

**A STUDY OF THE
COMPENSATION OF COACHES
OF INTERSCHOLASTIC ATHLETICS
OF THE STATE
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION**

Approved by the State department of education
at its regular session resolution no. 34, p.

ORIGINAL

**A STUDY OF THE
COMPENSATION OF COACHES
OF INTERSCHOLASTIC ATHLETICS
OF THE STATE
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION**

**A Report to the Governor and the Legislature
of the State of Hawaii**

**Submitted by the
Legislative Auditor of the State of Hawaii**

April, 1970

FOREWORD

This is a report on our study of salaries paid to coaches of interscholastic athletics in the State department of education. The study was conducted pursuant to house concurrent resolution no. 94, regular session, 1969.

Coaches' pay is an elusive subject when studied out of the context of the system which it is intended to support. Our report, while focusing on coaches' pay, recognizes that there are larger questions which must be answered before any intelligent decisions can be made on the compensation of coaching personnel. It examines, however, certain alternatives and recommends one as a temporary measure, pending a fuller analysis, to correct obvious and critical inequities now existing.

We are deeply grateful for the excellent cooperation and assistance extended to our representatives by the various officials and staff of the State department of education and the several interscholastic leagues which have some connection with the operations of interscholastic athletics in the State.

Clinton T. Tanimura
Legislative Auditor

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
PART I. INTRODUCTION	
Chapter 1 Purpose and Scope of Study	1
2 Frame of Reference	2
PART II. FINDINGS	
3 Existing Situation	5
4 Alternatives	12
PART III. THE LARGER QUESTIONS	
5 The Pay Schedule; The Program for Interscholastic Athletics	22
Appendix A House Concurrent Resolution No. 94, H.D. 1, 1969	26
Appendix B Salaries of Football Coaches per Season, F. Y. 1969-70	27
Appendix C Sports Offered by Schools, F. Y. 1968-69	28
Appendix D Examples of Variations in Expenditure Practices by Leagues	29
Appendix E Student Activity Fees for Athletics, F. Y. 1968-69	30
Appendix F Gate Admission Prices, F. Y. 1968-69	31

PART I. INTRODUCTION

Chapter 1

PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF STUDY

This is a report on our study of salaries paid to coaches of interscholastic athletics in the State department of education. The study was conducted pursuant to house concurrent resolution no. 94, regular session, 1969.¹

Scope

House concurrent resolution no. 94 was adopted out of legislative concern about the seeming disparity in the salaries being paid coaches of interscholastic athletics and the failure of coaches' salaries "to keep up with the cost of living." It asked this office "to study interscholastic athletics from the standpoint of coaches' salaries, method of funding, distribution of gate receipts, and other related aspects."

In one of its findings, the resolution noted that "a comprehensive study of the organizational, fiscal and budgetary aspects of interscholastic athletics has been long over due." This finding and other language of the resolution appeared to invite a rather sweeping examination of the entire interscholastic athletic program of the State. This report, however, is not that all encompassing. It is limited to an examination of coaches' pay. It is further restricted in that it does not attempt to determine what the coaches' salaries ought to be. We believe that the task of setting salaries belongs to the department of education and the legislature. What this report seeks to do are the following.

First, it examines what the existing situation is regarding coaches' pay. *Second*, it attempts to determine what the cause of the existing situation is. *Third*, it offers some alternatives to correct existing deficiencies. *Finally* (and hopefully), it provides some framework within which the department of education and the legislature might determine the salaries of coaches.

Organization of Report

This report has three parts. Part I consists of this introduction (chapter 1) and a frame of reference (chapter 2). Part II consists of our findings regarding the existing situation (chapter 3) and a discussion of some alternative methods of correcting the deficiencies noted (chapter 4). Part III includes a chapter which briefly explores but leaves unanswered some larger questions flowing from our consideration of coaches' pay (chapter 5).

¹See Appendix A for the complete text of HCR 94.

Chapter 2

FRAME OF REFERENCE

The athletic coaches are being paid today under a salary schedule adopted by the board of education in August 1968 (see table 2.1, column (A)). This schedule was developed by a group of athletic directors and endorsed by the personnel division of the department of education.

The schedule, in effect, establishes a maximum on the amounts the various coaches of the different sports may be paid. These maximum rates were reportedly arrived at by the athletic directors on the bases of the nature of the work involved, the length of the season, the number of students supervised and the amount of public interest in the sports competition.

Coaches' salaries (and all other expenditures of interscholastic athletics) are paid from each school's athletic fund made up of program receipts (including student activity fees and gate receipts), contributions and proceeds of fund-raising activities. Each school's athletic fund, however, is reimbursed to a limited degree from the State general fund. The reimbursement is specifically to assist each school in defraying the cost of coaches' salaries. (See table 2.1, column (B), for the amounts of each salary reimbursed by the State general fund.) The amount of each salary to be met out of the general fund was set by a program specialist in the department of education after consideration of the total appropriations made by the legislature to the department annually. Because it is available each year and its availability does not depend on program receipts, this amount has in effect been regarded by each school as the minimum salary to be paid coaches.

Later in this report, we comment on the subject of establishing salary schedules. Initially, however, in reporting our findings regarding the existing situation, we assume that the maximum (but not the minimum) established by the 1968 department of education salary schedule is reasonable and use it as a reference point.

Caveat on Statistical Data

Most of the data included in this report are those of fiscal year 1968-69. Where appropriate, the experience of the current fiscal year 1969-70 is used. The monetary figures are approximations. Accounting for receipts and disbursements differs from school to school. Hence, any attempt to verify the figures for accuracy would have entailed an item-by-item examination at all schools. For the purposes of this report, we did not believe that such verification was necessary.

Table 2.1
SCHEDULE OF COACHES' PAY*

	(A) Authorized Maximum	(B) General Fund Contribution
Athletic Director	\$1,000	\$150
	Rate per Year	
Football	Rate per Season	
1. Senior Head Coach	1,000	300
2. Junior Head Coach	500	200
3. Senior Assistant Coach	500	150
4. Junior Assistant Coach	350	100
5. Assistant Coach	350	0
6. Assistant Coach	350	0
Basketball		
7. Senior Coach	700	200
8. Junior Coach	350	100
9. Junior-Senior Coach	400	250
10. Assistant Coach	300	0
Baseball		
11. Senior Coach	700	200
12. Junior Coach	400	100
13. Assistant Coach	300	0
Track		
14. Boys Junior-Senior Coach	700	200
15. Boys Assistant Coach	300	100
16. Girls Track Coach (Junior-Senior)	700	100
17. Girls Assistant Coach	300	0
18. Cross-Country Coach	250	100
Swimming		
19. Boys Coach	700	100
20. Girls Coach	700	100
21. Boys and Girls Coach	450	175
22. Boys and Girls JV Coach	200	0
Tennis		
23. Boys Coach	300	100
24. Girls Coach	300	100
25. Boys and Girls Coach	400	175
Riflery		
26. Head Coach (Non-ROTC)	350	100
Bowling		
27. Boys Coach	300	0
28. Girls Coach	300	0
29. Boys and Girls Coach	400	0

*Source: Department of Education Policy No. 4143.2a.

		(A) Authorized Maximum	(B) General Fund Contribution
		Rate per Season	
Golf			
30.	Head Coach	\$300	\$100
Rowing			
31.	Head Coach	350	0
32.	Assistant Coach	200	0
Volleyball			
33.	Boys Coach	300	100
34.	Girls Coach	300	100
35.	Boys and Girls Coach	400	100
Wrestling			
36.	Head Coach	400	100
37.	Assistant Coach	250	0
Soccer			
38.	Head Coach	700	0
39.	Assistant Coach	300	0

PART II. FINDINGS

Chapter 3

EXISTING SITUATION

Disparity in Coaches' Pay

Our examination disclosed that there are indeed great differences in the amounts coaches are being paid. Coaches in the same sport occupying the same position are paid differently in the various schools. Take football, for example. During the 1969 season, the senior head coaches at nine of the 26 high schools offering varsity football were each paid \$1,000 (the maximum allowable under the 1968 schedule), while the senior head coaches at five schools were each paid \$300 (the limit of the general fund reimbursement). The remaining 12 schools paid varying amounts ranging from \$350 to \$900. Similarly, salaries of senior assistant coaches in football ranged from a low of \$150 to a high of \$500. In some instances, assistant coaches on Oahu received more than senior head coaches at some neighbor island schools. (See appendix B for the pay of all football coaches at each school.)

The magnitude of the differences is illustrated in table 3.1. The table notes for each school, by leagues, the total salaries being paid coaches of all sports and compares that total with the total maximum allowable under the 1968 schedule. Two facts are readily discernible. *First*, coaches on the island of Oahu are better paid than coaches on the neighbor islands. On the average, Oahu coaches are being paid close to the maximum allowable by the schedule. The salaries of the neighbor island coaches average less than 70 percent of the maximum. In fact, except for Kauai, all neighbor island coaches are being paid on the average less than one-third of the maximum. In most instances, neighbor island coaches are getting no more than that amount which is supported from the general fund.

Second, the salaries paid by the different schools are fairly even within each league, but in the Oahu Interscholastic Association (OIA) and the Big Island Interscholastic Federation (BIIF), they are not. In these two leagues, the amounts paid coaches by the different schools vary widely. In the OIA, excluding Nanakuli which is a recent entry into the league, the total compensation paid by each school varies from a low of 61.9 percent of the total allowable to a high of 100 percent. On the Big Island, the range is from a low of 26.2 percent of the total allowable to 50.2 percent.

Exact equality in pay of coaches occupying the same position in each sport at every school is not necessarily the end to be sought. However, the disparity now being experienced is so great as to suggest inequity in the treatment of coaches.

Availability of Funds as a Cause of Inequality

The reason why the pay of coaches varies so widely from league to league and from school to school within some leagues appears to lie in the manner in which the interscholastic athletic program is funded. There is a close and direct correlation between the amount of pay coaches receive at a given school and the amount of money available for interscholastic programs at that school. Table 3.2 lists the amount of money which was available to each school during the fiscal year 1968-69. It is clear from the table that schools which pay their coaches more enjoyed far more resources than schools which pay

Table 3.1
**PERCENTAGE OF ACTUAL COACHES' SALARIES
 TO SALARIES COMPUTED AT MAXIMUM ALLOWABLE RATES
 PER DOE SCHEDULE**
 Fiscal Year 1969-70

League	School	A	B	A : B
		Coaches' Salaries	Salaries at Maximum Allowable Rates	Per-centage
ILH	Kalani	\$ 10,650	\$ 11,050	96.3%
	Farrington	9,200	10,350	88.8
	Roosevelt	9,800	11,200	87.5
	Kaimuki	10,250	12,000	85.4
	McKinley	8,350	9,950	83.9
	Total	48,250	54,550	
	Average	9,650	10,910	88.4
OIA	Radford	10,900	10,900	100.0
	Castle	8,750	8,750	100.0
	Aiea	9,300	9,850	94.4
	Waianac	8,300	9,100	91.2
	Leilehua	7,200	8,600	83.7
	Waipahu	5,675	7,900	71.8
	Campbell	6,400	9,600	66.6
	Kahuku	5,550	8,400	66.2
	Kailua	6,900	11,000	62.7
	Waialua	5,325	8,600	61.9
	Nanakuli	650	1,850	35.1
	Total	74,950	94,550	
	Average	6,814	8,595	79.2
MIL	Maui	3,360	9,050	37.1
	Baldwin	3,650	10,900	33.5
	Lahainaluna	2,600	7,850	33.1
	Hana	675	2,450	27.5
	Total	10,285	30,250	
	Average	2,571	7,563	32.8
KIF	Waimea	3,925	5,450	72.0
	Kauai	3,875	5,600	69.2
	Kapaa	4,825	7,500	64.3
	Total	12,625	18,550	
	Average	4,208	6,183	68.5
BIIF	Hilo	4,570	9,100	50.2
	Pahoa	875	2,650	33.0
	Kau	1,550	5,100	30.4
	Kohala	1,350	4,550	29.7
	Honokaa	1,950	7,100	27.5
	Laupahoehoe	1,400	5,300	26.4
	Konawaena	2,150	8,200	26.2
	Total	13,845	42,000	
	Average	1,978	6,000	32.9
MLIL	Lanai	1,100	4,050	27.2
	Molokai	500	2,050	24.4
	Total	1,600	6,100	
	Average	800	3,050	25.8
Grand Total Average		\$161,555	\$246,000	65.7%

Table 3.2
**RESOURCES AVAILABLE FOR
 INTERSCHOLASTIC ATHLETICS,
 BY SCHOOLS AND LEAGUES**
 Fiscal Year 1968-69

League	School	(A) Total Resources	(B) General Fund For Salaries Only	(C) Program Receipt	(D) Volunteer Efforts	(E) Student Activities Fee - Included In Col. (C)
ILH	Roosevelt	\$ 44,137	\$ 2,775	\$ 37,087	\$ 4,275	\$ 5,347
	McKinley	42,193	2,450	37,405	2,338	3,879
	Farrington	40,968	2,400	33,801	4,767	7,292
	Kaimuki	39,321	2,800	33,492	3,029	8,005
	Kalani	36,360	2,575	31,785	2,000	7,164
	Total	202,979	13,000	173,570	16,409	31,687
	Average	40,596	2,600	34,714	3,282	6,337
OIA	Castle	36,511	2,275	27,033	7,203	5,762
	Radford	35,938	2,675	29,993	3,270	6,663
	Waianae	28,942	2,275	23,918	2,749	2,731
	Kailua	23,266	2,550	20,244	472	5,256
	Aiea	21,968	2,550	19,418	--	3,017
	Leilehua	21,128	2,050	18,803	275	7,099
	Waipahu	20,086	1,875	18,211	--	2,469
	Kahuku	18,183	2,200	11,131	2,352	2,500
	Waiialua	16,061	2,450	11,661	1,950	2,598
	Campbell	15,094	2,450	10,820	1,824	3,602
Total	237,177	23,350	191,232	20,095	41,697	
	Average	23,718	2,335	19,123	2,009	4,170
MIL	Maui	21,769	2,575	9,425	9,769	2,277
	Baldwin	20,399	2,875	11,484	6,040	4,716
	Lahainaluna	17,045	2,200	11,082	3,763	1,797
	Hana***	1,694	650	47	997	48
	Total	60,907	8,300	32,038	20,569	8,838
	Average	15,227	2,075	8,010	5,142	2,210
KIF	Kapaa	17,373	1,850	14,223	1,300	3,174
	Waimea	17,365	1,750	12,849	2,766	2,123
	Kauai	12,169	1,475	10,444	250	2,213
	Total	46,907	5,075	37,516	4,316	7,510
	Average	15,636	1,692	12,505	1,439	2,503
BIIF	Hilo	31,453	2,475	25,591	3,387	9,189
	Konawaena	18,473	1,550	5,257	11,666	461
	Honokaa	8,453	2,000	6,025	428	--
	Kau	7,920	1,600	5,385	935	1,120
	Kohala	7,657	1,600	3,919	2,138	248
	Laupahoehoe*	6,098	1,450	3,589	1,059	399
	Pahoa**	3,437	750	2,130	557	--
	Total	83,491	11,425	51,896	20,170	11,417
	Average	11,927	1,632	7,414	2,881	1,631
MLIL	Molokai*	5,365	600	2,870	1,895	2,319
	Lanai*	3,322	950	1,367	1,005	406
	Total	8,687	1,550	4,237	2,900	2,725
	Average	4,344	775	2,119	1,450	1,363
Grand Total		\$640,148	\$62,700	\$490,489	\$84,459	\$103,874
Average		20,650	2,023	15,822	2,724	3,350

*No football.

**No football, no baseball.

***No football, no baseball, no basketball.

their coaches less. Thus, the Honolulu city schools which pay their coaches on the average 88.4 percent of the total allowable maximum averaged \$40,596 in total resources, and the rural Oahu schools which pay their coaches an average of 79.2 percent of the allowable maximum averaged \$23,718 in total resources. But, the schools on the neighbor islands which pay their coaches on the average less than one-third of the allowable maximum averaged less than \$15,636 in total resources.

The amount available to each school is dependent upon the following: (1) the size of spectator audience; (2) the manner in which gate receipts are distributed among the schools within the league; (3) the contributions made by "booster" organizations and the extent to which fund-raising activities are carried out; and (4) the number of interscholastic sports offered at each school. On every count, the smaller schools (i.e., schools with smaller enrollment or schools in communities of limited population) are at a distinct disadvantage.

Size of spectator audience. The influence of the size of spectator audience at interscholastic athletic events on a school's total resource is indicated in column (C) of table 3.2. Included in column (C), "program receipts," are student activity fees, which account for but a small part of the total receipts (column (E)). The bulk of the program receipts comes from admission fees charged the general public at the gates. To some extent, the relative successes of the teams and importance of the game in determining team standings within the league affect gate receipts. However, as a general rule, in urban Honolulu and in the more heavily populated areas of rural Oahu, program receipts are substantial. On the other hand, in other parts of rural Oahu and on the neighbor islands where the population is smaller, program receipts are considerably less.

Gate receipt distribution method. The total resources available to a school is also affected by the method in which gate receipts are distributed to schools within a league. Earlier, we noted that the disparity in the amounts paid to coaches occupying the same position in the same sport within each league was greatest in the Oahu Interscholastic Association and the Big Island Interscholastic Federation. An examination of table 3.2 reveals that the differences in the amount of total resources available to the schools within these two leagues also vary widely, while the total resources available to schools within the other leagues are fairly uniform.

The reason for this wide disparity within the OIA and BIIF, but not in the other leagues, is that in the OIA and BIIF, all gate receipts generated at a game are retained by the home team, whereas in all other leagues except MLIL, all gate receipts, no matter which school is the host, are pooled and, after deducting league expenses, are distributed equally among the schools within the league.¹ Thus the total gate receipts of schools in the more populous communities within the OIA and BIIF are bound to be greater than the total receipts of schools in less populated areas.

Contributions and Fund-Raising Activities

The athletic fund of each school is supported to some extent by contributions from booster clubs and through fund-raising activities sponsored by students and civic organizations. Column (D) of table 3.2 indicates the extent to which such volunteer efforts contributed to the total resources of each school in fiscal year 1968-69.

As reflected by the figures in column (D), schools on the neighbor islands depend to a greater extent on contributions and fund-raising activities than do schools on the island of Oahu. This is understandable, since the greater population on Oahu tends to generate, on the whole, more program receipts than on the neighbor islands. (A summary of column (D) of

¹Although MLIL does not pool gate receipts, the disparity in coaches' pay between Molokai High and Lanai High is not very great.

table 3.2 by leagues is noted in table 3.3.) Perhaps, because of the smallness of community population and the consequent smallness of gate receipts, more effort is directed by neighbor island schools toward acquiring donations and conducting fund-raising activities than on Oahu. Note, for example, the relatively large amounts of contributions at the three major high schools on Maui and at Konawaena on the Big Island. However, again, because of the small population, the amount which can be derived through contributions and fund-raising activities is undoubtedly limited at most of the neighbor island schools.

TABLE 3.3
AVERAGE CONTRIBUTION TO AVERAGE
TOTAL RESOURCES BY LEAGUES

	A Average Contri- bution	B Average Total Resources	A÷B Percentage
ILH	3,282	40,596	8%
OIA	2,009	23,718	8%
MIL	5,142	15,227	34%
KIF	1,439	15,636	9%
BIIF	2,881	11,927	24%
MLIL	1,450	4,344	33%

Sports offering. If we assume that coaches of interscholastic athletics should be paid adequately, and if we further assume that the maximum amounts established by the department of education reflect a fairly adequate compensation for coaches, perhaps it is not unreasonable to expect schools with small resources to offer in comparison to schools with large resources a smaller number of interscholastic sports in order to make more of their resources available for coaches' salaries. Our examination revealed, however, that this is not necessarily so. (See table 3.4.)²

Generally, of course, the Honolulu city schools which had resources on the average of more than \$40,000 in fiscal year 1968-69 offer the highest number of sports (an average of 26) and pay their coaches near the maximum (an average of 88.4 percent of the maximum). There are, however, schools with less resources which offer just as many sports as the Honolulu city schools and pay their coaches less. Take rural Oahu, for example. Kailua with resources of \$23,266 in 1968-69 offers 19 sports—only one less than McKinley which had more than \$42,000 in resources in 1968-69—but pays its coaches on the average 62.7 percent of the maximum allowable. Campbell which had the least amount of resources in 1968-69 among all rural Oahu schools (\$15,094), offers as many as 16 sports and pays its coaches on the average 66.6 percent of the maximum allowable. Compare Kailua and Campbell with Waianae and Leilehua. Waianae which had resources totaling \$28,942 offers 14 sports, but pays its coaches on the average 91.2 percent of the State maximum; Leilehua which had resources of \$21,128, offers only 13 sports but pays its coaches on the average 83.7 percent of the maximum.

²See Appendix C for sports offering by each school.

Table 3.4
**COMPARISON OF NUMBER OF SPORTS OFFERED,
 TOTAL RESOURCES AND COACHES' PAY
 BY SCHOOLS AND LEAGUES**

Fiscal Year 1968-69

League	School	Number of Sports Offered			Total Resources 1968-69	Actual Coaches' Pay As a Percentage of Maximum Allowable
		Variety	Junior Varsity	Total		
ILH	Roosevelt	17	12	29	\$44,137	87.5%
	Kaimuki	16	13	29	39,321	85.4
	Kalani	16	13	29	36,360	96.3
	Farrington	13	10	23	40,968	88.8
	McKinley	11	9	20	42,193	83.9
	Average			26	40,596	88.4
OIA ^a	Radford	13	7	20	35,938	100.0
	Kailua	13	6	19	23,266	62.7
	Waialua	12	4	16	16,061	61.9
	Campbell	12	4	16	15,094	66.6
	Aiea	12	3	15	21,968	94.4
	Waianae	10	4	14	28,942	91.2
	Leilehua	11	2	13	21,128	83.7
	Castle	10	3	13	36,511	100.0
	Kahuku	8	3	11	18,183	66.2
	Waipahu	7	3	10	20,086	71.8
Average			15	23,718	79.9	
MIL	Baldwin	15	4	19	20,399	33.5
	Maui	12	4	16	21,769	37.1
	Lahainaluna	10	3	13	17,045	33.1
	Hana ^d	4	0	4	1,694	27.5
	Average			13(16)	15,227(19,738)	32.8(34.6)
KIF	Waimea	9	1	10	17,365	72.0
	Kauai	9	1	10	12,169	69.2
	Kapaa	8	1	9	17,373	64.3
	Average			9.7	15,636	68.5
BIIF	Hilo	12	3	15	31,453	50.2
	Laupahoehoe ^b	8	3	11	6,098	26.4
	Honokaa	8	1	9	8,453	27.5
	Konawaena	7	2	9	18,473	26.2
	Kohala	7	1	8	7,657	29.7
	Kau	4	3	7	7,920	30.4
	Pahoa ^c	2	2	4	3,437	33.0
	Average			9	11,927	31.9
MLIL	Molokai ^b	4	1	5	5,365	24.4
	Lanai ^b	3	1	4	3,322	27.2
	Average			4.5	4,344	25.8

^aExcludes Nanakuli.

^bNo football.

^cNo football, no baseball.

^dNo football, no baseball, no basketball.

() Denotes average excluding Hana.

On Maui, Baldwin, Maui and Lahainaluna received in 1968–69 an average of \$19,738 in total resources; they offer, on the average, 16 sports, but pay their coaches on the average a paltry 34.6 percent of the maximum allowable. Contrast Maui with the situation on Kauai. The three high schools on Kauai (Waimea, Kauai and Kapaa) had resources averaging \$15,636 in 1968–69, they offer on the average only 9.7 sports, and pay their coaches an average of 68.5 percent of the maximum. There are of course schools, particularly on the Big Island, Molokai and Lanai, which have very small amounts of resources and limit their sports offering, but yet are unable to pay their coaches anywhere near the allowable maximum.

The practice of schools with little resources offering a relatively large number of sports and not paying coaches adequate salaries raises the question of priorities. On the one hand, it might be desirable that opportunities to engage in different kinds of interscholastic sports be widened; on the other hand, coaches should be adequately compensated. Perhaps in the past, it was relatively easy to trade-off coaches' salaries for more sports offerings, since the social and rural environmental situations then existing tended to encourage individuals to undertake coaching assignments at little or no compensation. This is no longer true—witness the concerns which led to this study.³

³See chapters 4 and 5, *infra*, for a further development of this question.

Chapter 4

ALTERNATIVES

Since funding apparently lies at the heart of the present inequity in the pay being received by coaches, any solution to correct this inequity must center on making funds available for salaries. There are two broad ways in which this may be accomplished: (1) decrease expenditures for certain non-salary items; and (2) increase the total resource base. We explore each of these and the alternatives within each.

Decrease Expenditures for Non-Salary Items

With the same amount of total resources, more money can be made available to pay coaches by spending less on other items. There are many ways in which expenditures elsewhere might be reduced and more moneys freed for use in salaries. The following is an examination of some of these possibilities. In every case, however, the crucial question is, can such cuts really be made in sufficient amounts? An added question is, can such cuts be made without doing violence to program objectives?

Reducing expenditures for non-essential items. Items for which expenditures are made by each school might be classified as basic and non-basic. The expenditure pattern of each school by these categories is shown in table 4.1. The figures are for the 1968-69 fiscal year. What items are included in each class is explained in table 4.2. The inclusion and exclusion of certain items from each category might well be debated. Essentially, however, "basic" includes all items of expenditures which are "necessary" for intra-league competition; "non-basic" includes all items which are not necessary for competitive sports to occur, but which traditionally accompany athletics competition or may be desirable from a programmatic standpoint.¹

Reducing or eliminating expenditures on non-basic items might free more funds for coaches' pay. A close examination of the expenditures made on those items by the various schools, however, reveals that such reduction or elimination of non-basic expenditures would be of little assistance to schools which most need to pay coaches more.

Table 4.3 compares the amounts which each school spent in fiscal year 1968-69 for non-basic items and the difference between what it is now paying its coaches and the maximum amount payable under the department of education's schedule. The table shows that those schools with resources of \$28,000 or more, by reducing expenditures for non-basic items or by eliminating them altogether can derive more than sufficient amounts to pay their coaches the maximum permissible. These schools include all five Honolulu city schools, a few rural Oahu schools and Hilo High School. However, all of these schools, except Hilo High, are already paying their coaches at or near the allowable maximum.

As most of the schools with total resources of \$20,000 or less which now pay their coaches far less than the authorized maximum, even a complete elimination of non-basic expenditures will not produce the funds needed to pay their coaches anything approximating the maximum. Take the Big Island schools (other than Hilo High), for example. They spend on the average less than \$2,000 on non-basic items, and they need on

¹By "from a programmatic standpoint" we mean from the standpoint of the objectives of interscholastic athletics. See chapter 5, *infra*.

Table 4.1
SCHEDULE OF EXPENDITURES
 Fiscal Year 1968-69

League	School	Total Expenditures	Basic	Non-Basic
ILH:	Roosevelt	\$ 37,093	\$ 30,272	\$ 6,821
	McKinley	41,746	24,390	17,356
	Farrington	37,174	25,102	12,072
	Kaimuki	33,134	25,383	7,751
	Kalani	32,611	29,116	3,495
	Total	\$181,758	\$134,263	\$ 47,495
OIA:	Castle	\$ 33,297	\$ 29,113	\$ 4,184
	Radford	29,462	25,817	3,645
	Waianae	30,966	25,709	5,257
	Kailua	24,256	22,829	1,427
	Aiea	26,322	23,093	3,229
	Leilehua	16,279	15,606	673
	Waipahu	14,580	13,412	1,168
	Kahuku	16,744	14,396	2,348
	Waialua	17,838	16,069	1,769
	Campbell	15,550	13,657	1,893
	Total	\$225,294	\$199,701	\$ 25,593
MIL:	Maui	\$ 20,518	\$ 10,669	\$ 9,849
	Baldwin	21,093	17,085	4,008
	Lahainaluna	14,111	9,937	4,174
	Hana	1,894	1,503	391
	Total	\$ 57,616	\$ 39,194	\$ 18,422
KIF:	Kapaa	\$ 17,687	\$ 14,634	\$ 3,053
	Waimea	18,017	14,504	3,513
	Kauai	13,590	11,064	2,526
	Total	\$ 49,294	\$ 40,202	\$ 9,092
BIIF:	Hilo	\$ 30,650	\$ 24,693	\$ 5,957
	Konawaena	19,158	11,912	7,246
	Honokaa	7,098	6,378	720
	Kau	7,689	7,554	135
	Kohala	8,428	8,189	239
	Laupahoehoe	6,395	5,703	692
	Pahoa	2,850	1,949	901
	Total	\$ 82,268	\$ 66,378	\$ 15,890
MLIL:	Molokai	\$ 5,269	\$ 2,764	\$ 2,505
	Lanai	3,995	2,373	1,622
	Total	\$ 9,264	\$ 5,137	\$ 4,127
Grand Total		\$605,494	\$484,875	\$120,619

Table 4.2
ITEMS INCLUDED IN "BASIC " AND "NON-BASIC"

BASIC:

Players

- Personal equipment
- Physical examination and treatment
- Insurance

Athletic Director and Coaches

- Equipment
- Salaries

Field and game equipment

Field and game supplies

Medical equipment and supplies

Laundry (uniforms only)

Rental fees

League dues and fees

Local transportation—to and from practice and game sites

Intra-state travel and subsistence—league and State championship only

Team physician

Team trainer

Direct—(officials, etc.) and indirect—(ticket sellers, etc.) game expenses

Repair and maintenance of facilities and equipment

Office supplies

NON-BASIC:

Band, pep squad, majorettes expenses (uniforms, equipment, transportation, advisor)

Awards (letters, trophies, sweaters, medals, jackets)

Intra-state and out-of-state travel and subsistence (non-league and non-state championship)

Pre and post game meals or snacks and training tables (non-travel status)

Banquets

Table 4.3
COMPARISON OF RESOURCES REQUIRED
TO PAY AT MAXIMUM AND
EXPENDITURES IN FY 1968-69
FOR NON-BASIC ITEMS BY SCHOOLS AND LEAGUES

League	School	(A) Total Resource	(B) Salaries at Maximum Rate Less Salaries Now Being Paid	(C) Non-Basic Expenditures
ILH	Roosevelt	\$44,137	\$1,400	\$ 6,821
	McKinley	42,193	1,600	17,356
	Farrington	40,968	1,150	12,072
	Kaimuki	39,321	1,750	7,751
	Kalani	36,360	400	3,495
OIA	Castle	36,511	—	4,184
	Radford	35,938	—	3,645
	Waianae	28,942	800	5,257
	Kailua	23,266	4,100	1,427
	Aiea	21,968	550	3,229
	Leilehua	21,128	1,400	673
	Waipahu	20,086	2,225	1,168
	Kahuku	18,183	2,850	2,348
	Waialua	16,061	3,275	1,769
Campbell	15,094	3,200	1,893	
MIL	Maui	21,769	5,690	9,849
	Baldwin	20,399	7,250	4,008
	Lahainaluna	17,045	5,250	4,174
	Hana		1,775	391
KIL	Kapaa	17,373	2,675	3,053
	Waimea	17,365	1,525	3,513
	Kauai	12,169	1,725	2,526
BIIF	Hilo	31,453	4,530	5,957
	Konawaena	18,473	6,050	7,246
	Honokaa	8,453	5,150	720
	Kau	7,920	3,550	135
	Kohala	7,657	3,200	239
	Laupahoehoe	6,098	3,900	692
	Pahoa	3,437	1,875	901
MLIL	Molokai	5,365	1,550	2,505
	Lanai	3,322	2,950	1,622

the average \$4,000 if their coaches are to be paid at the maximum. This situation holds true for a large number of rural Oahu schools where expenditures for non-basic items total less than \$2,500, while coaches' pay lags by as much as \$3,275 from the maximum. On Maui, the non-basic items account for about \$4,000 at both Baldwin High School and Lahainaluna, but coaches' pay is short of the maximum by \$7,000 and \$5,000, respectively.

Thus, reducing or eliminating all non-basic items will not assist those schools which most need additional funds if their coaches' pay is to be raised.

Reducing number of sports. Reducing the number of competitive sports offered is another method in which more of the total resources might be shifted to increase coaches' pay. The schools on the island of Kauai is an example. There, the three high schools average 9.7 sports and pay their coaches almost 70 percent of the permissible maximum (see table 3.4). Compare this with the average of 16 sports offered by the three major high schools on the island of Maui which pay their coaches on the average only about one-third of the maximum. The total resources of each of these three Maui high schools are approximately the same as those of the three Kauai high schools. About the same thing might be said of some of the rural Oahu high schools, each of whose total resources are approximately the same as those of the three Kauai high schools. These rural schools offer as many as 16 competitive sports, although the amounts paid their coaches are about two-thirds of the maximum allowable. Indeed, for these schools, it would appear that a combination of reduction in the number of sports offered and reduction or elimination of non-basic items from expenditures might produce that additional amount required to pay coaches more. We note, however, two caveats.

First, for those schools with resources totaling less than \$10,000 (e.g., the Big Island high schools) which now limit their sports offerings to eight or nine, no amount of reduction in the number of sports offered, even when combined with a reduction or elimination of non-basic expenditure items, would free sufficient funds to enable them to grant pay raises to their coaches. *Second*, any attempt to reduce the number of sports offerings must answer to such policy determinations as may exist regarding the objectives of the entire interscholastic athletic program of the department of education, a question which is beyond the scope of this report.²

Economizing. A third possible way of making more of the existing total resources available for coaches' pay is to economize spending in some or all areas of expenditure. Thus, equipment and uniforms might be replaced less frequently, more economical means of transportation might be substituted for the current mode of travel, and more of the expenditures for such items as shoes and medical insurance premiums might be passed on to student participants.³

We did not examine what some of the economizing measures might actually be in each of the schools. We found it unnecessary to do so. It appears rather clear from table 4.1, that areas for economizing would be easier found at schools with large resources which spend more than schools with small resources which spend less in every category of expenditure. Yet, it is schools with small resources which need to pay coaches more. Since they spend less (often less than 50 percent of the amounts spent by schools with large resources), they

²See chapter 5.

³Some of these expenditures are already assumed by student participants. See Appendix D for examples of the costs borne by student participants and other individuals and the different degrees to which these costs are borne among leagues.

are probably already economizing in all areas of expenditure. It is doubtful that any more cut-back in spending will produce sufficient amounts to be diverted toward salaries.

Summary. To summarize, then, it would appear that decreasing expenditures on items other than salaries is hardly likely to be of immediate assistance to those schools which most need to raise the pay of coaches.

Increasing Resource Base

The second broad category of alternatives to enable schools to pay their coaches more is to increase the total resource base. With additional resources, more might be funneled into salaries. We explore several possible means of increasing the resources of the schools.

Increase program receipts. Program receipts (see table 3.2, column (C)) consist of student activity fees and charges made at the gates for athletic events. Student activity fees range from a low of \$2 per year at Laupahoehoe and Lanai high schools to a high of \$3.50 at 16 schools. Most of the others charge \$3.⁴ Gate admission fees vary, depending on the league and the sport involved. They are generally kept low to encourage public attendance.⁵

Program receipts constitute a large part of the total resources of the schools. The average portion of the total resources, by leagues, which is derived from program receipts is as follows:

ILH	86%
OIA	81%
MIL	53%
KIIF	80%
BIIF	62%
MLIL	49%

Increasing program receipts through increases in student activity fees or admission fees, or both, is a possible alternative way in which the total resources of each school might be increased. It is doubtful, however, that such recourse is desirable or that it will assist those schools which most need to pay their coaches more.

Take student activity fees. Substantially increasing student activity fees militates against maximizing opportunity for all students to attend (and thus "participate" in) interscholastic athletic activities.⁶ Yet, to close the gap between what coaches are actually receiving and what is permitted by the department of education's schedule through student fees would require increases of as much as \$20 to \$40 per student at schools whose student enrollment is less than 200.⁷ Not even an increase of as small an amount as \$2 will come close to closing the gap for a majority of the schools—including all of the neighbor island schools plus Waialua, Campbell and Kahuku on Oahu; and yet, these are the schools which are far below the allowable maximum in the amounts they pay their coaches. (See table 4.4.)

⁴These fees are based on those which were charged in fiscal year 1968-69. See Appendix E for a listing of fees at all schools.

⁵See Appendix F for admission fees charged by the various leagues.

⁶This assumes, of course, that maximizing student attendance is one of the objectives of interscholastic athletic program.

⁷Grades 10-12.

Table 4.4
SCHEDULE OF INCREASE IN STUDENT ACTIVITY FEE RATE
NEEDED TO PAY COACHES AT MAXIMUM ALLOWABLE

League	School	A Resources Needed to Pay Coaches at Maximum 1969-70	B Enrollment at December 1969 Grades 10-12	A : B Increase in Student Fee Rate Needed to Pay Coaches at Maximum*
ILH	Kaimuki	\$1,750	\$2,214	\$.79
	McKinley	1,600	2,189	.73
	Roosevelt	1,400	1,972	.71
	Farrington	1,150	2,970	.39
	Kalani	400	2,544	.16
OIA	Waialua	3,275	487	6.72
	Kahuku	2,850	523	5.45
	Campbell	3,200	974	3.66
	Kailua	4,100	2,925	1.40
	Waipahu	2,225	2,140	1.04
	Leilehua	1,400	1,870	.75
	Waianae	800	1,160	.69
	Aiea	550	1,243	.44
	Castle	00	1,669	.00
Radford	00	1,827	.00	
MIL	Hana	1,775	44	40.34
	Lahainaluna	5,250	417	12.58
	Maui	5,690	482	11.80
	Baldwin	7,250	1,154	6.28
KIL	Kapaa	2,675	514	5.20
	Waimea	1,525	548	2.78
	Kauai	1,725	721	2.39
BIIF	Laupahoehoe	3,900	108	36.11
	Pahoa	1,875	84	22.32
	Honokaa	5,160	337	15.31
	Kohala	3,200	202	15.84
	Kau	3,550	225	15.77
	Konawaena	6,050	631	9.59
Hilo	4,530	2,134	2.12	
MLIL	Lanai	2,950	131	22.51
	Molokai	1,550	211	7.35

*Assuming all students pay fees.

Increasing admission fees at the gates is also likely to benefit schools in the city of Honolulu and in the relatively heavily populated areas of rural Oahu and the neighbor islands, but fail to be of material assistance to schools situated in sparsely inhabited areas. How much more can be charged, without seriously affecting public attendance is highly problematical in areas such as Waialua, Kahuku, Kohala, Honokaa, Lanai, Waimea, Kapaa, etc.

Increase contributions. Contributions consist of outright gifts of money or tangible items by private organizations and funds raised through money-making activities by students and interested civic groups. In fiscal year 1968-69, contributions ranged from \$0 at Aiea and Waipahu high schools to \$11,000 at Konawaena High (see column (D), table 3.2). Any attempt to rely on increased contributions is fraught with difficulties.

First, contributions are outside the direct control of the schools; they depend on the willingness of the public. *Second*, the degree to which a community is motivated to make contributions often rides on the fortunes of the school in athletic competition. *Third*, the schools which need to pay their coaches more are in small communities and the ability of these communities to contribute ebbs much sooner than those larger communities which surround schools which are already paying their coaches near the maximum.

Pool resources. As noted earlier, three of the six leagues pool their gate receipts and distribute them equally among the participating schools. In three leagues, the Oahu Interscholastic Association, the Big Island Interscholastic Federation, and the Molokai-Lanai Interscholastic League, the host team retains all gate receipts generated at each game. Thus, while the total resources available to each school are fairly even in the ILH, MIL, and KIF leagues, they are very disparate in the OIA, BIIF and to some extent in the MLIL.

Some financial relief might be accorded to those OIA, BIIF, and MLIL schools which now have comparatively small resources if these leagues were to change their method of distributing gate receipts to that practiced by the three other leagues.⁸ Such change would increase the total resource base at these smaller schools by as much as \$4,000, which can be used to pay their coaches more. However, an equal distribution of gate receipts in the OIA, BIIF, and MLIL, would also mean that schools within these leagues which now enjoy comparatively larger amounts of resources would have to do with less. Such loss can be substantial—more than one-third at Castle and Radford and more than one-half at Hilo High. At these schools, a corresponding reduction in expenditures currently being made—either by reducing the number of interscholastic athletic sports, or reducing or eliminating certain expenditures, or economizing, or a combination of these—will be necessary if their coaches are to be paid or continue to be paid at or near the permissible maximum.

Any change in the method of distributing gate receipts within the OIA, BIIF, and MLIL, of course, will be of no assistance to the other neighbor island schools which are now sharing their gate receipts equally but are unable to pay their coaches anywhere near the maximum allowed by the DOE schedule. No pooling and equal sharing of resources, if confined internally within each league, would of itself assist in raising the pay of coaches uniformly throughout the State—witness Maui and Kauai, which now distribute gate receipts equally.

⁸We are informed that such equal distribution of gate receipts will be adopted by the OIA when the five Honolulu city schools join that league in September 1970.

If resource pooling and equal distribution of gate receipts is the means to be used in assisting those schools which now have small resources and pay their coaches at low rates, resource pooling must extend beyond the leagues and be made on a statewide basis. Under such scheme, the gate receipts of all schools would be put into a common pool and then distributed (equally, on the basis of need, or on some scale of priorities) to all schools in the State. In 1968-69, if the gate receipts of all schools for all sports had been pooled and all schools, regardless of the number of sports offered at each school shared in the pool equally, each school's share would have averaged approximately \$15,000. When other resources are added, each school would have averaged approximately \$20,000 in total resources. One must speculate, of course, what the schools which traditionally enjoy resources in excess of \$20,000 and have been paying coaches near or at the permissible maximum would have done in terms of their sports offerings and other expenditures to stay within this \$20,000 and yet continue to pay their coaches near the maximum allowable. Undoubtedly, some adjustments would have been required.

While pooling resources statewide may constitute a viable alternative to assist those schools which now have limited resources and pay their coaches little, adoption of this alternative should be preceded by a thorough review of the total interscholastic athletic program of the State, a task which is beyond the scope of this report. Such review should be made because this option affects the interscholastic athletic program at those schools which traditionally enjoy large resources.

Increase general fund contribution. Currently, the general fund contribution to the interscholastic athletic program of the State is limited to that portion of coaches' pay which is paid for out of the general appropriations made by the legislature to the department of education (see table 2.1). In fiscal years 1968-69 and 1969-70, the total general fund contribution for coaches' salaries was approximately \$58,550 and \$62,975, respectively.⁹ Certainly, increasing the general fund portion of the coaches' pay is one means by which coaches may be assured of higher salaries. An increase in general fund contribution may take one of two forms:

- . General fund pick up all of the coaches' pay.
- . General fund make up the difference between what the various schools are "able" to pay and what the coaches "ought" to be paid, up to the authorized maximum.

Under the first of these approaches, given the number of coaches now hired at each school, the total maximum additional general fund contribution would be \$183,025 for the fiscal year 1969-70. This figure is derived by subtracting from \$246,000, (the total maximum compensation payable under the DOE schedule), the sum of \$62,975, (which is the current general fund contribution).

Under the second approach, the total maximum additional general fund contribution would be \$84,445. This figure is the difference between the total amount which all coaches are now receiving and the total maximum which they can receive under the DOE schedule. This calculation assumes, of course, that the amount each school is now paying over and above the portion currently paid for by the general fund is the maximum amount that the school is capable of paying.

⁹Does not include general fund contribution for salaries of athletic directors which totaled \$4,150 and \$4,800 in fiscal years 1968-69 and 1969-70, respectively.

Of the two approaches, the second is to be preferred. *First*, the schools which most need help in raising their coaches' pay are those with limited resources. Schools with larger resources apparently are "able" to pay their coaches at or near the maximum without further assistance from the general fund; they are already doing so. There is little reason why the general fund should assume the whole of the obligations of these schools with large resources to compensate their coaches.

Second, allowing the whole of coaches' salaries to be paid for out of the State general fund constitutes an open invitation for general fund support of other aspects of interscholastic athletics. Yet, the extent to which interscholastic athletics should be supported by the general fund, as opposed to program receipts, is a question which cannot be answered at this time, for this question is inextricably tied to the larger question of the role of interscholastic athletics within the total State education program, the answer to which is not now available.

Recommendation

Of all the possible alternatives examined, we find that increasing general fund contribution to the extent necessary to make up the difference between what the schools are "able" to pay out of their program receipts and what the coaches "ought" to receive is the only feasible alternative at the present time. It will immediately assist those schools which now most need to raise the pay of their coaches, and it will do so, without affecting their (and other schools') current programs. We think, however, that this solution should only be a short-term, stop-gap measure—perhaps, only for the next school year.

In the long run, other alternatives, such as readjusting the number of sports offerings in some schools and pooling the gate receipts of all schools, might provide, either in whole or in part, a better means of assuring that coaches are paid fairly and equitably. However, as pointed out several times before, such alternatives cannot intelligently be decided upon without a determination of the role of interscholastic athletics in the total educational program of the State and a thorough review of the question of funding interscholastic athletics as a whole. A determination of such fundamental questions is not likely to be made before September 1970.¹⁰ In the meantime, the great disparity and inequity in the amounts coaches are now receiving cries out for some immediate action. Hence, our recommendation for a limited increase in general fund contribution as a stop-gap measure.

¹⁰See chapter 5.

PART III. THE LARGER QUESTIONS

Chapter 5

THE PAY SCHEDULE; THE PROGRAM FOR INTERSCHOLASTIC ATHLETICS

In the preceding discussion, we confined ourselves to exploring ways and means of increasing the pay of coaches, particularly at schools in rural Oahu and on the neighbor islands, who are now being paid at substantially less than the authorized maximum. We offered what we think is the most feasible alternative to correct existing inequities, but recommended that it be considered only as a short-term solution. We recognized that our treatment of the problem left unanswered certain larger questions. These questions are:

1. *Is the pay schedule established by the department of education in 1968 a reasonable one?* In our discussion thus far, we assumed that the maximum amounts set forth in the schedule are reasonable rates at which to compensate coaches and used those rates as points of reference in discussing existing inequities.

2. *What is (or should be) the role of interscholastic athletics in the total educational program of the State, and how should the athletic program as a whole be funded?* While recommending that the State general fund pick up more of the coaches' pay, we suggested that it pick up only to the extent of that difference between what the schools are now "able" to pay and what the coaches "ought" to be paid, up to the maximum authorized by the DOE schedule. We stated that allowing the general fund to support coaches' pay in its entirety constitutes an open invitation for the general fund to pick up the costs of other aspects of interscholastic athletics. We further noted that, other than the State general fund, a readjustment in the number of sports offered and the pooling of gate receipts of all schools might offer the long-range answer (or a partial answer) to the question of coaches' pay. We noted, however, that a general fund support of the entire interscholastic athletic program, a readjustment of the number of sports offered and a pooling of the gate receipts of all schools must await a thorough analysis of the role of interscholastic athletics within the total State educational program and a review of how such program as may be determined should be funded.

While we do not offer any answers to these questions, we examine here briefly—and only briefly—each of them. Hopefully, our discussion here will be of some assistance to the department of education and the legislature in their efforts to resolve them.

The Salary Schedule

The validity of our assumption that the 1968 DOE coaches' salary schedule is an appropriate one may be questioned in at least two respects: (1) the basis upon which the general wage level which the compensation plan reflects was arrived at; and (2) the basis upon which the rates for the specific jobs was established.

The general wage level base. The general wage level which any compensation schedule reflects is represented by the minimum and maximum rates which it contains. The range of possibilities for setting a wage level is numerous but, generally speaking, a reasonable decision takes into consideration the following:

- . The minimum rate necessary to enable the organization to recruit personnel and keep them.
- . Rates in the community for jobs which might be expected to attract the same kinds of persons.
- . The amounts paid for the same kind of work in other organizations.
- . The amounts paid for work having similar requirements in the same organization.

Similarly, reasonable maximums should be set after consideration of:

- . The total resources of the organization.
- . The number of jobs involved.
- . The need for equity in pay with other jobs in the organization.

The basic wage level of the 1968 DOE compensation plan for coaches is \$200 at the minimum (if we assume that the presently designated general fund portion of each salary is indeed the minimum) and \$1000 at the maximum. Our review of the plan did not reveal the basis upon which this wage level was arrived at. Questioning of department of education officials leaves us in doubt that any of the factors enumerated above was given adequate consideration. These officials were unable to tell us what factors went into deciding this \$200-\$1000 wage level, other than to inform us that the then \$100 minimum, \$750 maximum schedule was used as a guide.

Rates for specific jobs. Wage level decisions such as were discussed above are concerned with the general level of compensation for all jobs. Determination of pay rates for individual jobs or groups of jobs within the structure is a separate, though not unrelated, decision. Decisions of this nature are accomplished through a system of job evaluation which determines the relative value of each job or group of jobs in relation to all other jobs in the organization. It permits pay rates to be set on the basis of a hierarchy of the jobs in the organization which reflect their level of difficulty and responsibility.

The extent to which department of education officials evaluated the work of coaches' jobs before establishing the rates of pay in the salary schedule is not clear. We understand that they ranked the jobs in accordance with the judgment of a group of athletic directors as to what kind of work each typically was required to do. Pay setting is sometimes accomplished in this way; however, it may result in inequities by virtue of the fact that it assumes that every job with the same title does perform essentially the same kind of work and, of course, this may not be true.

Future effort. If we assume that the 1968 schedule is inadequate today to compensate coaches properly for the work they perform, then any attempt to change the existing schedule should take into account those factors enumerated above. We think it necessary to emphasize particularly that coaches' pay schedule cannot be considered in isolation from the pay schedules of all others who are similarly situated.

Coaching athletics is only one of many kinds of extra work performed by teachers in our public schools. For example, some teachers serve as grade level chairmen, department heads, supervisors of intramural athletics and beginning teachers' supervisors. Others serve as band leaders at athletic contests, and as pep squad advisors; still others serve as debate coaches, class advisors, etc. In some cases these teachers are paid for such extra work; in

others they are not. Where they are paid, monies come from various sources, and rates of compensation differ from one kind of work to another, and at times even within the same kind of work. ¹

There appears to be no rational basis for the present system of compensating teachers who perform different kinds of extra work. Why some kinds of work are compensated at certain rates and others at other rates, and some are paid out of State funds and others out of school funds is unclear. This being so, we believe that any change in the current coaches' pay schedule must take into account the larger question of compensation for extra work among teachers generally.

Role of Interscholastic Athletic Program Within DOE

There is today, no interscholastic athletic "program" as such within the department of education. There are many interscholastic athletic activities going on, but they are not part of an overall, integrated, statewide program. There is no clearly enunciated statement as to what it is that the State is seeking to achieve through interscholastic athletics and there is no identification of how such end contributes to the overall purpose of public education. In the absence of a statewide, integrated program, interscholastic athletics is currently administered completely independently by each school; there is almost no control at the State level of the department of education over the direction which interscholastic athletic activities take in our public high schools and over the expenditure of monies made for such activities by each school.

This is not to say that there has been no attempt to integrate interscholastic athletics on a statewide basis. In August 1965, an ad hoc committee of the board of education, formed to study interscholastic athletics, recommended that the superintendent develop a ten-year program in this area. Since then, both the board and the staff of the department of education have made sporadic, but thus far unsuccessful, efforts to develop such a "program." The most recent attempt has been to develop a program by applying the planning technique known as PPB. We are in agreement that the PPB approach can logically lead to a program for interscholastic athletics, but the results we have seen to date are less than encouraging.

The development of a meaningful, integrated program in interscholastic athletics begins with an identification of the end purpose of public education and a determination of the results in interscholastic athletics which will contribute to the attainment of that overall educational objective. It then requires an identification of the alternative means of achieving the results being sought in interscholastic athletics and an analysis of the alternatives in the light of anticipated cost and probable effectiveness of each. The formulation of a good program demands that a systematic approach be taken.

All of the planning done recently by the DOE has fallen short of a systematic approach. Much work has been directed toward altering the existing methods of operating programs rather than toward the more basic questions of assessing the need for and considering alternative objectives of the programs themselves, and developing alternative program designs. Thus, a number of these efforts have been directed toward altering the

¹For example, grade level chairmen receive from \$250 to \$350 per year while beginning teachers' supervisors receive \$50 per month, both from the general fund appropriation of the department of education. Band leaders at athletic events receive anywhere from \$15 per performance to \$400 for the season.

method by which interscholastic athletics are funded.² But, the question of funding cannot be intelligently dealt with except within the framework of basic programmatic decisions. Only when and as basic programmatic questions—such as, what are the objectives of interscholastic athletics, what is its role in public education, what are the options in reaching the ends sought in interscholastic athletics, what are the costs of each option, how can such costs be met—are posed and decided can funding methods be discussed and determined.

Likewise, much work has been performed in determining departmental organization and staffing patterns by which interscholastic athletics might be brought under closer supervision of the central office of the department of education. For example, the single program specialist position in physical education was recently split into two by the creation of an additional position to handle boys' physical education and interscholastic athletics, and a transfer of the functions of athletics and the specialist positions from "General Education—General Curricula" to a new "Special Programs—Student Services" has been proposed. Like the question of funding, organization and staffing matters such as these cannot logically be considered without prior decisions having been made as to the program objectives and program designs. Optimum organizational arrangements are entirely dependent upon what kind of a program we plan to have.

A review of the progress being made in the development of an integrated, statewide program in interscholastic athletics leads us to believe that such an integrated program is not likely to be completed before the opening of the 1970–71 school year. Nevertheless, we believe that efforts should continue.

²See, for example, the department of education's *Guidelines for Centralized Funding for Interscholastic Athletics*, April 1967, and *Proposed Minimum Standards for Centralized Funding of Interscholastic Athletics*, October 1968, neither of which has been implemented because, as the department officials explained, a "master plan" for athletics is needed first. See also board of education minutes of September 18, 1969, wherein the board members express concern about the lack of action in this area.

(To be made one and ten copies)

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
 FIFTH LEGISLATURE, 1969.....
 STATE OF HAWAII

H. C. R. NO. 94
 H. D. 1

COPY

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

REQUESTING THE LEGISLATIVE AUDITOR TO STUDY INTERSCHOLASTIC ACTIVITIES FROM THE STANDPOINT OF COACHES' SALARIES, METHOD OF FUNDING, DISTRIBUTION OF GATE RECEIPTS, AND OTHER RELATED ASPECTS.

WHEREAS, in today's society good, strong moral character and physical development of boys and girls can best be achieved through competitive sports; and

WHEREAS, both the State and nation benefit through competitive athletic competition in our high schools; and

WHEREAS, the morale of high schools is largely developed through good athletic teams; and

WHEREAS, there is noted throughout the State salary differences between coaches of the same sport; and

WHEREAS, faculty members serving as coaches have other responsible tasks necessitating long hours, particularly in the rural areas and the neighbor islands; and

WHEREAS, our high schools are losing many exceptionally qualified coaches because salary schedules are not being increased to keep up with the cost of living; and

WHEREAS, a comprehensive study of the organizational, fiscal and budgetary aspects of interscholastic athletics is now long overdue; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED by the House of Representatives of the Fifth Legislature of the State of Hawaii, Regular Session of 1969, with the Senate concurring, that the Legislative Auditor be, and is hereby, requested to study interscholastic athletics from the standpoint of coaches' salaries, method of funding, distribution of gate receipts, and other related aspects; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that said study be completed and a report transmitted to the Legislature twenty (20) days before the convening of the Regular Session of 1970; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that certified copies of this Concurrent Resolution be transmitted to the Department of Education and the Legislative Auditor.

APPENDIX B

SALARIES OF FOOTBALL COACHES PER SEASON
Fiscal Year 1969-70

League	School	Senior Head		Junior Head		Senior Assistant		Junior Assistant		Assistant		Assistant	
		Actual Amount	% of Authorized Maximum	Actual Amount	% of Authorized Maximum	Actual Amount	% of Authorized Maximum	Actual Amount	% of Authorized Maximum	Actual Amount	% of Authorized Maximum	Actual Amount	% of Authorized Maximum
ILH	Kalani	1,000	100	500	100	500	100	350	100	350	100	350	100
	Farrington	1,000	100	350	70	450	90	200	57.1	350	100	350	100
	Kaimuki	1,000	100	500	100	500	100	350	100	350	100	350	100
	McKinley	1,000	100	500	100	500	100	350	100	350	100	300	85.7
	Roosevelt	900	90	500	100	500	100	350	100	350	100	350	100
	Average	980	98	470	94	490	98	320	91.4	350	100	340	97
OIA	Radford	1,000	100	500	100	500	100	350	100	350	100	350	100
	Castle	1,000	100	500	100	500	100	350	100	350	100	350	100
	Aiea	1,000	100	500	100	500	100	350	100	350	100	350	100
	Waianae	1,000	100	500	100	500	100	300	85.7	350	100	300	85.7
	Leilehua	1,000	100	500	100	500	100	350	100	250	71.4	None	
	Waialua	900	90	475	95	475	95	350	100	275	78.6	200	57.1
	Waipahu	750	75	450	90	450	90	350	100	300	85.7	200	57.1
	Campbell	750	75	450	90	450	90	350	100	350	100	None	
	Kahuku	750	75	450	90	450	90	350	100	300	85.7	200	57.1
	Kailua	750	75	450	90	450	90	350	100	300	85.7	200	57.1
	Nanakuli	N/O		200	40	N/O		150	42.9	100	28.6	None	
	Average	890	89	452	90.4	478	95.6	327	93.4	298	85.1	269	76.9
MIL	Mau	375	37.5	250	50	200	40	175	50	75	21.4	None	
	Baldwin	350	35	225	45	175	35	125	35.7	175	50	125	35.7
	Lahainaluna	300	30	200	40	200	40	100	28.6	200	57.1	100	28.6
	Average	342	34.2	225	45	192	38.4	133	38	150	42.8	113	32.3
KIF	Waimea	750	75	N/O		450	90	N/O		300	85.7	None	
	Kauai	750	75	N/O		450	90	N/O		300	85.7	None	
	Kapaa	750	75	200	40	450	90	100	28.6	300	85.7	None	
	Average	750	75	200	40	450	90	100	28.6	300	85.7	None	
BIIF	Hilo	500	50	300	60	270	54	200	57.1	100	28.6	100	28.6
	Konawaena	300	30	200	40	150	30	100	28.6	100	28.6	100	28.6
	Kau	300	30	200	40	150	30	100	28.6	None		None	
	Honokaa	300	30	200	40	150	30	100	28.6	None		None	
	Kohala	300	30	N/O		150	30	N/O		None		None	
	Average	340	34	225	45	175	35	125	35.7	100	28.6	100	28.6

N/O - Not offered
None - Position not filled

APPENDIX C

SPORTS OFFERED BY SCHOOLS
Fiscal Year 1968-69

League	School	Number of Sports			Sport Offered at Varsity and Jr. Varsity Levels (*Denotes Varsity Level Only)																		
		Varsity	Jr. Varsity	Total	Football	Basketball	Baseball	Boys Track	Girls Track	Cross Country	Boys Swimming	Girls Swimming	Boys Tennis	Girls Tennis	Golf*	Wrestling	Boys Volleyball	Girls Volleyball*	Boys Bowling	Girls Bowling	Riflery*	Soccer	
ILH:	Farrington	13	10	23	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x*	x	x	x	x		
	Kaimuki	16	13	29	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x*	x	x	x	x		
	Kalani	16	13	29	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x*	x	x	x	x	x	
	McKinley	11	9	20	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
	Roosevelt	17	12	29	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x*	x	x	x	x	x	x*
	Average		14.6	11.4	26																		
OIA:	Aiea	12	3	15	x	x	x	x*	x*	x*	x*	x*	x*	x*	x			x					
	Leilehua	11	2	13	x	x	x*	x*	x*	x*	x*	x*	x*	x*	x							x	
	Radford	13	7	20	x	x	x	x	x	x	x*	x*	x*	x*	x	x							
	Waialua	12	4	16	x	x	x*	x	x	x*	x*	x*	x*	x*	x	x*							
	Campbell	12	4	16	x	x	x*	x	x*	x	x*	x*	x*	x*	x	x*							
	Waianae	10	4	14	x	x	x*	x	x	x*	x	x*	x*	x*	x	x*							
	Waipahu	7	3	10	x	x	x	x*	x*	x	x*	x*	x*	x*	x	x*							
	Castle	10	3	13	x	x	x	x*	x*	x*	x*	x*	x*	x*	x	x*							
	Kahuku	8	3	11	x	x	x	x*	x*	x*	x*	x*	x*	x*	x	x*							
	Kailua	13	6	19	x	x	x	x	x	x	x*	x*	x*	x*	x	x*						x*	
	Average		10.8	3.9	14.7																		
BIIF:	Hilo	12	3	15	x	x	x*	x		x*	x*	x*	x*	x	x*	x*	x	x					
	Honokaa	8	1	9	x*	x	x*	x*			x*	x*	x*	x	x	x*	x*	x					
	Kau	4	3	7	x	x	x*	x															
	Kohala	7	1	8	x*	x	x*	x*	x*									x*	x				
	Konawaena	7	2	9	x	x	x*	x*	x*									x*	x				
	Laupahoehoe	8	3	11		x	x*	x		x*			x*			x*	x	x					
	Pahoa	2	2	4		x		x									x	x					
Average		6.8	2.1	9.0																			
MIL:	Baldwin	15	4	19	x	x	x	x	x*	x*	x*	x*	x*	x	x*	x*	x	x				x	
	Hana	4	0	4				x*	x*	x*													
	Lahainaluna	10	3	13	x	x	x	x*	x*	x*			x*	x*			x*	x					
	Maui	12	4	16	x	x	x	x	x*	x*			x*	x*	x	x*	x*	x					
Average		10.2	2.7	13																			
MLIL:	Lanai	4	1	5		x	x*	x*						x									
	Molokai	3	1	4		x	x*								x*								
Average		3.5	1	4.5																			
KIF:	Kapa'a	9	1	10	x*	x	x*	x*			x*	x*	x*	x*	x								
	Kauai	8	1	9	x*	x	x*	x*	x*			x*	x*	x*	x								
	Waimea	9	1	10	x*	x	x*	x*	x*		x*	x*	x*	x*	x								
	Average		8.6	1	9.7																		

APPENDIX D

EXAMPLES OF VARIATIONS IN
EXPENDITURE PRACTICES BY LEAGUES

Expenditure	Leagues				
	ILH	OIA	BIIF	KIF	MIL
Players' Expenses					
Athletic shoes	Majority of the schools pays half of the cost	In the majority of schools, players absorb cost	Same as OIA	Same as OIA	Majority of schools pays less than half of the cost
Meals during inter-island travel	Majority of the schools pays for cost	Half of the schools pays for cost, while in the other schools players absorb cost	In the majority of schools, players absorb cost	In all schools, players absorb cost	Same as KIF
Medical insurance premiums	Majority of the schools pays for cost	In the majority of schools, players absorb cost	In all schools, players absorb cost	Same as BIIF	Same as BIIF
Support Services					
Trainer	Majority of schools pays for service	In the majority of schools, service provided free	In all schools, service provided free	Same as BIIF	Same as BIIF
Team physician	All schools pays for service	In the majority of schools, service provided free	In all schools, service provided free	Majority of schools pays for service	In the majority of schools, service provided free
Band instructor	All schools pays for service	Half of the schools pays for service, while in other schools service provided free	In majority of schools, service provided free	Same as BIIF	In all schools, service provided free
Pep squad advisor	Majority of schools pays for service	In the majority of schools, service provided free	Same as OIA	Same as OIA	In all schools, service provided free
Ticket sellers and collectors	All schools pays for service	In all schools, service provided free	In majority of schools, service provided free	Same as BIIF	Same as ILH

APPENDIX E

Student Activity Fees for Athletics
1968-1969

ILH:	Farrington	3.50
	Kaimuki	3.00
	Kalani	3.00
	McKinley	3.00
	Roosevelt	3.00
OIA:	Aiea	3.50
	Leilehua	3.50
	Radford	3.50
	Waialua	3.00
	Campbell	3.50
	Waianae	3.50
	Waipahu	3.00
	Castle	3.50
	Kahuku	3.50
Kailua	3.00	
BIIF:	Hilo	3.50
	Honokaa	None
	Kau	3.00
	Kohala	None
	Konawaena	3.00
	Laupahoehoe	2.00
	Pahoa	2.50
MIL:	Baldwin	3.50
	Hana	None
	Lahainaluna	3.50
	Maui	3.50
MLIL:	Lanai	2.00
	Molokai	3.50
KIF:	Kapaa	3.50
	Kauai	3.50
	Waimea	3.50

APPENDIX F

GATE ADMISSION PRICES
1968-69

Sport	Adult	Student
Football:		
ILH	\$2.00; \$3.00	\$.75
OIA	1.50	.50
BIIF	1.25	.50; \$.25
KIF	1.50	.75; .50
MIL	1.25	.25
Basketball:		
ILH	1.50; 2.00	.75
OIA	1.25	.50
BIIF	1.25	.50; .25
KIF	1.00	.50; .25
MIL	1.00	.25
Molokai	1.00	.75
Lanai	.75	.50
Baseball:		
ILH	1.00	.50
OIA	1.00	.50
BIIF	1.00	.50; .25
Track:		
ILH	1.50	.75
OIA	1.25	.50
Wrestling:		
ILH	1.00	.75
OIA	1.00	.50
Swimming:		
ILH	1.00	.50
OIA	1.00	.50
Volleyball:		
BIIF	1.00	.50; .25