The news in this publication is released for the press on receipt.

THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA

NEWS LETTER

Published Weekly by the University of North Carolina for the University Extension Division.

OCTOBER 5, 1927 — CHAPEL HILL, N. C. — VOL. XIII, No. 47

THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA PRESS

Editorial Board: E. C. Branson, S. H. Hobbs, Jr., P. W. Wager, L. R. Wilson, E. W. Knight, D. D. Carroll, H. W. Odum.

Entered as second-class matter November 14, 1914, at the Postoffice at Chapel Hill, N. C., under the act of August 24, 1912

SCHOOL EFFICIENCY

SCHOOL EFFICIENCY

Elsewhere in this issue we are relaying to our readers a portion of a table which was prepared by the State Department of Public Instruction and published in a recent issue of State School Facts. The table ranks the counties and principal cities of the state in school efficiency. In addition to the score attained by each county in the school year 1925-26, the table presents the 1923-24 scores. Thus the progress in each county or city is reflected.

Ten factors generally recognized as essentials of any school system are used as a basis of comparison. Five of the factors measure academic conditions and the other five pertain to expenditures and values and hence may be designated "financial factors." Each of these factors is translated into an index that would be perfect at 100. Thus by adding the ten factors and dividing the sum obtained by ten the composite score is obtained. This is the "general efficiency index."

According to State School Facts the factors used and the standard in each factor are as follows:

Academic Factors

1. Percentage of enrollment in average daily attendance. 100 percent attendance is the perfect score of this factor.

2. Average length of term in days divided by two. A term of 200 days is taken as the standard, which divided by two gives the basic 100.

3. Scholarship or teachers' index divided by eight. The index is obtained by translating the academic and professional training of the teachers as evidenced by the certificates they hold into 100 points for each year's training above elementary school graduation; e. g., a teacher with the equivalent of two years high school is given a score of 200, one with three years high school 300, one with four years 400, one year college 500, and so on to college graduation at 800. Taking this highest score as standard and dividing by eight the basic 100 is obtained.

4. Percentage of total enrollment in high school multiplied by four. In this factor 25 percent of the total enrollment is assumed to be a fair percentage to expect in high school. This percentage taken as the standard and multiplied by four gives the basic 100.

5. Percentage of enrollment normal and under age for grade multiplied by 1.25. The normal distribution is taken as the standard in this factor. In this distribution of children by ages and grades 60 percent is expected to be normal age for grade, 20 percent under age for grade and 20 percent over age for grade. The normal age for each grade is 6 and 7 years old for first grade, 7 and 8 years old for second grade, 8 and 9 years old for third grade, and so on to 16 and 17 years old for eleventh grade. A pupil having an age below the normal age for the grade in which he is located is said to be under age, and if his age is above this normal he is over age. Therefore, in a normal distribution 80 percent should be under age and normal age together. Multiplying this percentage by 1.25 gives the basic 100.

Financial Factors

6. Average annual salary of teachers divided by twelve. An annual salary of $1,200 is assumed to be a fair salary and is taken as the standard. Dividing this standard by 12 gives the basic 100.

7. Per capita cost of instruction based upon enrollment multiplied by two. It is assumed that $50 per pupil per year is a satisfactory cost of instruction. This standard multiplied by two gives the basic 100.

8. Total per capita cost of current expense based upon enrollment multiplied by 1.33. It is assumed that $25 per pupil added to the standard cost of instruction would be a satisfactory standard per capita cost of current expense. This sum, $75, multiplied by 1,33 1-3 gives the basic 100.

9. Total current expense per teacher and principal divided by 24. $2,400 is assumed to be a fair amount to spend per teacher for current expenses per year. This is $200 per month per teacher and admittedly a high standard. However, for comparative purposes it has been retained as it originally was set up. Dividing the $2,400 by 24 gives the basic 100.

10. Valuation of school property per child enrolled divided by two. A valuation of $200 per child enrolled is assumed to be a fair standard, which divided by 2 gives the quotient 100 as the basic score.

Progress Made

The state as a whole made progress in every particular in the two-year period, the general average score rising from 56.9 to 62.4. All the counties except Alexander, Alleghany, Duplin, and Hyde made gains, and in these few instances the changes were slight. Rutherford made the greatest gain, raising its score from 42.6 to 56.7. New Hanover has retained first place for the entire period. Currituck and Pamlico have been rivals for second place.

In the larger table the counties are ranked on the basis of rural white schools. The ranking of the city systems is given in the smaller table, which appears in the lower right-hand corner of this sheet. It will be noted that they score considerably higher than the rural schools.— Paul W. Wager.

COUNTY STUDIES

During the last three years, field studies of county government and county affairs have been made in forty-three counties of North Carolina and two counties in Alabama, by Research Assistants of the University of North Carolina Institute for Research in Social Science, as follows:

Alamance, Alleghany, Ashe, Beaufort, Brunswick, Burke, Cabarrus, Caldwell, Camden, Carteret, Cherokee, Chowan, Clay, Craven, Cumberland, Edgecombe, Gates, Haywood, Hyde, Jackson, Johnston, Lee, Macon, Madison, McDowell, Montgomery, Moore, New Hanover, Pamlico, Perquimans, Person, Pitt, Polk, Randolph, Robeson, Rutherford, Surry, Stanly, Union, Washington, Watauga, Wilson, and Yadkin, in North Carolina, and Coffee and Elmore counties, Alabama.

The surveys have been made by formal invitations of the county commissioners, without any expense whatsoever to the county authorities. They have been made in the interest of improved county government and not in the interest of any party or any person or any faction. They have been made for guidance alone and never for publicity. These survey MSS. were in the hands of the State Commission on County Government when our five new county government laws were being formulated.

No Publicity

The survey MSS. are housed in the Seminar Library of Rural Social-Economics, University of North Carolina, and are open to students of county government on the campus and in the state, but always for guidance and never for publicity.

These facts are so well known to the county officials of the state that they have not hesitated to lay all their cards on the table and to help our field surveyors in every possible way. Or so it has been with only an exception or two during the last three years.

During the three years just beginning, our field surveyors will be busy making direct studies of county government in the remaining forty-seven rural counties of the state; but these surveys cannot be made in any county without the formal invitation of the county commissioners. The surveys of the present year begin in January and the counties will be served in the order of the invitations received.

The county boards wishing county government surveys made ought to formulate invitations at the next meeting of the board, and hurry these invitations to E. C. Branson, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N. C.

The surveys of the ten big-city counties are under the direction of E. J. Woodhouse, Bureau of Municipal Research, University of North Carolina.

EDUCATION AT HOME

Our schools and colleges are blamed for most everything unlovely that we see in the youth of our time. There is little or no warrant for this. Education begins at home. If we're early taught to be respectful, patient and industrious, there won't be much trouble when we get into school. If we're allowed to lord it over the whole family, we shall prove a constant problem to the schoolmarm and recreant to all school authority.

It costs $60 a year to carry pupils through the first eight grades. In the high school this figure rises to $83 annually. Thus we have a cost of about $800 for each pupil when he arrives at graduation. This takes no account of investment in buildings or the sacrifice made by parents to keep the boy or girl in school.

Education is much more than a knowledge of mathematics, history, biology, physics and the languages. A youth may have acquired all these and yet be useless to himself and to society. If a boy passes through the grades and the high school with no thought of what makes them possible, we should consider the $800 above mentioned a bad investment. If he is thoughtless as to his parents and ungrateful to the public, he is not worth the cost and sacrifice. He would be a bad trade at any figure. Education is no birthright, it is the gift of the state. A boy should realize that he cannot fully repay his father and mother or the community. To do less than his best, marks him as ungrateful, a thoroughly selfish cad.

We are at the beginning of the school year, an appropriate time for youth to appreciate its opportunity and be suitably grateful to parents and the community therefor.—Roland T. Patten.

TO BEAT THE SHARKS

The Russell Sage Foundation has pledged its resources to end the activities of loan sharks and salary buyers so that innocent victims of bankruptcy proceedings may receive more protection. Sound banking does not permit loans to be made without good collateral security or upon endorsements representing sound property worth. There are many though who feel compelled at times to secure loans, and there are places where they can get them. These places charge such high rates of interest in the guise of fees, discounts, rents or what else they might call them that the borrower is unable to pay the original loan. These schemes are clothed in such manner that the borrower is not able to see the snare. The salary of the borrower may be pledged for a definite period and his family thus deprived of the regular income. The bankruptcy law offers an escape from bondage. And here is where the doctor, the merchant and others who serve the borrower for an honest profit become losers. If the Russell Sage Foundation can find a way out for the small borrower who cannot furnish the usual security it will confer an economic benefit not only upon the borrower but upon many others.—Lexington Dispatch.

SAVINGS IN THE U. S.

The prosperity of those who are able to save something out of their income is reflected to a large degree by accumulated savings and by the trend of annual savings. The National Industrial Conference Board has published figures along both of these lines.

The accumulated savings in building and loan associations increased from $1,360,000,000 in 1914 to $6,280,000,000 in 1926. These savings represent the total assets of such organizations. For life insurance companies the increase was from $4,640,000,000 in 1914 to $12,850,000,000 in 1926. These savings also represent the assets of the companies and are equivalent to the policy holders' equity. The savings accounts in all classes of banks increased from $8,710,000,000 in 1914 to $24,700,000,000 in 1926.

The rate of savings along the above lines as represented by the accumulations each year reflects some interesting contrasts. Obviously savings from year to year vary with changing conditions in prosperity. But bank savings vary more widely than either those in building and loan associations or life insurance companies. This is accounted for by the fact that savings of the last two forms involve a definite obligation of regularity of payments while the current withdrawls in banks may in some years exceed current additions.

The annual savings in life insurance companies, as reflected by the total premiums paid each year, have climbed steadily upward from $673,000,000 in 1913 to $2,383,000,000 in 1926. The variation in annual savings in building and loan associations has reflected to a greater degree changing conditions of prosperity, but they increased from $54,000,000 in 1913 to $495,000,000 in 1926.

In contrast, current withdrawals of bank savings exceeded current additions from 1913 to 1915, but deposits rose to over $1,000,000,000 in 1917, slumped off in 1918 to $250,000,000, skyrocketed to over $1,750,000,000 in 1920, dropped to $500,000,000 by 1922, rose again to over $1,500,000,000 in 1923, and in 1924 and 1925 ranged from $750,000,000 to nearly $1,250,000,000. In 1926 they stood at $752,000,000.

As we have previously pointed out, these figures undoubtedly reflect, among other things, savings due to prohibition.—Information Service, Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America.

SCHOOL EFFICIENCY

Rank of the Counties and Cities

The following table is an adaptation of a more comprehensive one which appeared in State School Facts, Volume III, Number 24.

In the first table the county school systems are ranked according to their general efficiency index. This index number is determined by scoring the school systems according to each of ten educational factors and then taking the average. A perfect score would be 100. The scores are given for the school years 1923-24 and 1925-26, the ranking being according to the more recent date.

During this period the rural white schools of the state rose in their efficiency rating from 50.1 to 55.9, the city white schools from 81.1 to 83.8, and all the white schools from 56.9 to 62.4. New Hanover, with a score 85.4, leads the counties, and Greensboro, with a score of 94.6, leads the cities.

Paul W. Wager

Department of Rural Social-Economics, University of North Carolina

Rank	County	School efficiency rating 1923-24	School efficiency rating 1925-26
1	New Hanover	75.7	85.4
2	Currituck	69.4	81.9
3	Pamlico	70:1	75.8
4	Durham	68.3	74.2
5	Vance	59.6	74.1
6	Granville	60.1	71.0
7	Craven	59.7	70.9
8	Northampton	65.2	70.3
9	Warren	63.2	69.5
10	Cumberland	61.6	69.3
10	Wilson	66.2	69.3
12	Edgecombe	63.6	69.1
13	Mecklenburg	57.5	66.9
14	Buncombe	55.5	66.1
15	Scotland	60.0	65.3
16	Washington	61.8	65.1
17	Hertford	59.9	64.9
18	Guilford	61.6	64.3
19	Hyde	64.4	64.1
20	Transylvania	52.5	63.9
21	Bertie	57.5	63.4
21	Halifax	60.5	63.4
23	Montgomery	57.6	62.5
24	Pender	49.9	62 2
25	Gates	53.9	61.8
25	Pasquotank	59.2	61.8
27	Robeson	56.3	61.5
28	Gaston	58.0	61.2
28	Hoke	54.6	61.2
30	Camden	59.4	61.0
31	Jones	56.3	60.7
32	Nash	60.2	60.6
33	Pitt	56.2	59.8
34	Anson	47.0	59.2
34	Richmond	53.4	59.2
36	Bladen	53.8	59.0
36	Catawba	51.0	59.0
38	Chowan	54.7	58.8
39	Rockingham	56.6	58.7
40	Perquimans	44.5	58.3
41	Wayne	51.0	58.1
42	Alamance	57.1	57.9
42	Wake	54.2	57.9
44	Martin	50.2	57.7
45	Lenoir	46.5	57.5
46	Orange	52.6	57.2
47	Polk	49.4	57.1
48	Forsyth	49.2	56.9
49	Dare	49.9	56.7
49	Rutherford	42.6	56.7
51	Carteret	52.1	56.6
52	Moore	50.2	56.5
53	McDowell	51.9	56.0
54	Lee	47.2	55.0
55	Davie	46.0	54.8
56	Jackson	49.3	54.2
57	Rowan	50.2	53.8
58	Beaufort	45.1	53.6
58	Iredell	46.0	53.6
60	Haywood	41.3	53.5
61	Henderson	46.7	53.4
62	Columbus	49.0	53.0
62	Harnett	43.9	53.0
64	Greene	50.0	52.8
65	Johnston	43.4	52.7
66	Tyrrell	46.0	52.4
67	Avery	51.4	52.1
67	Chatham	47.8	52.1
67	Franklin	49.5	52.1
70	Lincoln	44.9	52.0
71	Stanly	47.2	51.9
72	Duplin	54.4	51.3
73	Union	46.9	50.9
74	Person	43.7	50.5
75	Onslow	44.5	50.2
76	Sampson	43.8	49.8
77	Alexander	50.4	49.7
78	Burke	44.3	49.3
78	Swain	47.1	49.3
78	Watauga	42.6	49.3
81	Cleveland	46.3	49.0
81	Graham	45.4	49.0
83	Randolph	42.4	48.7
84	Clay	42.4	48.6
84	Davidson	45.1	48.6
86	Caldwell	44.0	48.5
87	Caswell	44.3	48.0
88	Cabarrus	44.6	47.5
89	Macon	42.0	46.8
90	Alleghany	46.9	46.2
91	Stokes	40.7	44.9
92	Mitchell	38.2	44.5
93	Brunswick	41.6	44.4
94	Madison	38.2	44.2
95	Yancey	42.4	43.9
96	Wilkes	40.4	43.6
97	Ashe	40.2	43.4
98	Surry	36.3	42.6
99	Yadkin	38.8	41.5
100	Cherokee	37.1	38.4

	City group I		
1	Greensboro	91.9	94.6
2	Durham	91.4	90.4
2	Wilmington	86.9	90.4
4	Winston-Salem	88.7	90.2
5	Charlotte	76.0	89.5
6	Raleigh	86.4	86.4
7	Asheville	84.0	85.9
8	High Point	77.0	78.5
	City Group II		
1	Salisbury	82.9	91.7
2	Kinston	78.6	84.3
3	New Bern	83.9	83.8
4	Wilson	81.1	83.6
5	Elizabeth City	82.2	83.2
5	Goldsboro	80.5	83.2
7	Rocky Mount	76.9	81.2
8	Gastonia	75.0	80.8
9	Concord	76.8	79.1
10	Henderson	69.9	64.6
	City Group III		
1	Hickory	86.2	92.2
2	Greenville	——	87.1
3	Reidsville	——	86.6
4	Fayetteville	81.5	86.6
5	Burlington	79.4	83.2
6	Roanoke Rapids	80.9	83.0
7	Statesville	80.6	82.8
8	Lexington	——	82.5
9	Smithfield	——	81.4
10	Tarboro	——	80.7
11	Mt. Airy	——	80.5
11	Washington	——	80.5
13	Dunn	——	79.7
14	Morganton	——	74.8
15	Shelby	——	72.4
16	Mooresville	69.8	68.6