



LIBRARIES

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-MADISON

Our small enrollment rural schools. [1935]

Wisconsin Teachers Association

Madison, Wisconsin: Wisconsin Teachers Association, [1935]

<https://digital.library.wisc.edu/1711.dl/VHIXX4PJKFGW48C>

This material may be protected by copyright law (e.g., Title 17, US Code).

For information on re-use, see

<http://digital.library.wisc.edu/1711.dl/Copyright>

The libraries provide public access to a wide range of material, including online exhibits, digitized collections, archival finding aids, our catalog, online articles, and a growing range of materials in many media.

When possible, we provide rights information in catalog records, finding aids, and other metadata that accompanies collections or items. However, it is always the user's obligation to evaluate copyright and rights issues in light of their own use.

F 502
8 E 25
RU

Pam 56-840 +



OUR

SMALL ENROLLMENT

RURAL SCHOOLS



Published By The

WISCONSIN TEACHERS ASSOCIATION

Madison, Wisconsin

100

FOREWORD

No phase of rural education has received more attention during recent years than the *size* of rural schools. It is a common subject of editorial comment and public discussion. For the most part, however, consideration accorded this important problem has been limited to broad generalities and citation of extreme cases. Recognizing the many inter-relating factors involved in rural school organization and the need for some basic facts on the rural school enrollment problem, the Wisconsin Teachers Association herein sets forth the findings which are believed to be requisite to any sound approach to rural school re-organization. This booklet makes no attempt to evaluate rural school work but confines itself specifically to enrollments and factors which cannot be excluded from a sincere treatment of the problem. It is, admittedly, only a beginning of what needs to be done. We hope it will be sufficiently revealing to interest those who have applied time and effort to the rural school problem.

WISCONSIN TEACHERS ASSOCIATION

Madison, Wisconsin
January, 1935

Contents

Foreword	1
The Rural School Situation in Wisconsin	3
Rural School Enrollments 1933-34	5
Small Schools Per Counties 1929-30, 1933-34	7
Number of Large One-Teacher Schools Per County	11
Cost of Maintaining Rural Schools in 14 Counties	13
Cost of Maintaining Transport Schools in 14 Counties	14
The Rural Situation in Specific Counties	
Bayfield	15
Columbia	18
Dane II (Western Dane)	19
Dodge	21
Douglas	23
Grant	25
Green Lake	28
Iowa	30
Jefferson	32
Juneau	33
LaFayette	35
Marquette	37
Rock	39
Waushara	41
What Can Be Saved By Combining the Smaller Rural Schools of Wisconsin	43

The Rural School Situation In Wisconsin



IN WISCONSIN, as in more than half of the other states, the district is the unit of control and administration in school affairs. In rural areas this unit is generally comparatively small both in number of pupils and taxable value of property. The advisability of combining the smaller rural school districts has frequently been under consideration, especially during recent years. Up to the present time, however, any discussion of the Wisconsin rural school problem has consisted of citing a few extreme cases rather than a careful analysis of the entire problem. Arguments for closing the smaller rural schools have been fiscal rather than educational, and varying statements of the amount of money that might be saved are often made. To date these statements have not been substantiated by a detailed study of the situation.

Purpose of This Study

An effort has been made in this study to compile data relative to the possibility of combining the smaller rural schools in Wisconsin so that some basis for estimating how much could be saved by so doing would be available. In this study, schools with 15 or fewer pupils are considered small schools. The combinations are evaluated from a financial point of view and only cases where the combining of schools would be likely to result in an immediate monetary saving are considered feasible. No attempt has been made in this study to compare the educational offering of the large and small rural school, but it should be pointed out that previous studies¹ have shown that larger rural schools sufficiently staffed offer a better grade of instruction. There are undoubtedly several combinations of schools that should be made and will be made at some future time where it will be necessary to construct new buildings, purchase additional equipment, etc., but these are not considered here even though the added cost could well be justified by the improved educational offering. In this instance educational considerations are subordinated to financial and those combinations likely to result in greater costs are excluded. The study was undertaken in the hope that it might assist in providing a basis for the intelligent discussion of the rural school problem and to encourage future study of each small rural district to the end that all schools that could profitably be closed should not be permitted to remain open.

In an attempt to secure an unbiased cross-section of the rural school problem throughout the state we chose counties from all sections. The counties studied were Bayfield, Columbia, Western Dane, Dodge, Douglas, Grant, Green Lake, Iowa, Jefferson, Juneau, Lafayette, Marquette, Rock and Waushara.

¹ Covert, Timon. *Educational Achievements of 1-teacher and of Larger Rural Schools*. Washington, Government Printing Office, 1928. (Office of Education, Bulletin, 1928, no. 15.) (A survey of studies on this problem.)

Type of Data Necessary

To study the practicability of combining the smaller rural schools the enrollment of each school had to be secured; the distance between the smaller schools had to be ascertained; and the character of the roads determined, i.e. whether dirt, graveled, hard-surfaced, or a combination of these. Cost data for maintaining small rural schools and maintaining transport schools (a transport school is one which does not employ an active teacher but the board arranges for the education of the children from that district in some neighboring school) had to be obtained for purposes of comparison. An effort was made to have the local county superintendents of schools check the combinations which seemed possible from a map study, indicating whether the proposed combinations were good, fair, poor, or impractical. This was done for thirteen of the fourteen counties which had been selected for detailed examination.

Sources of Data

Data presented for the entire state were obtained from the State Department of Public Instruction and the cost of the smaller rural schools from the Regional Planning Board's report. The enrollment figures for the fourteen counties selected for additional study were reported to us by the county superintendents and the number of smaller schools in each of these counties was verified by the figures reported to the State Department of Public Instruction at the end of the school year. Data sheets, from which the average cost of schools enrolling 15 or fewer pupils for the fourteen counties was calculated, were made available to this office by the school of education of the University of Wisconsin. The data from several of these counties had not been checked so it is possible that minor changes in the cost figures for the schools with 15 or fewer pupils enrolled may be made. No material change from the figures reported in this study is anticipated however. The location of each school was shown on a blueprint map on file at the office of the state superintendent. The distances between schools and the types of roads between the schools were worked out from maps in the office of the State Highway Commission and all but one of the fourteen counties studied were checked by the county superintendents of schools. The county superintendents by their rating of the combinations indicated the proposed combinations which they regarded as inadvisable or impractical because of local road conditions, size and condition of the building to be used, or other factors.

Limitation of the Study

It must be recognized at the outset that a study of this kind has certain limitations. To a very large extent the study of distances between schools, character of the roads, etc., have been from a map study rather than an investigation of actual road conditions. However, where these items were checked by county superintendents, the possibility of error is slight. The question of whether a given building would satisfactorily accommodate additional pupils, as well as whether local road conditions made a given combination impractical, are matters of judgment. It should be pointed out that where this judgment was expressed it is the judgment of the local superintendent, the person in most direct contact with the local situation and not one who is unacquainted with local matters.

It must also be remembered that the distances given are distances between schools and not the distances from the homes of the pupils to the school to which

TABLE I
RURAL SCHOOL ENROLLMENTS 1933-34

Enrollment	1	2	3	4	5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21-25	26-30	31-35	36-40	41-45	46-50	51-55	56-59	60 & over	Total	Total No. Rural Teachers
County																		Total	Total No. Rural Teachers
Adams				1		7	13	14	23	6	2	3			1			70	70
Ashland						3	8	8	4	5	2	2	1					34	34
Barron						3	11	14	27	25	15	16	8	3				122	122
Bayfield			2			9	9	9	10	5	6		3	1				54	55
Brown						3	10	5	9	7	7	4	6	2		1	2	56	56
Buffalo						11	13	18	19	7	7	1	3					81	81
Burnett			1	2	1	6	9	11	10	5	2	3						60	60
Calumet			1	4	4	11	9	6	6	7		1	1					50	50
Chippewa	1		1			3	14	20	18	17	18	11	13	2	1			119	119
Clark						3	10	20	25	24	19	21	11	3	2			133	133
Columbia						17	32	27	19	11	4	4	2					116	116
Crawford					1	10	9	27	21	12	6	2	2	1				91	91
Dane (1st)						3	14	28	17	18	5	8	2					96	96
Dane (2nd)			1		1	12	18	22	11	12	12		2					91	92
Dodge			2		1	34	43	44	26	12	3	1	1					167	167
Door						1	1	5	9	5	3	5	2	5				36	36
Douglas						8	8	14	5	7	4	3						49	49
Dunn						2	12	23	30	22	16	10	4	4	1			124	125
Eau Claire						5	10	17	18	12	6	8	4	4				84	84
Florence						1	5	3	2	2	1							14	14
Fond du Lac	1	1	1			11	35	34	24	19	10	8	1					145	145
Forest						2	3	3	5	2	2	2	2	2				21	21
Grant	1	1	2			29	45	51	31	14	13	2	1	1				191	191
Green				4		18	32	30	17	7	4	3						115	115
Green Lake					1	18	27	7	2	3		1	1					60	60
Iowa			2	1		16	35	35	16	11	5		1	1				123	123
Iron						2	3	4	2	2	2							15	15
Jackson						13	20	20	14	7	6	4	5					89	89
Jefferson			2	1	2	20	32	22	14	7	5							105	105
Juneau			1	1		10	25	25	17	10	5	3						97	97
Kenosha						4	3	4	12	9	7	2	1	2				44	44
Kewaunee						2	4	11	8	9	6	3	1	1				46	46
La Crosse						7	6	16	10	12	3	3	2	2	1			62	62
Lafayette					3	15	27	21	20	15	9	2						112	112
Langlade						5	4	12	7	14	14	5	2				1	65	65
Lincoln	1		1			8	15	10	13	14	7	2	1	3				75	75
Manitowoc						6	14	14	24	11	12	7	8		2			98	99
Marathon						7	13	30	24	26	32	33	26	4	7	2	7	211	219
Marquette					1	8	12	14	17	17	8	11	6	4				98	98
Milwaukee					2	5	18	14	9	4	3	1						56	56
Monroe							4	2	3	2	3	2	3		8	1		21	21
Monroe			1			12	16	26	15	23	19	9	4	1				131	132
Oconto						6	7	7	11	13	12	13	8	4	2		1	84	84
Oneida					1	4	10	13	8		2	2	1	1	2			44	45
Outagamie						3	22	21	26	15	10	8	6	2	1	1		115	115
Ozaukee						12	8	10	7	2	5	2	1					47	47
Pepin							10	9	6	6	4	2			1			38	38
Pierce			1		1	3	16	20	21	17	12	2	5	1	1			100	100
Polk						3	5	10	16	18	13	13	3	1	1			83	84
Portage						4	10	24	23	21	16	4	5	2	2	2	2	115	117
Price						5	13	18	21	10	2	3	2				1	75	77
Racine			1			2	5	10	6	8	11	3	2	1	1	2	1	53	54
Richland						4	15	19	24	19	15	6	6	1	2	2		113	113
Rock			1			17	34	32	28	20	4	5	2		1			144	144
Rusk			1	1		6	10	18	20	13	8	2	2	5				86	87
St. Croix				1		5	26	25	26	12	12	3	3		1			114	114
Sauk			1		1	16	41	36	28	15	4	4						146	146
Sawyer						6	10	8	10	4	2	1	3	1		1		47	47
Shawano						2	8	13	22	12	12	10	10	4	5	1	2	101	101
Sheboygan						4	11	15	24	18	6	1		3	1			83	83
Taylor						3	5	9	14	9	15	8	5	4	2			74	75
Trempealeau					1	4	11	19	23	22	10	4	3	1	1			99	101
Vernon						7	16	26	23	22	21	10	10	2	1	1		139	140
Vilas						1	6	6	3	2	3	1	1					23	23
Walworth						6	16	26	17	11	9	4	4					93	93
Washburn			1			11	11	10	12	5	7	3	4					64	64
Washington						16	15	17	10	11	3	2	1					75	75
Waukesha						5	12	22	20	8	10	4	1	1				83	83
Waupaca					1	11	24	29	16	12	8	5	3	4			1	114	115
Waushara			1	1		9	30	19	18	7	1			1				87	88
Winnebago						5	12	21	19	21	4	1	2	2	1			88	89
Wood						7	12	11	17	20	10	3	7	2				89	89
Totals	1	12	22	34		550	1068	1264	1131	843	577	337	233	95	48	15	18	6248	6276

they would go if their local school were closed. While a much more scientific method would be to study the distances from the homes to the school the pupils would attend if a combination were made, this was not possible in the time available for this study. However, since the school is generally located near the center of the district, the distance between schools should be a fair approximation of the average distance the pupils would have to travel.

The State Situation

Before data are presented for the fourteen counties selected for detailed study, a preview of the entire state in some of the larger phases of the rural problem will be given.

An analysis of the rural school situation in Wisconsin in 1933-34 shows that there were 6,248 districts. This number is exclusive of closed rural schools and transport districts. One of the 6,248 districts is a three-room (three-teacher) school; twenty-six others are two-teacher rural schools, and the remaining are one-teacher rural schools. The number of rural schools divided according to enrollments and the number of rural school teachers—by counties—is shown in Table I.

Table I is interpreted in the following manner: In 1933-34 Adams County had no rural schools enrolling 1, 2 or 3 pupils. One school enrolled 4 pupils; no school enrolled five pupils; 7 schools enrolled from 6 to 10 pupils; and 13 schools 11 to 15 pupils. On the other extreme it is seen that one school enrolled from 46 to 50 pupils. Since there are 70 rural schools and also 70 rural teachers, it is apparent that all of the schools in this county are one-teacher rural schools. Thus it is evident that the school with more than 46 pupils is taught by one teacher. A further study of this table shows that 176 schools, the majority of which are taught by one teacher, have 46 or more pupils enrolled. There is as great a problem of education in the "too large" as there is in the "too small" rural school in this state.

General interest in rural school size has been directed almost exclusively toward the small school. For every small school at one end of the distribution there is an over-size school at the other end. Which of these is the greater evil depends upon whether the measure of cost or the measure of education is applied. Any readjustment which omits the large school is an unworthy adventure into educational administration. The objective should be to approach, insofar as the practical problems permit, a balanced rural school enrollment. The average number of pupils per teacher by counties, shown in Table III (p. 11), again emphasizes this point.

The opponents of the state aid system often charge that the present state aid for elementary schools increases rather than decreases the number of small rural schools. This statement is untrue for the state as a whole. In some individual counties the number of small schools has increased but in more counties there has been a decrease. The number of small rural schools for the state as a whole is smaller every year. Table II shows the number of small schools with comparative enrollments for the school years 1929-30 and 1933-34.

TABLE II
SMALL SCHOOLS PER COUNTIES 1929-30 AND 1933-34

County	Schools En-rolling 1-5 Pupils		Schools En-rolling 6-10 Pupils		Schools En-rolling 11-15 Pupils		Schools En-rolling 15 Pupils or Less	
	1929-30	1933-34	1929-30	1933-34	1929-30	1933-34	1929-30	1933-34
Adams	4	1	5	7	17	13	26	21
Ashland	1	--	6	3	9	8	16	11
Barron	2	--	1	3	6	11	9	14
Bayfield	7	2	13	9	9	9	29	20
Brown	--	--	2	--	2	3	4	3
Buffalo	3	2	13	11	17	13	33	26
Burnett	3	3	7	11	6	6	16	20
Calumet	--	5	9	4	9	11	18	20
Chippewa	1	2	8	3	12	14	21	19
Clark	--	--	6	3	10	10	16	13
Columbia	1	--	10	17	37	32	48	49
Crawford	1	1	12	10	21	9	34	20
Dane 1st]								
Dane 2nd]	1	3	16	15	26	32	43	50
Dodge	3	3	23	34	48	43	74	80
Door	--	--	--	1	2	1	2	2
Douglas	3	--	11	8	12	8	26	16
Dunn	--	--	--	2	15	12	15	14
Eau Claire	2	--	3	5	7	10	12	15
Florence	--	--	3	1	6	5	9	6
Fond du Lac	2	3	22	11	34	35	58	49
Forest	--	--	1	2	6	3	7	5
Grant	6	4	26	29	41	45	73	78
Green	4	4	12	18	26	32	42	54
Green Lake	--	1	10	18	14	27	24	46
Iowa	2	3	20	16	32	35	54	54
Iron	--	--	3	2	4	3	7	5
Jackson	4	--	9	13	11	20	24	33
Jefferson	2	5	10	20	30	32	42	57
Juneau	4	2	24	10	21	25	49	37
Kenosha	--	--	4	4	8	3	12	7
Kewaunee	--	--	--	--	1	2	1	2
La Crosse	--	--	4	7	10	6	14	13
Lafayette	5	3	12	15	26	27	43	45
Langlade	2	--	4	5	8	4	14	9
Lincoln	2	2	12	8	19	15	33	25
Manitowoc	1	--	9	6	9	14	19	20
Marathon	--	--	5	7	12	13	17	20
Marinette	3	1	11	8	18	12	32	21
Marquette	--	2	10	5	14	18	24	25
Milwaukee	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Monroe	2	1	10	12	26	16	38	29
Oconto	2	--	4	6	8	7	14	13
Oneida	--	1	5	4	13	10	18	15
Outagamie	2	--	5	3	12	22	19	25
Ozaukee	--	--	9	12	9	8	18	20
Pepin	1	--	5	--	9	10	15	10
Pierce	1	2	3	3	15	16	19	21
Polk	--	--	3	3	6	5	9	8
Portage	--	--	3	4	14	10	17	14
Price	1	--	13	5	8	13	22	18
Racine	--	1	--	2	5	5	5	8
Richland	--	--	2	4	13	15	15	19
Rock	2	1	18	17	40	34	60	52

TABLE II—(Continued)

SMALL SCHOOLS PER COUNTIES 1929-30 AND 1933-34

County	Schools Enrolling 1-5 Pupils		Schools Enrolling 6-10 Pupils		Schools Enrolling 11-15 Pupils		Schools Enrolling 15 Pupils or Less	
	1929-30	1933-34	1929-30	1933-34	1929-30	1933-34	1929-30	1933-34
Rusk.....	4	2	12	6	11	10	27	18
St. Croix.....	--	1	5	5	15	26	20	32
Sauk.....	--	2	7	16	35	41	42	59
Sawyer.....	--	1	5	6	10	10	15	17
Shawano.....	--	--	4	2	6	8	10	10
Sheboygan.....	--	--	4	4	11	11	15	15
Taylor.....	--	--	6	3	10	5	16	8
Trempealeau.....	--	1	3	4	22	11	25	16
Vernon.....	--	--	2	7	13	16	15	23
Vilas.....	1	--	5	1	10	6	16	7
Walworth.....	--	--	15	6	22	16	37	22
Washburn.....	6	1	6	11	19	11	31	23
Washington.....	2	--	4	16	18	15	24	31
Waukesha.....	--	--	5	5	11	12	16	17
Waupaca.....	--	1	11	11	17	24	28	36
Waushara.....	2	2	10	9	19	30	31	41
Winnebago.....	--	--	9	5	11	12	20	17
Wood.....	1	--	7	7	16	12	24	19
Totals.....	96	69	556	550	1069	1068	1721	1687

Table II shows that in 1929-30 Adams County had 4 schools enrolling 1 to 5 pupils, inclusive. In 1933-34 there was only one school in this group in Adams County. In 1929-30 there were 5 schools enrolling 6 to 10 pupils; in 1933-34 there were 7. The number of schools enrolling 11 to 15 pupils was 17 in 1929-30, and 13 in 1933-34. The total number of schools enrolling 15 or less pupils decreased from 26 in 1929-30 to 21 in 1933-34.

It is to be noted that several counties have materially reduced the number of small schools. Pepin County, which in 1929-30 had six schools with 10 or less enrolled, in 1933-34 had no school with ten or less enrolled; Bayfield County has reduced the number of schools with 10 or less enrolled from 20 to 11; Douglas County has reduced the same size group from 14 to 8; Juneau County from 28 to 12; Price County from 14 to 5; Vilas County from 6 to 1; and Walworth County from 15 to 6.

The totals (representing the state as a whole) show that the number of schools with 5 or less enrolled decreased from 96 to 69 in the four year period. This is a percentage decrease of more than 28. There is also a slight decrease in the number of schools enrolling 6-10 pupils (from 556 to 550) and 11-15 pupils (from 1069 to 1068). This is rather remarkable when cognizance is taken of the fact that the rural school population is decreasing. In the one year period 1932-33 to 1933-34 there was a decrease of 10 in the number of schools enrolling 5 or less pupils. Every year shows a decrease in the number of rural schools in this state. This decrease is not a happenstance. It is the result of hard work and a persistent

fight against local opposition made by county superintendents and others interested in education. Generally, the people in a community are strenuously opposed to closing their schools regardless of how small the enrollment has become and it is a tribute to the fine work and continued effort of the educational workers that so many small schools have been closed in the past. Indications for the current year point to the closing of an even greater number of small rural schools than are usually closed during a one year period.

Cost of Maintaining a Rural School in Wisconsin

The major consideration in the rural school situation at the present time is how much money (if any) could be saved by combining the smaller rural schools, and it is to this question that the present study is devoted. An attempt is made to compile data that will provide some basis for making such an estimate.

The first step is to determine the cost of rural schools of the various enrollment sizes. The cost of maintaining* Wisconsin's 6248 rural schools in 1933-34 was \$6,347,214 or \$1015.88 per school. However, since a few of these schools contain two or more teachers this figure must be adjusted to obtain the average cost of a *one-teacher* rural school. In 1933-34 in Wisconsin the average cost of a one-teacher rural school was \$1011.35.

The total cost, rather than the cost of current expenses, was used in this study. Because capital outlay and debt service are part of the cost of providing education to rural children the money spent for these items must be given consideration, and so are included. The amount of money spent for capital outlay and debt service fluctuates greatly from year to year, hence figures for a single year do not present the true picture of such costs as a long time proposition. The average expenditure for capital outlay and debt services for the ten year period 1924 to 1934 was approximately \$210 annually for the rural schools. In 1933-34 the amount spent by the rural schools for these two items averaged approximately \$110. In 1933-34 debt service and capital outlay represented approximately 10% of the rural school expenditures and over the ten year period 1924 to 1934 approximately 15%. However, due to changing conditions and conceptions of rural education and building needs in rural areas, it is doubtful if the amount spent in the past, during a single year or a long period of years, will provide a satisfactory basis for predicting capital outlay and debt service expenditures for rural schools in the future. So, while it is generally unsound to include the costs of capital outlay and debt service in comparisons representing a single year, in this case it seems advisable to do so.

The Regional Planning Board in a recent publication¹ estimated that a school with from 1-5 pupils enrolled cost approximately 65% as much as the average school; one with from 6-10 pupils, 75% as much; and a school with 11-15 pupils, 86% as much as the average. Calculated on this basis a school with from 1-5 pupils enrolled in 1933-34 cost on the average \$660.32; one with 6-10 enrolled, \$761.91; and one with from 11-15 enrolled, \$873.66. The average cost for all districts with 15 or less enrolled on this basis was \$828.50 in 1933-34. The average cost of schools with 15 or less enrolled in the 14 counties studied was \$853.61 which does not vary greatly from the figure reported by the Regional Planning Board.

* Total cost including Debt Service, Capital Outlay, etc. The cost of transport schools has, of course, been excluded.

¹ Wisconsin—Planned Progress Through Federal, State, and Local Cooperation. Regional Planning Committee's Progress Report, August 1934.

The Cost of Maintaining Transport Schools in Wisconsin

An important factor to be considered in any plan of closing the smaller rural schools is how much it would cost any given district to operate as a transport school where the children from the closed school are instructed in a neighboring school. The average cost of a transport school, of which Wisconsin had 454 in 1933-34, as reported to the state department, was \$720.77.* However, for an intelligent interpretation of this cost figure additional information is needed regarding the various transport districts, as is here presented.

It often happens, especially in the northern part of the state, that the districts are large and the same district maintains several different schools. When one of these schools becomes too small to warrant operation, the children are transferred to another school in the same district. In these cases there is no tuition charge and the only cost is for transportation. The fact that no tuition costs appear on the reports of these districts makes the cost of maintaining transport schools appear slightly less than they actually are. Last year in Wisconsin there were 67 transport schools which showed money spent for *transportation only*. In 79 schools the children from a closed school were within walking distance of a neighboring school and the only charge was the item of tuition. Since the schools which are best located for a combination with neighboring schools are generally the first to close, it is probable that in the future a larger percent of closed schools will have to provide transportation than is now the case. In this event transport schools in the future will have a higher average cost than those operating at the present time.

In 294 cases, or 65% of the transport schools, both transportation and tuition were paid last year. Fourteen transport schools either reported no money spent or failed to file claim for state aid. Since a transport district is entitled to state aid representing a large share of the money spent, the districts not claiming state aid, in all probability, spent very little if any money. The total cost of maintaining all transport schools last year (1933-34) was \$327,228.23. On the basis of 454 transport schools the average cost was \$720.77 and on the basis of the 440 indicating they had spent money and giving the amount, the average cost was \$743.70. The average for all schools paying both transportation and tuition was \$751.05. However, some of these schools have rather large enrollments so it is necessary to make a comparison of transport school costs where the enrollment is more nearly comparable to the smaller rural school before significance can be attached to a comparison of the cost of maintaining a transport school and the cost of employing a teacher to conduct a small rural school. Comparisons of these costs in comparable size schools are made for 14 counties in the state.

Large Rural Schools in Wisconsin

Any fair and comprehensive study of the rural school problem in Wisconsin must recognize the fact that the over-crowded one-teacher rural school offers as great an educational problem as the small one-teacher school. From a strictly educational point of view, this is one of the greatest problems facing effective rural instruction. In 1929-30 the Interim Committee's report on education¹ showed that there were 114 schools with 50 or more pupils enrolled. In 1933-34 there were still 81 schools in this state with 51 or more pupils enrolled. Twenty-two of these schools employed more than one teacher. However, there were still 59 rural schools

* This includes tuition and transportation costs but is exclusive of minor expenses such as cost of school board services, insurance of building, if one is employed by the district, etc.

¹ *Plan for Reorganizing Wisconsin's System of Education.*—p. 56

taught by one teacher with more than 50 pupils enrolled. It is extremely difficult to understand how one teacher (regardless of how excellent a teacher he or she is) can conduct a school of 51 or more pupils through a minimum of 25 classes per day and give each pupil the individual attention deemed so necessary in present educational practices. In the opinion of this office the requirement that a school must have 40 pupils in average daily attendance to be entitled to state aid for two teachers is a backward step educationally. With the current ratio of enrollment to attendance this means that a school of less than 45 enrollment finds it extremely difficult to qualify as a two-teacher school.

The following table (Table III) shows the number of one-teacher rural schools in each county with 51 or more pupils enrolled, together with the gross enrollment, number of teachers, and pupil-teacher ratio by counties.

TABLE III
NUMBER OF LARGE ONE-TEACHER SCHOOLS PER COUNTY
With Gross Enrollments, Number of Teachers
and Pupil-Teacher Ratios

County	Schools with 51 pupils or more taught by one Teacher	Gross En- rollment	Number of Rural Teachers	Pupil- Teacher Ratio
Adams.....	--	1,407	70	20.1
Ashland.....	1	772	34	22.7
Barron.....	--	3,322	122	27.2
Bayfield.....	--	1,095	55	19.9
Brown.....	5	1,850	56	33.0
Buffalo.....	--	1,649	81	20.4
Burnett.....	--	1,347	60	22.5
Calumet.....	--	992	50	19.8
Chippewa.....	1	3,161	119	26.6
Clark.....	2	3,901	138	28.3
Columbia.....	--	2,137	116	18.4
Crawford.....	--	1,903	91	20.9
Dane I.....	--	2,181	96	22.7
Dane II.....	--	1,804	92	19.6
Dodge.....	--	3,106	167	18.6
Door.....	--	1,081	36	30.0
Douglas.....	--	977	49	19.9
Dunn.....	--	3,207	125	25.7
Eau Claire.....	--	2,091	84	24.9
Florence.....	--	274	14	19.6
Fond du Lac.....	--	2,927	145	20.2
Forest.....	--	523	21	24.9
Grant.....	--	3,488	191	18.3
Green.....	--	2,172	115	18.9
Green Lake.....	--	899	60	15.0
Iowa.....	--	2,177	123	17.7
Iron.....	--	265	15	17.7
Jackson.....	--	1,946	89	21.9
Jefferson.....	--	1,862	105	17.7
Juneau.....	--	1,812	97	18.7
Kenosha.....	--	1,053	44	23.9
Kewaunee.....	2	1,364	46	29.7
La Crosse.....	1	1,438	62	23.2
Lafayette.....	--	2,106	112	18.8

TABLE III—(Continued)
NUMBER OF LARGE ONE-TEACHER SCHOOLS PER COUNTY
 With Gross Enrollments, Number of Teachers
 and Pupil-Teacher Ratios

County	Schools with 51 pupils or more taught by one Teacher	Gross En- rollment	Number of Rural Teachers	Pupil- Teacher Ratio
Langlade.....	2	1,713	65	26.4
Lincoln.....	--	1,623	75	21.6
Manitowoc.....	1	2,468	99	24.9
Marathon.....	8	6,786	219	31.0
Marinette.....	--	2,463	98	25.1
Marquette.....	--	970	56	17.3
Milwaukee.....	4	798	21	38.0
Monroe.....	--	3,097	132	23.5
Oconto.....	3	2,466	84	29.4
Oneida.....	1	965	45	21.4
Outagamie.....	2	2,953	115	25.7
Ozaukee.....	--	924	47	19.7
Pepin.....	1	860	38	22.6
Pierce.....	1	2,345	100	23.5
Polk.....	--	2,294	84	27.3
Portage.....	4	3,207	117	27.4
Price.....	--	1,661	77	21.6
Racine.....	3	1,478	54	27.4
Richland.....	4	2,744	113	24.3
Rock.....	1	2,833	144	19.7
Rusk.....	--	2,108	87	24.2
St. Croix.....	1	2,468	114	21.6
Sauk.....	--	2,933	146	20.1
Sawyer.....	1	1,005	47	21.4
Shawano.....	8	3,046	101	30.2
Sheboygan.....	--	1,956	83	23.6
Taylor.....	1	2,159	75	28.8
Trempealeau.....	--	2,321	101	23.0
Vernon.....	1	3,608	140	25.8
Vilas.....	--	486	23	21.1
Walworth.....	--	2,039	93	21.9
Washburn.....	--	1,341	64	21.0
Washington.....	--	1,374	75	18.3
Waukesha.....	--	2,016	83	24.3
Waupaca.....	--	2,583	115	22.5
Waushara.....	--	1,496	88	17.0
Winnebago.....	--	2,148	89	24.1
Wood.....	--	2,370	89	26.6
Totals.....	59	144,394	6,276	23.0

Table III shows for the state as a whole that there are 23 pupils for each rural teacher. In several counties the pupil-teacher ratio exceeds 25, and in one it is thirty-eight. This seems to substantiate the statement that the solution of the problem of rural education is a proper distribution of the teachers rather than an elimination of any of the teachers now employed. This situation needs study and it is possible that a complete scheme of re-districting the rural area may be the ultimate solution of the difficulties in education. While a more complete analysis of the larger rural schools would be very interesting, it is outside the province of the present study and cannot be treated here.

The Rural Situation in Specific Counties

The discussion up to this point has presented the rural school picture for the entire state. It is regretted that time and facilities have not permitted the continued analysis on a state-wide basis. Fourteen counties of the state were selected for detailed study to determine to what extent combinations of small rural schools are feasible and likely to result in an immediate saving. Counties selected are representative of the various sections of the state and had last year a large number of small rural schools either in total number or proportionately. The selected counties in alphabetical order are: (1) Bayfield, (2) Columbia, (3) Dane II, (4) Dodge, (5) Douglas, (6) Grant, (7) Green Lake, (8) Iowa, (9) Jefferson, (10) Juneau, (11) Lafayette, (12) Marquette, (13) Rock, and (14) Waushara.

The total cost of maintaining rural schools in the fourteen counties is shown in Table IV, together with the average cost per school and per teacher and the average cost of schools with 15 or fewer pupils.

TABLE IV
COST OF MAINTAINING RURAL SCHOOLS IN FOURTEEN
COUNTIES 1933-34

County	Cost	No. of Dists.	Ave. Cost Per Dist.	No. of Teachers	Ave. Cost Per Teacher	Average Cost of a School with 15 or fewer Pupils
Bayfield*..	\$51,466.32	54	\$953.08	55	\$935.75	\$1,072.59**
Columbia..	110,846.40	116	955.57	116	955.57	865.50
Dane II....	88,190.84	91	969.21	92	958.68	\$27.01
Dodge.....	153,952.44	167	921.87	167	921.87	858.94
Douglas*..	54,562.23	49	1,113.51	49	1,113.51	1,026.04
Grant.....	173,995.88	191	910.97	191	910.97	877.12
Green Lake	49,654.07	60	827.57	60	827.57	809.06
Iowa.....	101,492.86	123	825.15	123	825.15	759.39
Jefferson..	95,451.75	105	909.06	105	909.06	836.42
Juneau....	91,642.82	97	944.77	97	944.77	914.58
Lafayette..	112,808.08	112	1,007.22	112	1,007.22	904.25
Marquette	42,305.18	56	755.45	56	755.45	717.02
Rock.....	156,480.25	144	1,086.67	144	1,086.67	940.51
Waushara	70,949.41	87	815.51	88	806.24	756.57
Totals..	\$1,353,798.53	1,452	\$932.37	1,455	\$930.45	853.61

* The cost of schools with 15 or fewer pupils was based on a partial list—complete data not at present available.

** Six of the smaller schools showed an average expenditure of almost \$300 under the heading "Other Payments." Since it was possible to obtain complete data for only a limited number of the small schools of this county these six schools weigh heavily in determining the average and probably increased it over the amount that would be found if the average cost for all the small schools were available.

The average cost of maintaining a rural school in the 14 counties (1933-34) was \$932.37. However, three of the schools in these counties have two teachers so the average cost for a one-teacher school was approximately \$930.45. In one county (Marquette) the average cost of maintaining a rural school was as low as \$755.45 and in only two counties did the cost exceed the state average of \$1,015.88 per rural school. The average cost of a rural school with 15 or fewer pupils was \$853.61 in these counties.

The major basis for the selection of the counties was the number of small rural schools, which accounts for the fact that the average cost of maintaining a rural school in these counties is below the average for the state.

The average cost of maintaining a transport school in each of the 14 counties in 1933-34 is shown in Table V, together with the average cost of a transport school with 15 or fewer pupils for whom education must be provided.

TABLE V
COST OF MAINTAINING TRANSPORT SCHOOLS IN FOURTEEN
COUNTIES 1933-34

County	Cost of transport Schools	Total No. transport Schools	Ave. Cost for all transport schools	Number of transport schools with 15 or fewer pupils	Ave. Cost for transport schools with enrollment of 15 or fewer pupils
Bayfield.....	\$10,228.33	19	\$538.33	11	\$379.55
Columbia.....	18,089.35	23	786.49	16	686.39
Dane II.....	21,323.29	16	1,332.71	7	586.48
Dodge.....	11,210.73	19	590.04	16	522.33
Douglas*.....	2,634.18	5	526.84	3	578.06
Grant.....	5,401.10	12	450.09	9	324.51
Green Lake.....	4,252.00	8	531.50	7	497.86
Iowa.....	7,087.91	10	708.79	6	611.06
Jefferson.....	7,476.03	17	439.77	13	381.20
Juneau.....	7,021.00	10	702.10	9	680.31
Lafayette.....	3,917.02	8	489.63	5	267.93
Marquette.....	787.05	2	393.53	2	393.53
Rock.....	9,469.08	11	860.83	6	730.59
Waushara.....	5,683.83	10	568.38	5	431.80
Totals.....	\$114,580.90	170	\$674.01	115	\$514.56

* The two schools with more than 15 pupils pay only *transportation* costs, consequently their costs are less than the average for the other three schools which pay both *transportation* and *tuition*.

It is seen from Table V that considerable variation exists in the costs of the transport schools. Many factors account for this variation. In some cases there are very few children (one or two) in a transport school area and in other cases the number of pupils is very large (105 or more). Even in analyzing the cost of the small (15 or fewer pupils) transport schools it must be recognized that in some cases these schools have only one pupil and others 14 or 15 pupils. The distance to be traveled also influences materially the cost of any transport school. Because of the several factors influencing the cost it must not be assumed from the preceding table that the counties with a high average cost per transport school are spending more than is necessary nor that those with a small average cost per transport school are more economical. To a large extent factors not under the control of the district determine the cost of the transport schools.

In these fourteen counties the average cost of maintaining a transport district was \$674 in 1933-34, slightly less than the average cost of transport schools for

the state as a whole. When all schools with an enrollment over 15 are excluded the average cost for transport schools in the 14 counties is reduced to \$514.56 for 1933-34. However, in comparing the cost of transport with open schools, it must be recognized that in these counties there are 11 transport schools with only one pupil each. No school in any county of the entire state employs a teacher for so small an enrollment. The six transport schools in these counties which failed to report or reported no expense are not included in the calculation of the average cost for transport schools with 15 or fewer pupils. In estimating the probable cost of transport schools to be established in the future it should be borne in mind that in general the transport schools already formed are the ones where instruction for the children can be provided in a neighboring school at the least expense, and where the distance between schools is not great. Consequently, transport schools in the future will probably cost more than they do at present.

Comparative data regarding the possibility of combining the small rural schools will be presented for each of the fourteen counties selected for additional study.

Complete information could not be obtained for Grant County. However, the information which is available will be given, in the hope that it may be of some assistance to anyone desiring to investigate the possibility of combining the rural schools in this county.

In the first county (Bayfield) some discussion in interpretation of the several tables will be given. Since the data are very similar for the remaining counties the tables presented will be accompanied by a minimum of explanation.

BAYFIELD COUNTY

Number of rural schools 1933-34	54
Number of rural school teachers 1933-34	55
Number of rural schools with 15 or fewer pupils 1933-34	20
Number of transport schools 1933-34	19
Average cost of a one-teacher rural school 1933-34	\$ 935.75
Average cost of a rural school with 15 or fewer pupils 1933-34	1,072.59*
Average cost of a transport school 1933-34	538.33
Average cost of a transport school with 15 or fewer pupils 1933-34	379.55

* Complete data not available.

The preceding data are presented for each county as fundamental considerations in the formulation of a basis for estimating the possible monetary saving in combining the smaller rural schools. Information regarding possible combinations of the smaller rural schools will be presented for each of the counties. These tables will be explained for Bayfield County and should be interpreted in a like manner for the other counties.

Last year there were 54 rural schools in Bayfield County; one of them a two-teacher school. In all but three of the 14 counties studied, the number of schools and the number of school teachers are the same. In the counties where the number of schools and number of teachers are identical, the item—*number of rural school teachers 1933-34* is not given. It is seen that last year Bayfield County had 20

schools with 15 or fewer pupils enrolled. There were 19 transport schools operating in that county last year. Comparative cost figures for maintaining the average rural school, together with transport school cost, are shown. These items, previously discussed, need no additional interpretation.

This year (1934-35) one of the smaller rural schools in Bayfield County closed. Like most northern counties, Bayfield has large districts with several schools in the same district which facilitates the combination of schools as there is no tuition problem. This accounts to some extent for the comparatively large number of schools that have already closed. Table VI shows the possible combinations of the rural schools with 15 or less enrolled, the enrollment of each, the distance between schools, the character of the roads, and the rating of the county superintendent regarding the feasibility of the combinations. It must be kept in mind that the judgment regarding the possibility of combination for each of the counties is that of the local superintendent of schools.

TABLE VI
POSSIBLE RURAL SCHOOL COMBINATIONS

Bayfield County

Enrol- ment	School	Enrol- ment	School	Distance between Schools (miles)	Character of Road	Possibility of Com- bination
11	Barnes 1 (Barnes)	14	Barnes 1 (Pease)	6½	Dirt & Gravel	Fair
11	Barnes 1 (Barnes)	7	Barnes 1 (Lake)	3	Dirt	Good
9	Bayfield Jt. 1 (Sand Riv.)	18	Russel 1 (Sand Bay)	7	Dirt	Impractical
14	Cable Jt. 1 (Frels)	6	Cable State Graded	9	Gravel & Dirt	Poor
7	Delta 2 (W. Mason)	6	Barnes 1 (McNeil)	3¼	Dirt	Good
6	Delta 1 (Pike River)	30	Mason 2 (Butler)	4½	Dirt	Impractical
10	Hughes 2 (Wills)	14	Hughes 3 (Hughes)	5½	Dirt	Good
13**	Kelly 1 (Maple Ridge)	42	Kelly 1 (Yerslad)	2	Dirt	Impossible
13	Kelly 1 (Maple Ridge)	6	Mason State Graded	5	Gravel	Good
6	Kelly 1 (Olson)	21	Eileen 3	3	Dirt	Good
14	Lincoln 1 (Dybedal)	with	Grandview St. Graded	3½	Dirt & Gravel	Good
13	Namekag'n1 (Namekag'n)	24	Pratt 2	9	Dirt & Gravel	Impossible
4	Orienta 5	with	Orienta 2	4	Dirt	Impossible
4	Orienta 5	with	Pt Wing St. Graded	6	Dirt & Gravel	Good
6	Orienta 4	with	Pt. Wing St. Graded	8	Gravel	Good
7	Pratt 1 (Tank)	with	Pratt 1 (Grand View St. Graded)	6	Gravel & Dirt	Good
12	Washburn 1 (Long Lake)	with	Washburn 1 (Wilson)	2	Dirt	Poor
12	Washburn 1 (Long Lake)	with	Washburn 1 (Progressive)	3¼	Dirt	Good
12	Washburn 1 (Long Lake)	with	Washburn 2 (Four Mile Ck.)	4½	Dirt	Impossible

* Enrollment for 1933-34.

** Both buildings over-crowded now.

Studying Table VI it is clear that Barnes 1 (Barnes School) had an enrollment of 11 pupils and Barnes 1 (Pease) had an enrollment of 14 pupils in 1933-34. The distance between these two schools is 6½ miles on dirt and gravel roads. The combination is rated as fair by the local superintendent.

It is seen that the possibility of combining 14 of these smaller schools is rated as good or fair. The distance between these 14 schools, together with the type of road surface, is given in Table VII.

TABLE VII
DISTANCE AND TYPE OF ROADS BETWEEN SCHOOLS

Bayfield County

Distance	Dirt	Gravel	Surfaced	Dirt and Gravel
Less than 2 miles.....	--	--	--	--
2 Miles.....	--	--	--	--
2¼ Miles.....	--	--	--	--
2½ Miles.....	--	--	--	--
2¾ Miles.....	--	--	--	--
3 Miles—3.9 Miles.....	6	--	--	1
4 Miles—4.9 Miles.....	--	--	--	--
5 Miles—5.9 Miles.....	2	1	--	--
6 Miles—6.9 Miles.....	--	--	--	3
7 Miles—7.9 Miles.....	--	1	--	--
8 Miles and Over.....	--	1	--	--
Totals.....	8	2	--	4

In no case is the distance between schools less than three miles. In 8, or 57% of the cases, the roads connecting the schools are dirt. In 7, or 50% of the cases, the distance is 5 miles or more. In one case the distance between the two schools to be combined is 8 miles. It is apparent that the distance to be traveled and the type of road in Bayfield County between the smaller schools indicate that few really good possibilities of combining the smaller schools still exist.

While it is probably desirable that small schools even at a great distance from other schools should be combined with them, the resulting combination would in most cases cost more rather than less money. The improved educational offering would probably justify the increased cost but such combinations cannot be advocated on the basis of smaller costs. The distance between schools in the northern counties is generally greater than in the southern counties of the state, which makes combining of schools more difficult. Bayfield County already had 19 transport schools in 1933-34, five in one district. These schools cost \$10,228.33, an average cost of \$538.33 per transport school. When the schools with more than 15 pupils are excluded, the average cost of the remaining transport schools is reduced to \$379.55.

There is a factor in the cost of the transport schools in Bayfield County that must be recognized in making cost comparisons. Most of the transport schools are located in the same district as an open school and consequently no tuition charges appear in the reported cost of the transport schools. The whole district of which the closed school is a part is taxed to support the school which provides education for the children from the transport school, and as a result the actual cost of educating the children from the transport school is greater than the report shows. If the cost of tuition were added (calculated at \$30 per year per pupil, the average state rate) the average cost of a transport school in Bayfield County would be increased from \$538.33 to \$849, and the cost of the average transport school with 15 or fewer pupils from \$379.55 to \$489.55. The cost of transport schools formed in the future will probably exceed the cost of the average transport school operating at present, inasmuch as the distance the pupils must travel is greater. Judged from the distance between schools and type of road it is unlikely that any extensive saving can be effected by combining the smaller schools in this county. Several cases, however, indicate that some saving would probably be possible by combining the smaller rural schools.

COLUMBIA COUNTY

Number of rural schools 1933-34 -----	116
Number of rural schools with 15 or fewer pupils enrolled----	49
Number of transport schools 1933-34 -----	23
Average cost of a one-teacher rural school 1933-34-----	\$955.57
Average cost of a rural school with 15 or fewer pupils 1933-34	865.50
Average cost of a transport school 1933-34 -----	786.49
Average cost of a transport school with 15 or fewer pupils 1933-34 -----	686.39

In spite of the fact that there is a comparatively large number of schools with 15 or fewer pupils enrolled (49 out of 116) the possibilities of combining most of them are rated as poor by the local superintendent. In no case does the county superintendent feel that the possibility of combining the small rural schools is good. In only 14 schools is the possibility of combination even fair. The remaining cases are rated as poor possibilities by the county superintendent. The combinations that appear to be fair are given in the following table, together with the enrollment, type of road, and distance between schools.

TABLE VIII
POSSIBLE RURAL SCHOOL COMBINATIONS

Columbia County

Enrol- ment	School	Enrol- ment	School	Distance between Schools (miles)	Character of Road	Possibility of Com- bination
15	Columbus 4-----	with 12	Columbus Jt. 4-----	1½	Dirt	Fair
12	Columbus Jt. 9-----	with 8	Columbus 7-----	2	Dirt	Fair
9	Columbus 5-----	with	Columbus City-----	3½	Surfaced	Fair
6	Columbus 8-----	with	Columbus City-----	2¾	Surfaced	Fair
8	Columbus 3-----	with	Columbus City-----	2½	Surf. & Dirt	Fair
8	Ft. Winnebago Jt. 1-2-----	with	Portage City-----	1½	Surfaced	Fair
7	Fountain Prairie 2-----	with	Fall River Village-----	2¾	Surf. & Grav.	Fair
10	Lewiston 9-----	with	Portage City-----	2¾	Gravel	Fair
12	Randolph 2-----	with	Cambria Village-----	1¾	Gravel	Fair
6	Springvale 2-----	with	Rio Village-----	2¼	Gravel & Dirt	Fair
6	Springvale 2-----	with 9	Springvale Jt. 3-----	1¾	Dirt	Fair
7	Wyocena 7-----	with	Rio Village-----	2½	Surfaced	Fair

TABLE IX
DISTANCE AND TYPE OF ROADS BETWEEN SCHOOLS
Columbia County

Distance	Dirt	Gravel	Surfaced	Surfaced and Dirt	Surfaced and Gravel	Gravel and Dirt
1¼ Miles.....	--	1	--	--	--	--
1½ Miles.....	2	--	--	1	--	--
1¾ Miles.....	2	--	--	--	--	--
2 Miles.....	2	--	--	--	--	--
2¼ Miles.....	--	--	--	--	--	--
2½ Miles.....	--	--	1	1	--	--
2¾ Miles.....	--	1	1	--	1	--
3—3.9 Miles.....	--	--	1	--	--	--
Totals.....	6	2	3	2	1	--

Table IX shows that almost half of the combinations are on dirt roads. The distance between schools is not great, in no case exceeding 3½ miles. However, since the average cost of a transport school with 15 or fewer pupils is \$686.39 in this county, it is not likely that any very great saving will be possible, under the present set up, by the closing of the smaller schools.

DANE II (Western Dane)

Number of rural schools 1933-34	91
Number of rural school teachers 1933-34	92
Number of schools with 15 or fewer pupils enrolled	32
Number of transport schools 1933-34	16
Average cost of a one-teacher rural school 1933-34	\$ 958.68
Average cost of a rural school with 15 or fewer pupils 1933-34	827.01
Average cost of a transport school 1933-34	1,332.71
Average cost of a transport school with 15 or fewer pupils 1933-34	586.48

Dane County, unlike the other counties of the state, is divided into two units for the administration of the schools not under city superintendents. Each district has a superintendent of schools. It is the only county in the state that has two county superintendents. Dane County is large, both in number of schools and enrollment and the present set-up is pointed out here not as a criticism of the organization, but only to make it clear that the present study does not include the entire county but only one unit: Dane II, or Western Dane, as it is usually called.

In this county, as in several others studied, much work in combining the rural schools has already been done. By 1933-34 there were 16 schools in Western Dane County closed and operating as transport schools. This year the district superintendent has succeeded in closing two more small schools. At a recent meeting of the county board he recommended that all schools with enrollments of ten or less be closed. The county board, however, failed to carry out his recommendation.

Table X shows the smaller schools with their enrollment, distances between schools, and types of road.

TABLE X
POSSIBLE RURAL SCHOOL COMBINATIONS

Dane II

Enrol- ment	School	Enrol- ment	School	Distance between Schools (miles)	Character of Road	Possibility of Com- bination
8	Berry 4	with	17 Berry 3	2	Gravel	Good
8	Berry 6	with	Cross Plains Vil.	2 3/4	Gravel	Fair
11	Black Earth 3	with	14 Black Earth 2	3	Gravel	Poor
11	Black Earth 3	with	Black Earth Village	3	Gravel	Fair
14	Black Earth 2	with	Black Earth Village	3 1/2	Gravel	Fair
14	Black Earth 2	with	Mazomanie Village	2	Gravel	Good
12	Blue Mound Jt. 6	with	15 Blue Mound 3	2 1/2	Gravel	Fair
12	Blue Mound Jt. 6	with	15 Blue Mound 9	4	Gravel	Fair
15	Blue Mound 3	with	15 Blue Mound 9	2 1/2	Gravel	Poor
10	Blue Mound Jt. 8	with	22 Springdale 2	3 1/2	Gravel	Poor
14	Cross Plains 4	with	10 Cross Plains Jt. 1 & 5	3	Gravel	Fair
14	Cross Plains Jt. 6	with	16 Cross Plains 7	3	Gravel	Fair
10	Dane 3	with	10 Dane 6	2 3/4	Gravel	Fair
15	Fitchburg Jt. 12	with	15 Fitchburg 7	2	Gravel	Good
15	Mazomanie 3	with	16 Berry 1	2 3/4	Gravel	Poor
13	Middleton 7	with	17 Middleton 3	2 1/2	Gravel	Good
13	Middleton 7	with	17 Middleton 9	3	Gravel	Fair
13	Montrose 6	with	Belleville Village	3 1/2	Gravel	Fair
13	Montrose 6	with	17 Primrose 4	3 1/2	Gravel	Fair
13	Montrose 6	with	17 Montrose 5	4	Gravel	Fair
12	Oregon 9	with	2 Oregon 10	2 1/4	Gravel	Good
5	Oregon Jt. 11	with	19 Oregon Jt. 3	2 1/4	Gravel	Good
9	Oregon 2	with	19 Oregon Jt. 3	2 1/2	Gravel	Good
5	Oregon Jt. 11	with	9 Oregon 2	2 1/2	Gravel	Good
9	Oregon 2	with	9 Oregon 8	1 1/2	Gravel	Good
9	Oregon 8	with	Oregon Village	2 1/2	Gravel	Good
2	Oregon 10	with	7 Oregon 4 (Closed)	2	Gravel	Good
8	Roxbury Jt. 3	with	13 Roxbury 6 (Closed)	4	Gravel	Poor
14	Roxbury 1	with	21 Dane 5	4	Gravel	Poor
14	Springdale 1	with	Mt. Horeb Village	2 3/4	Surfaced	Good
14	Springdale 1	with	18 Springdale Jt. 9	4 1/2	Gravel	Fair
7	Springfield Jt. 2	with	7 Springfield 4	3	Gravel	Good
10	Vermont 2	with	17 Vermont 1	4	Gravel	Fair
10	Vermont 2	with	Mt. Horeb Village	3	Gravel	Good
14	Vermont Jt. 6	with	19 Vermont 7	3	Gravel	Fair

The preceding table shows that there are good or fair possibilities of combining the smaller schools in 26 cases. The distance between schools and type of road for these schools are summarized in Table XI.

TABLE XI
DISTANCE AND TYPE OF ROADS BETWEEN SCHOOLS

Dane II

Distance	Dirt	Gravel	Surfaced
Less than 2 Miles.....	--	2	--
2 Miles.....	--	4	--
2¼ Miles.....	--	3	--
2½ Miles.....	--	3	--
2¾ Miles.....	--	3	1
3-3.9 Miles.....	--	9	--
4-4.9 Miles.....	--	1	--
Total.....	--	25	1

In the majority of cases rated as good or fair, the distance is not excessive and the roads are either graveled or surfaced. It would appear that many of the combinations given in this table would be satisfactory and probably should be put in actual practice. The average one-teacher rural school in this section of Dane County cost \$958.68 last year. The average cost of a transport school was \$1,332.71. This large transport school cost is accounted for in the fact that some transport districts in this county have as many as 105 pupils. When these large schools are excluded from the calculation (including only schools of 15 or fewer pupils) the average transport school cost is reduced to \$568.48. This is less than the average cost of maintaining a smaller rural school and it is likely that some money can be saved by a combination of the smaller rural schools. However, a comparison of transport costs and the cost of maintaining a school gives a warning that too great a saving cannot be expected.

DODGE COUNTY

Number of rural schools 1933-34	167
Number of rural schools with 15 or fewer pupils enrolled 1933-34	80
Number of transport schools 1933-34	19
Average cost of a one-teacher rural school 1933-34	\$921.87
Average cost of a rural school with 15 or fewer pupils 1933-34	858.94
Average cost of a transport school 1933-34	590.04
Average cost of a transport school with 15 or fewer pupils 1933-34	522.33

The county superintendent of Dodge County feels that there is unlimited possibility for the improvement of rural education in this county by the enlargement of the units. However, he has indicated both in a letter to this office and in his annual report to the county board of supervisors that the solution of the problem lies not in combining entire schools but in re-districting the county in such a way

that it would eliminate many of the districts. He cites district No. 6, Town of Ashippun, as an example. The roads will not permit any logical combination of this district with any other single district, but this district could be dissolved and the territory parceled out to surrounding districts. In this and many other cases there is no practical way of combining a school with any other school, yet a program of re-districting would solve the problem. This office is most heartily in favor of the plan suggested and hopes that a study of this kind can be carried out in the near future. However, since this study is yet to be made, the present report will list the combinations which the local superintendent indicated have some feasibility.

TABLE XII
POSSIBLE RURAL SCHOOL COMBINATIONS

Dodge County

Enrolment	School	Enrolment	School	Distance between Schools (miles)	Character of Road	Possibility of Combination
8	Calamus Jt. 3	with	19 Calamus Jt. 2	1½	Surfaced	
10	Calamus 7	with	18 Elba 6	1¾	Dirt & Surf.	
15	Chester Jt. 7	with	11 Chester 8	1¾	Gravel	
11	Chester 8	with	17 Chester 2	1¾	Dirt	
6	Chester 5	with	17 Chester 2	1¾	Surfaced	
6	Chester 5	with	16 Chester 6	1¾	Gravel	
	*Clyman 5	with	Vil. Clyman Jt. 6	1½	Dirt	
3	Elba Jt. 8	with	15 Elba Jt. 1	2¾	Dirt	
15	Emmet Jt. 9	with	10 Emmet 3	3¾	Dirt & Gravel	
11	Fox Lake Jt. 8	with	Fox Lake Village	1¾	Surfaced	
12	Le Bannon 1	with	27 Le Bannon 3	2¾	Surfaced	
12	Le Bannon 2	with	27 Le Bannon 3	2	Surf. & Dirt	
6	Le Roy 6	with	6 Le Roy 4	1½	Gravel	
6	Le Roy 4	with	14 Le Roy Jt. 2	1½	Gravel	
14	Le Roy Jt. 2	with	17 Le Roy Jt. 1	3¾	Gravel	
10	Le Roy 3	with	17 Le Roy Jt. 1	1¾	Gravel	
9	Lowell 12	with	Lowell St. Gr.	2½	Gravel	
15	Lowell 10	with	Lowell St. Gr.	1½	Surfaced	
14	Lowell 4	with	15 Lowell 10	1¾	Surfaced	
12	Lowell 16	with	13 Lowell Jt. 3	2½	Gravel & Dirt	
12	Oak Grove 2	with	16 Beaver Dam 1	2	Dirt	
14	Oak Grove 3	with	16 Beaver Dam 5	1¾	Surfaced	
8	Theresa 9	with	16 Theresa 8	2½	Dirt	

* Closed last year. Employing a teacher this year.

It is seen from Table XII that there is some possibility of combining 25 rural schools with 15 or fewer pupils enrolled. The distance between schools, together with the type of road, is given in Table XIII.

TABLE XIII
DISTANCE AND TYPE OF ROADS BETWEEN SCHOOLS

Dodge County

Distance	Dirt	Graveled	Surfaced	Dirt and Surfaced	Dirt and Gravel
1 Mile and Less	--	--	--	--	--
1¼ Miles	1	--	1	--	--
1½ Miles	1	3	2	--	--
1¾ Miles	--	2	3	1	--
2 Miles	1	--	--	1	--
2¼ Miles	2	--	--	--	--
2½ Miles	1	1	--	--	2
2¾ Miles	--	--	1	--	--
3-3.9 Miles	--	--	--	--	2
Totals	6	6	7	2	4

In 21 or 84% of the cases the distance is 2½ miles or less. In 6 or 24% of the cases the connecting roads are dirt. In this county the distance and the character of the road indicate that several combinations would probably work out quite well. In general the local people in this county, as in most of the other counties, are very much opposed to closing the schools within their districts. If any substantial change is made it is obvious that the action must come from the state legislature rather than local initiative.

As emphasized by the local superintendent, the ultimate solution of the rural school problem in Dodge or any other county is not the combining of a few rural schools that can conveniently be combined, but a comprehensive scheme of re-districting, combining, and consolidating the rural schools to provide for the operation of rural schools under a larger unit of administration. The cost figures previously given indicate that a saving could probably be effected by combining of smaller schools in this county.

DOUGLAS COUNTY

Number of rural schools 1933-34	49
Number of rural schools with 15 or fewer pupils enrolled 1933-34	16
Number of transport schools 1933-34	5
Average cost of a one-teacher rural school 1933-34	\$1,113.51
Average cost of a rural school with 15 or fewer pupils 1933-34	1,026.04*
Average cost of a transport school 1933-34	526.84
Average cost of a transport school with 15 or fewer pupils 1933-34	578.06

* Complete data not available.

That the cost of maintaining a transport school is greater (on the average) for schools of 15 or less than it is for all transport schools in this county is obvious. This is due to the fact that the two schools with an enrollment of 15

or more are both in the same district, and in this district there is another school employing a teacher. Consequently no tuition charges are shown and the average cost of these schools is shown as less than for the smaller schools which pay both tuition and transportation.

That the local superintendent is working for the combination of the smaller schools wherever practical is evidenced by the fact that two additional schools have closed this year.

Table XIV gives the enrollment of the smaller schools, distance between schools, and the character of the road for this county, together with the reaction of the local superintendent to the proposed combinations.

TABLE XIV
POSSIBLE RURAL SCHOOL COMBINATIONS

Douglas County

Enrol-ment	School	Enrol-ment	School	Distance between Schools (miles)	Character of Road	Possibility of Combination
13	Cloverland 8	with 16	Cloverland 1	1 3/4	Dirt	Good
11	Dairyland 2 (Waggoner)	with 30	Dairyland 2 (Carpenter)	5 1/2	Dirt & Gravel	Fair
11	Dairyland 2 (Waggoner)	with 28	Dairyland 1 (Thompson)	5	Dirt	Fair
11	Dairyland 2 (Waggoner)	with 30	Dairyland 2 (Stevens)	2	Dirt	Good
8	Gordon 2 (Hulten)	with 7	Gordon 2 (Gloria)	5	Dirt	Good
11	Gordon 2 (Lakeside)	with 7	Gordon 2 (Gloria)	2 1/2	Dirt	Fair
11	Gordon 2 (Lakeside)	with	Gordon 1 (St. Graded)	3 1/2	Dirt	Fair
6	Gordon 1 (Rockwell)	with	Gordon 1 (St. Graded)	5 1/2	Gravel	-----
6	Gordon 1 (Rockwell)	with	Gordon 1 (Norway Plains)	5 1/2	Dirt	-----
14	Hawthorne 4	with	Hawthorne (St. Graded)	4 1/2	Gravel	Fair
14	Hawthorne 4	with 16	Hawthorne 2	3 1/2	Dirt	Fair
16	Hawthorne 2	with 25	Hawthorne 3	5	Gravel & Dirt	Fair
11	Oakland 2	with 17	Oakland 4	4 1/2	Gravel	Good
16	Parkland 1	with	Parkland 2 (St. Gr.)	3	Gravel	Good
7	Superior 1 (Dedham)	with 40	Superior 1 (Blk. Riv.)	4	Dirt	-----
7	Superior 1 (Dedham)	with 28	Superior 1 (Perizzo)	2 1/2	Dirt	-----
7	Superior 1 (Dedham)	with 64	Summit 1 (Patzau)	4 3/4	Gravel	-----
13	Summit 1 (Milchesky)	with 17	Summit 3	6 1/2	Gravel	Fair
18	Summit 1 (Milchesky)	with 64	Summit 1 (Patzau)	4	Dirt	Good
9	Summit 6	with 16	Summit 4	4	Dirt	Fair
9	Summit 6	with 17	Summit 3	5 1/2	Dirt & Gravel	Good
14	Wascott 5	with 17	Wascott 3	5	Dirt & Gravel	Fair

Since two of the smaller schools have closed this year, there remain only 14 small rural schools in this county. Of these smaller schools 7 have good possible connections, 3 more fair, three have no advisable connections, and one is probably larger this year due to the closing of a neighboring school.

Table XV summarizes the road connections and distance between the schools with good or fair possibilities of combination.

TABLE XV
DISTANCE AND TYPE OF ROADS BETWEEN SCHOOLS

Douglas County

Distance	Dirt	Gravel	Surfaced	Dirt and Gravel
1¾ Miles	1	--	--	--
2 Miles	1	--	--	--
2¼ Miles	--	--	--	--
2½ Miles	2	--	--	--
2¾ Miles	--	--	--	--
3—3.9 Miles	--	1	--	--
4—4.9 Miles	1	1	--	--
5—5.9 Miles	2	--	--	2
Total	7	1	--	2

Seven of the ten road connections are on dirt roads. Six of the ten schools to be combined are four miles or more from the nearest neighboring school. The distance between the schools and the type of roads connecting the schools seem to point to a larger transport school cost for schools established in the future in this county. Because of a long distance to be traveled over poor roads, in most cases no very material saving could be effected by combining the smaller schools in this county. Since this is also the case in the other northern county (Bayfield) studied, it seems that the southern part of the state is where the greatest possibility of combining schools exists and not in the northern counties, as is so often stated.

GRANT COUNTY

Number of rural schools 1933-34	191
Number of schools with 15 or fewer pupils enrolled	78
Number of transport schools 1933-34	12
Average cost of a one-teacher rural school 1933-34	\$910.97
Average cost of a rural school with 15 or fewer pupils 1933-34	877.12
Average cost of a transport school 1933-34	450.09
Average cost of a transport school with 15 or fewer pupils enrolled	324.51

The information compiled by this office regarding the possibility of combining the smaller rural schools of Grant County was not checked by the local superintendent, who felt that a scheme of combining schools would not work out very well in his county. However, because of the large number of small rural schools in this county, and the comparatively low cost of maintaining transport schools, there is sufficient reason to believe that some saving could be made by a combination of the smaller schools. The combinations that appeared possible from a map study are shown in the following table. In the use of this table its limitations and possible inaccuracies should be fully recognized since it has not been checked by

a person in close contact with the local situation. While it is likely that some of our estimates of possible combinations are not valid because of local conditions, we nevertheless feel that there are many combinations which are practical and desirable, both from the standpoint of economy and educational services rendered.

TABLE XVI
POSSIBLE RURAL SCHOOL COMBINATIONS

Grati County

Enrol-ment	School	Enrol-ment	School	Distance between Schools (miles)	Character of Road	Possibility of Combination
8	Beetown 9	with	19 Waterloo 7	4 $\frac{1}{4}$	Dirt & Gravel	
8	Beetown 9	with	20 Beetown 8	3 $\frac{1}{4}$	Dirt	
8	Beetown 9	with	17 Beetown 3	3 $\frac{1}{4}$	Dirt	
15	Beetown 10	with	17 Beetown 3	2 $\frac{3}{4}$	Dirt	
14	Bloomington 4	with	14 Patch Grove Jt. 10	3 $\frac{3}{4}$	Dirt	
14	Bloomington 4	with	21 Bloomington 5	2 $\frac{1}{2}$	Gravel & Dirt	
14	Bloomington 4	with	8 Bloomington Jt. 1	2	Dirt	
8	Bloomington Jt. 1	with	21 Bloomington 5	3 $\frac{1}{4}$	Gravel & Dirt	
8	Bloomington Jt. 1	with	14 Glen Haven Jt. 1	3 $\frac{1}{4}$	Dirt	
3	Cassville 6	with	23 Cassville 3	2 $\frac{1}{4}$	Dirt	
3	Cassville 6	with	25 Cassville Jt. 2	3	Dirt & Gravel	
3	Cassville 6	with	14 Waterloo 3	1 $\frac{1}{4}$	Dirt	
12	Castle Rock Jt. 3	with	10 Wingville Jt. 11	2 $\frac{3}{4}$	Dirt	
12	Castle Rock Jt. 3	with	10 Wingville Jt. 11	5	Gravel	
12	Castle Rock Jt. 3	with	14 Hickory Jt. 6	2	Gravel	
13	Clifton 9	with	Vill. of Livingston	2 $\frac{1}{4}$	Gravel & Dirt	
10	Clifton 8	with	18 Clifton 4	1 $\frac{3}{4}$	Dirt	
16	Clifton Jt. 11	with	18 Clifton Jt. 1	2	Dirt	
14	Clifton 3	with	15 Clifton Jt. 6	2 $\frac{1}{2}$	Gravel & Dirt	
14	Clifton 3	with	20 Clifton Jt. 5	2 $\frac{3}{4}$	Gravel & Dirt	
13	Clifton 9	with	14 Clifton 3	2 $\frac{1}{2}$	Dirt	
14	Clifton 3	with	18 Clifton Jt. 1	2 $\frac{1}{2}$	Dirt & Gravel	
10	Clifton 8	with	13 Clifton 9	1 $\frac{1}{4}$	Dirt	
13	Clifton 9	with	20 Clifton 2	2 $\frac{1}{2}$	Dirt & Gravel	
13	Ellenboro 1	with	25 Ellenboro 2	2 $\frac{1}{4}$	Dirt	
13	Ellenboro 1	with	18 S. Lancaster Jt. 8	3	Dirt	
15	Ellenboro 4	with	20 Ellenboro 5	2 $\frac{3}{4}$	Dirt	
15	Ellenboro 4	with	16 S. Lancaster Jt. 6	2 $\frac{3}{4}$	Dirt & Gravel	
11	Fennimore Jt. 2	with	12 Hickory 5	2 $\frac{1}{4}$	Dirt	
11	Fennimore Jt. 2	with	14 Hickory Jt. 6	2 $\frac{3}{4}$	Dirt	
11	Fennimore 1	with	16 Fennimore 4	2 $\frac{3}{4}$	Dirt, Gr., Pav.	
11	Fennimore 1	with	Village of Fennimore	2	Dirt & Gravel	
11	Fennimore 1	with	Village of Fennimore	2	Dirt & Pav.	
11	Fennimore 1	with	15 Liberty Jt. 3	3 $\frac{1}{2}$	Gravel & Dirt	
14	Glen Haven Jt. 1	with	5 Glen Haven 2	2	Dirt	
5	Glen Haven 2	with	15 Glen Haven Jt. 9	2 $\frac{1}{2}$	Dirt	
5	Glen Haven 2	with	15 Glen Haven Jt. 9	3	Gravel & Dirt	
5	Glen Haven 2	with	10 Glen Haven 6	3 $\frac{1}{2}$	Gravel & Dirt	
10	Glen Haven 6	with	15 Glen Haven Jt. 9	3 $\frac{1}{2}$	Gravel & Dirt	
10	Glen Haven 6	with	16 Cassville 4	3	Dirt	
10	Glen Haven 6	with	11 Glen Haven 5	3	Dirt	
11	Glen Haven 5	with	16 Cassville 5	3 $\frac{1}{4}$	Dirt & Gravel	
12	Harrison 2	with	30 Potosi 6	2 $\frac{1}{4}$	Gravel	
11	Harrison 7	with	12 Harrison 2	3 $\frac{1}{2}$	Dirt & Gravel	
6	Harrison 5	with	11 Harrison 7	2 $\frac{1}{2}$	Dirt	
6	Harrison 5	with	19 Harrison Jt. 1	2	Dirt	
13	Harrison 8	with	15 Harrison 4	2 $\frac{3}{4}$	Dirt	
12	Harrison 3	with	13 Harrison 8	4	Dirt	
12	Harrison 3	with	15 Harrison 4	4	Dirt	
11	Hazel Green 6	with	Vil. of Hazel Green	3 $\frac{1}{2}$	Gravel	
10	Hazel Green Jt. 7	with	Vil. of Hazel Green	3 $\frac{1}{4}$	Gravel	
10	Hazel Green Jt. 7	with	16 Hazel Green 2	2	Dirt	
14	Hickory Jt. 8	with	16 Castle Rock 1	4	Dirt	
14	Hickory Jt. 6	with	27 Fennimore 6	1 $\frac{3}{4}$	Gravel & Dirt	
7	Hickory 3	with	14 Hickory Jt. 6	1 $\frac{1}{2}$	Dirt	
7	Hickory 3	with	14 Hickory Jt. 8	1 $\frac{3}{4}$	Dirt	
12	Hickory 5	with	16 Hickory Jt. 1	2 $\frac{1}{2}$	Dirt & Gravel	
12	Hickory 5	with	12 Hickory Jt. 5	2 $\frac{3}{4}$	Dirt	

TABLE XVI—(Continued)
POSSIBLE RURAL SCHOOL COMBINATIONS

Grant County

Enrol-ment	School	Enrol-ment	School	Distance between Schools (miles)	Character of Road	Possibility of Combination
12	Hickory Jt. 5	with	25 Hickory 6	2	Gravel & Dirt	-----
12	Hickory Jt. 5	with	16 Hickory Jt. 1	3 $\frac{1}{4}$	Gravel	-----
6	Jamestown 3	with	7 Jamestown 6	3 $\frac{1}{4}$	Dirt & Pav.	-----
6	Jamestown 3	with	11 Jamestown 2	2 $\frac{3}{4}$	Gravel & Dirt	-----
6	Jamestown 3	with	14 Jamestown 7	2 $\frac{3}{4}$	Pavement	-----
14	Jamestown 7	with	18 Jamestown 8	2 $\frac{1}{2}$	Pavement	-----
7	Jamestown 5	with	18 Jamestown 8	3 $\frac{1}{4}$	Dirt & Gravel	-----
7	Jamestown 1	with	7 Jamestown 5	1 $\frac{1}{4}$	Dirt	-----
7	Jamestown 1	with	18 Jamestown 8	2 $\frac{1}{2}$	Gravel	-----
7	Jamestown 1	with	11 Hazel Green 6	3 $\frac{1}{2}$	Grav. & Pav.	-----
15	Liberty Jt. 3	with	16 Liberty Jt. 4	3 $\frac{1}{4}$	Gravel & Dirt	-----
15	Liberty Jt. 3	with	51 Liberty 2 (St. Gr.)	1 $\frac{1}{2}$	Gravel & Dirt	-----
15	Liberty 5	with	16 Liberty Jt. 4	2 $\frac{1}{2}$	Dirt	-----
15	Liberty 5	with	15 Liberty 7	2 $\frac{1}{2}$	Dirt	-----
9	Liberty 9	with	20 Ellenboro 5	2 $\frac{1}{2}$	Dirt & Gravel	-----
11	Lima Jt. 9	with	16 Lima Jt. 3	3 $\frac{1}{4}$	Dirt	-----
11	Lima Jt. 9	with	12 Platteville Jt. 8	2 $\frac{1}{2}$	Dirt	-----
11	Lima Jt. 12	with	21 Lima 4	3	Dirt & Gravel	-----
10	Lima 1	with	11 Lima Jt. 12	2 $\frac{1}{2}$	Dirt & Gravel	-----
10	Lima 1	with	14 Ellenboro 7	3	Dirt	-----
10	Lima 1	with	16 Lima 2	2 $\frac{1}{2}$	Dirt & Gravel	-----
10	Lima 1	with	7 Platteville 1	2 $\frac{3}{4}$	Dirt & Gravel	-----
9	Little Grant 4	with	15 Little Grant 5	3 $\frac{1}{4}$	Dirt & Gravel	-----
6	Little Grant 2	with	9 Little Grant 4	2 $\frac{1}{2}$	Dirt & Gravel	-----
6	Little Grant 2	with	14 Little Grant 3	2 $\frac{1}{2}$	Dirt	-----
6	Little Grant 2	with	18 N. Lancaster Jt. 15	4	Dirt	-----
14	Little Grant 3	with	14 Little Grant Jt. 7	1 $\frac{3}{4}$	Dirt & Gravel	-----
14	Little Grant Jt. 7	with	8 S. Lancaster Jt. 17	3	Dirt & Gravel	-----
11	Little Grant Jt. 6	with	Vil. of Bloomington	3 $\frac{1}{2}$	Dirt & Gravel	-----
11	Little Grant Jt. 6	with	19 Beetown 6	1	Dirt	-----
5	Mt. Hope Jt. 3	with	20 Mt. Hope Jt. 1	3	Dirt & Gravel	-----
6	Mt. Ida 4	with	16 Fennimore Jt. 7	1 $\frac{3}{4}$	Dirt	-----
6	Mt. Ida 4	with	Vil. of Fennimore	1	Pavement	-----
6	Mt. Ida 4	with	27 Mt. Ida 3	2 $\frac{3}{4}$	Pavement	-----
6	Mt. Ida 4	with	20 Mt. Ida Jt. 8	3	Dirt	-----
11	Mt. Ida Jt. 13	with	27 Mt. Ida 3	2 $\frac{1}{2}$	Dirt	-----
11	Mt. Ida Jt. 13	with	19 N. Lancaster 1	2 $\frac{1}{2}$	Dirt	-----
11	Muscoda Jt. 3	with	17 Muscoda 2	3 $\frac{1}{4}$	Dirt & Gravel	-----
14	N. Lancaster Jt. 10	with	8 S. Lancaster Jt. 17	2 $\frac{1}{2}$	Dirt	-----
14	N. Lancaster Jt. 10	with	21 N. Lancaster 12	4 $\frac{1}{4}$	Dirt & Gravel	-----
15	Paris Jt. 6	with	31 Smelzer Jt. 3	2 $\frac{1}{2}$	Dirt	-----
10	Paris 3	with	15 Paris Jt. 6	3 $\frac{1}{2}$	Dirt	-----
10	Paris 4	with	10 Paris 3	2	Dirt & Pav.	-----
10	Paris 4	with	6 Jamestown 3	3 $\frac{1}{2}$	Dirt & Gravel	-----
10	Paris 4	with	11 Jamestown 2	2 $\frac{3}{4}$	Dirt	-----
12	Platteville Jt. 8	with	City of Platteville	1 $\frac{1}{2}$	Gravel	-----
7	Platteville 1	with	City of Platteville	2 $\frac{1}{2}$	Gravel	-----
4	Platteville Jt. 2	with	24 Platteville Jt. 6	3	Dirt	-----
7	Platteville 10	with	17 Platteville 7	2 $\frac{1}{2}$	Dirt & Gravel	-----
7	Platteville 10	with	9 Platteville 8	2 $\frac{3}{4}$	Dirt & Pav.	-----
11	Potosi 5	with	22 Potosi Jt. 9	2 $\frac{1}{2}$	Dirt	-----
11	Potosi 5	with	30 Potosi 6	2 $\frac{1}{2}$	Dirt & Gravel	-----
11	Potosi 5	with	27 Potosi 2	2 $\frac{1}{2}$	Dirt	-----
11	Potosi 4	with	27 Potosi 2	2 $\frac{1}{2}$	Dirt	-----
11	Potosi 4	with	30 Potosi 6	1 $\frac{3}{4}$	Gravel	-----
10	Smelzer 6	with	30 Smelzer 1	1 $\frac{3}{4}$	Dirt & Gravel	-----
10	Smelzer 6	with	29 Smelzer 4	2	Gravel	-----
13	Smelzer 5	with	20 Smelzer Jt. 10	1 $\frac{1}{2}$	Gravel & Dirt	-----
13	Smelzer 5	with	31 Smelzer Jt. 3	1 $\frac{1}{4}$	Gravel & Dirt	-----
13	Smelzer 5	with	29 Smelzer 4	2	Gravel	-----
8	S. Lancaster Jt. 17	with	15 S. Lancaster 14	2 $\frac{3}{4}$	Dirt & Gravel	-----
15	S. Lancaster 14	with	Vil. of Lancaster	2 $\frac{3}{4}$	Gravel	-----

TABLE XVI—(Continued)
POSSIBLE RURAL SCHOOL COMBINATIONS

Grant County

Enrol- ment	School	Enrol- ment	School	Distance between Schools (miles)	Character of Road	Possibility of Com- bination
12	Waterloo 1	with 15	Waterloo 4	3 3/4	Dirt	-----
12	Waterloo 1	with 14	Waterloo 3	4	Dirt	-----
12	Waterloo 1	with 21	Waterloo 5	3 1/2	Dirt & Gravel	-----
8	Wingville 12	with 25	Fennimore 5	2 1/2	Dirt & Pav.	-----
8	Wingville 12	with 25	Wingville Jt. 10	2 1/2	Dirt & Pav.	-----
7	Wingville Jt. 7	with 8	Wingville 12	3 1/4	Dirt & Pav.	-----
7	Wingville Jt. 7	with	Village of Montfort	2 3/4	Dirt	-----
7	Wingville Jt. 9	with 10	Wingville Jt. 11	2 3/4	Dirt & Gravel	-----
8	Woodman Jt. 4	with	Village of Woodman	3	Dirt	-----
8	Woodman Jt. 4	with 17	Woodman Jt. 1	3 3/4	Dirt	-----
8	Woodman Jt. 4	with 17	Woodman Jt. 1	4 3/4	Dirt & Gravel	-----
14	Woodman 4	with	Village of Woodman	4 1/2	Gravel	-----
14	Woodman 4	with 5	Mt. Hope Jt. 3	2 3/4	Gravel	-----
14	Wyalusing 4	with	Village of Bagley	2 1/2	Gravel	-----

GREEN LAKE COUNTY

Number of rural schools 1933-34	60
Number of schools with 15 or fewer pupils enrolled 1933-34	46
Number of transport schools 1933-34	8
Average cost of a one-teacher rural school 1933-34	\$827.57
Average cost of a rural school with 15 or fewer pupils 1933-34	809.06
Average cost of a transport school 1933-34	531.50
Average cost of a transport school of 15 or fewer pupils 1933-34	497.86

In this county more than three-fourths of the rural schools had an enrollment of 15 or fewer pupils in 1933-34. The possibility of combining several of these schools is poor or impractical. However, there are 33 good or fair possible combinations. These are shown in the following table together with the enrollment, character of the roads, and distance between schools.

TABLE XVII
POSSIBLE RURAL SCHOOL COMBINATIONS

Green Lake County

Enrol-ment	School	Enrol-ment	School	Distance between Schools	Character of Road	Possibility of Combination
8	Berlin Jt. 12	with 24	Berlin 3	1 1/4	Dirt	Good
8	Berlin Jt. 8	with 25	Brooklyn Jt. 3	3 1/2	Gravel & Dirt	Fair
14	Brooklyn 2	with 14	Brooklyn 4	2	Surfaced	Good
14	Brooklyn 2	with	Green Lake Village	2	Surfaced	Good
12	Brooklyn 13	with	Green Lake Village	3 1/2	Surfaced	Good
7	Green Lake Jt. 15	with 15	Brooklyn Jt. 9	2 1/2	Dirt	Fair
7	Green Lake Jt. 15	with 16	Green Lake Jt. 8	2	Dirt	Fair
9	Green Lake 2	with 16	Green Lake Jt. 8	2	Dirt	Good
9	Green Lake 2	with 18	Green Lake 5	2	Gravel	Good
9	Green Lake 1	with 20	Green Lake 7	1 3/4	Dirt	Fair
9	Green Lake 1	with 15	Green Lake Jt. 2	2	Dirt	Good
15	Green Lake Jt. 2	with 12	Green Lake Jt. 17	1 1/2	Dirt & Gravel	Fair
12	Green Lake Jt. 17	with 20	Green Lake 7	1 3/4	Dirt	Fair
15	Green Lake Jt. 11	with 29	Green Lake 6	1 3/4	Dirt	Fair
12	Green Lake Jt. 17	with 27	Manchester 4 (2 tchrs)	2 1/2	Surf. & Grav.	Fair
15	Green Lake Jt. 11	with 22	Mackford 2	2 1/4	Dirt	Fair
15	Green Lake Jt. 2	with 16	Marquette Jt. 4	1 1/4	Dirt	Fair
12	Green Lake Jt. 17	with 16	Marquette Jt. 4	3 1/2	Dirt	Fair
5	Mackford 5	with 22	Mackford 2	2 3/4	Gravel	Fair
8	Mackford 8	with 5	Mackford 5	2 3/4	Gravel	Fair
5	Mackford 5	with 11	Mackford 1	2 3/4	Dirt	Good
5	Mackford 5	with 13	Mackford 6	3 1/4	Dirt	Good
8	Mackford 8	with 13	Mackford 6	2 1/2	Dirt	Fair
8	Manchester 1	with 14	Manchester 3	2 3/4	Dirt	Fair
8	Manchester 1	with 27	Manchester 4	2 3/4	Dirt	Good
12	Manchester 7	with 15	Manchester Jt. 2	4	Gravel	Fair
8	Manchester 8	with 27	Manchester 4 (2 tchrs)	2	Surf. & Grav.	Good
8	Manchester 8	with 12	Green Lake Jt. 17	2 1/2	Gravel	Fair
12	Manchester 7	with 15	Kingston 1	2 3/4	Surf. & Grav.	Fair
12	Manchester 7	with	Kingston Village	3 1/4	Surf. & Grav.	Fair
13	Marquette Jt. 3	with 50	Marquette 1 (3 tchrs)	2 3/4	Dirt	Good
7	Marquette Jt. 2	with 50	Marquette 1 (8 tchrs)	2 1/4	Dirt	Good
9	Princeton 7	with	Princeton Village	2	Dirt	Good
7	Princeton Jt. 4	with	Princeton Village	2 1/2	Dirt	Good
14	Princeton 11	with	Princeton Village	2 1/2	Gravel	Good
9	Princeton Jt. 7	with 28	Princeton 12	2 3/4	Gravel & Dirt	Fair
9	Princeton Jt. 7	with 19	Princeton 6	2 3/4	Gravel & Dirt	Fair
13	St. Marie 5	with 17	St. Marie Jt. 3	2	Gravel	Fair
7	St. Marie 8	with	Princeton Village	3 1/4	Gravel	Good
7	St. Marie 8	with 12	St. Marie Jt. 9	3 3/4	Gravel	Fair
6	St. Marie 7	with 12	St. Marie Jt. 9	4 3/4	Surfaced	Fair
6	St. Marie 7	with 7	St. Marie 8	2 1/4	Dirt	Fair
6	St. Marie 7	with 9	Princeton 7	2 3/4	Dirt	Good
11	Seneca 6	with 13	Seneca 4	2	Dirt	Good
11	Seneca Jt. 1	with 14	Seneca Jt. 2	1 3/4	Gravel	Good

Table XVIII summarizes the distance and type of road connecting the schools having good or fair possibilities of combining.

TABLE XVIII
DISTANCE AND TYPE OF ROADS BETWEEN SCHOOLS
Green Lake County

Distance	Dirt	Gravel	Surfaced	Dirt and Gravel	Surfaced and Gravel
1¼ Miles.....	1	--	--	--	--
1½ Miles.....	--	--	--	2	--
1¾ Miles.....	2	2	--	--	--
2 Miles.....	4	2	2	--	1
2¼ Miles.....	2	--	--	--	--
2½ Miles.....	2	1	--	--	--
2¾ Miles.....	4	1	--	1	2
3—3.9 Miles...	1	1	1	--	--
4—4.9 Miles...	--	1	--	--	--
Total.....	16	8	3	3	3

It is to be noticed that almost half of the connections are via dirt roads. The distance in most cases is not great. In only 4 of the 33 cases does it exceed 2¾ miles.

IOWA COUNTY

Number of rural schools 1933-34	123
Number of rural schools with 15 or fewer pupils 1933-34.....	54
Number of transport schools 1933-34	10
Average cost of a one-teacher rural school 1933-34	\$825.15
Average cost of a rural school with 15 or fewer pupils 1933-34	759.39
Average cost of a transport school 1933-34	708.79
Average cost of a transport school with 15 or fewer pupils 1933-34	611.06

Many of the smaller schools have no practical connections with other schools. The schools which the county superintendent feels have some possibility of combining with other schools are shown in the following table, together with the enrollment, distance, and type of roads.

TABLE XIX
POSSIBLE RURAL SCHOOL COMBINATIONS

Iowa County

Enrol-ment	School	Enrol-ment	School	Distance between Schools (miles)	Character of Road	Possibility of Combination
9	Arena 5	with	Arena St. Graded	1 1/4	Surfaced	Good
7	Arena Jt. 7	with	Arena St. Graded	1 1/4	Surfaced	Good
9	Arena Jt. 11	with	10 Arena 15	2 1/2	Dirt	Poor Roads
16	Dodgeville 2	with	Dodgeville City	2 1/2	Dirt & Gravel	Good
15	Dodgeville 3	with	18 Dodgeville 4	3 1/2	Gravel	Good
5	Dodgeville 5	with	Dodgeville City	3 3/4	Dirt	Possible
11	Dodgeville 14	with	23 Highland 13	2 3/4	Dirt	Poor Roads
10	Dodgeville 20	with	13 Wyoming Jt. 7	4	Dirt & Gravel	Fair
4	Dodgeville 18	with	24 Dodgeville 12	5	Dirt & Gravel	Fair
10	Eden Jt. 2	with	Highland Village	4	Gravel	Good
15	Eden 12	with	15 Linden 11	4	Dirt	Poor Roads
	Highland 10	with	Highland Village	3	Dirt	Good
(Closed 1933-34)						
13	Highland 11	with	Highland Village	5	Gravel	Fair
11	Mifflin 10	with	Rewey Village	2 1/2	Gravel	Good
11	Mifflin 10	with	7 Mifflin 1	2	Gravel	Good
8	Mineral Point 2	with	15 Mineral Point 5	2	Dirt	Fair
4	Mineral Point Jt. 1	with	Mineral Point City	1 1/2	Dirt	Good
9	Moscow 7	with	Hollandale Village	3	Gravel	Poor Roads
11	Pulaski Jt. 7	with	14 Pulaski 4	3	Gravel	Good

Table XX summarizes the type of road and distance between schools for the 17 small schools that the county superintendent rates as having good or fair possibility of combination.

TABLE XX
DISTANCE AND TYPE OF ROADS BETWEEN SCHOOLS

Iowa County

Distance	Dirt	Gravel	Surfaced	Dirt and Gravel
1 Mile or Less	--	--	--	--
1 1/4 Miles	--	--	2	--
1 1/2 Miles	1	--	--	--
1 3/4 Miles	--	--	--	--
2 Miles	2	2	--	--
2 1/4 Miles	--	--	--	--
2 1/2 Miles	--	--	--	--
2 3/4 Miles	--	--	--	--
3-3.9 Miles	1	4	--	--
4-4.9 Miles	--	1	--	2
5-5.9 Miles	--	1	--	1
Total	4	8	2	3

The distance between the combining schools in 10, or 59%, of the cases is 3 miles or more. In eight cases the connections can be made via gravel roads; in two cases the connecting roads are surfaced; and in four cases, dirt.

JEFFERSON COUNTY

Number of rural schools 1933-34 -----	105
Number of rural schools with 15 or fewer pupils 1933-34-----	57
Number of transport schools 1933-34 -----	17
Average cost of a one-teacher rural school 1933-34 -----	\$909.06
Average cost of a rural school with 15 or fewer pupils 1933-34	836.42
Average cost of a transport school 1933-34 -----	439.77
Average cost of a transport school with 15 or fewer pupils 1933-34 -----	381.20

This year (1934-35) another small school in Jefferson County closed. In 13 cases the road connections, condition of the building, etc., prohibit practical consideration of combination of the small schools. In 43 cases (the school which closed this year is excluded) combinations are possible although in some cases it seems a shame to abandon practically new buildings and those recently modernized under C. W. A. projects. The combinations of rural schools in this county rated as good or fair by the county superintendent are given in Table XXI with the enrollment of the schools and distances between them.

TABLE XXI
POSSIBLE RURAL SCHOOL COMBINATIONS

Jefferson County

Enrol- ment	School	Enrol- ment	School	Distance between Schools	Character of Road	Possibility of Com- bination
				(miles)		
7	*Aztalan 8	with 13	*Aztalan 1	1 3/4	Dirt	Good
6	Aztalan 2	with	Jefferson City	2 3/4	Dirt	Good
6	Aztalan 2	with	Johnson Creek	2 3/4	Gravel	Good
3	Aztalan 7	with	Jefferson City	3 3/4	Gravel	Good
7	Aztalan 9	with	Jefferson City	2	Surfaced	Good
6	Cold Springs 3	with	Whitewater City	3 1/2	Gravel	Good
8	Concord Jt. 3W	with 10	Concord 2	2 1/2	Dirt	Fair
4	Concord Jt. 5	with 12	Concord 10	1 3/4	Dirt	Good
12	Farmington 9	with 16	Aztalan 5	2 1/2	Dirt	Good
13	Hebron 1	with	Ft. Atkinson	3 1/2	Surfaced	Good
8	Ixonia Jt. 3	with 14	Ixonia 2	3 3/4	Dirt	Fair
11	Ixonia Jt. 1	with 12	Watertown Jt. 9	2 1/2	Dirt & Surf.	Good
7	Ixonia 5	with 32	Ixonia 4	1 1/2	Surfaced	Good
12	Jefferson Jt. 4	with	Jefferson City	3 3/4	Surfaced	Good
15	Jefferson 3	with	Jefferson City	3	Gravel	Good
13	Jefferson 13	with	Jefferson City	2 1/2	Gravel	Good
14	Jefferson Jt. 9	with	Ft. Atkinson City	2	Surfaced	Good
12	Jefferson 11	with 59	Sullivan 8 (2 tchrs)	3 1/2	Dirt	Good
11	Koshkonong 5	with	Ft. Atkinson City	3	Surfaced	Good
13	Koshkonong Jt. 1	with	Whitewater City	2	Gravel	Good
12	Lake Mills 9	with	Lake Mills City	4 1/2	Dirt & Surf.	Good
10	Lake Mills Jt. 2	with	Lake Mills City	2 3/4	Surfaced	Good
12	Milford 8	with 11	Watertown Jt. 8	3 1/2	Gravel	Good
3	Milford 7	with 11	Watertown Jt. 8	2	Surfaced	Good
14	Milford 2	with 37	Milford 1 (2 tchrs)	2 1/2	Surfaced	Good
8	Oakland 2	with 14	Oakland 1	2	Surfaced	Good
8	Oakland 2	with 10	Oakland 7	2	Surfaced	Good
10	Oakland 10	with 19	Oakland Jt. 12	2	Dirt	Good
12	Palmyra 2	with	Palmyra Village	2 3/4	Gravel	Good
14	Palmyra 5	with	Palmyra Village	2	Surfaced	Good

TABLE XXI—(Continued)
POSSIBLE RURAL SCHOOL COMBINATIONS

Jefferson County

Enrol-ment	School	Enrol-ment	School	Distance between Schools	Character of Road	Possibility of Combination
8	Sullivan 6	with 59	Sullivan 8 (2 tehrs)	(miles) 1	Surfaced	Good
10	Sullivan Jt. 8	with	Palmyra Village	4 1/4	Gravel	Good
5	Waterloo Jt. 12	with 30	Waterloo Jt. 18	3 1/2	Gravel	Good
11	Waterloo 5	with	Waterloo Village	2	Gravel	Good
14	Watertown 11	with 19	Watertown 5	2 3/4	Dirt & Surf.	Good
9	Watertown 12	with	Watertown City	3 1/4	Surfaced	Good
6	Watertown 2	with	Watertown City	2 1/2	Surfaced	Good
6	Watertown 6	with	Watertown City	4 1/2	Surfaced	Good

* Both have comparatively new school buildings.

In 43 cases there is a good or fair possibility of combining the smaller rural schools. The distance between schools, with the type of road, is given in table XXII.

TABLE XXII
DISTANCE AND TYPE OF ROADS BETWEEN SCHOOLS

Jefferson County

Distance	Dirt	Gravel	Surfaced	Dirt and Surfaced
1 Mile	--	--	1	--
1 1/2 Miles	--	--	1	--
1 3/4 Miles	4	--	--	--
2 Miles	--	2	8	--
2 1/2 Miles	3	1	2	2
2 3/4 Miles	--	2	1	1
3—3.9 Miles	3	5	4	--
4—4.9 Miles	--	1	1	1
Total	10	11	18	4

The preceding table shows that the distance generally is not great and the majority of the roads are graveled or hard surfaced.

JUNEAU COUNTY

Number of rural schools 1933-34	97
Number of rural schools with 15 or fewer pupils enrolled 1933-34	37
Number of transport schools 1933-34	10
Average cost of a one-teacher rural school 1933-34	\$944.77
Average cost of a rural school with 15 or fewer pupils 1933-34	914.58
Average cost of a transport school 1933-34	702.10
Average cost of a transport school with 15 or fewer pupils 1933-34	680.31

Table XXIII shows the schools that the local superintendent thinks have the best possibilities of combining with other schools. It is seen that several schools which were closed last year are operating this year. It is also seen that many of them have more than 15 pupils enrolled. It often happens that the schools with larger enrollments are situated much more favorably for combination than are the smaller schools.

TABLE XXIII
POSSIBLE RURAL SCHOOL COMBINATIONS

Juneau County

Enrollment	School	Enrollment	School	Distance between Schools (miles)	Character of Road	Possibility of Combination
14	Armenia 4	with	18 Armenia 2	4	Dirt	Good
*	Armenia 6	with	25 Necedah 5	4	Dirt	Good
18	Clearfield 2	with	19 Clearfield 3	3	Dirt	Good
16	Cutler Jt. 3	with	20 Orange 3 (2 tch. St. Gr.)	4	Dirt & Gravel	Good
12	Cutler 2	with	18 Cutler 5	6	Dirt & Gravel	Good
*	Cutler 6	with	24 Kingston 2	4	Dirt & Gravel	Good
*	Cutler 7	with	13 Necedah 13	3	Dirt	Good
*	Finley 2	with	15 Finley 1	3	Dirt	Good
*	Finley 3	with	15 Finley 1	3	Dirt	Good
8	Fountain Jt. 2	with	New Lisbon City	2½	Black Top	Good
22	Fountain Jt. 4	with	Hustler Village	1½	Black Top	Good
12	Fountain 5	with	27 Lisbon Jt. 1	3½	Dirt & Gravel	Good
20	Fountain Jt. 9	with	Hustler Village	2	Black Top	Good
4	Germantown 3	with	17 Germantown 2	2½	Dirt	Good
15	Germantown 1	with	24 Germantown 5	3½	Dirt	Good
13	Kildare 6	with	13 Kildare 5	3	Dirt	Good
*	Kildare 8	with	Lyndon Station Vil.	4	Dirt	Good
12	Lemonweir 7	with	24 Lemonweir 4	3	Dirt	Good
6	Lyndon 6	with	18 Lyndon Jt. 7	3	Black Top	Good
14	Marion 3	with	19 Marion 1	3½	Dirt	Good
25	Necedah Jt. 2	with	19 Clearfield 3	3	Dirt	Good
30	Necedah 4	with	Necedah Village	2½	Dirt & Gravel	Good
25	Necedah 5	with	Necedah Village	4	Dirt & Gravel	Good
5	Necedah Jt. 10	with	7 Necedah 6	2½	Dirt & Gravel	Good
14	Necedah 11	with	12 Cutler 2	3½	Dirt & Gravel	Good
5	Necedah Jt. 10	with	9 Necedah Jt. 12	3	Dirt	Good
24	Orange 1	with	Camp Douglas Village	3	Concrete	Good
18	Orange 5	with	19 Cutler 1	3	Dirt & Gravel	Good
6	Seven Mile Ck. 1	with	30 Kildare Jt. 3	3	Black Top	Good
12	Kingston 1	}	with 24 Kingston 2	10 (Combin'd)	Dirt & Gravel	Good
16	Kingston 3					
*	Kingston 4					

* Closed last year; open this year.

There are 24 smaller schools—those with 15 or fewer pupils last year, or schools closed last year—that have good possibilities of combining. The distance and type of road between these schools is shown in the following table.

TABLE XXIV
DISTANCE AND TYPE OF ROADS BETWEEN SCHOOLS

Juneau County

Distance	Dirt	Gravel	Surfaced	Dirt and Gravel
1½ Miles.....	--	--	--	--
1¾ Miles.....	--	--	--	--
2 Miles.....	--	--	--	--
2¼ Miles.....	--	--	--	--
2½ Miles.....	1	--	1	--
2¾ Miles.....	--	--	--	2
3—3.9 Miles.....	11	--	2	3
4—4.9 Miles.....	3	--	--	1
5—5.9 Miles.....	--	--	--	--
6—6.9 Miles.....	--	--	--	--
Total.....	15	--	3	6

In addition to the above combinations Kingston 1, Kingston 2, Kingston 3, and Kingston 4 could all be combined with the maximum traveling distance of 10 miles on a dirt and graveled road. This four-school combination would probably be a very satisfactory one.

Table XXIV shows that the distance between schools in most cases is not excessive in this county. The majority of the connections would be on dirt roads.

LAFAYETTE COUNTY

Number of rural schools 1933-34	112
Number of rural schools with 15 or fewer pupils 1933-34..	45
Number of transport schools 1933-34	8
Average cost of a one-teacher rural school 1933-34	\$1,007.22
Average cost of a rural school with 15 or fewer pupils 1933-34	904.25
Average cost of a transport school 1933-34	489.63
Average cost of a transport school with 15 or fewer pupils 1933-34	267.93

The county superintendent is making a study of the rural situation in this county at the present time. As he has pointed out in his letter to us, the districts are so irregular that a better solution of the situation seems to be to dissolve certain districts and send some of the children to one school and some to another. Many combinations are workable for parts of districts but not for the entire district. A plan providing for a general re-districting of the rural area in this county is very much needed and it is hoped that the study that is being made by the local superintendent will reveal what can be done along that direction.

Table XXV shows possible rural combinations of the schools in this county together with the comments of the local superintendent regarding the combinations listed. Those combinations rated poor or impractical by the local superintendent are not included in this table.

TABLE XXV
POSSIBLE RURAL SCHOOL COMBINATIONS

Lafayette County

Enrol- ment	School	Enrol- ment	School	Distance between Schools (miles)	Character of Road	Possibility of Com- bination
10	Belmont Jt. 3	with	Belmont Village	3	Gravel	Possible
11	Belmont Jt. 6	with	Belmont Vil.	3	Surfaced	Possible
12	Belmont 3	with 11	Belmont Jt. 6	2½	Surfaced	Feasible
15	Benton 3	with	18 Benton 4	4	Gravel	Possible
15	Benton 3	with	New Diggings Vil.	2½	Gravel	Possible
11	Benton Jt. 6	with	Cuba City	2¾	Gravel	Possible
13	Benton Jt. 8	with	25 Elk Grove Jt. 8	2½	Gravel	Possible
8	Darlington Jt. 3	with	15 Darlington 9	3	Gravel	Possible
13	Darlington 5	with	26 Darlington 4	3	Gravel	Some child.
7	Elk Grove 9	with	Belmont Village	2	Gravel	Desirable
11	Elk Grove Jt. 1	with	20 Elk Grove 5	1¾	Dirt	Possible
12	Elk Grove Jt. 4	with	20 Elk Grove 5	2	Gravel	Possible
11	Elk Grove Jt. 1	with	11 Benton Jt. 6	2	Gravel	Possible
8	Fayette 8	with	24 Fayette Jt. 5	2½	Gravel	Part of Dist.
8	Fayette 8	with	21 Fayette 4	2¾	Gravel	Part of Dist.
9	Gratiot 6	with	Gratiot Village	3¼	Gravel	Possible
8	Gratiot 8	with	11 Gratiot Jt. 17	1	Gravel	Part of Dist.
5	Gratiot Jt. 13	with	29 Gratiot 5	2¾	Gravel	Possible
5	Gratiot Jt. 13	with	16 Monticello 3	1½	Gravel	Some port.
13	Gratiot 16	with	16 Wayne 4	1¾	Gravel	Part of Dist.
9	Kendall 5	with	10 Belmont Jt. 3	3½	Gravel	Possible
10	Kendall Jt. 6	with	7 Elk Grove 9	3	Gravel	Possible
14	Lamont Jt. 6	with	18 Lamont Jt. 1	2¾	Gravel	Parts
11	Monticello 2	with	18 White Oak 2	2½	Gravel	Possible
15	Monticello Jt. 5	with	15 Shullsburg 3	2¾	Gravel	Possible
5	Seymour Jt. 4	with	10 Kendall Jt. 6	2	Gravel	Possible
5	Seymour Jt. 4	with	26 Elkgrove 7	3¼	Grav. & Surf.	Possible
8	Shullsburg 1	with	Shullsburg Village	2½	Gravel	Possible
15	Shullsburg 3	with	Shullsburg Village	4	Gravel	Possible
8	Shullsburg 1	with	16 White Oak 3	1¾	Gravel	Possible
15	Shullsburg 3	with	16 Shullsburg 5	3	Gravel	Possible
10	Wayne 5	with	24 Wayne 8	2	Gravel	Possible
10	Wayne 5	with	15 Wayne 1	2	Gravel	Possible
9	White Oak 1	with	16 White Oak 3	1¾	Gravel	Possible
9	Willow Springs Jt. 11	with	Darlington Village	4½	Gravel	Possible
5	Willow Springs 7	with	38 Willow Springs 9	2	Gravel	Very pos.

Table XXVI gives the distance between schools and character of the roads for the smaller schools having some possibility of combining in part or completely with some other school.

TABLE XXVI
DISTANCE AND TYPE OF ROADS BETWEEN SCHOOLS

Lafayette County

Distance	Dirt	Gravel	Surfaced
1 Mile.....	--	2	--
1½ Miles.....	--	1	--
1¾ Miles.....	--	3	--
2 Miles.....	--	11	--
2¼ Miles.....	--	--	--
2½ Miles.....	--	3	4
2¾ Miles.....	--	3	--
3—3.9 Miles.....	--	6	--
4—4.9 Miles.....	--	1	--
Total.....	--	29	4

It is to be noted that all combinations can be made on gravel roads and surfaced roads. In only one case is the distance greater than four miles.

MARQUETTE COUNTY

Number of rural schools 1933-34	56
Number of rural schools with 15 or fewer pupils enrolled 1933-34	25
Number of transport schools 1933-34	2
Average cost of a one-teacher rural school 1933-34.....	\$755.45
Average cost of a rural school with 15 or fewer pupils 1933-34	717.02
Average cost of a transport school 1933-34	393.53
Average cost of a transport school with 15 or fewer pupils 1933-34	393.53

There are only two closed schools in this county operating as transport schools and the voters are opposed to combining *any* schools regardless of how small the enrollment is. It is obvious that if any material change in the number of small schools is to be made in this county, it must be compelled by legislative action of the state. A large percent of the small schools have good or fair possibilities of combining as is shown in table XXVII.

TABLE XXVII
POSSIBLE RURAL SCHOOL COMBINATIONS

Marquette County

Enrol-ment	School	Enrol-ment	School	Distance between Schools (miles)	Character of Road	Possibility of Combination	
12	Buffalo 5	with	13	Buffalo 9	3	Dirt & Gravel	Fair
13	Buffalo 9	with	23	Buffalo 6	2½	Dirt	Good
12	Crystal Lake 3	with	15	Crystal Lake 1	3	Dirt	Fair
7	Crystal Lake Jt. 4	with	18	Crystal Lake 4	3¼	Dirt	Fair
12	Crystal Lake 3	with	18	Crystal Lake 4	1¼	Gravel	Fair
7	Harris 1	with	22	Harris 2	3¼	Gravel	Good
7	Harris 1	with	16	Harris Jt. 3	3¼	Dirt	Fair
6	Montello 5	with		Montello Village	3	Gravel	Good
8	Montello 6	with		Montello Village	3¼	Gravel	Good
15	Moundville 2	with	12	Buffalo 5	2¼	Gravel & Dirt	Good
15	Neshkoro Jt. 3	with		Neshkoro Village	1¼	Gravel	Good
11	Newton 5	with	15	Newton 3	5	Dirt	Fair
8	Newton 6	with	11	Newton 5	4	Dirt	Fair
8	Newton 6	with	13	Newton Jt. 2	4	Dirt	Fair
15	Newton 3	with	16	Newton 7	3¼	Dirt	Fair
8	Newton 6	with	22	Springfield Jt. 3	2½	Dirt & Gravel	Fair
13	Newton Jt. 2	with	22	Springfield Jt. 3	4	Dirt	Fair
5	Oxford Jt. 6	with		Oxford Village	3¾	Gravel	Fair
5	Oxford 12	with		Oxford Village	2¾	Dirt	Fair
5	Oxford 12	with	16	Douglas 12	2½	Dirt	Fair
5	Oxford Jt. 6	with	17	Westfield 3	3¾	Gravel	Good
11	Packwaukee 4	with		Montello Village	3¼	Gravel	Good
11	Packwaukee 8	with	18	Packwaukee Jt. 2	3¼	Gravel & Dirt	Good
11	Packwaukee 4	with	23	Packwaukee 3	2¼	Gravel & Dirt	Good
14	Shield 2	with	16	Shield Jt. 5	3	Gravel	Good
14	Shield 2	with	15	Shield 6	1¾	Gravel	Good
15	Springfield 2	with	22	Springfield Jt. 3	3	Grav. & Surf.	Good

The distances between schools with the type of road for the 21 schools with good or fair possibilities of combining are shown in Table XXVIII.

TABLE XXVIII
DISTANCE AND TYPE OF ROADS BETWEEN SCHOOLS

Marquette County

Distance	Dirt	Gravel	Surfaced	Gravel and Dirt	Gravel and Surfaced
1¼ Miles	--	2	--	--	--
1½ Miles	--	--	--	--	--
1¾ Miles	--	1	--	--	--
2 Miles	--	--	--	--	--
2¼ Miles	--	--	--	1	--
2½ Miles	2	--	--	1	--
2¾ Miles	--	--	--	2	--
3—3.9 Miles	4	4	--	1	1
4—4.9 Miles	2	--	--	--	--
5—5.9 Miles	--	--	--	--	--
Total	8	7	--	5	1

ROCK COUNTY

Number of rural schools 1933-34 -----	144
Number of schools with 15 or fewer pupils enrolled 1933-34 -----	52
Number of transport schools 1933-34 -----	11
Average cost of maintaining a one-teacher rural school 1933-34 -----	\$1,086.67
Average cost of a rural school with 15 or fewer pupils 1933-34 -----	940.51
Average cost of a transport school 1933-34 -----	860.83
Average cost of a transport school with 15 or fewer pupils 1933-34 -----	730.59

The combinations rated by the superintendent as excellent, good, and fair are shown in the following table. Those combinations considered impractical, poor, and impossible are excluded. Satisfactory combinations could be made for most of the smaller rural schools in Rock County. Almost 85 percent of the schools with 15 or fewer pupils enrolled have excellent, good or fair possibilities of combining with other schools.

TABLE XXIX
POSSIBLE RURAL SCHOOL COMBINATIONS

Rock County

Enrol-ment	School	Enrol-ment	School	Distance between Schools	Character of Road	Possibility of Combination
				(miles)		
8	Avon 3	with	16 Newark 4	2 3/4	Dirt & Gravel	Good
8	Avon 3	with	9 Avon 2	2 3/4	Dirt & Gravel	Good
14	Avon Jt. 1	with	18 Newark 3	2 1/2	Dirt	Good
9	Avon 2	with	17 Avon 6	1 1/2	Dirt	Good
10	Beloit 6	with	13 Newark 6	2 3/4	Dirt & Surf.	Good
15	Beloit 8	with	19 Beloit 3	2	Dirt & Pav.	Good
15	Beloit 8	with	18 Beloit 7	2 3/4	Dirt	Fair
13	Beloit Jt. 1 NE	with	Beloit 4 (St. Gr.)	2	Dirt & Surf.	Fair
13	Beloit Jt. 1 NE	with	Beloit City	3	Dirt	Good
10	Beloit 6	with	Beloit City	3 1/2	Surfaced	Good
10	Beloit 6	with	15 Beloit 8	2 1/2	Dirt	Fair
14	Bradford Jt. 14E	with	20 Bradford 5	4	Dirt	Fair
14	Center Jt. 2 SE	with	18 Center Jt. 2 SW	2 1/4	Gravel & Dirt	Fair
16	Center 1	with	14 Center Jt. 2 SE	2 1/2	Gravel & Dirt	Good
9	Center Jt. 3	with	14 Center Jt. 2 SE	2 1/2	Dirt	Fair
10	Fulton 2	with	16 Fulton 1	1 1/4	Surfaced	Excellent
9	Fulton 5	with	14 Fulton 9	2	Dirt	Fair
11	Fulton Jt. 2	with	14 Fulton 9	2 1/4	Gravel	Excellent
9	Fulton 5	with	16 Fulton 1	2 1/2	Dirt (poor rds)	Fair
11	Fulton Jt. 2	with	16 Milton Jt. 5	1 1/2	Dirt	Good
11	Fulton Jt. 2	with	15 Milton Jt. 6	1 1/2	Dirt	Most Exc.
15	Harmony 4	with	17 Johnstown 1	2 1/4	Gravel	Excellent
15	Harmony 4	with	15 Harmony 5	2 1/2	Dirt & Gravel	Fair
8	Harmony 7	with	15 Harmony 4	2 3/4	Dirt	Excellent
9	Harmony 8	with	15 Harmony 6	2 1/2	Surf. & Dirt	Excellent
4	La Prairie 1	with	13 La Prairie 7	3 1/2	Dirt & Gravel	Fair
13	La Prairie 7	with	16 La Prairie Jt. 6-2	2 1/2	Gravel	Good
13	Lima Jt. 15	with	25 Lima Jt. 14	2	Dirt (Rd. poor)	Fair
8	Lima Jt. 5	with	17 Lima Jt. 11	1 3/4	Dirt (Rd. poor)	Fair
17	Lima Jt. 7	with	17 Lima Jt. 11	2 3/4	Dirt (Rd. poor)	Fair
12	Lima Jt. 10	with	17 Lima Jt. 7	2 1/2	Dirt (Rd. poor)	Fair
12	Lima Jt. 10	with	16 Lima 12	1	Dirt	Good
12	Magnolia 2	with	23 Magnolia 1	3 1/2	Dirt & Gravel	Fair
12	Magnolia 2	with	18 Magnolia 5	3 1/2	Dirt & Gravel	Fair
13	Magnolia 7	with	18 Magnolia 5	4	Dirt & Gravel	Fair
13	Magnolia 7	with	15 Magnolia 6	2 1/2	Dirt	Good
18	Magnolia 6	with	19 Spring Valley 1	3 3/4	Surf. & Dirt	Fair

TABLE XXIX—(Continued)
POSSIBLE RURAL SCHOOL COMBINATIONS

Rock County

Enrollment	School	Enrollment	School	Distance between Schools (miles)	Character of Road	Possibility of Combination
15	Milton Jt. 6 (Center)	with	Milton Village	1	Surfaced	Excellent
9	Newark 1	with	18 Beloit 7	2	Dirt	Good
9	Newark 1	with	18 Newark 2	2	Dirt	Good
11	Newark 5	with	13 Newark 6	2 1/2	Dirt	Fair
11	Newark 5	with	13 Newark 2	3	Dirt	Fair
10	Newark 8	with	13 Newark 6	2 3/4	Dirt	Fair
13	Newark 6	with	16 Newark 7	2 3/4	Dirt & Surf.	Good
10	Newark 8	with	18 Newark Jt. 1	3	Dirt	Fair
16	Newark 7	with	16 Newark 4	3 1/2	Dirt & Gravel	Good
6	Plymouth 8	with	Orfordville Village	3	Surfaced	Fair
6	Plymouth 8	with	Footville Village	1 1/2	Dirt	Very Good
10	Porter 6	with	27 Porter Jt. 5-8	3	Dirt & Surf.	Fair
10	Porter 6	with	22 Porter 4	3	Dirt & Gravel	Fair
10	Porter 6	with	21 Porter 8	2 1/2	Dirt & Surf.	Fair
11	Porter Jt. 9	with	21 Porter 8	2	Dirt	Good
14	Porter 1	with	22 Porter 4	1 1/2	Dirt	Good
13	Spring Valley 2	with	19 Spring Valley 1	2 1/2	Dirt	Good
13	Spring Valley Jt. 1	with	19 Spring Valley 1	2 1/2	Dirt	Good
13	Spring Valley Jt. 2	with	16 Spring Valley Jt. 8-2	2 3/4	Dirt	Fair
9	Union 1	with	12 Union 3	2 1/2	Dirt	Good
12	Union 3	with	20 Union 7	4	Dirt & Gravel	Good
9	Union 1	with	14 Union 9	2 3/4	Dirt & Surf.	Good
9	Union 1	with	Evansville City	3 3/4	Surfaced	Good

Forty-four of the smaller schools have excellent, good or fair possibilities of combination with other schools. In addition there are a few schools with more than 15 enrolled that could well be combined with other schools. Table XXX shows the distance and type of road between the 44 smaller schools that have possibilities of combining.

TABLE XXX
DISTANCE AND TYPE OF ROADS BETWEEN SCHOOLS

Rock County

Distance	Dirt	Gravel	Surfaced	Gravel and Dirt	Dirt and Surfaced
1 Mile	1	--	1	--	--
1 1/4 Miles	--	--	1	--	--
1 1/2 Miles	4	--	--	--	--
1 3/4 Miles	1	--	--	--	--
2 Miles	6	--	--	--	1
2 1/4 Miles	2	1	--	2	1
2 1/2 Miles	9	2	--	1	3
2 3/4 Miles	3	--	--	--	2
3-3.9 Miles	--	1	--	1	--
4-4.9 Miles	1	--	--	--	--
Total	27	4	2	4	7

Since the distances are not great in most cases, and the roads in this county are well maintained, there seems to be ample possibility for combination. However, as in most of the other counties, little can be done unless it is provided by legislative action, as the people are opposed to closing their schools even if the enrollment is small.

WAUSHARA COUNTY

Number of rural schools 1933-34 -----	87
Number of rural school teachers 1933-34 -----	88
Number of schools with 15 or fewer pupils enrolled -----	41
Number of transport schools 1933-34 -----	10
Average cost of maintaining a one-teacher rural school 1933-34 -----	\$806.24
Average cost of a rural school with 15 or fewer pupils 1933-34 -----	756.57
Average cost of a transport school 1933-34 -----	568.38
Average cost of a transport school of 15 or fewer pupils 1933-34 -----	431.80

As was pointed out by the county superintendent of this county, there are two important factors to consider in planning the combinations of rural schools: first, the people in any given district are opposed to closing their school and no amount of effort can change the sentiment they have toward their district school; second, at the present time the side-roads are not kept open during the winter months and since children live on the side-roads in most cases and not on the main highway, the cost of road maintenance would increase with the combination of the smaller schools. The increased road maintenance cost must, of course, be subtracted from any amount saved by combining the smaller schools to determine the amount actually saved.

The schools which the local superintendent indicated have possibilities of combining are shown in Table XXXI together with enrollments, distances, and type of roads.

TABLE XXXI
POSSIBLE RURAL SCHOOL COMBINATIONS

Waushara County

Enrolment	School	with	Enrolment	School	Distance between Schools	Character of Road	Possibility of Combination
11	Aurora 4	with	37	Aurora Jt. 8 (2 tchrs)	(miles) 1 3/4	Surfaced	-----
10	Aurora Jt. 2	with	26	Aurora 7	3	Dirt	-----
14	Bloomfield Jt. 4	with	15	Bloomfield 2	3	Dirt	-----
15	Bloomfield 2	with	17	Bloomfield Jt. 7	2	Dirt	-----
15	Bloomfield 2	with	19	Poy Sippi 2	3	Dirt & Gravel	-----
10	Coloma Jt. 1	with	24	Coloma 3	1 1/2	Dirt	-----
12	Coloma 4	with	-----	Coloma 2 (Vil.)	3 1/4	Gravel	-----
15	Dakota Jt. 5	with	15	Dakota 3	3 1/4	Dirt	-----
13	Dakota 2	with	15	Dakota 3	3 1/2	Gravel	-----
15	Dakota 3	with	-----	Wautoma Village	1 1/2	Gravel	-----
14	Dakota Jt. 1	with	13	Richford 2	3 1/4	Dirt	-----

TABLE XXXI—(Continued)
POSSIBLE RURAL SCHOOL COMBINATIONS

Waushara County

Enrol-ment	School	Enrol-ment	School	Distance between Schools	Character of Road	Possibility of Combination
				(miles)		
9	Deerfield Jt. 2	with 19	Deerfield 3	3 1/4	Dirt & Gravel	-----
13	Deerfield 1	with 19	Deerfield 3	3 1/4	Dirt & Gravel	-----
11	Hancock Jt. 9	with	Coloma 2 (Vil.)	4 1/4	Surfaced	-----
14	Hancock 2	with	Hancock Village	3 1/4	Dirt & Surf.	-----
13	Leon 2	with	Poy Sippi St. Gr.	2	Gravel	-----
13	Leon Jt. 6	with	Leon Jt. 1 St. Gr.	2 1/4	Gravel	-----
13	Leon 2	with	Leon Jt. 1 St. Gr.	3 1/4	Gravel & Dirt	-----
13	Leon Jt. 6	with 18	Mt. Morris 2	2 1/2	Dirt	-----
10	Marion Jt. 6	with 13	Marion Jt. 2	3	Dirt & Surf.	-----
6	Mt. Morris Jt. 5	with	Wautoma Village	2 3/4	Gravel	-----
15	Oasis 8	with 21	Rose 5	1 3/4	Dirt	-----
15	Oasis 8	with 21	Oasis Jt. 1	2 1/4	Gravel	-----
11	Oasis Jt. 3	with 10	Rose Jt. 8	3 1/2	Dirt	-----
12	Plainfield Jt. 2	with	Hancock Village	3 1/2	Dirt & Gravel	-----
11	Plainfield 4	with 12	Plainfield Jt. 2	2 1/2	Dirt	-----
12	Poy Sippi 5	with 18	Poy Sippi 1	4 3/4	Gravel	-----
8	Poy Sippi Jt. 12	with 12	Poy Sippi 5	2 3/4	Dirt	-----
11	Richford 3	with 21	Richford 1	3	Gravel	-----
10	Rose Jt. 8	with 21	Oasis Jt. 1	2	Gravel	-----

The distance between schools and the type of roads for Waushara County are shown in Table XXXII.

TABLE XXXII
DISTANCE AND TYPE OF ROADS BETWEEN SCHOOL

Waushara County

Distance	Dirt	Gravel	Surfaced	Dirt and Surfaced	Gravel & Surfaced	Dirt and Gravel
1 Mile	--	--	--	--	--	--
1 1/4 Miles	--	--	--	--	--	--
1 1/2 Miles	1	--	--	--	--	--
1 3/4 Miles	--	1	1	--	--	--
2 Miles	1	2	--	--	--	--
2 1/4 Miles	--	--	--	--	--	--
2 1/2 Miles	3	2	--	--	--	--
2 3/4 Miles	2	1	--	--	--	--
3—3.9 Miles	6	3	--	3	--	2
4—4.9 Miles	--	--	1	--	--	--
5—5.9 Miles	--	--	--	--	--	--
Total	13	9	2	3	--	2

Table XXXII shows that 29 of the small schools of this county have possibilities of combining with other schools. Almost 45% of the connecting roads are dirt. The distance between schools in most cases is not great.

What Can Be Saved by Combining the Smaller Schools of Wisconsin



IN PRESENTING the data regarding the rural situation little has been said of the amount of money that might be saved by the combinations of the smaller schools. On the basis of the data collected, an estimate of the amount that could be saved by combining the schools of 15 or fewer pupils will be attempted.

As previously pointed out, there were 69 schools with 5 or fewer pupils enrolled in Wisconsin during 1933-34, 550 with from 6-10 pupils, and 1068 with 11-15 pupils enrolled. Thus, there were 1687 schools with 15 or fewer pupils enrolled.

In the 13 counties from which adequate information was obtained there were 554 schools of 15 or fewer pupils. As rated by the local superintendents, 333 of these schools had some practical possibility of combining with others. If these figures are taken as representative of the entire state, then approximately 60% of the schools with 15 or less enrollment can be combined with other schools. Thus it would be practical to combine approximately 1000 of the smaller schools of Wisconsin.

The average cost of maintaining a one-teacher rural school, with 15 or fewer pupils, in Wisconsin last year (1933-34) was \$828.50. The average state cost of maintaining a transport school in 1933-34 was \$720.77. This figure includes the cost of several large transport districts and consequently is probably greater than the cost would be for maintaining a transport school with 15 or fewer pupils. The average cost of maintaining a transport school for 15 or fewer pupils in the 14 counties studied was \$514.56 in 1933-34. The amount that could be saved by combining all schools of 15 or fewer pupils would probably be somewhere near \$300 (\$828.50-\$514.56) per school. For the 1000 schools this would approximate \$300,000 for the schools that could be closed. In addition to the money that could be saved by the schools which closed and organized as transport schools, money could be saved by the districts to which the pupils from the closed schools would go. These schools would receive tuition money from the children coming from the closed school which is more money than would be needed for books, supplies, and equipment. These costs, in a normal year averaged approximately \$5.00 (1930 was taken as a basis) per pupil per year whereas the tuition averages approximately \$30. A saving of about \$25 for each non-resident pupil can be realized by the school to which the pupils from the transport schools go. If 1000 schools of 15 or fewer pupils were combined, it would mean the transfer of approximately 9000 pupils (1932-33 figures). At a saving of \$25 per pupil it would save approximately \$225,000 for the schools to which the pupils would go. This, added to the \$300,000 saved by the districts which closed, would be a saving of approximately \$525,000. On the basis of present data, any estimate substantially greater than this amount seems a little optimistic. However, future studies may reveal factors that will increase the saving.

Permissive Laws on District Changes

The foregoing indicates what savings might reasonably be expected from a maximum operation of the laws on consolidation and transportation as they now stand. It is also prefaced upon the assumption that voluntary or forced consolidation of districts has fairly well-established limits as far as savings or adoption of the plans are concerned. The study is based upon the districts as they are under present district organization and law.

It is quite common to hear the term "consolidation" used loosely. It means the closing of a school, the abandonment of the original supporting district, transfer of assets, abolition of its school board and complete transfer of prerogatives to a newly created district. This may be done by referendum according to Section 40.35 which reads:

40.35 Consolidation of schools by referendum. (1) This section shall not apply to a school district, any part of which is within a city. When fifteen per cent of the electors, in each of two or more contiguous common school districts, shall petition therefor, the school boards shall meet at a time and place designated by the school board of the most populous district, to fix a time for an election to determine whether the district shall be consolidated, which election shall be not less than two, nor more than four weeks from the date of their meeting. Such election shall be called for eight o'clock in the afternoon, at the regular places for holding the district meeting. The district clerk of the respective districts shall give notice of the election as notices of annual school district meetings are given. The elections shall be conducted by the school officers of the respective districts, and the votes shall be by ballot. They shall, within three days, report the result of the elections in their respective districts to the clerk of the district in which the meeting to fix the time of the election was held. The several school boards, one week after the election, shall meet at said place and shall canvass the returns.

(2) If a majority of the votes cast in each district is in favor of consolidation, the school districts shall thereby be consolidated into a single school district, and the school boards, at the time of canvassing the returns, shall name and number the new district, and shall appoint a time and place for the first district meeting, and they shall give notice thereof as notices of annual meetings of common school districts are given.

(3) When a consolidated school district shall be organized, the school districts out of which it shall have been formed shall cease to exist, and the title to all property and the assets of every nature of such several school districts shall thereupon become vested in the consolidated school district, and claims and obligations and contracts of said several school districts shall become the claims and obligations and contracts of such consolidated district. The consolidated district shall conduct the schools theretofore maintained and conducted by the several districts until such time as the consolidated district shall have made new provisions therefor. [1931 c. 67 s. 55; 1933 c. 140 s. 2]

Municipal governing boards have the power to alter district boundary lines. Such procedure is governed by Section 40.30, as follows:

40.30 Common school districts; creation, alteration, dissolution. (1) **NAME, CONTIGUOUS TERRITORY.** Town and village boards and councils of cities of the fourth class may, by order, create, alter, consolidate or dissolve common school districts. Such districts shall be known by the names of the municipalities in which they lie, and if there is more than one district in a municipality, those districts shall be further designated by numbers. Such districts must be of contiguous territory, and no territory shall be detached from a district unless it be by the same order attached to another district, and no district shall be created having less than one hundred fifty thousand dollars of taxable property as shown by the last assessment roll.

(2) **NOTICE OF PROPOSED ACTION.** Whenever such alteration, creation, consolidation or dissolution shall be contemplated, the municipal board shall give at least five days' notice, in writing, to the clerk of each district to be in any way affected thereby of the day, hour and place it will be to decide upon proposed changes. Each district clerk shall immediately notify the other members of his board.

(3) **JOINT ACTIONS OF BOARD.** When the territory to be affected by proposed order lies in more than one municipality, the municipal boards shall act jointly, and the concurrence of a majority of each board shall be necessary to a valid order.

(4) **ORDER AS EVIDENCE.** Such order shall be presumptive evidence of the facts recited therein and of the validity of all proceedings preliminary thereto.

(5) **DISTRICT NUMBERED.** An order creating a district shall number the district and mention the municipality in which it is situated.

(6) **ORDER FILED AND RECORDED.** Every order shall be promptly filed and recorded in the office of the clerk of the municipality in which the school districts affected by the order are situated (and if in more than one, a sufficient number of originals shall be executed so that one may be filed with each municipal clerk), and a copy of such order shall be mailed to the county superintendent.

(7) **FIRST DISTRICT MEETING.** When a common school district is created, the municipal board shall fix the time and place for the first district meeting, and shall give six days' notice thereof in the manner provided for giving notice of an annual district meeting, and proof of such notice shall be filed with the municipal clerk.

Consolidation of districts results in the loss of identity of original districts and may be accomplished by the statutory methods cited. Too often any closing of a school is termed "consolidation" when it may not be that at all. A school may be suspended for an indefinite period and its children transported to an adjoining district. Such is not consolidation. The closed school district operates as a district in every sense of the word. It has its district meetings, school board, budget and identity. This arrangement is what is commonly called a transport school. It may reopen the school any year. The law on transportation reads as follows:

40.34 Transportation, board, lodging. (1) **SCHOOL TRANSPORTATION.** The school district meeting may authorize the board to provide transportation for all the children of school age residing in the district. The board of every consolidated school district or in a district which has voted to close its school and provide tuition and transportation shall provide transportation to and from school for all school children residing in the district and over two miles from the schoolhouse. The board shall provide transportation to and from school for all school children residing in the district and over two and one-half miles from the schoolhouse, in case of a common school and four miles in case of a union high school. And if it fails to provide such transportation the parents may provide suitable transportation for their children, and shall be paid therefor by the district, at the rate of twenty cents per day for the first child and ten cents per day for each additional child transported; provided, the child shall have attended not less than one hundred and twenty days during the school year unless prevented by absence from the district; provided further, that any child residing more than four miles from the school of his district may attend the school of another district, in which case the home district shall pay the tuition of such child. The district shall be entitled to state aid on account of such transportation at the rate of ten cents per day for each child transported.

(1m) **CRIPPLED CHILDREN.** Any district may provide transportation for crippled children to any schools located in said district regardless of distance, provided the request for such service is approved by the crippled children division before any reimbursement is made for service. State aid for such approved cases will be granted on the same basis as transportation of normal children. The approval of such cases shall be based on whether or not the child can walk to school with safety and comfort and whether he can carry the regular academic course. In the case of a crippled child, attendance of one hundred twenty days during the school year shall not be necessary in order to receive transportation aid, if the child's absence from school is due to illness or treatment.

(2) **SUSPENDED SCHOOL.** The board of any district which has suspended school shall pay the tuition of all children of school age residing in the district who attend other district schools during such suspension, and shall provide transportation to and from school for all children residing more than two miles from the nearest school which they may attend, and the district shall receive the regular state and county money and state aid on account of such transportation; and in the event such district shall provide such transportation for all such children residing more than two miles from the nearest school which they may attend one hundred dollars additional state aid.

(3) **CONTRACTS FOR TRANSPORTATION.** The board, when authorized or required to provide transportation, shall enter into a written contract which shall provide that the children shall be transported in a safe and comfortable manner, with suitable protection against cold and stormy weather. The driver of each conveyance shall be of good moral character, and shall have control of the children while going to and from school. He shall report all cases of insubordination to the parents and to the teacher or principal of the school. When a contract is entered into with a person, other than the parents of the children to be transported, such person shall furnish a bond in the sum of two hundred and fifty dollars running to the school district, with approved surety, to insure the faithful performance of his contract. In case it is

the intention of the parent to provide transportation for his children, he shall notify the district board of his plans prior to the beginning of transportation.

(4) **BOARD AND LODGING.** If, in the judgment of the board, and the parent or guardian, it is to the advantage of the district and also to the advantage of the child to provide board and lodging in lieu of transportation for all or part of the time for children of the district, residing more than two miles from the school, the board and parent or guardian shall enter into a written contract under which such children shall be properly boarded and lodged not more than one mile from the school, and the board shall pay for such board and lodging from the general fund not to exceed two dollars per week. The district shall be reimbursed by the state at the rate of one dollar per week of five days for each child so boarded and lodged. It shall also be the privilege of the parent or guardian to select the home in which the child be boarded and lodged. If the parent or guardian prefers to transport his child or children he shall be compensated and the district reimbursed as provided by subsection (1) of this section. The board may, if in its judgment it is to the interest of the district, in lieu of furnishing transportation or board and lodging, pay the tuition of such children in a school in another district which such children can conveniently attend without transportation.

(5) **TRANSPORTATION AND LODGING; RECORDS AND REPORT; STATE ALLOWANCE.** The school clerk shall give the teacher at the opening of the school the names of all children of school age in the district, residing more than two miles from the school, and the teacher shall inquire of every such child when enrolled, whether he is to be transported, and the manner of transportation, and shall keep a record that shall show every day each child is transported and, at the close of the term, the teacher shall file a special report of such attendance with the clerk, who shall include such report with his annual report, to the county superintendent, giving the names of the parents, the names and ages of the children, the distance transported, the number of days transported, the amount due for each child, and the total sum paid by the district. The parent shall keep a daily record of such attendance and present such record with his bill for transportation. A similar report and record shall be kept and made for all children who are boarded and lodged. The county superintendent shall make personal inspection of the transportation and lodging furnished, and shall report his findings thereon to the state superintendent at the close of the school year. If the state superintendent shall be satisfied that the law and the contracts for the transportation and board and lodging of pupils have been substantially complied with, he shall certify to the secretary of state the sum due each district under the provisions of this section. In case of differences concerning the character and sufficiency of the transportation or board and lodging, the state superintendent shall have the power to determine such matter and his decision thereon shall be final.

(5a) **RENT HOUSE FOR FAMILY.** Whenever in the judgment of the board it is to the interest of the district in lieu of transportation to rent a house for the family of children required to be transported, it may enter into a written lease for such house and pay as rental therefor not more than the amount which would have to be paid for transportation pursuant to subsection (3).

(6) **LIMITATION.** This section does not apply to children who reside in cities.

(7) **APPROPRIATION PRORATED.** If in any year the total of the claims for state aid under this section shall exceed the amount appropriated in subsection (2) of section 20.25, the state superintendent shall equitably prorate the amount available among the several school districts entitled to share in this state aid. [1933 c. 140 s. 5; 1933 c. 154 s. 2; 1933 c. 494 s. 13; 1933 c. 495.]

The Problem

The nub of the small-enrollment school problem is found in district boundary lines. Under present law little improvement can be expected. Any one reflecting upon the facts presented in the previous pages will be impressed with the multitude of factors surrounding our school districts. Variations have a range so wide that they crowd the extremes of any distribution scale. Besides variables common to many, there are conditions peculiar to individual districts. Each district differs from others in certain aspects and these must be recognized and comprehended in any practical discussion seeking to terminate in a solution of the problem. Enrollments, fluctuating from year to year, have always been a puzzler to districts contemplating temporary discontinuance. Another, and perhaps the most retarding influence, is the reluctance of people to surrender local self-government as they conceive it. Local autonomy is deeply imbedded in the mind of the body politic and it will maintain a "show me" attitude before relinquishing anything now extended

under district school law. In our opinion, then, the savings possible under the present law and as previously computed, approximate the limit of economy unless the way is opened for complete revision of boundary lines.

No phase of educational organization has received more public comment than the small-enrollment rural school. So great is the zeal of some in this direction that it obliterates any other serious considerations of education. While the problem demands attention, it should be kept in mind that the job of remedying the situation is not as easy as some would have us believe. Any action toward closing schools should be the result of careful impartial study of factors involved. A blanket law closing all schools of less than a predetermined enrollment will not work. Nor should the solution be actuated by a definite sum to be saved by the revision. Financial saving to be sure, but educational advantage should always be in the picture.

The Solution of the Rural School Problem

It must be emphasized that this study is merely suggestive in the problem of enlarging the rural school unit. Additional studies of each district should be made by groups authorized to act on their findings in determining what rural schools should be closed. Plans for complete re-districting must be studied and legislative action must be provided if any material change is to be made. Let it be pointed out in this connection that the schoolmen of the state are in favor of and are working for the combination of the smaller schools. The fact that so much remains to be accomplished is due to local opposition to closing the schools in the districts of small enrollment. Legislators have done little to remedy the situation and it is the consensus of opinion of the people in close touch with the situation that little can be done unless and until some group or board is authorized to decide what schools shall be allowed to operate. The solution of the rural school problem is in the hands of the legislators more than it is in the hands of the educators of Wisconsin.

What specifically can be done to improve the rural school situation in Wisconsin? What procedure is most likely to result in economy and at the same time provide at least as good an educational offering for the boys and girls of the state as is available at the present time? Obviously any reorganization cannot be left to local initiative. In spite of the splendid efforts of local superintendents of schools much remains to be accomplished. Local opposition to combining schools has proved time and again that dependence on the action of the local districts is no solution to the problem.

Several plans might be suggested. Delaware has made the state the unit of control and support. In this small state, state control has proven a very satisfactory plan. However, since Wisconsin is unlike Delaware in many respects a state system might not prove satisfactory here. A more practical plan for this state seems to be the establishment of the county to replace the district for the unit of control of school affairs, transferring the power of the town board to the County Board of Education authorizing them to close all small schools except those where road conditions, cost of transportation, etc., make closing inadvisable. If the County Board of Education fails to make needed changes some other board not dependent on popular vote for office should be authorized to do so. Many studies have shown the county unit superior in the intelligent and economical management of schools.¹ Under a county unit plan many small schools are closed with an accompanying saving of funds. To quote from but two examples:

¹ Carr, Wm. G. *Unit of Sch. Adminis.* New York, The H. W. Wilson Co., 1931. Deffenbaugh, W. S. and Covert, Timon. *School Administrative Units with Special Reference to the County Unit.* Washington Govt. Ptg. Office, 1933 (U. S. Office of Educ. Pamphlet, No. 34).

West Virginia, a state with approximately 200 schools in the several counties with an average daily attendance of 8 pupils, has indicated that under a "County unit law" recently going into effect, these very small schools are rapidly disappearing.¹

The county board is authorized to close all schools with an average daily attendance below 20 and "if the board fails or refuses to consolidate when, in the judgment of the state superintendent consolidation is wise, all state aid is withheld."²

In Oregon,³ the county unit of school administration reduced to a marked degree the per capita cost of the rural schools. It was found that in a county operating under the county unit plan the annual cost was \$5.68 less per pupil than in a county otherwise similar but operating under a district plan. When it is remembered that the average annual per pupil cost in rural schools (in Wisconsin) is less than \$50 the percentage saving under the county unit is apparent. Savings possible by combining the smaller schools have been shown in studies in Iowa⁴, Illinois⁵, Kansas⁶, Missouri⁷, Arkansas⁸, and other states.

As has been pointed out repeatedly throughout this study, local opposition makes it impossible to combine schools which should be closed and little can be expected until legislative action has provided a larger unit of control.

There is no doubt that it is within the jurisdiction of the state to pass regulatory measures for school administration. The state of Wisconsin has through its equalization law provided assistance for the elementary schools of \$250 per teacher and made it mandatory that the county furnish a like amount. Equalization aid in addition is given all schools with an equalized value of less than \$200,000 per teacher. In addition this year the state has given \$30,250.00 in emergency aid to the rural schools, of which \$6,400.00 has been paid to rural schools enrolling 15 or fewer pupils. Since education is a function of the state, in theory,—and as far as elementary education is concerned, in practice,—it is the responsibility of the state to see that the best possible education is provided for the money invested. If the present administration of school affairs is not satisfactory to guarantee the best education for the money spent it is a state obligation to provide the necessary revisions. The foregoing data indicate that there is an opportunity to improve the situation. Local autonomy and democracy in school affairs are not to be discouraged but the autonomy should present itself in effective substance, not merely in form. Autonomy and self-government do not surrender when they operate through larger units of control. The administration of schools needs to be based upon a larger unit, supported by a larger base and animated by a larger sphere of influence. This principle has been approved at various times by the Wisconsin Teachers Association.

¹ Gaumnitz, W. H. *Economies Through the Elimination of Very Small Schools*, Dept. of Interior Bulletin, 1934, No. 3.

² Statute—Chap. 9 Extra Session 1933—W. Virginia.

³ Huffaker, C. L. *A survey of Lane & Klamath Counties*. Manuscript, Univ. of Ore. 1933.

⁴ Bachman, Dr. Frank P. Peabody College for Teachers.

⁵ Hicks, H. S. *The rural schools of Illinois*. Ill. State Tax Comm. Manuscript 1932.

⁶ O'Brien, F. P. "Small School Situation in Kansas".

⁷ Eighty-third Missouri Report of Public Schools. Jefferson City, State Dept. of Education, 1932.

⁸ Dawson, Howard A., et al. *Financial and Administrative Needs of the Public Schools of Arkansas*. Vols. I and II. Supt. of Public Inst., Little Rock, Ark., 1930.

We thank the county superintendents who furnished information and checked data submitted by this office, and also the Department of Public Instruction and State Highway Commission for generously providing access to records.

Large-scale maps of the counties referred to in this booklet are at Wisconsin Teachers Association headquarters. The maps show district boundary lines, roads, types of connecting roads, distances between schools, closed schools, active schools, enrollments, etc. These may be examined at the office by any group or individual interested in the problem.

