Keeping Schools Open in Depression Era Texas: The CWA and the 1933-34 School Year

Lynn M. Burlbow

Follow this and additional works at: http://scholarworks.sfasu.edu/ethj

Part of the United States History Commons

Tell us how this article helped you.

Recommended Citation
Available at: http://scholarworks.sfasu.edu/ethj/vol49/iss1/6
Keeping Schools Open in Depression Era Texas: The CWA and the 1933-1934 School Year

By Lynn M. Burlbow

By the middle of 1933 the economic condition in the United States was anything but bright. Nationally, hundreds of thousands of men and women were out of jobs. From a probable number of 5,000,000 unemployed during the 1922-1929 period, "the number of unemployed had risen to a figure which was estimated at over 10,000,000 in 1931, and in June, 1933, at 12,000,000 or more — a quarter of the number listed as 'gainfully employed.'"

Hundreds of businesses had closed their doors and in the four years before 1932, "forty-five thousand miles of railway had gone into bankruptcy courts and into the hands of receivers and trustees."

While businesses had suffered greatly during the early 1930s, schools had not escaped the effect of reduced revenues. Writing in 1937, the Information Service of the WPA reported

Lack of funds, ordinarily accruing from various tax sources for school purposes, in addition to heavy indebtedness harassed the school officials of many states, districts, and counties. New school construction, except in rare instances, had been halted. The making of extensive repairs, in thousands of cases was out of the question. In many places, school terms had been cut short so that the salaries of teachers might be saved. In many other places, because of shifts in population and for other reasons, schools were badly over crowded. Many were the instances where pupils got only half-day instruction. In Texas, the situation was equally bad and, as businesses closed and property values declined, schools suffered. This paper looks at what the short-lived Civil

Lynn M. Burlbow is an Associate Professor in the Department of Teaching, Learning, and Culture at Texas A&M University.
Works Program can tell the reader about federal funding for schools in Texas during the 1933-1934 school year.

Civil Works Administration

The day after the 1933 election, on November 9, 1933, “President Franklin Roosevelt issued an executive order that promised a massive work relief effort during the winter months of 1933 and 1934.”

In a speech delivered in New York, Harry Hopkins, Federal Administrator of the Emergency Relief program explained the newly created plan,

I had a perfectly good speech this afternoon which was knocked into a cocked hat by the President a couple of hours ago, so I am going to talk really about a new plan which has been announced. . . .Some of us are getting awfully sick of it, of these millions of people being on relief. Well, they are coming off. That is the essence of the President's new plan. Two million families are coming off relief a week from today, and they are going to be given real jobs; and two million more families are going to be given jobs within thirty days. Four million American men are going to be put to work within thirty days on real jobs. . . .The Public Works Administration is going to give to me as the Civil Works Administrator—I was appointed to that office this morning by the President—$50,000,000 a month for these two million families, and we, the Federal government, the states, the cities and the counties are going to continue to put in the $65,000,000 a month that we are now spending for wages and materials. Second, we propose to organize in thirty days additional public works project which will not be done under contract but under what is known as force account in cities all over the United States,...

Using $450 million borrowed from the Federal Emergency Relief Administration, Harry Hopkins found work for millions
of Americans through the Civil Works Administration. “Divided into federal, state, and local organizations, the Civil Works Administration funded projects that state and local governments could no longer afford.” Freed of, and deliberately ignoring, government regulations, Harry Hopkins, through the CWA, “moved with lightening speed to employ four million workers by December 15, 1933.”

This informality would be the undoing of the CWA however.

Because the CWA had been rather haphazardly organized and not fully explained to the American public, confusion and discontent surfaced. Private businessmen believed that the CWA should utilize their services, following the pattern of the PWA, although Hopkins took care to avoid large-scale projects that duplicated PWA programs.

The appearance, and in some cases the actual occurrences, of corruption spelled the end of the CWA program and, even as it was just beginning to improve lives, “the Roosevelt administration announced in January its plans to terminate the CWA by the spring of 1934.” The initial termination date was announced to be May 1 but was later changed to April 1.

Even though the program was short-lived, the CWA had an effect on public schools. According to the Information Service Report, across the United States, a total of 2,200 new schools were built and 41,600 schools were repaired or improved.

Several thousand applications for aid were submitted from Texas. The actual benefit of the CWA to teacher in schools in Texas was very small as only 51 school districts out of over 7000 filed applications for supplemental salaries. Even though this is a very small percentage, by analyzing the applications, certain information about schools in Texas can be uncovered.

Changes in Texas

Over the ten years prior to the 1933-1934 school year, the school population in Texas had increased 20%. In 1930, the
number of students of students counted as being in school increased 9.5% solely as a result of a counting change; 6 year-old students were counted for the first time. Prior to this counting 6 year-old children had been attending school but had not been counted in the official census (See Table 1: Total Student Enrollment).\textsuperscript{11}

The number of pupils in average daily attendance by 1932-33 \textbf{exceeded} the number in 1930-31 by approximately 20,000. Even though a real effort was apparently put forth to allocate a larger percentage of the Total Current Expenses in 1932-33 to Instructional Service, the increased attendance, as well as other factoy leading to a larger pupil-teacher ratio, have made it decidedly difficult, and in most cases impossible, to continue the same high type of instructional services preceding this period of retrenchments (emphasis in original).\textsuperscript{12}

![Total Student Enrollment](chart)

Total enrollment increased 17\% between 1926 and 1933 but the increase was not evenly distributed. In common schools, those run by county school boards, the increase was only one percent while in the independent school districts, the increase was 29\%. This clearly reflects the statewide move to consolidate schools and towns and cities to set up school districts independent of county school governance. The following chart shows the dramatic change in enrollments in common and independent

\[\text{Total Student Enrollment}\]

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
Year & White Students & Black Students & Total Enrollment \\
\hline
1926 & 100,000 & & & & & & \\
1928 & 150,000 & & & & & & \\
1930 & 200,000 & & & & & & \\
1932 & 250,000 & & & & & & \\
1934 & 300,000 & & & & & & \\
1936 & 350,000 & & & & & & \\
1938 & 400,000 & & & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{center}
Changes in Student Enrollment
Common Schools and Independent Schools

schools over the ten year period, 1926 to 1935.

Clearly, then, the rise in the number of students in schools created an increased financial burden on schools, both county and independent. In order to provide the instruction for the increased number of students, more teachers were needed. During the six years prior to 1931, the number of teachers employed by districts had also increased (See Chart 3: Texas Teacher Employment$^{13}$).

The chart illustrates how teacher employment, which had been increasing steadily during the late 1920s, leveled off during the first years of the 1930s even as student enrollment in the independent schools began its big increase.

Funding Texas Schools

In 1933, Texas schools were funded through a combination of local taxes and state appropriations. This is still true of school funding in Texas today with the addition of a small percentage from the Federal government through Title programs. As economic conditions worsened in the early 1930s, the value of local property decreased and tax revenues shrank, both at
the local level and the state level. Businesses, which had paid county taxes to support schools either closed or were unable to pay their taxes as sales revenues declined. In one Frio County school district, tax collections were only 26% of the budgeted amount.\textsuperscript{14}

The \textit{Biennial Reports} give information on the annual assessed value of property in the various independent school districts. An examination of the assessed values show the following changes during the years between 1931 and 1934. The greatest change from 1931 to 1932 was 29\% in the Edinburg ISD (Hidalgo Co), from 1931 to 1933 was 38\% in Orangefield ISD (Orange Co), and from 1931 to 1934 was 51\% in Rangerville ISD (Cameron Co). Two of these three districts are in far south Texas.

This condition is confirmed by the \textit{Biennial Report of the State Board of Education, 1934-1936} where it was written:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change from 1931 to</th>
<th>1932</th>
<th>1933</th>
<th>1934</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Change from 1931 to</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change from 1932 to</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change from 1933 to</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There has been an accepted responsibility by the State which has operated to offset unjustifiable educational inequalities. The system of financing public elementary and secondary schools in Texas is characterized by its dual nature which is particularly significant because the last six-year period reveals an increasing amount of State participation, while the same period shows a marked decrease in local school support due to the apparent decline in taxable values and incident delinquency in payment of the property tax, the only source of revenue of any concern that has even been open to local effort for school support.\textsuperscript{15}

Even with this statement, the actual dollar amount of the state appropriation to schools per scholastic year had been reduced
in the 1933-1934 school year to a level lower than it had been during the previous five years. The table above shows the pattern of state appropriations for the years 1926-1938.

Had the decline in appropriation been the only change in funding schools, maintaining a level budget would have been difficult. However, the appropriations were money listed on paper but not actually available to the schools to pay their obligations. Payments from the state had been in arrears since the 1930-1931 school year.

At the beginning of the biennium, September 1, 1932, a deficit of $3.50 remained in the 1931-32 per capita apportionment. When the new administration began on January 15, 1933, the first $1 payment on the $16 apportionment for the 1932-33 [year] had just been made, and the problem of paying a $16 apportionment from resources accumulated over a period of eight months instead of a full twelve-month period was faced, since the resources of the other four months were exhausted paying off the aforesaid $3.50 deficit.

Of the total of $16 per capita apportioned for 1932-33, $11 was paid by the end of the scholastic year, bring forward into the year 1933-34 a deficit of $5. During the scholastic year 1933-34 this $5 deficit was paid
and, in addition, $14 of the total amount of the $16 per capita apportionment for said year was also paid before the end of the year, which made a total payment of $19 per capita to the school children of Texas during the twelve-month period ending August 31, 1934. There remained a deficit of $2 to be carried over into the 1934-35 scholastic year. The scholastic apportionment for 1934-35 was fixed at $16.50 per capita.\(^{16}\)

Had districts received all of the appropriation in a timely manner (all funds were received by August but schools had been dismissed in April, May or June) the situation would not have been as difficult. One change which came out of the state's attempt to make funds available to schools in a more timely manner was the policy of allowing taxpayers to make partial payments — half in December and the other half in June.

Against this backdrop of increasing enrollments, reduction in property values and state appropriations for education, teachers' salaries became an issue for schools in Texas. Teachers' salaries in Texas had never been high. "For all the population groups and school divisions, the median salaries for Texas are exceedingly low, compared with the corresponding national medians. They are at least 25 percent below the salaries of the nation."\(^{17}\) Texas teachers however were not the only teachers facing a bleak future as teachers across the nation were facing salary reductions and/or dismissals.

During the first two years of the depression, the great majority of American teachers and educational leaders faced the future with comparative cheerfulness. Many educators had shared in a modest way the expansive psychology which pervaded most walks of life in the late 1920's and the belief had begun to grow that the golden age of American education was just ahead. The downswing in the economic cycle was largely an academic matter to be seriously discussed in college.
classrooms only. The usual lag occurred between the downswing of business and industrial activities, and in reduction in expenditures for education. The high point in the average teacher's salary was reached about 1931, and reductions in his salary became most marked only after 1932. After 1932, the downswing became less and less an academic matter, and more and more an increasingly distasteful experience with reductions in salaries, shortening of school terms, greatly increased oversupply of certified teachers, intensified competition for teaching positions, and actual loss of jobs formerly thought secure.\textsuperscript{18}

This condition was no different in Texas — funding shortages for teachers' salaries had become very a significant issue by 1932. In a \textit{Newsweek} story, the editors had written about the New York State Teachers Association study of teachers and the reductions in their salaries:

About $20,000,000 has been lopped from school budgets throughout New York State in the past year. This saving was accomplished largely; by cutting teachers' salaries. Salary cuts averaged 10 percent, though sometimes running as high as 33 1/3 percent. \ldots In addition, such educational services as Summer schools, kindergartens, music classes, recreation and playground service, medical and dental care, evening and Americanization classes, have been curtailed or eliminated to reduce expenses.\textsuperscript{19}

In the same column, \textit{Newsweek} reported on the New York Governor's commission which released its report a week after the Association's report. Although the commission suggested a return of the school appropriation to the same level as the 1932-1933 school year; the legislature had cut the budget to a figure
10\% lower than that. The Governor’s commission said it would “prefer to see classes increased in size, to see teachers adopt a heavier program of teaching, even to see salaries further cut, than to deprive children of a well-rounded education and equal opportunity.”20

The following table shows changes in the average salary of Texas teachers during the years 1924 to 1935. The average salary for the 1935-1936 school year had nearly returned to the level of the 1931-1932 school year (i.e., $1022.00 as compared to $1025.18).21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Average Dollars per Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1924</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1925</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1926</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1927</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1928</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1929</td>
<td>1100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1931</td>
<td>1300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1932</td>
<td>1400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1933</td>
<td>1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1934</td>
<td>1600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Districts, faced with declining revenues and increasing student enrollments, were forced to seek additional help. In November 1933 the perfect solution seemed to appear. The Civil Works Administration would make grants to districts to help with school funding for salaries, repairs, improvements, and new educational programs. Fifty-one districts completed and submitted applications requesting assistance in paying teachers’ salaries for the completion of the 1933-1934 school year. The applications of the fifty-one districts form the raw data for this paper.22

Records of over 7250 applications for projects were submitted from Texas for funding.23 Among the various projects approved in Texas, several had a direct impact on the education of the State’s citizens, both children and parents. The aid to schools can be classified in four coding categories: E, R, S, and T. Each of these codes referred to a different type of funding support.
Code E referred to projects which improved the conditions of schools (e.g., painting of buildings and refinishing desks; rebuilding schools; landscaping school grounds for safety purposes) and access to schools (e.g., road improvement).

Code R referred to projects designed to improve access to school and public libraries either by lengthening hours or increasing the number of books available or provide funds to develop and deliver adult education, primarily literacy, programs. No new teachers were hired under this category’s code.

Code S referred to projects where school districts needed money to finish paying teachers’ salaries to the end of the school year. The teachers were already on the school faculty but the district lacked funds to pay them for nine months.

Code T referred to projects where unemployed teachers were hired to teach in schools - where the scholastic population was growing, to provide adult parenting education, to initiate bilingual programs. Some projects requested teachers who educated pre-school children while parents worked.

This paper focuses solely on the projects which were coded in the “S” category, those where districts asked a supplement to fund teachers’ salaries to the end of the regularly scheduled school year. Thirty-one counties in Texas received funding to supplement teachers’ salaries for the 1933-1934 school year. The majority of the counties are from the eastern part of Texas, the most populous part of the state (Map 1 on the following page shows the counties from which applications were submitted). There is a concentration of counties in the Big Thicket section of Texas where logging is a major industry as well as in far South
Texas Counties
Applications for Teacher Aid Submitted

Map 1: Counties where CWA Applications Originated
School Continuation Funding, Code S-16

Texas and Central Texas. In the Medina/Frio area goat and sheep ranching was the major industry while peanuts and other row crops were the agriculture base in the San Saba to Eastland/Erath area of Central Texas. In those thirty-one counties, a total of fifty-one different school organizations received funding. Eighteen of the fifty-one school organizations were common school (county) districts. In twenty-five of the 51 schools organizations, the high schools were listed as accredited high schools in the Bulletin No. 334 of the State Department of Education.24

As stated, data for this paper was taken from the applications for aid filed by different school districts in Texas. Although the applications asked for the same standard information, not
all applications were filled out in the same detail. Differences
can be found in description of the schools (variation in names
and location), staff hired by the funds, and reasons for the
application. All applications asked for budgets (these were
uniformly completed) but not all applications include the
explanations in equal detail. For some schools and teachers,
gender and ethnicity are listed, but on most only the word teacher
or a name. In Raymondville (Willacy Co), Waller (Waller
Co), and La Feria (Cameron Co), the applications specifically
listed teachers for “colored” schools. Gillette School District
#4 (Karnes Co) applied for funds to keep its schools open the
usual eight months and requested funding for one teacher for
the “Mexican” school. The teacher in the “Mexican” school
received a salary of $.61 per hour; other teachers in the school
received a salary of $.64 per hour.

On various applications, teachers are listed by name, by subject
and grade level with and without names, and just as “teacher,”
sometimes male or female. In the case where names are listed,
one can often examine a Biennial Report and determine the
subject taught and the teacher’s tenure in the school district. On
other applications, where the subject is all that is listed, it is
possible to work the process in reverse and determine teachers’
names.

The application asked for personnel to be paid for by the funds
to be classified as skilled, semi-skilled, and unskilled; however,
the manner in which districts listed teachers is inconsistent.
In some districts, teachers are classified as skilled whereas in
others they are classified as semi-skilled. There is no pattern
of classification to be discerned by looking at the salaries paid
or the position of the person classified. For example, in the
application from Tabasco Consolidated Independent School
District (Edinburg, Hidalgo County), the superintendent, S. D.
Hendrix, who taught two history classes is listed as semi-skilled
and paid $1.90 per hour. In the same district, Haupf Edwards,
the manual training teacher was also listed as semi-skilled and paid
$1.08 an hour. Because of this inconsistency, and the fact that
teachers were not consistently listed by name and subject they taught, it is difficult to draw any conclusions about how many teachers/administrators were in each classification. Whether the recipient of the funds was classified as un-, semi-, or skilled on many applications may be a function of where the secretary typing the application began the listing.

**Term of School**

The period for which the requests were being made varied from seven days (Yancey #16, Medina Co) to sixteen weeks (e.g., Nance Prairie #70, Grayson Co; Tabasco CISD; Hidalgo Co). In most cases, the request is made to keep school in session to complete the regular session. A regular session appears to have ranged from as little as six or seven months (Nance Prairie #70, Grayson Co. and Jarrett, Lampasas Co. respectively) to nine months. Twenty-eight school districts reported holding school for nine months; nine schools reported an eight month term. These requests are consistent with the data shown in the *Twenty-Eighth Biennial Report.*

The value the districts placed on education is evident from the language they used in the applications. Phrases such as “maintaining elementary and secondary schools . . . for a normal term” (LaFeria ISD, Cameron Co), “to enable the Garwood school to run a normal term” (Garwood, Colorado Co.), “to extend length of school term . . . to normal length of nine months” (Edna Hill, Erath Co.), and “extending the school thirty-three days in order to complete the regular school term” (Peach Tree #23, Medina Co.) demonstrate the value the schools placed on education and the importance of keeping it “normal” schedule even in times of financial difficulty.

**Hours of Work per week**

On some of the applications, a per hour salary is listed; on others the salary is listed for the term of the application, in days, months, or weeks. Using the information provided, it is possible to calculate the hours teachers were paid per week; teachers
were either paid for a thirty-five hour week or a forty hour week. These hours per week numbers are not given in any of the Biennial Reports published by the State Board of Education or Superintendent of Schools.

**Salaries**

The amount requested for teacher salaries ranged from $.25 to $.40 an hour for black teachers and from $.50 to $1.20 per hour for white teachers. Administrator, principals and superintendents, salary requests ranged from a dollar (Rangerville ISD, Cameron Co) to $1.90 per hour (Tabasco ISD, Edinburg, Hidalgo Co). On most applications (fifty percent), salary requests were for the same dollar amount per hour for all teachers in a school, regardless of what they taught or how long they had been at the school. Tenure and subject, which was not the usual case, can be learned by reading the Biennial Reports. On the other applications, differences in pay rates, likely based on tenure and gender, are evident as there are multiple per-hour figures listed.

**Summary**

During the 1933-1934 school year, Texas schools faced a severe financial strain, both in terms of absolute dollars and in access to dollars appropriated on paper, primarily due to lowered tax collections. A few districts in the state applied for and received short-term additions to their funding from the Civil Works Administration. Some of the funds were used to pay teachers' salaries for the balance of the school year.

Although the CWA program to supplements to teachers' salaries expired on April 1, 1934, Texas did receive a significant influx of money during the period of February 2, 1934, to June 30, 1934, much of it from the CWA program. The Statistical Report prepared by the Texas Director of Emergency Education Programs, George H. Fern, reported that 847 elementary schools (784 white, 63 black) and 586 high schools (554 white, 32 black) serving 91,777 elementary students (88,979 white, 2,798 black) and 51,669 high school students (50,307 white, 1,362 black).
black) received funding from the program. 4,999 teachers had received a total of $619,170.36 in salary. The days worked ranged from fewer than ten (3%) to between seventy and eighty (4%). Seventy percent of the teachers worked between twenty and forty-nine days with approximately twenty-eight percent working twenty to twenty-nine days and twenty-four percent working forty to forty-nine days.

Eighty-four percent of the elementary teachers received a monthly salary of between seventy and one hundred dollars. Among high school teachers, 89% of them received a salary in the same range. The lowest paid ten percent received less than $60.00 per month in salary. The statistical report does not contain enough detail to ascertain if there was a difference in the average salaries paid black and white teachers.

The analysis of the applications reveals several things: While there were differences in how much teachers were paid district to district, the applications usually asked for a uniform hourly rate and hours within a district, regardless of gender or time of tenure of the districts' teachers. Administrators did receive a higher salary although this, too, varied from district to district.

Only three applications indicate that the supplements were for teachers in schools where minority students were enrolled. Matching school names with classifications in the School Adequacy Survey of 1934-1935, revealed that five of the fifty-one schools were for black students.

While only a short-lived infusion of money into the school systems, the CWA was able to support schools for the brief period in 1934, enabling them to complete their school terms of eight or nine months. The modification of tax collection and distribution of student apportionment from the state that occurred in 1934 eased some of the shortage going into the 1934-1935 academic year. The CWA program had done what Roosevelt had asked Hopkins to accomplish, "... American men are going to be put to work within thirty days on real jobs."
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