of 1965 (Public Law 89-10), the Economic Opportunity Act and the Vocational Education Act of 1963. An estimated \$4 million in federal funds is being made available to the Minneapolis Public Schools in 1966. According to federal specifications, this money must be spent on new projects and not to continue the regular school program.

The School Board is estimating about \$4 million will be spent on special federal projects in 1967.

Following is a breakdown of proposed spending for 1967 over estimated spending for 1966:

| <u>Category</u> | <u>1966</u> | <u>1967</u> | <u>Amount of Increase</u> | <u>% Increase</u> |
|--|--------------|--------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------|
| Administration | \$ 1,252,565 | \$ 1,355,678 | \$ 103,113 | 8.2 |
| Instruction | 28,632,924 | 30,713,355 | 2,080,431 | 7.2 |
| Attendance & Health Services | 936,721 | 1,000,416 | 63,695. | 6.8 |
| Pupil Transportation Services | 387,843 | 387,918 | 75 | - |
| Operation of Plant | 4,831,569 | 4,882,488 | 50,919 | 1.1 |
| Maintenance of Plant | 1,695,001 | 1,695,001 | - | - |
| Fixed Charges | 983,733 | 983,733 | - | - |
| Community Services | 641,574 | 653,202 | 11,628 | 1.9 |
| Capital Outlay | 357,919 | 357,919 | - | - |
| Outgoing Transfer Accounts | 500 | 500 | - | - |
| Provision for 1967 Salary Increases | | 500,000 | 500,000 | - |
| Estimated Expense Transfer from Federal Projects | (117,509) | (100,916) | -16,593 | - |
| Total Disbursements, exclusive of special federal projects | 39,602,840 | 42,429,294 | 2,826,454 | 7.1 |
| For Special Federal Projects | 4,263,696 | 4,142,390 | -121,306 | - |
| Total Disbursements: | 43,866,536 | 46,571,684 | 2,705,148 | 6.2 |

The above figures show an increase in estimated spending in 1967, exclusive of special federal projects, of \$2,826,454. The School Board has provided the following explanation for the proposed increase in spending:

| | |
|---|--------------------|
| Total Salary Increases, all personnel: | \$1,116,000 |
| Salary Increases for the last half of 1967 (undistributed): | 500,000 |
| Increase in number of personnel, due mainly to implementation of Elsbree administrative staff study: | 200,000 |
| Increases in number of professionals of 140 in the last half of 1967: | 452,604 |
| In-service training for teachers: | 424,600 |
| Curriculum development: | 125,000 |
| Total: | <u>\$2,818,204</u> |

EVALUATION OF SALARY INCREASES

Perhaps no area of the budget is more important or difficult to evaluate than salary increases for teachers, counselors, librarians, consultants, visiting teachers, principals and other professionals in the school system.

We will confine our evaluation of salaries for certificated personnel to the category of teachers. Many other professionals are paid at the same rate, and all other professionals are paid on a percentage basis according to what the teachers receive. Further, the vast majority of professionals in the school system - almost 90 per cent - are teachers.

There are six different classes of salary levels for teachers to reflect college training: Class 1, less than a degree; Class 2, bachelor's degree; Class 3, bachelor's degree plus 20 semester hours; Class 4, master's degree; Class 5, master's degree plus 30 semester hours; and Class 6, Ph.D.

Within each class each teacher is paid according to the number of years of experience, with the maximum salary reached in 12 or 13 years, depending upon the class. Classes 1, 2 and 3 reach maximum in 12 years, and Classes 4, 5 and 6 in 13 years. A teacher receives an automatic pay increase or increment as he moves up the scale each year until he reaches maximum. Approximately 1,165 teachers, or 40 per cent, are at the maximum salary level in their respective classes.

The School Board yearly revises the entire salary schedule by increasing the annual salaries for the various years of experience. Thus, teachers who have not yet reached the maximum in years of experience receive their regular incremental increase, plus an increase in salary because of the change in the schedule. Teachers at the maximum receive an increase in salary because of the schedule change, but don't, of course, receive an incremental increase.

(The School Administration has estimated that the cost in the 1967 budget of the 1966-67 salary increases for teachers will be \$800,200. In addition, teachers will receive incremental increases with a total value of about \$500,000.)

For the school year 1966-67 the salary range in each class is as follows:

Class 1 - less than a bachelor's degree: \$4,450 to \$8,000. (Actually, the lowest salary which will be paid to teachers in this class will be \$5,700, which is the fifth year salary level, because Minneapolis no longer has any teachers at the lower salary levels in this class.)

Class 2 - bachelor's degree: \$5,400 to \$9,200.

Class 3 - bachelor's plus 20 semester hours: \$5,650 to \$9,700.

Class 4 - master's degree: \$5,900 to \$10,400.

Class 5 - master's degree plus 30 semester hours: \$6,150 to \$10,900.

Class 6 - Ph.D. - \$6,400 to \$11,400.

The 1966-67 salary levels represent a 4.8 per cent increase for teachers at the bachelor's maximum (Class 2) and a 5.9 per cent increase at the master's maximum (Class 4).

The major factor which the Minneapolis School Board and its top administration have used in determining salary increases has been competitiveness with suburban school districts.

Two years ago when the Citizens League was reviewing another proposed increase in the maximum mill authority, we were told by Supt. Rufus A. Putnam that, because of the superior retirement program for Minneapolis teachers, the total compensation level for Minneapolis teachers was comparable to that for suburban teachers.

We have compared the increases for Minneapolis Teachers during the past two years with increases in 27 other school districts in the Twin Cities area for the two major classes of teachers: bachelor's degree without extra credits and master's degree without extra credits. The results are as follows:

- The salary for a beginning teacher with a bachelor's degree in the Minneapolis public schools has increased \$250 in the two-year period, compared with an average increase for all school districts of \$232. (See Table I at the back of this report.)
- The salary for a beginning teacher with a master's degree in the Minneapolis public schools has increased \$200 in the two-year period, compared with an average increase of \$330 for the other school districts. (See Table II at the back of this report.)
- The maximum salary for a teacher with a bachelor's degree has increased \$725 in Minneapolis in the two year period, compared with an average increase for the other districts of \$484. (See Table III at the back of this report.)
- The maximum salary for a teacher with a master's degree has increased \$1,125 in Minneapolis in the two-year period, compared with an average increase of \$831 for the other districts. (See Table IV at the back of this report.)

It will be noted that the only category where the Minneapolis increase is not well above the average is in the minimum master's category, where Minneapolis ranks low. Minneapolis school officials point out, though, that they are not too interested in encouraging beginning teachers to have a master's degree. They would much prefer that a teacher start with a bachelor's and earn his master's after he has been teaching a few years.

(Table V at the back of this report compares salaries in Minneapolis with those in other cities over 300,000 population. The comparison reveals that Minneapolis ranks 7th among 27 cities at the bachelor's maximum and 5th at the master's maximum.)

Although Minneapolis' increases in the past two years have generally exceeded those in the suburbs, it must be clearly acknowledged that the salaries in suburban school districts generally are greater than those in Minneapolis. But, as Supt. Putnam pointed out, it is the superior retirement plan in Minneapolis which offsets the difference.

The principal issue of controversy in this connection, though, is how much value to attach to the difference in retirement plans. Because of the importance of the pension issue, we have made a serious attempt to compare the two systems.

Suburban teachers are covered under the State of Minnesota retirement plan for teachers, Teachers Retirement Association (TRA). Minneapolis teachers have their own retirement plan, the Minneapolis Teachers Retirement Fund Association (MTRFA). St. Paul also has its own retirement plan, which is better than TRA but not as good as MTRFA. The St. Paul situation will not be discussed here.

The suburban plan - The suburban TRA plan is a "money purchase" plan. The teacher and the school district involved make regular deposits of a percentage of salary (currently 3% each). There currently is a ceiling on salary for benefit purposes of \$7,200. There is no pension benefit for salary above that level. Deposits by the teacher and school district are credited with interest and accumulated to the member's retirement date. At retirement, the accumulated amount is used to purchase an annuity at the rate then in effect under the plan.

The Minneapolis plan - The Minneapolis MTRFA plan is a "formula annuity plan." Teachers retire on a percentage ($1 \frac{2}{3}$ per cent for each year of credited service) of their highest five-year average salary. Thus, a teacher with 30 years' service retires on one-half of his highest five-year average salary, which can be expected to be the last five years he worked. This benefit is granted regardless of the amount the teachers or the school district contribute, regardless of interest earnings, and regardless of salary in any but the highest five years. There is no ceiling on the salary considered or on the benefit. Currently, the teachers are contributing 6 per cent of salary and the school district 4 per cent of salary toward the fund.

Morton C. Mosiman of Deferred Compensation Administrators, Inc., has recently completed an analysis of the extra value of the Minneapolis pension plan. The analysis was done for the Minneapolis School Board through its salary consultants, Stanton Associates, Inc.

The Mosiman analysis makes three assumptions:

- (a) Neither the TRA nor the MTRFA plans will be changed so that greater benefits would be granted.
- (b) Social Security will not be increased beyond projections under present law.
- (c) Present salaries will increase at the rate of 3 per cent a year. If the increases are greater than that, the extra benefit to Minneapolis teachers will be greater. (Between 1955 and 1965 average annual increases to Minneapolis teachers at the bachelor's maximum were 4.31 per cent. The 1966-67 increase was 4.84 per cent.)

Following are some examples of the extra benefit available to Minneapolis teachers under its pension plan, in comparison with suburban teachers:

Example 1

A Minneapolis teacher retiring in 1966 with 30 years' service will have an extra value to his pension which, in order to duplicate, a suburban teacher retiring in 1966 with 30 years' service would have had to save \$343 annually, after taxes, for the last 30 years. Before taxes it would have had to be about \$429, assuming a 20% tax rate.

When \$343 is added to the maximum bachelor's salary for a Minneapolis teacher, Minneapolis moves from 19th to 7th in rank among the school districts in the metropolitan area. If \$429 is added, Minneapolis moves to 4th.

When \$343 is added to the maximum master's salary for a Minneapolis teacher, Minneapolis moves from 24th to 16th in rank among the school districts in the metropolitan area. If \$429 is added, Minneapolis moves to 13th.

Example 2

A Minneapolis teacher who has 20 years of service in today and will be retiring 10 years from now will have an extra value to his pension which, in order to duplicate, a suburban teacher in the same category would have had to be saving \$562 annually, after taxes, for the last 20 years and would have to continue to save this much for the next 10 years. Before taxes, the amount would have to be about \$702, assuming a 20% tax rate.

When \$562 is added to the maximum bachelor's salary for a Minneapolis teacher, Minneapolis moves to 1st in rank among the school districts in the metropolitan area, with the next school district \$20 behind the Minneapolis level. If \$702 is added, Minneapolis moves further out in front, of course.

When \$562 is added to the maximum master's salary for a Minneapolis teacher, Minneapolis moves to 12th in rank among the school districts in the metropolitan area. If \$702 is added, Minneapolis moves to 4th.

Example 3

A Minneapolis teacher who has 10 years of service in today and who will be retiring 20 years from now will have an extra value to his pension which, in order to duplicate, a suburban teacher in the same category would have had to be saving \$828 annually, after taxes, for the last 10 years and would have had to continue to save this much annually for the next 20 years. Before taxes, this amount would be about \$1,035, assuming a 20% tax rate.

When \$828 is added to the maximum bachelor's salary for a Minneapolis teacher, Minneapolis moves to 1st among the school districts in the metropolitan area with the next school district \$286 behind Minneapolis. If \$1,035 is added, Minneapolis moves further out in front.

When \$828 is added to the maximum master's salary for a Minneapolis teacher, Minneapolis moves to 2nd in rank among the school districts in the metropolitan area. If \$1,035 is added, Minneapolis remains in second place, behind Golden Valley by \$102.

Example 4

A beginning Minneapolis teacher who will be retiring 30 years from now will have an extra value to his pension which, in order to duplicate, a beginning suburban teacher would have to save \$1,253, after taxes, every year for the next 30 years. Before taxes, this amounts to \$1,566, assuming a 20% tax rate.

When \$1,253 is added to the maximum bachelor's salary for a Minneapolis teacher, Minneapolis moves to 1st among the school districts in the metropolitan area, with the next school district \$711 behind Minneapolis. If \$1,560 is added, Minneapolis moves further out in front.

When \$1,253 is added to the maximum master's salary for a Minneapolis teacher, Minneapolis moves to 1st in rank among the school districts in the metropolitan area, with the next school district \$116 behind. If \$1,566 is added, Minneapolis moves further out in front.

Example 5

A Minneapolis teacher who leaves the system before 10 years does not accumulate any pension benefits. He receives his 6 per cent contribution back, plus interest. A suburban teacher who leaves the system before 10 years, receives his 3 per cent contribution back without interest. In addition, about \$300 a year in Social Security payments will have been made by the suburban teachers, for which very little benefit, if any can be assumed.

It is our firm conclusion, based on the above information on salary increases granted in the last two years, and on the comparison of pension benefits, that minimum and maximum levels of Minneapolis teachers' salaries are competitive with the suburbs at their present level.

In fact, we were told by the Director of Personnel for the Minneapolis Public Schools that decisions of prospective teachers on whether to teach in Minneapolis or in the suburbs are based more on the question of whether they'll have to teach in a school in a low socio-economic area than on the salary in Minneapolis as against the suburbs. Many prospective teachers, he said, are told by their college professors to teach in suburban schools, if at all possible, because discipline problems are greater in the big city schools. This attitude is changing somewhat now, he said, because some institutions are offering specific training courses for teachers in low socio-economic areas.

It is also a myth to assume that large numbers of teachers are leaving the Minneapolis Public Schools for higher salaries in the suburbs. As Table VI at the back of this report reveals, less than 10 per cent of the teachers who leave the Minneapolis Public Schools do so to accept other teaching positions in Minnesota, including the suburbs.

We are disappointed with the attitude of some school officials who feel a need to apologize for the salaries and hint that higher salaries would be granted if more money were available. We believe the Minneapolis School Board is doing a good job of compensating teachers and that the Board and Administration should be selling this idea to the public. The facts are on their side. They have nothing to apologize for..

Legitimate questions can be raised, we believe, as to whether higher salaries than can be justified have been granted in some parts of the salary schedule. We are particularly concerned about the sizable increases granted at the bachelor's maximum level. Many suburban school systems are doing their utmost to encourage teachers to improve themselves by obtaining additional college credits. These systems have been granting low increases at the bachelor's level but higher increases if more college credits are obtained. School officials in Minneapolis have also pointed out to us the importance of training beyond the bachelor's degree and that it would be desirable that every teacher have a master's degree by the time he reaches the maximum on the salary scale. It would appear to us that the types of increases granted to Minneapolis teachers at this level in the past year are directly contrary to the principle of encouraging teachers to improve themselves. In fact, the substantial increases at the bachelor's maximum seem little more than reward for longevity. There are more teachers at the bachelor's maximum in Minneapolis than at any other level on the salary schedule, but this fact should not influence the amount of the increases at this level.

We are very concerned that unless there is a major change in policy of the Minneapolis public schools, increases will be granted next year on the same basis as this year.

An amount of \$500,000 is included in the 1967 budget for salary increases in the last half of 1967. School officials do not yet know where this money will be specifically allocated, but it represents, on a yearly basis, the same cost as this year's increases. It would be ill advised for the Minneapolis Public Schools to continue to grant next year, for example, the same increase at the bachelor's maximum as was granted this year.

The School Board sorely needs an overall policy on teachers' compensation. We have been told that the School Board's salary consultant, Stanton and Associates, has been hired to gather facts on comparative salaries between school systems as a basis for the study. We were informed, though, that Stanton will not recommend policy changes, but only will provide basic information for school officials.

To provide maximum guidance for the School Board in developing an overall policy on teachers' compensation, other questions need to be answered in addition to how Minneapolis compares with other school systems.

We believe the School Board, at a minimum, should see that the following questions are faced in the salary study - either by the professional administration or by an outside consultant:

- (a) What is the actual benefit to the teacher and the cost to the taxpayer of the teachers' retirement plan in the overall compensation package and how should this be used in determining salaries of teachers?
- (b) Are the long-term interests of the teachers and taxpayers of Minneapolis best served by continuing the present retirement plan or should state law be changed to allow beginning teachers the option of coming under the state retirement plan at a higher annual salary or remaining under the present plan at a lower salary?
- (c) Is it the objective of the Minneapolis Public Schools to encourage as many teachers as possible to obtain additional college training beyond the bachelor's degree? If so, is this reflected in the salary schedule?
- (d) What types of increases should be granted in the middle steps?
- (e) To what extent should the School District be interested in hiring teachers who want to stay in Minneapolis for their entire career as compared with hiring good teachers who will stay only a few years and then move on?
- (f) Should there be a relationship between what a teacher receives in salary and what subjects and where he teaches?
- (g) Should length of service and credit-hours of college work be the sole basis for differences in compensation between teachers?
- (h) How does compensation for extra-curricular activities fit into the total plan?
- (i) What about summer school salaries? Should the fact that a Minneapolis teacher has more opportunity for year-round employment than a suburban teacher be a factor in determining salaries?

We believe the above questions need answering, so that taxpayers of Minneapolis will have a better idea than they now have that the school system is developing a sound policy on teachers' compensation. In developing its policy, the School Board should involve also the two teachers' organizations, the City of Minneapolis Education Association and the Minneapolis Federation of Teachers.

The School Board particularly needs to settle the question of pension benefits and their value in the salary package. Minneapolis taxpayers are paying approximately \$3,600,000 a year for the teachers' retirement system at the present time. The Assistant Superintendent in charge of Business Affairs has estimated for us that Minneapolis could save \$600 per year per teacher if the City were under the State retirement plan with the suburbs, instead of having its own. Currently, the retirement plan is imposing a cost upon the taxpayers of Minneapolis for which it is not at all clear that a corresponding benefit is received. We believe that the School Board, as part of its teachers' salary survey, should review whether state law should be changed to permit beginning teachers to choose the State Retirement Plan, at a higher annual salary, or the Minneapolis Retirement Plan, at a lower annual salary. This, of course, would not mean any loss of pension benefits to the teachers already in the school system on the present retirement plan.

The question of summer school compensation also is very important. The advent of special federal projects has produced unprecedented summer activity in the Minneapolis Public Schools this year. We have determined that some 1,350 Minneapolis teachers are involved in summer programs either teaching or attending workshops or institutes - all for compensation in addition to the regular school year program. This is almost one-half of the entire staff of teachers.

Salaries for summer school work differ from regular salaries. Teachers who are teaching receive \$5.50 per hour of actual classroom teaching. Teachers attending workshops receive from \$70 to \$115 per week, depending upon the number of dependents. Our information indicates that teachers are receiving up to \$880 each for summer school activity. (One federal program getting under way this fall, the Work Opportunity Center, will employ teachers on a 12-month basis, and teachers will receive an amount pro-rated above their regular 9-month salary. This means that a teacher at the master's maximum of \$10,400 on a 9-months' basis will receive more than \$13,000 on an annual basis.)

Finally, in terms of putting the issue of teachers' salaries truly into perspective, it should be noted that only slightly more than one-third of the total number of teachers are men. (See Table VII at the back of this report.) We are not suggesting that it would be sound policy, or possible under law, to have different schedules of pay for men and women. It merely serves to point out that in comparing salary levels, women's occupations, such as nurses and secretaries, should be compared, as well as occupations for men, such as lawyers and engineers.

REACTION OF TEACHER ORGANIZATIONS TO SALARY INCREASES

City of Minneapolis Education Association

The City of Minneapolis Education Association has asked its parent organization, the National Education Association, to investigate the Minneapolis situation, with a view to imposition of national sanctions against the Minneapolis School Board.

Sanctions include such measures as urging teachers throughout the nation not to seek employment in the Minneapolis Public Schools and withdrawal of teachers from

all extracurricular activity in Minneapolis. The practical effect of imposing sanctions would be to single out Minneapolis among the major school systems in the country and indicate that Minneapolis is not adequately supporting its educational program and its teachers. Based on the information we have received, we conclude that the recommendation for sanctions is not justified.

As far as we could determine, the reasons for proposed sanctions are that the CMEA is dissatisfied with middle steps in the salary schedule, that the CMEA wants the School Board to undertake a study of teachers' compensation and then go to the voters with a proposal to increase the mill levy to pay for whatever salary increases the study revealed were needed, and that the CMEA believes the School Board has made numerous promises in other areas over the past few years which have not been fulfilled. In view of the fact that salaries in Minneapolis are competitive, and that Minneapolis has increased its teachers' salaries at a faster rate than most suburbs in the past three years, we cannot understand how sanctions can be contemplated.

We also consider the 50-page salary proposal of the CMEA to the School Board to be subject to question. For example:

- (a) A chart was shown showing starting salaries for college graduates in the fields of teaching, business, sales, accounting, physics and engineering. Teaching was lowest at \$5,000, and engineering highest, \$7,560. However, the bar graphs showing the difference in salaries were such that the bar graph for engineering was more than twice as long as the bar graph for teachers, even though the difference in salaries was half that amount.
- (b) Teachers' salaries on a 9-month basis were compared with salaries in occupations which are on a 12-month basis.
- (c) Teachers' salaries were compared generally with male occupations, although almost two-thirds of the Minneapolis teachers are women.
- (d) One chart estimated that elementary teachers work 62 hours a week and secondary teachers 65 hours a week, whereas persons in insurance, industrial and business management occupations work no more than 45 hours a week. We seriously question whether this is true.

The Minneapolis Federation of Teachers

After the School Board approved salary increases for 1966-67, the President of the Federation of Teachers, Local No. 59, appeared before the Board claiming that teachers of Minneapolis are not being paid in accordance with what is being paid elsewhere. The Federation presented a resolution stating that unless the issue is resolved before school starts this fall, "the Federation has no recourse but to take such union action thereafter as may be necessary to correct the situation." We believe that these comments also are uncalled for, given the salaries which Minneapolis teachers receive.

In claiming that Minneapolis was not spending enough for education, Federation officials pointed out to us that the mill rate for schools in Minneapolis is the lowest in Hennepin County. The facts are, however, that the mill rate bears very little relationship to the number of dollars spent per pupil. It will be noted on

Table IX at the back of this report that the mill rate in Brooklyn Center for schools is more than twice the mill rate in Minneapolis. Yet the cost per pupil unit in average daily attendance in Minneapolis is \$34 more than in Brooklyn Center. The range of maintenance cost per pupil unit among the county school districts is from \$340 in Eden Prairie to \$500 in Orono, with Minneapolis ranking 9th among 15 districts.

EVALUATION OF PROPOSALS TO ADD ADDITIONAL
PROFESSIONAL STAFF IN THE LAST HALF OF 1967

The proposed addition in professional staff for the last half of 1967 is expected to cost approximately \$652,000. This money will be spent in the following way:

- (a) \$200,000 for modified implementation of a consultant's recommendations on administrative staffing, plus addition of a few other professionals in certain areas, such as librarians.
- (b) \$450,000 for 140 new professionals as the first step in a three-year program to increase the ratio of professionals to students from 44 per 1,000 to 50 per 1,000.

The \$200,000

Dr. Willard S. Elsbree, Professor at Columbia University, New York, last fall recommended the addition of several new administrative positions in the public schools. His recommendations have been modified somewhat. Some of his recommendations will be implemented in the fall of 1966 and more will be implemented in the fall of 1967. Among the new positions are three directors of curriculum, a consultant in pupil services, an assistant in personnel, an assistant director in charge of urban affairs, an assistant in census, plus a staff of clerks for all these positions.

We find no basic reason to question the need for improving the administrative staff. It appears to be part of a sound plan developed by a consultant.

The \$450,000

This money would be used to hire 140 additional professionals in the fall of 1967; that is, teachers, consultants, directors, administrators and others, as the first phase of a three-year program to hire 420 additional professionals to bring Minneapolis to a ratio of 50 professionals per 1,000 students. Currently, the ratio is 44 professionals per 1,000. The yearly additional cost to the school system, if the goal is met, will be in excess of \$3 million.

We were informed by top officials in the Minneapolis public schools that research throughout the nation on evaluating quality of education has revealed that a key difference between good school systems and poor systems is their ratio of professionals per 1,000 students. We were referred specifically to a recent study of schools in New York State by William D. Firman of the New York State Department of Education, which concluded: "The good schools had nearly five more professionals per 1,000 than did the poor."

Dr. Willard Elsbree of Columbia University in his administrative staff study for the Minneapolis Public Schools called the ratio of 50 professionals per 1,000 "a reasonable and by no means ideal ratio." The National Education Association, the Educational Policies Commission and James B. Conant are among others who have called for the ratio as a minimum goal.

The Educational Research and Development Council of the Twin Cities Area, Inc., an organization of 38 school districts in the Minneapolis-St. Paul area, in its March 1966 report on staffing adequacy in school districts, said that the use of the ratio of professionals per 1,000 students, rather than class size data, is more useful today, because it accounts for all certificated personnel who contribute to the learning of children. The Council said that this measure, which originated in the Institute of Administrative Research, Teachers College, Columbia University, has gained wide acceptance and is now used by many agencies as a better measure of school staffing than class size data.

The Council annually conducts a study of its 38-member school districts to compare their respective ratios of professionals per 1,000 students.

The March 1966 study reveals that the median ratio is 44.18 professionals per 1,000 students, with a range from 25.12 to 53.08. One-half of the 38 schools have a level between 42.25 professionals per 1,000 students and 46.70.

The Council does not publish individual data for each school district. It lists each ratio, but does not say which ratio is for which school district. It furnishes each school district with its own information and no other district's. The result is that a district learns its position among school districts, but doesn't learn the position of any other district.

The Citizens League staff contacted some of the school districts in the metropolitan area to ask them for their standings. From these contacts the following ratios emerged:

| | |
|---------------|-------|
| Edina | 45.40 |
| Hopkins | 45.19 |
| Richfield | 44.68 |
| Minneapolis | 44.08 |
| Bloomington | 43.91 |
| Golden Valley | 43.55 |
| Robbinsdale | 42.25 |

Thus, the ratio of professionals to 1,000 in Minneapolis is almost at the median for the metropolitan area. There are six districts with ratios of 50 or over. We were unable to determine which districts these are.

A similar study in the New York metropolitan area for 75 school districts revealed a range of 44 to 77 professionals per 1,000 students, with the median 60 professionals per 1,000.

The Educational Research and Development Council of the Twin Cities Area made the following comments in its March 1966 study on staffing ratios:

"The above recitation of research, opinion, and existing conditions in other school systems helps us very little in determining what staffing levels in Council schools ought to be. At best, the data indicate that the staffing of Council schools is lower than in the compared groups of schools and lower than the levels recommended by the Educational Policies Commission.

"Adequate research in this area must follow the same guides indicated for class size research. There is no 'adequate' staffing level for all purposes. To determine what is 'adequate' to accomplish a specific educational goal, with certain children, under given conditions is extremely important and appears to be a researchable question."

The Citizens League has consistently supported sound proposals for improving education in the Minneapolis Public Schools. In fact, we have frequently been critical because proposals for spending lacked imagination and seemed to tend more to continuing the present situation rather than making improvements. We also have urged a stepping up of the pace to reduce class size. (See Table VIII at the back of this report for class size data.)

Consequently, we are pleased to see that the School Board this year is proposing some bold, new programs. We are not at all satisfied, though, that the proposal to add 140 new professionals in the fall of 1967 and an additional 140 in each of the next two years has yet been thoroughly planned out.

We have repeatedly asked school administration officials where the new personnel will be placed, for example, how many will be classroom teachers. These officials said that at least 90 per cent will be in positions in which they are in direct contact with children. Not all of the 90 per cent will necessarily be used in reducing class size, but they all will be placed where they can work with students.

The estimated cost of hiring the 140 persons was placed at an average salary of \$7,600 a year per person, with the total cost approximately \$1 million per year.

Administration officials have indicated that a large percentage of these new professionals will be used in schools of the city which are not eligible for some of the special federal programs. In particular, the school administration intends to stress those schools which border on areas where federal programs are in progress. To a large extent, therefore, the proposal to add 140 professionals is to add staff in those schools where staff cannot be added with federal aid.

We are in basic agreement with the need to improve education in the Minneapolis Public Schools and that the general proposal to add professional staff is in keeping with this need. If the current ratio of professionals per 1,000 students in Minneapolis were substantially below the ratios for other school systems in the Twin Cities area, we probably would be able to accept on its face the need to add a certain number of professionals to improve the ratio. However, since Minneapolis seems to be comparable with most of its neighboring school districts, we believe that it is very important for the School Board to develop a specific plan for placement of the additional personnel before the Board levies taxes to carry out the plan. This plan should be developed in advance of any election which might be held on millage for 1967. If the plan shows that less than \$450,000 will be needed in the fall of 1967, then the School Board should decrease its levy for 1967 accordingly.

We must emphasize here that we do not dispute the goal of 50 professionals per 1,000 students for the Minneapolis public schools, despite the present comparability with suburbs. We only ask that a specific plan be outlined for placement of the additional staff.

Questions such as the following need to be answered:

- (a) What specific educational goals, other than 50 professionals per 1,000 students, does the administration have in mind in hiring these additional personnel?
- (b) How many of the 140 will actually be classroom teachers?
- (c) How many will be other professionals working with children? Specifically, what will these professionals be?

- (d) How many will be administrators?
- (e) Will present school personnel be promoted to some of these jobs and beginners hired to take their present places, or will all new personnel be hired for these jobs?
- (f) What is an "adequate" staffing ratio in Minneapolis, and why?
- (g) In general, where will the additional 140 professionals in 1968 and the additional 140 in 1969 be placed?
- (h) What about the trend in enrollments and its effect on the ratios?
(See Table X at the back of this report for past enrollments.)

We do not believe it is asking too much that the school administration develop a specific plan in advance of the time the 1967 levy is certified to the County Auditor. With a specific plan before it, the School Board can decide exactly how much money will be needed for this program in the fall of 1967 and levy accordingly.

EVALUATION OF PROPOSAL TO IMPROVE IN-SERVICE EDUCATION FOR TEACHERS

Beginning in January 1967, the Minneapolis Public Schools propose to embark on a four-phase program to upgrade the quality of its teachers through a much broadened program of in-service education. "In-service education" is the process by which additional training is given to the teachers by the school system itself. This program is estimated to cost \$425,000 annually, which would be distributed in the following manner:

| | |
|-----------------------------------|----------|
| Regional and National Conferences | \$75,000 |
| Visiting Consultants | 20,000 |
| Teacher Visitation | 70,000 |
| Summer School Training | 20,000 |
| Summer Workshops | 240,000 |

School officials told us many teachers in Minneapolis Public Schools go through their entire career without ever attending a regional or national conference where they can learn about new and better ideas in their various fields. Under the proposed plan, every tenure teacher would be able to attend such a conference once every seven years.

Also proposed is to bring outstanding educational consultants to Minneapolis to offer helps to teachers here and to broaden their outlook.

School officials see much benefit in teachers observing other teachers at work in the school system to pick up better ideas. Therefore, money is proposed to pay for substitute teachers to handle the individual classrooms while regular teachers are visiting other classrooms.

School officials said that teachers are not properly trained to meet many of the needs in a big city school system - such as remedial reading.

The biggest item in the proposal is for summer workshops next summer, in which teachers will learn better methods. They will be paid stipends of \$75 to \$120 per week, depending upon the number of dependents. Conceivably, the equivalent of

500 teachers could attend four-week sessions next summer with this money. Or, 1,000 teachers could attend two-week courses.

We are wholly in agreement with the proposal to broaden in-service education. We would prefer, though, that the administration develop a better idea about the types of workshops which will be conducted next summer before the School Board certifies its tax levy to the County Auditor this fall.

EVALUATION OF PROPOSAL ON CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT

This money, \$125,000, will go primarily to pay for salaries of teachers who would be working next summer, and possibly on Saturday during the regular school year, developing new curriculum plans to experiment with new ideas in curriculum.

As with the above two proposals, we regard this as a refreshing departure from the past. The infusion of new ideas and plans in the public schools of Minneapolis is something which Minneapolis has lacked in the past.

ECONOMIES IN JANITORIAL OPERATIONS

Two years ago we were told flatly by the Business Department of the Minneapolis Public Schools that several efficiencies would shortly be inaugurated in the janitorial operations which would produce savings of \$450,000 annually "in the next three or four years."

School officials told us that while they have made some progress, the progress has not been as rapid as they would like.

Two key changes in producing efficiencies have not yet come about.

The vast majority of janitors still work during regular school hours. A proposed system of shifts, in which janitors would clean the buildings when students are gone, has not yet been implemented. We have been informed by the head of the Business Department that janitors are expected to be placed on shifts beginning in the fall of 1967.

The other change which has not yet been made is a change in the practice of assigning janitors on the basis of one janitor for every 20,000 square feet of space, regardless of a building's condition. We were not told whether the Business Department will change this practice.

We are disappointed that more progress has not been made, but we extend our encouragement to the Business Department in making reforms and will watch future developments closely.

Savings were running at the rate of \$144,200 annually as of the end of 1965 and are projected to total \$290,017 annually by the end of 1967.

1967 REVENUE

If there were no increase in the mill rate over its present level, available revenue in 1966 to finance the budget would total approximately \$40,634,507, according

to present estimates. This means that an additional \$5,937,177 will have to be found if the School Board is to meet its proposed expenditure level of \$46,571,684.

A property tax increase of 15.3 mills would make up the difference. The School Board is proposing an increase of 16 mills, which will also provide for a small balance at the end of 1967, according to present estimates.

The largest single part of the \$5,937,177 is increased spending in 1967, estimated at \$2,818,204, or approximately 7.3 mills. The balance, \$3,118,973, is divided in the following manner:

-- \$2,000,000 to make up for a decrease in the property tax base in 1967 due to broad tax equalization brought about by court order as a result of the Donaldson property tax case in Minneapolis. 5.1 mills.

-- \$1,118,973 to make up for the absence of any surplus in the 1966 budget to provide a carryover into 1967. Of this amount, approximately \$500,000 is to make up for refunds expected to be made in 1966 because of the Donaldson case. These refunds will be taken from funds which otherwise would have been a surplus in 1966 and could have been used to help finance the 1967 budget. 2.9 mills.

Discussion of the Donaldson Case Impact

The City Assessor has estimated that the total loss in revenue to all government agencies in 1967 because of a smaller tax base as a result of the Donaldson Case will be \$7.5 million. (In the Donaldson Case, the Hennepin County District Court ruled that business property could not be assessed at a higher ratio than residential property, with the result that valuations on some business property were reduced, producing refunds on back taxes as well as a smaller tax base.)

The Minneapolis Public Schools' share of the \$7.5 million is approximately 37 per cent, which is the same percentage the total mill rate for schools bears to the total mill rate in the city.

Taking 37 per cent of the \$7.5 million, the result is \$2.8 million, which is the total loss to the public schools. This figure represents the loss to the regular school operating budget, as well as the other school millage funds, group insurance and pension funds. The millage for regular school budget is 62/85 of the total school millage. Applying this fraction against \$2.8 million, we come up with \$2,000,000 as the loss to the operating budget, which is the figure used above. The other \$800,000 will be made up by an automatic increase in the school's millage outside the regular school operating budget millage. This is approximately a 2-mill increase. That is, the total millage increase for school purposes in 1967 will be the amount of the increase for the school operating budget, plus about 2 mills.

The City Assessor has also estimated that the total loss to all agencies in 1966 because of refunds expected to be ordered is \$3.9 million, with the schools' share \$1.4 million. About \$1 million of this would be attributable to the regular operating budget of the schools. The Director of Financial Affairs for the Minneapolis Public Schools has said that he is attributing only \$500,000 as impact in 1966, because not all the cases can be expected to be settled this year, he believes. These refunds will be made to various taxpayers which had not withheld any payments when they protested their taxes. He acknowledges that the estimate of \$500,000 may be low, but said that about \$200,000 in addition for regular refunds already is built into the budget. If the loss were to go as high as \$1,000,000 in 1966, the money could be taken from the expected balance at the end of the year, which is not yet official.

It must be pointed out, though, that the amount of the loss in 1966 may even be less than \$500,000, depending upon how many cases are settled this year. If so, funds should be set aside for payment when the cases are settled.

We have been made aware of the possibility that the Minneapolis Public Schools and all other tax agencies can - within certain limitations - levy outside any current property tax maximums - to pay for these refunds. (Refunds are possible, of course, only in those cases where taxes were legally protested.) In order for the Minneapolis Public Schools to do this, the refunds would have to be for years in which the School Board was not at its maximum legal millage. In 1961, the Board was 1.6 mills below its maximum limit of 52.6 mills; in 1963, 3 mills below the maximum of 58.6; and in 1965, one-half mill below the maximum of 62.0 mills. We have been advised that the School Board may be able to levy outside of any current property tax maximums to pay for refunds for the years 1961, 1963 and 1965. We do not know how great a levy this could be, though one responsible source estimated about one mill.

BALANCES AT THE END OF 1966 AND 1967

We believe it is likely that the Minneapolis Public Schools will end 1966 with a substantial balance, probably between \$800,000 and \$1.2 million, even though officially the school administration is saying that the balance at the end of this year will be only \$39,718.

If revenues and expenditures continue as they have so far this year, we should be in the same position at the end of this year as we have in the past few years, we were informed by school officials. This means a balance of about \$1.2 million. This will be reduced, though, if refunds because of the Donaldson Case exceed \$500,000 in 1966. Even with higher refunds, though, we still expect a substantial balance.

School officials told us that such a balance at the end of this year, coupled with a similar balance at the end of 1967, could be about \$2 million, or the equivalent of 5 mills, and be sufficient to finance operations through 1968. What this means, therefore, is that school officials expect their conservative estimating of revenues and high estimating of expenditures in both 1966 and 1967 to produce enough year-end balances to make the 16-mill increase a two-year plan, instead of a one-year plan. This would be consistent with past practices in which the School Board has proposed increases in the millage maximum every other year, instead of every year.

By the time the School Board must certify a levy to the County Auditor this fall for the 1967 budget, we believe the Board will have a much better idea of what its 1966 year-end balance will be. We urge the School Board to reduce its levy for 1967 by an amount equal to what the year-end balance will then be estimated to be.

THE 16-MILL INCREASE

In analyzing the School Board's additional financial needs for 1967, we conclude as follows:

- (a) The maximum mill authority must be increased to cover the loss of revenue because of the Donaldson Case in 1966 and 1967. This totals \$2,500,000, or an increase of 6.4 mills in maximum mill authority.
- (b) The School Board already has granted salary increases which will carry through 1967 and cost an additional \$1,116,000. The money to meet these increases must be found. This is an additional 2.9 mills in the maximum mill authority which must be granted and levied for in 1967.

- (c) The School Board proposes to set aside a lump sum of \$500,000, or 1.3 mills, for additional salary increases in the last half of 1967. We have no objection to the amount itself and therefore would accept an increase in the maximum mill authority to cover this cost. However, we urge that the School Board, prior to the time it establishes the 1967 levy, which can be less than the mill levy maximum, undertake the proper study to assure that an overall policy will be developed for 1967 on compensation for teachers.
- (d) The School Board proposes to spend an additional \$652,604 in the fall of 1967 for additional personnel, which accounts for a millage increase of 1.7 mills. We have received information indicating that \$200,000 of this will be spent according to a plan which already has been developed. The remaining \$452,604 is to undertake the first phase of a three-year plan to increase the ratio of professionals per 1,000 students from 44 to 50. As far as we can determine, there has been no plan developed to date on where these additional professionals will be assigned (140 of them in the fall of 1967.) We support the increase in the maximum mill authority to give the School Board permanent authority to increase the size of its staff. However, we urge the School Board to publicly declare, prior to the time it establishes the 1967 levy, what specific plans have been developed. At that time the Board should be able to decide whether it is necessary to levy the full amount.
- (e) The School Board proposes a major increase during 1967 in its program of in-service training of teachers. The cost is estimated at \$424,600, or about 1.1 mills. We believe this is most urgently needed in the school system to broaden the outlook of the teachers and give them new and improved teaching ideas. School officials have given us a fairly detailed account of where the money will be spent. We believe an increase in the maximum mill authority for this is justified, as well as an increase in the 1967 levy. It would be advisable for the School Board, though, prior to the time it adopts the 1967 levy, to be more specific on the nature of the summer workshops proposed for next summer. Summer workshops account for more than one-half of the cost.
- (f) The School Board proposes to spend \$125,000, or about .3 of a mill, for curriculum development, primarily for trying out new ideas in curriculum. We believe this is badly needed, and support an increase in the mill levy maximum as well as the 1967 levy for this purpose.
- (g) The School Board proposes an increase in the mill levy maximum of about 1.6 mills, or \$618,973, in 1967 to make up for the lack of a substantial balance at the end of 1966 to carry over into 1967. The Board also proposes an increase of .7 mill, or \$279,000, to provide a small balance at the end of 1967 to carry over into 1968. We do not object to an increase in the maximum mill authority for these purposes, but we have been informed unofficially that a balance of between \$800,000 and \$1.2 million is likely at the end of 1966. Therefore, it probably would not be necessary for the School Board to actually levy for 1967 to make up for any lack of a carryover. We urge the School Board not to levy in 1967 an amount equal to whatever the year-end balance is expected to be when the levy is made about three months from now.

In summary, we urge the increase of 16 mills in the maximum mill authority, but we believe the School Board should reduce its actual levy for 1967 below the 16 mills in every case where the Board cannot provide detailed plans for spending the money by the time the levy is made. Further, by that time also, it is very likely that the Board will have a better idea of its anticipated balance at the end of 1966 and should reduce its 1967 levy by this amount.

If the School Board proposes to take advantage of the provision in the state law which may allow a levy outside the maximum mill authority for refunds on taxes paid in previous years, we urge the Board to reduce its maximum mill authority accordingly. We will not urge the Board to take advantage of this law, because we do not at this time know all its implications. But, if, for example, the Board finds it wants to levy outside the legal maximum for this purpose, the Board should not levy this amount in addition to an increase in the maximum mill authority of 16 mills.

The School Board should also publicly state its intentions regarding the 16 mills as to whether it constitutes a one-year program or a two-year program. It is conceivable that up to \$2 million will be available at the end of 1967 as a balance to carry over into 1968.

Finally, the School Board itself will have to reach the political decision as to whether it should submit the 16-mill maximum in this year of property tax equalization or whether it would be wiser to adopt a lower figure, perhaps deleting some of the educational improvements which might better be inaugurated in another year. We have tried to analyze the budget on its merits and have not asked whether taxpayers of the city of Minneapolis will or will not accept a 16-mill increase.

MINORITY VIEW

Robert Black, Jr., a committee member, dissented from the statements in this report concerning proposed sanctions by the City of Minneapolis Education Association. He agrees with the balance of the report. Black presented his minority viewpoint to the Board of Directors. He contends that the CMEA has experienced several years of frustration in dealing with the School Board because the Board, the CMEA believes, has almost totally ignored the CMEA viewpoint on a number of matters, including salaries.

TABLE I

Minimum Salary, Bachelor's Degree
 27 Metropolitan Area School Districts
 (without extra college credits beyond Bachelor's degree)

| | 1966-67 | 1965-66 | 1964-65 | Total Increase from 1964-65 to 1966-67 |
|--|---------|---------|---------|---|
| Anoka | \$5250 | \$5100 | \$5000 | \$250 |
| Bloomington | 5300 | 5200 | 5100 | 200 |
| Brooklyn Center | 5300 | 5200 | 5100 | 200 |
| Burnsville | 5300 | 5100 | 5100 | 200 |
| Centennial | 5300 | 5200 | 5000 | 300 |
| Columbia Heights | 5350 | 5200 | 5100 | 250 |
| Eden Prairie | 5300 | 5150 | 5000 | 300 |
| Edina | 5350 | 5250 | 5150 | 200 |
| Fridley | 5300 | 5200 | 5100 | 200 |
| Golden Valley | 5225 | 5125 | 5000 | 225 |
| Hopkins | 5300 | 5200 | 5100 | 200 |
| Minnetonka | 5275 | 5125 | 5050 | 225 |
| Mound | 5200 | 5125 | 5050 | 150 |
| Mounds View | 5300 | 5200 | 5100 | 200 |
| North St. Paul | 5300 | 5200 | 5100 | 200 |
| Orono | 5200 | 5125 | 5050 | 150 |
| Osseo | 5400 | 5300 | 5150 | 250 |
| Richfield | 5300 | 5200 | 5100 | 200 |
| Robbinsdale | 5300 | 5200 | 5100 | 200 |
| Roseville | 5350 | 5200 | 5100 | 250 |
| St. Anthony | 5250 | 5150 | 5000 | 250 |
| St. Louis Park | 5300 | 5200 | 5100 | 200 |
| St. Paul | 5300 | 5100 | 5000 | 300 |
| South St. Paul | 5450 | 5300 | 5150 | 300 |
| Spring Lake Park | 5400 | 5300 | 5000 | 400 |
| Wayzata | 5300 | 5150 | 5050 | 250 |
| Minneapolis | 5400 | 5200 | 5150 | 250 |
| Average Increase all school districts except Minneapolis | | | | \$232 |

TABLE II

Minimum Salary, Master's Degree
 27 Metropolitan Area School Districts
 (without extra college credits beyond Master's degree)

| | 1966-67 | 1965-66 | 1964-65 | Total Increase from 1964-65 to 1966-67 |
|---|---------|---------|---------|---|
| Anoka | \$6352 | \$6171 | \$5850 | \$502 |
| Bloomington | 6000 | 5850 | 5700 | 300 |
| Brooklyn Center | 6050 | 5700 | 5600 | 450 |
| Burnsville | 5936 | 5712 | 5550 | 386 |
| Centennial | 5900 | 5800 | 5600 | 300 |
| Columbia Heights | 6250 | 6100 | 6000 | 250 |
| Eden Prairie | 5800 | 5650 | 5500 | 300 |
| Edina | 5992 | 5880 | 5768 | 224 |
| Fridley | 5900 | 5600 | 5500 | 400 |
| Golden Valley | 6270 | 5894 | 5750 | 520 |
| Hopkins | 5900 | 5800 | 5700 | 200 |
| Minnetonka | 6000 | 5800 | 5700 | 300 |
| Mound | 5798 | 5689 | 5606 | 192 |
| Mounds View | 6100 | 5800 | 5700 | 400 |
| North St. Paul | 5900 | 5800 | 5763 | 137 |
| Orono | 5800 | 5725 | 5650 | 150 |
| Osseo | 6050 | 5900 | 5750 | 300 |
| Richfield | 6000 | 5800 | 5700 | 300 |
| Robbinsdale | 6000 | 5800 | 5700 | 300 |
| Roseville | 6206 | 6032 | 5814 | 392 |
| St. Anthony | 6037 | 5923 | 5750 | 287 |
| St. Louis Park | 6000 | 5900 | 5700 | 300 |
| St. Paul | 5800 | 5600 | 5500 | 300 |
| South St. Paul | 6050 | 5900 | 5750 | 300 |
| Spring Lake Park | 6300 | 5800 | 5400 | 900 |
| Wayzata | 5936 | 5768 | 5656 | 280 |
| Minneapolis | 5900 | 5750 | 5700 | 200 |
| Average Increase, all school districts except Minneapolis | | | | \$330 |

TABLE · III

Maximum Salary, Bachelor's Degree
 27 Metropolitan Area School Districts
 (without extra college credits beyond Bachelor's degree)

| | 1966-67 | 1965-66 | 1964-65 | Total Increase from 1964-65 to 1966-67 |
|--|---------|---------|---------|---|
| Anoka | \$9660 | \$9384 | \$9200 | \$460 |
| Bloomington | 9593 | 9412 | 9275 | 318 |
| Brooklyn Center | 9425 | 9275 | 9050 | 375 |
| Burnsville | 8798 | 8160 | 8260 | 538 |
| Centennial | 9116 | 8632 | 8300 | 816 |
| Columbia Heights | 9523 | 9256 | 9078 | 445 |
| Eden Prairie | 8700 | 8350 | 8150 | 550 |
| Edina Morningside | 9282 | 9188 | 9013 | 269 |
| Fridley | 9368 | 8944 | 8619 | 749 |
| Golden Valley | 9092 | 8918 | 8700 | 392 |
| Hopkins | 9650 | 9350 | 9125 | 525 |
| Minnetonka | 8990 | 8832 | 8832 | 158 |
| Mound | 9360 | 9225 | 9090 | 270 |
| Mounds View | 9200 | 9150 | 9100 | 100 |
| North St. Paul | 9260 | 9100 | 8964 | 296 |
| Orono | 9300 | 9025 | 8550 | 750 |
| Osseo | 9478 | 9335 | 8950 | 528 |
| Richfield | 9550 | 9350 | 9200 | 350 |
| Robbinsdale | 9550 | 9400 | 9200 | 350 |
| Roseville | 9202 | 8944 | 8772 | 430 |
| St. Anthony | 9345 | 8858 | 8600 | 745 |
| St. Louis Park | 9500 | 9200 | 9100 | 400 |
| St. Paul | 9200 | 8600 | 8300 | 900 |
| South St. Paul | 9742 | 9474 | 9206 | 536 |
| Spring Lake Park | 9504 | 9000 | 8600 | 904 |
| Wayzata | 9540 | 9270 | 9090 | 450 |
| Minneapolis | 9200 | 8775 | 8475 | 725 |
| Average Increase all school districts except Minneapolis | | | | \$484 |

TABLE IV

Maximum Salary, Master's Degree
 27 Metropolitan Area School Districts
 (without extra college credits beyond Master's degree)

| | 1966-67 | 1965-66 | 1964-65 | Total Increase from 1964-65 to 1966-67 |
|---|---------|---------|---------|---|
| Anoka | \$10762 | \$10455 | \$10050 | \$ 712 |
| Bloomington | 11100 | 10823 | 10300 | 800 |
| Brooklyn Center | 10725 | 10375 | 9665 | 1060 |
| Burnsville | 10494 | 9996 | 9258 | 1236 |
| Centennial | 10028 | 9548 | 9175 | 853 |
| Columbia Heights | 10744 | 10468 | 10131 | 613 |
| Eden Prairie | 9200 | 8850 | 8650 | 550 |
| Edina Morningside | 11101 | 10710 | 10506 | 595 |
| Fridley | 10580 | 10304 | 9790 | 790 |
| Golden Valley | 11537 | 10845 | 10350 | 1187 |
| Hopkins | 11100 | 10650 | 10300 | 800 |
| Minnetonka | 11115 | 10625 | 10501 | 614 |
| Mound | 10800 | 10240 | 10090 | 710 |
| Mounds View | 11050 | 10700 | 10300 | 750 |
| North St. Paul | 10820 | 10480 | 9987 | 833 |
| Orono | 10500 | 10125 | 9650 | 850 |
| Osseo | 10617 | 10395 | 9650 | 967 |
| Richfield | 11100 | 10600 | 10400 | 700 |
| Robbinsdale | 11000 | 10600 | 10250 | 750 |
| Roseville | 11021 | 10400 | 10098 | 923 |
| St. Anthony | 10447 | 9940 | 9650 | 797 |
| St. Louis Park | 11130 | 10700 | 10400 | 730 |
| St. Paul | 9900 | 9200 | 8800 | 1100 |
| South St. Paul | 10951 | 10679 | 10278 | 673 |
| Spring Lake Park | 10500 | 9500 | 9000 | 1500 |
| Wayzata | 11024 | 10712 | 10504 | 520 |
| Minneapolis | 10400 | 9825 | 9275 | 1125 |
| Average Increase, all school districts except Minneapolis | | | | \$ 831 |

TABLE V

COMPARATIVE STUDY OF TEACHERS SALARY SCHEDULE
OF CITIES WITH 300,000 POPULATION OR MORE
 1966 - 67

| | <u>Bachelors Degree</u> | | <u>Masters Degree</u> | |
|-----------------------|-------------------------|----------------|-----------------------|-------------------|
| | <u>Min.</u> | <u>Max.</u> | <u>Min.</u> | <u>Max.</u> |
| Akron, Ohio | \$ 5,600 | \$ 8,850 | \$ 5,900 | \$ 9,375 |
| Buffalo, New York | 5,500 | 9,075 | 6,000 | 9,575 |
| Cleveland, Ohio | 5,300 | 8,717 | 5,504 | 9,329 |
| Columbus, Ohio | 5,200 | 9,000 | 5,700 | 9,500 |
| Dayton, Ohio | *5,380 | *8,600 | *5,770 | *9,200 |
| Denver, Colorado | 5,400 | 8,725 | 5,600 | 9,700 |
| Indianapolis, Indiana | 5,450 | 8,700 (14 yrs) | 5,900 | 9,800 (15 yrs) |
| | | 8,900 (18 yrs) | | 10,300 (20 yrs) |
| Long Beach, Calif. | 6,010 | 9,640 | 6,790 | 11,080 |
| Louisville, Kentucky | 5,100 | 8,160 | 5,508 | 8,568 |
| Milwaukee, Wisconsin | 5,550 | 8,810 | 5,772 | 9,247 |
| Newark, New Jersey | 6,300 | 10,700 | 6,700 | 11,100 |
| New York City | 5,400 | 9,950 | 6,900 | 11,450 |
| Oakland, Calif. | **5,652 | **8,655 | **6,126 | **9,510 |
| Oklahoma City, Okl. | 5,250 | 7,350 | 5,500 | 7,900 |
| Omaha, Nebraska | 5,300 | 8,533 | 5,830 | 9,328 |
| Philadelphia, Pa. | 5,500 | 8,900 | 5,800 | 9,300 |
| Pittsburgh, Pa. | 5,600 | 8,900 | 5,900 | 9,200 |
| Portland, Oregon | 5,350 | 8,600 | 5,550 | 9,275 |
| Rochester, New York | 5,700 | 10,260 | 6,215 | 11,115 |
| St. Louis, Missouri | 5,400 | 8,640 | 5,670 | 9,450 |
| San Francisco, Calif. | 6,365 | 10,395 | 6,865 | 11,245 (MA Equiv) |
| Seattle, Washington | 5,330 | 6,380 | 5,905 | 8,435 |
| Toledo, Ohio | 5,000 | 8,000 | 5,200 | 8,400 |
| Tulsa, Oklahoma | 5,000 | 7,400 | 5,400 | 8,200 |
| Washington, D. C. | 5,350 | 9,350 | 5,850 | 9,850 |
| Wichita, Kansas | 5,100 | 6,765 | 5,450 | 8,270 |
| MINNEAPOLIS | 5,400 | 9,200 | 5,900 | 10,400 |

* 1965-66 schedule - 4.2% increase proposed for 1966-67

** 1965-66 schedule - 6% increase proposed for 1966-67

SOURCE: Superintendent's office, Minneapolis Public Schools

TABLE VI

REASONS FOR TEACHERS LEAVING THE
MINNEAPOLIS PUBLIC SCHOOLS

| | 62-63 | 63-64 | 64-65 |
|---|----------|-----------|-----------|
| Compulsory Retirement | 17 | 18 | 12 |
| Wish to Retire | 46 | 38 | 32 |
| Deceased | 3 | 1 | 10 |
| Family Responsibility | 43 | 17 | 17 |
| Homemaking | 6 | 9 | 5 |
| Leaving city to be with Husband | 71 | 51 | 50 |
| Marriage | 5 | 12 | 15 |
| Maternity | 61 | 53 | 50 |
| Other position | 9 | 18 | 54 |
| Other Teaching posi- tion in Minnesota | 25 | 28 | 30 |
| Other Teaching Posi- tion out of Minn. | 21 | 9 | 26 |
| Health | 25 | 3 | 9 |
| Personal | 23 | 7 | 29 |
| Requested by Adm. | 9 | 8 | 0 |
| Study or Travel | 12 | 15 | 23 |
| Unknown | <u>3</u> | <u>29</u> | <u>20</u> |
| TOTAL | 379 | 316 | 382 |

TABLE VII

CERTIFICATED PERSONNEL IN MINNEAPOLIS PUBLIC SCHOOLS
COMPARISON OF MEN AND WOMEN EMPLOYED

| <u>Year</u> | <u>Men</u> | | | <u>Total Men</u> | <u>% of Total Certificated</u> |
|----------------------------|-------------------|------------------|--------------|------------------|--------------------------------|
| | <u>Elementary</u> | <u>Secondary</u> | <u>Other</u> | | |
| 1965-66 | | | | 1191* | 37.3% |
| 1964-65 | 259.9 | 828.6 | 64.6 | 1153.1 | 36.6 |
| 1963-64 | 263.9 | 798.5 | 46.0 | 1108.4 | 35.8 |
| 1962-63 | 248.3 | 763.3 | 44.0 | 1055.6 | 35.1 |
| 1961-62 | 234.9 | 728.6 | 37.5 | 1001.0 | 34.2 |
| 1960-61 | 223.8 | 728.4 | 35.5 | 987.7 | 33.9 |
| | <u>Women</u> | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| 1956-66 | | | | 2003* | 62.7% |
| 1964-65 | 1271.2 | 610.8 | 117.0 | 1999.0 | 63.4 |
| 1963-64 | 1263.3 | 619.0 | 108.3 | 1990.6 | 64.2 |
| 1962-63 | 1250.3 | 594.9 | 104.5 | 1949.7 | 64.9 |
| 1961-62 | 1235.1 | 582.5 | 105.1 | 1922.7 | 65.8 |
| 1960-61 | 1224.5 | 603.8 | 99.4 | 1927.7 | 66.1 |
| <u>Total Men and Women</u> | | | | | |
| 1965-66 | | | | 3194* | |
| 1964-65 | 1531.1 | 1439.4 | 181.6 | 3152.1 | |
| 1963-64 | 1527.1 | 1417.5 | 154.3 | 3099.0 | |
| 1962-63 | 1498.6 | 1358.2 | 148.5 | 3005.3 | |
| 1961-62 | 1470.0 | 1311.1 | 142.6 | 2923.7 | |
| 1960-61 | 1448.3 | 1332.2 | 134.9 | 2915.4 | |

* as of February 1966

TABLE VIII

Minneapolis Public Schools

Class Size by Years and by Types of Schools

| | September: 1965 | 1964 | 1963 | 1962 | 1961 | 1960 | 1959 |
|------------------|--------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Kindergarten | 28.6 | 28.8 | 29.6 | 29.2 | 30.1 | 30.2 | 30.6 |
| Elementary (1-6) | 29.6 | 29.4 | 30.3 | 31.4 | 31.4 | 31.9 | 32.3 |
| Junior High | 29.2 | 29.2 | 29.2 | 29.8 | 30.2 | 30.0 | 29.8 |
| Senior High | 27.7 | 28.2 | 28.7 | 28.4 | 28.5 | 28.5 | 28.3 |
| | 1958 | 1957 | 1956 | 1955 | 1954 | 1953 | 1952 |
| Kindergarten | 29.9 | 29.8 | 30.4 | 29.8 | 30.1 | 30.2 | 30.8 |
| Elementary (1-6) | 32.4 | 31.9 | 33.1 | 32.9 | 33.4 | 33.9 | 34.5 |
| Junior High | 30.2 | 29.5 | 31.0 | 30.9 | 31.1 | 31.3 | 31.2 |
| Senior High | 28.7 | 28.0 | 28.6 | 28.8 | 28.3 | 28.6 | 28.4 |
| | 1951 | 1950 | 1949 | 1948 | 1947 | 1946 | |
| Kindergarten | 31.1 | 29.2 | 29.2 | 30.0 | 31.2 | 29.9 | |
| Elementary (1-6) | 35.0 | 35.1 | 35.3 | 35.3 | 36.0 | 36.0 | |
| Junior High | 31.5 | 31.1 | 31.1 | 31.1 | 31.8 | 31.9 | |
| Senior High | 27.6 | 27.8 | 28.4 | 28.7 | 30.1 | 29.1 | |

TABLE IX

BASIC FINANCIAL DATA

HENNEPIN COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICTS

Source: "Basic Financial Data in Minnesota Public School Districts," February, 1966, Minnesota Education Association

| <u>School</u> | <u>1965-66 Enrollment</u> | <u>1964 Total Assessed Valuation</u> | <u>1964 Tax Rate--in Mills¹</u> | <u>Maintenance Cost Per Pupil Unit in Average Daily Attendance²</u> | <u>Rank, Maintenance Cost Per Pupil Unit</u> |
|-----------------|-------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Minneapolis | 71,569 | 418,219,210 | 79.30 ³ | 441. | 9 |
| Bloomington | 18,620 | 36,643,641 | 173.06 | 380. | 12 |
| Eden Prairie | 1,450 | 2,969,697 | 149.66 | 340. | 15 |
| Edina | 9,666 | 32,187,959 | 184.56 | 463. | 5 |
| Hopkins | 9,504 | 30,313,403 | 145.92 | 453. | 6 |
| Golden Valley | 1,533 | 6,623,235 | 149.84 | 496. | 2 |
| Minnetonka | 7,121 | 15,633,609 | 194.56 | 466. | 4 |
| Mound | 2,870 | 6,882,603 | 190.26 | 493. | 3 |
| Orono | 1,888 | 4,555,413 | 192.58 | 500. | 1 |
| Osseo | 9,534 | 11,849,378 | 196.12 | 377. | 13 |
| Richfield | 11,326 | 26,914,667 | 169.02 | 452. | 7 |
| Robbinsdale | 23,541 | 40,807,579 | 154.74 | 370. | 14 |
| St. Anthony | 1,751 | 6,475,030 | 115.50 | 440. | 10 |
| St. Louis Park | 11,100 | 33,602,647 | 151.14 | 451. | 8 |
| Wayzata | 4,846 | 11,110,270 | 187.98 | 441. | 9 |
| Brooklyn Center | 2,375 | 3,112,531 | 215.28 | 407. | 11 |

¹ This is the 1964 rate payable in 1965.

² This is for the 1964-65 school year. The maintenance cost per pupil unit excludes transportation costs.

³ The booklet "City of Minneapolis Financial Statistics," issued annually by the Board of Estimate and Taxation, shows a total tax rate for this year of 79.28 mills. This does not include the school's share of the levy for the Municipal Employees Retirement Association, estimated at 2.99 mills. This would make a total levy for the school system of 82.27 mills.

TABLE X

TOTAL ENROLLMENT, MINNEAPOLIS PUBLIC SCHOOLS

| | <u>Elementary</u> | <u>Secondary</u> | <u>Total</u> |
|-----------|-------------------|------------------|--------------|
| Fall 1966 | 39,195 | 32,050 | 71,245* |
| 1965 | 39,690 | 31,874 | 71,564 |
| 1964 | 39,479 | 32,067 | 71,546 |
| 1963 | 40,223 | 31,865 | 72,088 |
| 1962 | 40,971 | 30,819 | 71,790 |
| 1961 | 40,689 | 29,971 | 70,660 |
| 1960 | 40,712 | 30,371 | 71,083 |
| 1959 | 41,171 | 30,532 | 71,703 |
| 1958 | 42,118 | 29,679 | 71,797 |
| 1957 | 42,286 | 29,187 | 71,473 |
| 1956 | 42,141 | 28,998 | 71,139 |

* Estimated