

VOL. VIII, NO. 2

MARCH, 1930

Research Bulletin

OF THE

National Education Association

A Self-survey Plan for State School Systems

Part I: Checklists

Preliminary edition

PUBLISHED BY THE RESEARCH DIVISION
OF THE NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION
1201 SIXTEENTH STREET NORTHWEST, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Entered as second-class matter February 10, 1923, at the Post Office at
Washington, D. C., under Act of August 24, 1912. Acceptance for
mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103,
Act of October 3, 1917, authorized February 10, 1923.

Research Bulletin of the National Education Association

Published five times each year in January, March, May, September, and November by the Research Division of the National Education Association of the United States.

President, E. RUTH PYRTLE

Secretary, J. W. CRABTREE

The payment of the \$5 membership fee of the National Education Association entitles one to receive the Research Bulletin, the Journal, the Annual Volume of Addresses and Proceedings, and certain other publications of the National Education Association for one year. One dollar of each \$5 membership fee is for a year's subscription to the Research Bulletin. The Research Bulletin may be subscribed for separately at a subscription price of \$1 per year. Copies may be purchased for 25 cents, and in quantities at a reduced rate. Those entitled to receive the Research Bulletin regularly are asked to report at once any change of address, giving old as well as new address.

Entered as second-class matter February 10, 1923, at the Post Office at Washington, D. C., under Act of August 24, 1912. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized February 10, 1923.

Director of Research: John K. Norton Associate Director: Margaret Alltucker Norton
Assistant Directors: Frank W. Hubbard, William G. Carr
Executive and Editorial Offices - - - 1201 Sixteenth Street N. W., Washington, D. C.

How to Secure Additional Copies

Additional copies of this issue of the Research Bulletin may be obtained at the following prices, postpaid if remittance accompanies order:

Single copies of this issue 25¢
2 to 9 copies—10% reduction
10 to 99 copies—25% reduction
100 or more copies—33 1/3% reduction.

Orders for Research Bulletins not accompanied by remittance are subject to transportation charges. Make checks payable to National Education Association.

Subscriptions to Research Bulletins

The Research Bulletin may be received regularly through a special subscription at \$1 per year. Only those holding the \$5 membership (see statement at top of this page) receive the Research Bulletin without such subscription. Many of the early issues of the Research Bulletin are already out of print. The special subscription at \$1 per year offers an opportunity to maintain a complete file of future Research Bulletins.

Reproduction of Material in Research Bulletins

Electro-mat-slide service: The National Education Association maintains a special service to aid those reproducing material appearing in its publications. Send orders or requests for further information to the Division of Publications.

Tables, charts, and any other material appearing in Research Bulletins may be reproduced for the advancement of education. No authority other than this notice is needed previous to such reproduction. For further information on this subject or others affecting the work of the Division, address the Research Division, National Education Association, 1201 Sixteenth Street N. W., Washington, D. C.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
Foreword	56
How to Use the Checklists.....	57
How to Continue the Self-survey.....	59
Four General Cautions	60
Who Can Use the Self-survey?.....	61
Checklists	62
Page for Recording Additional Notes and Comments.....	77
Application of the Self-survey—Illustrations.....	78
The Certification of Teachers in California.....	78
Employment and Contracts of Teachers in Pennsylvania.....	81
Retirement of Teachers in Virginia.....	83
Apportionment of State School Funds in Maryland.....	86

LIST OF TABLES

Checklists for State School Systems (Table A).....	58
Checklist for Attendance Laws and Their Enforcement (Table 1).....	62
Checklist for Child Labor Laws (Table 2).....	63
Checklist for Pupil Personnel and Adjustment (Table 3).....	64
Checklist for Teacher Training and Supervision (Table 4).....	65
Checklist for Certification of Teachers (Table 5).....	66
Checklist for Employment and Contracts (Table 6).....	67
Checklist for State Salary Laws (Table 7).....	68
Checklist for Professional Organizations (Table 8).....	69
Checklist for Teacher Retirement Systems (Table 9).....	70
Checklist for Sources of School Revenue (Table 10).....	71
Checklist for Apportionment of State School Funds (Table 11).....	72
Checklist for Material Equipment (Table 12).....	73
Checklist for State Board of Education (Table 13).....	74
Checklist for State Department of Education (Table 14).....	75
Checklist for Higher and Adult Education (Table 15).....	76

FOREWORD

A DECADE ago Leonard P. Ayres published his *Index Number for State School Systems*. Where properly used this Index served a useful purpose but its limitations have been widely recognized. Ayres himself said of this Index:

If some great national agency were to undertake a survey of each of the 48 state school systems, it would surely report on many phases of their work not included in the items of the index. Among such phases would be the legal basis of the system, its organization, professional leadership and supervision, business management, course of study, teaching staff, plant and equipment, and the results of standard tests of classroom work. These elements, and others like them, are not directly included in the index, although some of them are crudely measured by the several items for financial expenditures.

In issuing *A Self-survey Plan for State School Systems* the National Education Association does not undertake "a survey of each of the 48 state school systems." Rather, it offers a means whereby many essential features of a state's provision for education may be evaluated by the people of the state. It includes a wide range of factors which the Ayres Index but crudely or indirectly measured, if it measured them at all.

In addition to its breadth of scope this self-survey plan presents three characteristics which make it unique among methods for evaluating the effectiveness of a state school system. In the first place, its fundamental purpose is the improvement of schools in each state, rather than comparisons among states. While the value of such comparisons is definitely recognized and provided for, each state is to be checked against a series of generally accepted criteria of administrative efficiency. Only incidentally is it compared with the practices prevailing in other states.

A second feature of the plan is the principle of improvement from within. It is not contemplated that an evaluation of any state school system shall be superimposed by an outside central agency. The plan is an opportunity, not a verdict.

Flexibility is the third outstanding characteristic of this self-survey. Although the plan crystalizes competent opinion it is not presented as the final word on state school administration. While probably 90 percent of the criteria would be enthusiastically accepted by those qualified to judge, it doubtless includes a few points on which full agreement has not been reached. The bulletin is therefore issued frankly as a preliminary and experimental edition. Revisions in the future are contemplated, and suggestions from the field concerning such revisions are invited.

As it stands, this self-survey plan is destined to exercise a significant influence on state educational advance during the next decade. It deserves discriminating study and use by both lay and professional groups in every state.

J. W. CRABTREE, *Secretary,*
National Education Association.

A Self-survey Plan for State School Systems

Part I: Checklists

SUPPOSE A GROUP of eminent educators were asked to appraise your state school system. Suppose that these educators were familiar with the generally accepted principles of state school organization and thoroughly competent to discover points of strength and weakness in your state's educational machinery. Suppose, also, that they had no other interest than the unbiased appraisal of your school system. What questions would they raise about your schools and their administration? What features would they be likely to approve and what to disapprove? What would they say with respect to the provision which your state has made for the education of its children as compared with the provision made by the United States in general?

This self-survey plan provides a method whereby school people and other groups of citizens may make an orderly, careful, and continuing study and analysis of the strong and weak points in the structure of their state school system. Such study will lead to a better understanding of the fundamental problems of their state educational system and will furnish a basis for planned and intelligent improvement.

The self-survey plan is published in two parts. Part I, constituting this issue of the Research Bulletin, contains a series of fifteen checklists covering various aspects of a state system of education. It also contains instructions and suggestions for using these checklists. Part II will be published as the May, 1930, number of the Research Bulletin. It constitutes a handbook for use with the checklists in Part I. The handbook, Part II, discusses the standards implied in the various items which make up the checklists, and cites a wide range of authorities in support of their validity. It also gives some indication of how the country as a whole is progressing towards the criteria composing the checklists.

How to Use the Checklists

The fifteen checklists, page 62 to 76, provide a method for gathering the necessary basic data for the self-survey. The checklists are not the self-survey. The really important part of the survey begins after the checklists are filled out. At that point in the investigation the surveyor, having necessary data before him, begins to search out points of strength and weakness, to attempt to discover the causes for unsatisfactory conditions, and, above all, to seek ways and means of improving the situation.

Furthermore, the checklists should not be used uncritically. Best results will be secured when they are thoroughly understood. It is the purpose of the handbook to provide the background necessary for intelligent use of the checklists. The detailed instructions and suggestions which follow should be read before the actual work of gathering data for the self-survey is undertaken.

The checklists consist of a series of questions concerning the administration of a state school system.¹ Each question is worded so as to call for an answer of either "yes" or "no." The wording of the questions is such that "yes" is, according to the most expert and practical judgment available, the desirable answer. A "no" answer generally, but not always, indicates a fault in the legislative or administrative basis of the state school system. For convenience the questions are grouped into fifteen topical checklists which include such titles as: attendance laws and their enforcement, state school revenues, school buildings and equipment, adult and higher education. The titles of all checklists are given in Table A, page 58. At the right of each checklist, pages 62 to 76, there are two columns: one headed Yes, the other No. In using the checklists, place a check after each question in either the "yes" or "no" column according to the answer which must be given for your state.

¹ The expression "state school system" does not exclude cities. The checklists apply to the state as a whole, including school districts of all sizes. The use of this self-survey for city school systems alone is not feasible on account of the general scope of the questions. Most cities at present exceed the criteria proposed for the states as a whole. The educational function of the state, however, is to fix progressively higher minimum standards and to encourage cities and other local jurisdictions to exceed these standards where possible.

Examples. Suppose North Carolina is being studied. The first question in table 1, the checklist which deals with attendance laws and their enforcement, asks "Is an annual or continuing school census on a state-wide basis required by law?" Since a continuing school census is required in North Carolina, that state would be checked in the "yes" column after this particular question. Each succeeding question would be similarly checked either "yes" or "no."

Suppose, instead of North Carolina, New Jersey were being checked on the same question. This state does not require a state-wide annual or continuing school census.¹ It would, therefore, be checked in the "no" column after this particular question. Each succeeding question would be similarly checked either "yes" or "no."

Questions which do not apply—Since the checklists are intended for general application, it is possible that a few questions may not apply in a given state. Where this occurs simply write "does not apply" across the two right-hand columns opposite this question.

¹ A committee of New Jersey school people is now studying this problem with a view to remedying the lack of a state-wide school census.

Example. Suppose Utah is being studied with reference to table 9 which deals with teacher retirement systems. Question 1 of this checklist asks, "Is there a state-wide teacher retirement system?" There is no state-wide retirement system covering Utah teachers, therefore the state would be checked in the "no" column after this question. The remaining questions ask for certain important details covering the operation of teacher retirement systems. But Utah, having no such system, cannot answer these questions. After checking "no" on the first question, therefore, Utah would write "does not apply" across the two right-hand columns opposite each question from question 2 on.

Questions which call for qualified answers—

While most of the questions can be answered by an outright "yes" or "no" there will probably be one or two questions for which a state should give a qualified answer. Neither an outright "yes" or "no" may be entirely accurate. In such cases the questions should be checked in the column which, in the judgment of the user, most closely approximates the truth.

TABLE A—CHECKLISTS FOR STATE SCHOOL SYSTEMS

The Child and His Welfare		Page
Table 1.	Checklist for Attendance Laws and Their Enforcement.....	62
Table 2.	Checklist for Child Labor Laws.....	63
Table 3.	Checklist for Pupil Personnel and Adjustment.....	64
The Teaching Profession		
Table 4.	Checklist for Teacher Training and Supervision.....	65
Table 5.	Checklist for Certification of Teachers.....	66
Table 6.	Checklist for Employment and Contracts.....	67
Table 7.	Checklist for State Salary Laws.....	68
Table 8.	Checklist for Professional Organizations.....	69
Table 9.	Checklist for Teacher Retirement Systems.....	70
State School Finance		
Table 10.	Checklist for Sources of School Revenue.....	71
Table 11.	Checklist for Apportionment of State School Funds.....	72
Material Equipment		
Table 12.	Checklist for Material Equipment.....	73
Administration and Control		
Table 13.	Checklist for State Board of Education.....	74
Table 14.	Checklist for State Department of Education.....	75
Table 15.	Checklist for Adult and Higher Education.....	76

Qualifying statements should be placed in the space provided below each checklist.

Example. Table 7 deals with teachers' salaries and this is the first question asked: "Are there state regulations governing the minimum amount of teachers' salaries?" Suppose California is answering the question. California has no state minimum salary law. However, there is a provision which specifies that all state school funds and sixty percent of all county school funds shall be spent for teachers' salaries. The minimum amount of these funds is fixed by law in terms of the average daily attendance. In effect, therefore, California does govern the minimum amount of teachers' salaries, although it has no minimum salary law. California should answer this question by checking the "yes" column and should briefly describe the situation in a note in the space provided. The note might read as indicated at the bottom of this page.

In order to show in further detail how the checklists are to be filled out, several illustrations of their use are given in pages 78 to 86. Reading these illustrations will make clear how the checking is to be done.

How to Continue the Self-Survey

The use of the checklists, as indicated above, is only the first step in making the self-survey. To stop at this point would be to have collected a mass of possibly interesting data, and no more. The second step in the self-survey is the interpretation of the data. The third step is the evolution of a program of improvement. The fourth step is to put this program into effect.

Interpreting the data—In the work of interpreting the data collected on the checklists, the handbook, Part II of the self-survey to be published as the May, 1930, number of the Research Bulletin, will be found valuable. The handbook shows why the questions in the checklists are significant, refers to authoritative discussions of the topic, and shows in some

instances how many states can meet the criterion suggested.

The interpretation and analysis should include both those questions which are answered "yes" and those which are answered "no."

A "yes" answer does not necessarily mean that there is no room for improvement. Excellent laws and regulations occasionally fail because they are poorly administered. Furthermore, the checklists cover only points which are of major importance. Practically every question listed could become the starting-point for extensive and intensive investigations.

Example. Suppose New York is being studied on the basis of table 1 which deals with attendance laws and their enforcement. The first question asks, "Is an annual or continuing school census on a state-wide basis required by law?" The state answers this question in the affirmative. But this answer gives rise to many further questions of great importance, such as: Is the law being enforced? Is the administration of the law economical and effective? Are the proper kinds of information being collected? Are the returns handled in such a way as to be speedily available to all who need to consult them? Are the returns put to effective use in the enforcement of the attendance laws?

On the other hand, when a "no" answer is given for any question, the surveyor should have in mind that each question in the checklists embodies principles of wide acceptance. If a state deviates from these principles there should be very potent reasons for setting them aside. It is true that unusual conditions in a few cases may justify a "no" answer, but this would only be true in a state where exceptional conditions prevail. In short the burden of proof rests on the exceptional cases.

If good reasons for making an exception do not appear, the surveyor will raise such questions as these:

1. Why would the children in my state be better educated if my state could answer "yes" to this question?

Table	Item	Comment
7	1	Constitution, Section 16, requires all state and 60% county school funds to be spent for salaries. Under our system of state and county school revenue and apportionment this is, in effect, a minimum salary regulation, although we have no direct minimum salary law.

2. What should be the long-time objective of my state with respect to this factor of school efficiency?
3. What steps can be taken immediately to improve the situation with respect to this criterion?
4. How does the practice of other states compare with what my state does in this respect?

Example. The chief state school officer in Colorado is not appointed by the state board of education but is elected by popular vote. This state would, therefore, place a check in the "no" column after question 9 of table 13, which asks whether the chief state school officer is appointed by the state board of education. The surveyor in Colorado would first ask if there were any sufficient reason why Colorado schools should be an exception to this very generally accepted principle of state school administration. If no good reason be found, he will then make himself familiar with the reasons why this principle is sound, using the handbook (Part II of the self-survey plan), and other cited references if necessary. Having secured a clear picture of the situation in his state and the reasons why a change might be desirable, the surveyor will attempt to determine what immediate steps should be taken and what long-term policies should be formulated and supported. In making these decisions he will probably want to find out what the practice is in other states. Here again the handbook, with its citations to authorities and sources of information, will be useful.

Four General Cautions

A tool intended for one purpose is ineffective for another purpose. An axe is useful for felling trees but it has few merits as a wood-carver's tool. A surveyor's chain is an excellent instrument for laying out the boundaries of a township; other measuring devices are needed to gauge the diameter of piano-wires. Exactly so with the self-survey plan. Correctly used for the purposes for which it was constructed it should yield good results. But it should not be used in ways for which it was not intended. The few cautions necessary to the intelligent use of the self-survey plan, therefore, take the form of a statement of what the self-survey is not. The self-survey plan in its present form is not merely a series of isolated questions. It is not a thinking machine. It is not a prescription for all the ills of state school administration, but rather a guide for diagnosis. Finally, it is not a micrometer for making hair-line comparisons be-

tween states with respect to school efficiency. Since it is none of these things it should not be used for these purposes.

Caution 1—Use the self-survey as a unit. The questions which comprise the checklists and the checklists themselves are closely inter-related. For instance, the checklist on the training of teachers is related to the checklist on certification and both of these are related to the two checklists which deal with the state board and state department of education. The individual questions in each of the checklists are similarly bound together. It follows that no one question or checklist should be considered solely as an isolated element. The factors which make for efficient state school administration are inextricably interwoven. The various threads may be momentarily examined, one by one, but the large pattern must be always kept in view.

Caution 2—Use the self-survey as a stimulant to thought, not as a substitute for thinking. The raw data concerning a state school system cannot be dumped into the self-survey plan at one end and be delivered at the other as a fool-proof nostrum for the ailments of a state school system. Rigorous thinking, the application of common-sense, careful research by qualified agencies, and vigorous state educational leadership are not rendered obsolete by the publication of this bulletin.

Caution 3—Use the self-survey critically. The self-survey plan does not cover every phase of state school efficiency. Instead it draws attention to a few crucial points upon which progressive educational thought is fairly well agreed. It omits much that is important but still controversial; much that is significant but still not fundamental. A state that could answer "yes" to every question in the checklists might still fall short of perfection. A state that answered every question in the negative might still have some points to commend.

Caution 4—Use the self-survey as a means of improvement. Do not use the self-survey to secure a numerical measure of school efficiency. As a rule questions should be broadly interpreted in terms of results. The primary purpose of the self-survey is not comparison but improvement. The self-survey plan should be used to help a state give its children the educational opportunities they need and

are entitled to have. Comparative studies of state school systems based on the self-survey will prove valuable, but they should not be motivated by a desire to find out whether a state is first, second, twenty-fourth, or forty-eighth among its neighbors. The self-survey is a diagnostic guide to further critical study; not a micrometer.

Who Can Use the Self-survey?

In general, the self-survey plan should prove useful to all who are interested in understanding state school systems and in increasing the efficiency of state educational control and leadership. More specifically, the self-survey can be used by the following agencies.

1. Chief state school officials, state educational research directors, and state departments of education can compare the practice of their own state with practice which is generally recognized as desirable. They can use the self-survey as the basis for a series of staff meetings. They can report to their state boards of education and to the people how closely the state approximates the criteria proposed, at what points it has done well, at what points it needs to do better, and what legislative and constitutional changes are necessary to make an efficient state school system possible.

2. Secretaries of state education associations and their staffs will find the self-survey plan helpful in organizing their membership into a unified body with a dynamic educational policy. The self-survey plan as a whole will also be useful to the legislative committees of state education associations while single checklists may be intensively studied by other special committees. Still another method would be to appoint a committee to make a self-survey of the state each year and to report annually. The annual report of this self-survey committee would soon acquire tremendous cumulative effect.

3. The editors of state education association journals will find that the self-survey offers a basis for a significant series of articles. One editor plans to have educational leaders evaluate his state on one of the checklists each month until the entire series is covered. An-

other proposes to select one checklist each year and to use that topic as the central theme of the year's activities.

4. Civic and welfare organizations, both national and state-wide in scope, will find the self-survey useful. These organizations often work through a series of committees. The committee on education might well use the self-survey as a basis for study and as a stimulus for a general program of improvement. Organizations which are national in scope can make the self-survey through education committees in the several states. Usually, before the self-survey reaches the point where the formulation of a definite program is in order, it will be necessary to secure competent expert guidance. The officials of the state department of education will often be able to give assistance at this point. The work of these committees should be co-ordinated by the central national office, thus providing for making the experience of each state available to all.¹

5. Education committees of state legislatures will find that the checklists and the handbook give in small space and in convenient reference form the principles of state school administration which are generally accepted as fundamental.

6. Schools and colleges of education will find the self-survey plan a useful collateral textbook for courses in educational administration. The checklists can be made the basis for class discussions, using the handbook and the references suggested therein as supplementary reading. The careful application of the self-survey to a given state school system would constitute an educational contribution suitable for theses for advanced degrees.

The types of agencies named above are suggestive rather than all-inclusive. Other groups will probably survey their state school systems with the instrument here presented. But the six agencies just named—state departments of education, state education associations, editors of state educational journals, civic organizations, education committees of state legislatures, and schools of education—serve to illustrate the types of agencies which may use the self-survey plan.

¹ The Research Division of the National Education Association, 1201 Sixteenth Street, Washington, D. C., will be glad to advise organizations with state branches as to how this self-survey may be used most effectively in cooperative studies.

TABLE 1

Checklist for Attendance Laws and Their Enforcement

See May 1930 Research Bulletin, p. 94-99 for discussion of these criteria

Answer the following questions for your state:	Yes	No
1. Is an annual or continuing school census on a state-wide basis required by law?		
2. Does the law permit local school districts to establish and maintain public kindergartens?		
3. Must all normal children of seven years and over be enrolled in public or approved non-public schools?		
4. Is full-time school attendance required of all normal children, without exception, at least through age 16?		
5. If full-time school attendance is not required beyond age 16, is a system of free, compulsory part-time continuation schools maintained at least up to age 18?		
6. Must all schools be maintained at least 8 months or 160 days?		
7. Is the appointment of some officer for checking attendance provided for by law in each school unit?		
8. Is the appointment of attendance officers wholly in the hands of school authorities?		
9. Are professional or educational qualifications required of attendance officers?		
10. Does the state department of education include a person to whom is assigned the supervision of attendance?		
11. Is there a uniform state-wide system of attendance records and reports?		
12. Are non-public schools required to make attendance reports to public school officials?		
13. Does the state department of education maintain a policy of continuous study and improvement of conditions relating to attendance laws and their enforcement?		

Space for Comments	
Item	Comments

Additional space for comments is provided on page 77

TABLE 2

Checklist for Child Labor Laws

See May 1930 Research Bulletin, p. 100-04 for discussion of these criteria

<i>Answer the following questions for your state:</i>	Yes	No
1. Is the minimum age for employment at least 16 at times when schools are open (except for work at home in agricultural pursuits and domestic service when schools are not in session)?		
2. Is the minimum age for employment in mines and quarries 18?		
3. Are physical examinations required of all children before a first certificate or permit for going to work is issued?		
4. Are physical examinations required either whenever a child for whom an employment certificate or permit is required changes employers or at stated intervals after a child goes to work?		
5. Is 8 hours work a day, including time spent in continuation school, the maximum for minors under 18?		
6. Is a 44 hour week, including time spent in continuation school, the maximum for minors under 18?		
7. Are employment certificates or work permits required for all workers under 18?		
8. Is the employment of minors under 18 in hazardous occupations forbidden?		
9. Is the completion of the 8th grade or 8 years of school attendance required for the issuance of an employment certificate or work permit?		
10. Is the employment of minors under 18 between 7 p. m. and 6 a. m. forbidden?		
11. Is there any specific regulation of the work of children in agricultural pursuits?		
12. Is the employment of minors in street trades regulated?		
13. Is the work of issuance of employment certificates supervised by state authority?		
14. Does the state department of education or the state department of labor, or some other state agency maintain a policy of continuous study and improvement of conditions relating to child labor laws?		

Space for Comments	
Item	Comments

Additional space for comments is provided on page 77

See May 1930 Research Bulletin, p. 104-07 for discussion of these criteria

Yes	No
-----	----

- [illegible]

Space for Comments

[64]

See May 1930 Research Bulletin, p. 107-13 for discussion of these criteria

Answer the following questions for your state:	Yes	No
1. Have all teacher-training classes in connection with high schools been abandoned in favor of state normal schools or teachers colleges?		
2. Is graduation from high school required for admission to all institutions accredited by the state for teacher-training purposes?		
3. Do teacher-training institutions offer a variety of curricula leading to definitely differentiated positions?		
4. Do you avoid separate boards of control for each of the state teacher-training institutions? (State University and A. & M. Colleges not included)		
5. Are free placement services available to the graduates of all state teacher-training institutions?		
6. Is tuition in all state teacher-training institutions free to residents of the state?		
7. Is a social development program an integral part of the curriculum of teacher-training institutions?		
8. Is there a uniform, permanent, and continuous census of teachers and their qualifications?		
9. Is every teacher in the state directly responsible to a superintendent, principal, or supervisor for educational work performed?		
10. If the personnel available for supervisory work in rural schools is relatively inadequate, do you supplement it by two or more of the following devices: reading circles, demonstration schools, helping teachers, teachers' institutes?		
11. Do the state teacher-training schools or the state department of education, or both, have a definite program of follow-up work and continuation training for their graduates?		
12. Do the state teacher-training institutions or the state department of education, or both, maintain a policy of continuous study and improvement of the curriculum and other factors in the preparation of teachers?		

Space for Comments	
Item	Comments

TABLE 5

Checklist for Certification of Teachers

See May 1930 Research Bulletin, p. 113-20 for discussion of these criteria

Answer the following questions for your state:	Yes	No
1. Are at least two years of education beyond graduation from high school required for all initial elementary certificates?		
2. Are at least four years of education beyond graduation from high school required for all initial secondary certificates?		
3. Does the state have the exclusive authority to issue certificates?		
4. Are certification requirements, other than general minimum standards, set by the state board of education rather than by statute?		
5. Is a special certificate for administration and supervision required?		
6. Are special certificates for teachers of special subjects and classes (e. g. music, art, etc.) provided?		
7. Are high-school certificates differentiated as to validity among the various secondary school fields?		
8. If life diplomas are issued, are they invalidated when holder discontinues educational work for a period of years?		
9. Are equivalent training and experience secured in other states recognized as a basis for certification?		
10. Is a minimum age of at least 18 required for all certificates?		
11. Is the candidate required to give evidence of moral character?		
12. Is a certificate of good health required for all initial certificates?		
13. Have examinations as a basis for initial certification been discontinued in favor of the recommendations of teacher-training institutions?		
14. Has certification on the basis of teacher-training work in high schools been discontinued?		
15. Are all initial certificates of a probationary nature, valid for a limited period?		
16. Are there equivalent (although not necessarily identical) minimum certification standards for rural and city teachers?		
17. Is practice teaching or experience required of candidates for all teachers' certificates?		
18. Are teachers in non-public schools required to meet standards essentially equivalent to those required of public school teachers?		

Space for Comments	
Item	Comments

Additional space for comments is provided on page 77

TABLE 6

Checklist for Employment and Contracts

See May 1930 Research Bulletin, p. 120-24 for discussion of these criteria

<i>Answer the following questions for your state:</i>		Yes	No
1. Is a try-out period of teaching service specified?			
2. Is an indefinite appointment required after this try-out period?			
3. May continuous employment be made contingent upon a reasonable program of study or other forms of improvement?			
4. May teachers on indefinite status be dismissed for proven incompetency or other good cause?			
5. Is the power to dismiss in the hands of the appointing body?			
6. Is a notice of dismissal required by law?			
7. May dismissed teachers appeal to the state educational authority?			
8. Are the laws governing employment and contracts of teachers state-wide in their application?			
9. Are teachers penalized for the violation of a contract without the consent of the employer?			
10. Does the state department of education maintain a policy of continuous study and improvement of the factors affecting teachers' contracts?			

Space for Comments	
Item	Comments

Additional space for comments is provided on page 77

See May 1930 Research Bulletin, p. 124-26 for discussion of these criteria

Space for Comments	
Item	Comments

Additional space for comments is provided on page 77

See May 1930 Research Bulletin, p. 126-28 for discussion of these criteria

<i>Answer the following questions for your state:</i>	Yes	No
1. Are at least 50% of the teachers of the state members of the National Education Association?		
2. Are at least 90% of the teachers of the state members of their state education association?		
3. Is a full-time executive secretary employed by the state education association?		
4. Has the state association adopted a code of ethics for the teaching profession?		
5. Does the state association publish a journal?		
6. Does the state association have committees actively at work on teaching problems?		
7. Does the state association have committees actively at work on problems of school finance and administration?		
8. Does the state association have committees actively at work on problems directly connected with teacher welfare?		
9. Does the state association hold an annual convention, either state-wide or by districts?		

Space for Comments	
Item	Comments

Additional space for comments is provided on page 77

TABLE 9

Checklist for Teacher Retirement Systems

See May 1930 Research Bulletin, p. 128-33 for discussion of these criteria

Answer the following questions for your state:	Yes	No
1. Is there a state-wide teacher retirement system?		
2. Is membership required of new teachers?		
3. Do both teachers and public contribute to the support of the retirement sytem?		
4. Is the method of determining the total amounts to be deposited in the retirement fund by teachers and the payments to be made by the public fixed by law?		
5. Is the retirement system organized on the reserve basis so that the moneys necessary to meet all obligations will be regularly accumulated without the necessity of recurring legislation?		
6. If teachers leave service prior to retirement, may they withdraw their deposits?		
7. If teachers die prior to retirement is the sum of their deposits payable to their heirs or estate?		
8. Is an age for compulsory retirement fixed?		
9. Is a periodic actuarial investigation of the retirement system provided?		
10. Is provision made for retirement for disability?		
11. Are public funds used to pay for prior service benefits?		
12. Is provision made for cooperative or reciprocal relations with other sound teacher retirement systems?		

Space for Comments	
Item	Comments

Additional space for comments is provided on page 77

See May 1930 Research Bulletin, p. 133-38 for discussion of these criteria

Answer the following questions for your state:	Yes	No
1. Does the state board of education control the investment of the permanent school fund?		
2. Is the investment of the permanent school fund in bonds of the state prohibited?		
3. Must all losses from the permanent school fund be made good from income or special appropriations?		
4. Is a unified state education budget prepared by the state department of education or by some other responsible agency?		
5. Is the total amount of state school aid determined in such a way that it increases with increased school attendance or other similar measures of educational need?		
6. Are constitutional maximal limitations on local or state school taxes avoided?		
7. Is a state personal income tax levied to supplement the general property tax?		
8. Is a state business income tax levied to supplement the general property tax?		
9. Is there a permanent state tax commission or tax commissioner?		
10. Are all local school units required to levy a school tax?		
11. Are the school boards of all local school tax units fiscally independent?		
12. Are non-public schools not conducted for profit, exempted from taxation on buildings and grounds used for instructional purposes?		
13. Is bonding for current operating expenses prohibited?		
14. Does the law require school district bonds to be of the serial type?		
15. Does the state department of education maintain a policy of continuous study of the most effective and equitable methods of securing revenue for schools?		

Space for Comments	
Item	Comments

TABLE 11

Checklist for Apportionment of State School Funds

See May 1930 Research Bulletin, p. 138-41 for discussion of these criteria

Answer the following questions for your state:	Yes	No
1. Does the law fix, or is the state board of education empowered to fix, minimum school tax-rate requirements which local units must levy in order to receive state aid?		
2. Is there a state equalizing fund apportioned so as to recognize differences in local financial ability to support schools?		
3. Does the state apportionment amount to at least 20 percent of the operating cost of public schools?		
4. Is the use of census or enrolment statistics as bases for apportioning the state school funds avoided?		
5. Does the state department of education conduct a continuous and systematic study of the effect of the present system of state apportionments on the welfare of the schools?		

Space for Comments	
Item	Comments

Additional space for comments is provided on page 77

TABLE 12

Checklist for Material Equipment

See May 1930 Research Bulletin, p. 142-45 for discussion of these criteria

<i>Answer the following questions for your state:</i>	Yes	No
1. Is there a division of school housing or a school architect in the state department of education?		
2. Are minimum school building standards set by the state board or state department of education?		
3. Is there a state schoolhousing code?		
4. Must free textbooks be supplied in elementary schools?		
5. Must free textbooks be supplied in secondary schools?		
6. If the adoption of textbooks is on a state-wide basis, is the state board or state department of education the adopting authority?		
7. If the adoption of textbooks is on a state-wide basis, is the adoption in terms of a multiple list?		
8. Are small local districts combined for the purpose of purchasing standard school supplies?		
9. Does the state department of education give advisory service in connection with the purchase of school supplies?		

Space for Comments	
Item	Comments

Additional space for comments is provided on page 77

TABLE 13

Checklist for State Board of Education

See May 1930 Research Bulletin, p. 146-49 for discussion of these criteria

Answer the following questions for your state:	Yes	No
✓ 1. Is the state board of education predominantly a lay body?		
✓ 2. Are ex-officio members omitted from the personnel of the board?		
✓ 3. Does the board consist of more than 4 and less than 10 members?		
✓ 4. Are terms of office at least five years?		
✓ 5. Do terms of office of members overlap?		
✓ 6. May members be removed during their term of office only on proved charges of malfeasance and other specified derelictions?		
✓ 7. Is service on the board without regular salary?		
8. Are there at least four fixed meetings of the board annually?		
9. Does the board appoint the chief state school officer?		
10. Does the board fix the salary of the chief state school officer?		
11. May the chief state school officer be removed during his term of office by the state board of education only for neglect of duty and similar derelictions?		
12. Does the board act as a board for vocational and agricultural education in the Federal program?		

Space for Comments	
Item	Comments

Additional space for comments is provided on page 77

Checklist for State Department of Education

Answer the following questions for your state:

1. Is the state superintendency open to all without regard to residence?		
2. Is the term of office either indefinite or for a period of at least four years?		
3. Is the salary of the chief state school official adequate?		
4. Is the state superintendent required by law to be a professional educator?		
5. Does the state department of education provide suggested courses of study and similar helps for schools?		
6. Does the state department of education prepare a uniform system of recording receipts and expenditures for use by local units?		
7. Does the state department of education include personnel sufficient to discharge all generally recognized educational functions?		

Item	Comments
------	----------

[75]

Table
Number

Answer the following questions for your state:

Yes	No
-----	----

Space for Comments

Item

Comments

Application of the Self-survey

To show more specifically how the self-survey would be applied several selected states will be studied, each with respect to a different one of the fifteen checklists. The states and topics selected for this illustrative analysis are:

California, Table 5, Certification of Teachers
Pennsylvania, Table 6, Employment and Contracts
Virginia, Table 9, State Teacher Retirement System
Maryland, Table 11, Apportionment of School Funds

It should be noted that these states are not selected as examples of either good or bad conditions. They are merely used here to illustrate in detail how the self-survey can be applied. In making these illustrative applications, the question of the validity of the various criteria for the particular states concerned has not been raised. As pointed out in the instructions for using this bulletin, the criteria were prepared with the United States as a whole in mind. Modifications to fit the special needs and conditions of individual states may be necessary.

Illustration 1

The Certification of Teachers in California

Table 5, page 66, is a checklist of questions concerning teacher certification. For purposes of illustration these questions will be applied to California.

The first question in Table 5 asks, "Are at least two years of education beyond graduation from a four-year high school required for all initial elementary certificates?" There are two jurisdictions in California authorized to issue elementary teachers' certificates: the state and the county.¹ The state credentials for elementary school teachers meet this criterion but those of the county do not. On examination county boards of education may grant certificates to high school graduates or to persons with four years of teaching experience (*School Code*, Sec. 5.241.) California would therefore check this question in the "No" column.

¹ As a matter of strict terminology all California teaching certificates are issued by the respective counties. The state issues credentials on presentation of which county boards of education issue certificates valid for the county concerned. For all practical purposes, however, the state credentials constitute valid teaching certificates for the entire state. The granting of county certificates on presentation of state credentials is largely a formality. However, in addition to the authority to issue county certificates to holders of state credentials, the 58 county boards of education also possess initial jurisdiction in the power to issue certificates of elementary grade on examination. Except in the case of these certificates issued on county board examinations, the strict distinction in terminology between credentials and certificates as defined in California will not be preserved in this illustrative application.

² However a constitutional provision somewhat qualifies the authority of the state board.

The person making the survey would probably wish to indicate in a footnote that the relative number of county certificates actually issued on this basis is small and that all state credentials for elementary teachers reach and exceed this criterion. (*Regulation Governing . . . Teachers' Credentials*, p. 38.) By referring to the parallel discussion for this question in the handbook, page 113, one may secure a list of authorities which discuss the issue and certain facts showing how the nation as a whole has progressed toward meeting the standard proposed.

The second question in Table 5 deals with requirements for secondary certificates and proposes a four-year course beyond high school as the minimum. California can meet this criterion, for it requires at least a bachelor's degree from an accredited institution for the general secondary credential. (*Regulations*, p. 10.) The discussion of this question on pages 113-14 of the handbook shows that in 1927 only twelve states met this four-year standard for high-school certification.

On the third question, "Does the state have exclusive authority to issue certificates?" California answers "No." This answer is given because, as pointed out above, county boards of education in California have the independent right to grant elementary certificates on examination. To this extent the state does not possess exclusive certificating authority. The discussion of this point in the handbook, page 114, indicates that the decentralized certification system of California is not in accord with the general historical development of certification practice in other states. In order to fall in with this tendency California would need to repeal the right of county boards of education to grant certificates on examination.

California answers "Yes" to the fourth question which asks whether certification requirements, other than general minimum standards, are set by the state board of education, rather than by statute.² (*School Code*, Sec. 5, 150)

To questions 5 and 6 the state also answers with an affirmative. These two questions ask whether special certificates are provided for teachers of special subjects and for administrators and supervisors. Since California does provide these certificates (*Regulations*, pp. 13-36, 41-45) it meets these criteria. The handbook discussion, pages 115-6, indicates that in 1926 twenty states issued certificates for administration and supervision and forty-five states issued certificates for teaching special subjects.

Since California does not differentiate secondary credentials as to validity for separate fields, it fails to meet the seventh criterion. The general secondary credential in California "authorizes the holder to teach any or all subjects" (*Regulations*, p. 10). The discussion on page 116 of the handbook shows why secondary certificates might well be differentiated by fields and briefly describes the special problems involved. It also shows that nineteen states now issue specialized high school certificates to college graduates.

Because a California life diploma is valid for life even though the holder discontinues educational work over a considerable period of years (*School Code*, Sec. 5.260) the state answers "No" to question 8 of Table 5. However, the discussion in the handbook on page 117 indicates that few states have reached this criterion, since only six states limit the persistence of the life diploma after the holder retires from teaching, while thirty-eight states follow California's practice of allowing life diplomas to continue valid indefinitely.

Since California recognizes equivalent training and experience secured in other states as a basis for certification, it would answer "Yes" on question 9. On question 10, "Is a minimum age of 18 required for all certificates?" California answers "Yes." (*School Code*, Sec. 5.440).

California requires each candidate for state credentials to "verify that he is a person of good moral character" and "to present from the recommending institution a statement certifying that the applicant is physically and mentally competent to render effective serv-

ice" (*Regulations*, p. 6). If only the credentials issued by the state were concerned, therefore, the state could answer "Yes" to questions 11 and 12 of Table 5. But the self-survey would have to report that the system of county certificate examinations creates an exception which prevents California from answering these questions in the affirmative.

Very much the same situation prevails with respect to question 13 which asks whether examinations as a basis for initial certification have been discontinued. California would answer "No" to this question although only a very few certificates are issued each year on examination. The discussion on page 118 of the handbook tells why authorities consider evidence of training a better basis of certification than examinations and shows that a number of states have entirely abandoned the examination method of certification.

California answers "Yes" to question 14, which asks "Has certification on the basis of teacher training work in high schools been discontinued?" The discussion, handbook, page 119, indicates why this question is valid and shows that California is one of thirty-three states which no longer attempt teacher training in high schools.

California answers "Yes" to question 15, since all initial certificates are valid for a limited period only.¹ The importance of the requirement is indicated in the handbook.

Since California does not differentiate between certificates as to their validity in rural or city school districts, a check should be placed in the "Yes" column after question 16.

Question 17, which asks whether practice teaching or teaching experience is required of candidates for teacher's certificates, must be checked in the "No" column since county boards of education may issue certificates to high school graduates on examination without reference to any professional training or practice.

Finally, question 18 asks whether the teachers in non-public schools are required to meet standards essentially equivalent to those required of public school teachers. California answers this question also in the negative. Al-

¹ Theoretically, credentials granted upon graduation from state teachers colleges are unlimited in time. In practice, however, experience is required for all life diplomas.

though many teachers in the non-public schools of the state are doubtless excellently trained, there is no law which effectively prevents the employment of untrained teachers in schools not under public control.

Summarizing, the self-survey, as applied for purposes of illustration to certification laws and regulations in California, reveals certain points of strength and weakness. The majority of the questions which call forth a "No" answer (numbers 1, 3, 11, 12, 14, 15, and 17) could be answered "Yes" if it were not for the existence of the county examination route to certification. Thus, although only a few hundred certificates are issued yearly on this basis, the general position of the state with respect to certification regulations is lowered. Three other points at which the California certification system might be open to some criticism are: The failure to limit the persistence of the life diploma in case the holder discontinues educational work for a considerable period of years, the absence of standards for teachers in non-public schools, and the fail-

ure to provide for differentiation of high school certificates as to validity to teach the various subject-matter fields.

On the positive side the self-survey calls attention to the fact that if the county examination route be omitted from consideration the California system of certification imposes uniformly high standards of training. It requires evidence of mental, physical, and moral standards. Certificates for teaching the special subjects and for various types of administrative and supervisory work are provided. Discrimination against rural schools is avoided. All initial certificates are for limited periods, the state board of education is empowered to fix certification requirements beyond the minima fixed by statute, and equivalent training and experience in other states is recognized as a basis for certification.

Facts of this type, as revealed in an organized manner by the self-survey would provide, in any state, a fundamental basis for further study which might lead to legislative recommendations and administrative adjustments.

THE purpose of all certification requirements is to insure to the child a properly-prepared teacher on the one hand, and to protect the State against the employment of incompetents and a wasting of the proceeds of taxation for education on the other. Just what is meant by these statements, in the different States, is wholly relative to the general professional standards in force and the economic resources of the people.—Ellwood P. Cubberley, *State School Administration*, page 635.

Illustration 2

Employment and Contracts of Teachers in Pennsylvania

Table 6, page 67, is a checklist of questions concerning state regulation of the employment and contracts of teachers. For purposes of illustration, these questions will be applied to Pennsylvania.

"Is a try-out period of teaching service specified?" This is the first question asked by Table 6. Reference to page 120 of the handbook will show why new teachers should be required to complete successfully a specified period of service before being given an indefinite appointment. Although the Pennsylvania law makes no mention of such a try-out period, all Pennsylvania certificates for beginning teachers are for limited periods. In effect, therefore, Pennsylvania takes an affirmative position on this question. The desirable length of the try-out period and the need of placing the teacher under the best type of supervision, during this period, are also discussed in the handbook.

The next question in Table 6 asks, "Is an indefinite appointment required after the try-out period?" A bill known as the "Continuing Contract Bill" was passed by the Pennsylvania legislature in 1929. This legislation makes it mandatory upon second, third, and fourth class school districts to give contracts to all teachers, which "shall continue in force, year after year, unless terminated by the teacher, at the close of the school term, by written resignation presented on or before the close of the school term, or by the Board of School Directors by written notice presented to the teacher on or before the close of the school term." ("Digest of Educational Legislation," *Pennsylvania School Journal*, June, 1929, p. 596). The law does not extend this requirement to school districts of the first class. However, in all first-class school districts (Philadelphia and Pittsburgh) regulations providing for the indefinite appointment of teachers are in effect. In actual practice, then, all school districts in Pennsylvania are meeting the criterion set up by this question, although the state law does not make it mandatory upon first-class school districts to do so. Reasons that have been advanced as to why states

should enact legislation requiring the indefinite contract for all teachers of proved ability are set forth in the handbook on page 121.

To the third question of Table 6, Pennsylvania's answer is "Yes." This question asks whether continuous employment of teachers may be made contingent upon a reasonable program of study or other forms of improvement. The state law provides certain opportunities and inducements for the teacher's professional improvement. Such improvement is a condition for certificate renewals. There is nothing in the school law which would prevent a district from fixing such requirements as a condition for continued employment.

Pennsylvania is able to answer questions 4, 5, and 6 affirmatively. These questions are: "May teachers on indefinite status be dismissed for incompetency, or other good cause?" "Is the power to dismiss in the hands of the appointing body?" and, "Is a notice of dismissal required by law?" The law provides that "The board of school directors of any school district in this commonwealth . . . shall, after due notice, giving the reasons therefor, and after hearing if demanded, have the right to remove any of its officers, employees, or appointees for incompetency, intemperance, neglect of duty, violation of any of the school laws of this Commonwealth, or other improper conduct." (*School Code*, 1927, Section 406.) These three questions are dealt with in page 122 of the handbook.

Pennsylvania fails to meet the criterion set up in the seventh question of Table 6, which asks, "May dismissed teachers appeal to the state educational authority?" The discussion on page 122 of the handbook presents evidence as to why, in cases of teacher dismissal, appeal to a professional, rather than to a judicial body, is to be preferred.

Although the "Continuing Contract Bill" enacted by the legislature of 1929, does not apply to school districts of the first class, Pennsylvania's answer to question 8 should be in the affirmative. This is because only the school districts of Philadelphia and Pittsburgh are included in the group classified as first-class school districts. The purpose of setting up the criterion implied in this question in the checklist was to test whether the laws governing

employment and contracts applied to rural communities. There appears to be no discrimination against the rural child and the rural teacher in the Pennsylvania "Continuing Contract" Act. Other laws affecting the employment and contracts of teachers in Pennsylvania apply to all classes of school districts.

Pennsylvania also answers "Yes" to question 9, "Are teachers penalized for the violation of a contract without the consent of the employer?" In order to protect the employing school district from wilful violation of the contract by the teacher, the Pennsylvania law provides that "Any principal or teacher who, unless released by the board of school directors, refuses or neglects to teach through the term for which he was engaged, except when prevented by personal illness, shall be disqualified from teaching in any public school in the Commonwealth during the term of said contract." (*School Code*, 1927, Section 1209.)

Finally, question 10 of Table 6 asks, "Does the state department of education maintain a policy of continuous study and improvement of the factors affecting the stability of the teaching profession?" Pennsylvania answers this question affirmatively. The State Superintendent of Public Instruction in his last Annual Report (p. 8) states, "An extensive study of the entire teaching force of the public schools of the Commonwealth is now being made. The completion of this study will reveal the preparation and experience of the

teachers of today, will give something of their history, and enable us to know more about the future teacher needs of the Commonwealth than ever before."

To summarize: In applying the self-survey to the regulation of the employment and contracts of teachers in Pennsylvania, we find that improvements have been effected by recent legislation which has made the annual election of teachers unnecessary.

There are, however, certain further steps that might be considered. At present beginning teachers are given an indefinite appointment upon the same status as those who have many years of service to their credit. In cases of dismissal, the teacher is given the privilege of a local hearing, but no appeal to state educational authority is made possible. Any further appeal must be made to a court of law. Many educators feel that since the dismissal of teachers is a professional matter, appeal should be to a professional rather than a judicial body.

Provisions relating to local procedure in connection with the contracts of teachers are in accord with generally approved practice, as is indicated by Pennsylvania's affirmative answer to questions 4, 5, and 6. That the importance of securing a better qualified and more stable teaching force is keenly realized is shown by the study which state educational leaders in Pennsylvania are devoting to the problem.

THE good teacher should be relieved of all concern over her security, and the public should in turn be guaranteed competent service. Justice to the teachers and justice to the children as well are requisite. The purpose should be to build up both an efficient teaching profession and an efficient school system. The annual election fails to attain these objectives; the real solution depends upon appointment during good and efficient service.—John C. Almack and Albert R. Lang, *Problems of the Teaching Profession*, page 230.

Illustration 3

Retirement of Teachers in Virginia

Table 9, page 70, is a checklist of questions concerning state teacher retirement systems. For purposes of illustration, these questions will be applied to Virginia.¹

The first question in Table 9 asks, "Is there a state-wide teacher retirement system?" The state of Virginia operates a "Retired Teachers' Fund," benefits from which are available to all teachers (not including division superintendents) in the public schools of the state. (*School Code*, Sec. 787-805) Virginia will therefore answer question 1 in the affirmative, being among the twenty-two states which have set up a state-wide teacher retirement system. However, it is necessary to apply the remaining items in the self-survey, before it can be determined how far the established fund meets other accepted criteria of retirement legislation.

Under the Virginia retirement system monthly deductions are made from the salary of every teacher for retirement purposes. (*School Code*, Sec. 790) Every teacher is required to make provision toward his retirement income. Virginia, therefore, is one of twenty-one states answering "Yes" to the second question of Table 9. "Is membership required of new teachers?" Reference to the discussion under this question in the handbook, page 129, will show why this criterion is considered important.

The third question, "Do both teachers and public contribute to the support of the retirement system?" can also be answered affirmatively by Virginia. The retirement act makes provision for monthly deductions of one percent of each teacher's salary to the credit of the retirement fund and also anticipates receipt of appropriations from public sources. (*School Code*, Sec. 710-791) Virginia, then, in company with sixteen other states, provides for joint support of its state-wide retirement system by both teachers and public. In this connection, however, reference should be made to the application of questions number 4 and 5

to the Virginia system. The advantages of joint support of teachers' retirement systems have been described in the handbook, page 129.

The next question asks, "Is the method of determining the total amounts to be deposited in the retirement fund by teachers and the payments to be made by the public fixed by law?" As far as the teachers' deposits are concerned this question can be answered definitely in the affirmative by Virginia. According to the retirement act:

In order to provide a fund to pension said retired teachers, all contracts with teachers shall provide that the chairman and clerk of the school board, or other officers whose duty it is to pay public school teachers, shall deduct monthly from the salary of each teacher in the state a sum equal to one per centum of his salary. (*School Code*, Sec. 790.)

However with regard to the state's payments the statutes are vague and indefinite, as may be seen from the following excerpt.²

Such sums as may be appropriated for the benefit of the "retired teachers' fund" shall be turned over to the State Board of Education and deposited as aforesaid with the State Treasurer to be placed to the credit of said fund. (*School Code*, Sec. 791.)

Virginia is, therefore, one of the eighteen states whose retirement laws fix or describe the amounts to be deposited by teachers. However, it is one of the three states that do not fix or describe the method of determining the amounts to be derived from public funds. On this latter consideration Virginia would have to answer "No" to the fourth question. The discussion of the related criterion, handbook, pages 129-30, shows why a sound retirement law needs to take this criterion into account.

From the preceding discussion, it is also evident that Virginia will answer "No" to the fifth question, "Is the retirement system organized on the reserve basis so that the moneys necessary to meet all obligations will be regularly accumulated without the necessity of recurring legislation?" A special appropriation bill is necessary in Virginia whenever amounts from public sources are needed

¹ As this bulletin goes to press a bill is being considered by the Virginia legislature which, if passed, will completely revise the retirement laws of the state.

² Reports on the actual situation show that Virginia appropriates annually from general funds amounts needed for payment of current pensions. For some time past the appropriation has amounted to \$10,000 a year. (U. S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics. *Public Service Retirement Systems, (United States, Canada, and Europe)* January, 1929, Bulletin 477. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C. 1929, Chapter 5, "State and City Retirement Systems for Teachers," p. 100.)

for the retirement fund. The disadvantage of such a situation has been presented in the discussion of question number 5, page 130, of the handbook. Virginia remains one of the three states wherein only an indefinite provision is made for payment of public funds to the teachers' retirement system.

"If teachers leave service prior to retirement, may they withdraw their deposits?" is the sixth question asked. Virginia is one of nine states answering this question in the negative. A teacher who leaves teaching service upon resignation or dismissal, prior to regular retirement, will not receive back any of his contributions to the Retired Teachers' Fund. The desirability of making provision for such a refund has been pointed out in the discussion of this criterion, page 130 of the handbook.

Likewise, Virginia is among the nine states answering "No" to the seventh question, "If teachers die prior to retirement, is the sum of their deposits payable to their heirs or estate?" The arguments for the return of a deceased teacher's deposits to his heirs or estate are similar to those advanced in connection with the practice of making refunds to teachers who resign or are dismissed prior to retirement.

The Virginia Retired Teachers' Fund involves no compulsory age for retirement. "No" is therefore the answer for question number eight, "Is an age for compulsory retirement fixed?" Seven of twenty-two states may answer this question in the affirmative. The discussion on page 131 of the handbook will show why the weight of informed opinion favors a compulsory age limit for active teaching service.

In line with the plan upon which the Virginia Retired Teachers' Fund is organized, no provision is made for a periodic actuarial investigation of the fund. Therefore, "No" is the appropriate answer to the ninth question of the self-survey, "Is a periodic actuarial investigation provided?" The importance of meeting this criterion is pointed out in the parallel discussion in the handbook.

All the state-wide teacher retirement systems, including the one operative in Virginia, provide a benefit in case of disability. Virginia requires a minimum period of twenty

years of service in the state for receipt of this benefit. (*School Code*, Sec. 787, 788, 794.) Virginia therefore answers question ten in the affirmative. According to the Virginia law a disability benefit is payable to teachers in "class A," who can present satisfactory evidence to substantiate their claim:

"Class A" shall include every person who has taught in the public schools of this state an aggregate of at least twenty years and who has maintained a good record and by reason of physical or mental infirmity or old age is incapable of rendering efficient service as a teacher. (*School Code*, Sec. 787.)

The wisdom of providing a retirement allowance for disabled teachers is pointed out in the discussion of question ten on pages 131-32 of the handbook.

No provision is made in the Virginia retirement law to meet the costs of retirement allowances paid to teachers who were in service when the Retired Teachers' Fund became operative. A negative answer is therefore indicated for Virginia to the eleventh question, "Are public funds used to pay for prior-service benefits?" The grave dangers involved in neglecting to meet the cost of prior-service benefits have been emphasized in the discussion of this criterion, handbook, page 132.

The last question in Table 9 asks, "Is provision made for co-operative or reciprocal relations with other sound teacher retirement systems?" Virginia answers this question in the negative also. In fact, it is extremely doubtful whether, considering the deficiencies of the existing retirement law, it would be possible to establish such relations.

To summarize: The establishment of the Retired Teachers' Fund shows that an attempt has been made in Virginia to provide for retirement of public school teachers. However, the system as it exists does not meet most of the generally accepted criteria for judging state teacher retirement systems. No compulsory age for retirement is fixed, the system is not organized on a reserve basis and no investigation of the condition of the fund is provided for. Teachers who leave service or die prior to retirement lose all the deposits which they have made to the fund. The amounts and methods of securing the teachers' deposits are

fixed and definite, but the state's obligations in this mutual responsibility are described in vague terms. Furthermore, the state has failed to face the problem created by the teachers who were in service when the retirement system went into effect and has made no provision for meeting the cost of the prior-service benefits which are promised.

While the preceding application of the self-survey shows that, in some respects, the Virginia system does not meet accepted standards,

the system presents a number of good points. Both teachers and public contribute to support of the retirement fund, deposits are required of all new teachers, and the fund provides for disabled teachers who have rendered a certain period of service.

If the proposals of civic and educational leaders for the revision of the retirement law are enacted by the Virginia legislature, the standing of the state with respect to this checklist will be materially improved.

"THE public and the teacher have a common interest in sound teacher-retirement legislation. The public is interested because such legislation promises greater efficiency in the classroom and protects children from teachers rendered incompetent by advanced age; the teacher is anxious for the elevating effect that a sound retirement system has upon the profession in general and for the benefits that such a system guarantees him as an individual."—Philip E. Carlson.

Illustration 4

Apportionment of State School Funds in Maryland

Table 11, page 72, is a checklist presenting five questions for the evaluation of a state system of apportioning state school funds. For purposes of illustration those questions will be applied to Maryland.

The first question in Table 11 asks "Does the law fix, or is the state board of education empowered to fix, minimum school tax-rate requirements which local units must levy in order to receive state aid?" In Maryland the county is the local unit of school taxation and administration. The law fixes a minimum county school tax of 34 cents on each \$100 of assessable property in each county. This is a minimum; if the approved budget requires a higher rate it must be levied. (*School Laws*, Sec. 56.) Still further minimum rates are fixed in the law for counties entitled to receive the equalization fund. Such counties must levy at least 67 cents for school purposes other than debt service and capital outlay. (*School Laws*, Sec. 204.) Maryland, therefore, can answer "Yes" to the first question of the checklist on apportionment of state school funds. The reasons for including this criterion are stated in the handbook, page 138.

The second question asks "Is there a state equalizing fund apportioned so as to recognize differences in local financial ability to support schools?" Maryland also answers this question in the affirmative. There is an equalization fund of approximately \$500,000. This is distributed to the counties to make up the difference between the total state approved budget and the sum of proceeds from the minimum county tax and all other state appropriations. (*School Laws*, Sec. 204.) This fund definitely recognizes differences in local financial ability to support schools. The importance of this equalization principle to a state system of apportioning school funds is indicated in the parallel section of the handbook, page 139.

The third question is, "Does the state school fund apportionment amount to at least 20 percent of the revenue receipts of public schools?" Maryland answers this question in the affirmative. Twenty-one percent of the school receipts of Maryland from taxation and appropriation were from state sources according to the most recent published Federal statistics. (U. S. Office of Education, *Statistics of State School Systems*, 1925-1926, p. 27.)

The fourth question asks whether the state avoids the use of census or enrolment statistics as bases for apportioning state school aid. To this question Maryland answers in the negative. In fact, about 40 percent of all state aid in Maryland is apportioned among the counties and the city of Baltimore on the basis of the school census between 6 and 14 years of age. (*School Laws*, Sec. 208.)

The disadvantages of the use of census statistics for apportionment purposes are pointed out in the section of the handbook which parallels this checklist, pages 140-41.

The last question asks whether the state department of education makes a systematic study of the effect of the present system of state apportionments on the welfare of the schools. Maryland answers this question in the affirmative. The annual reports of the state department of education indicate that comprehensive data on this subject are collected and studied. (State Board of Education, *Annual Report*, 1928, p. 224 ff.)

To summarize: With the exception of its use of the census basis of apportionment, the Maryland system successfully meets every criterion proposed for the evaluation of a state system for apportioning school funds. A minimum local tax is fixed, an equalizing apportionment is made, the state participates in a significant way in school support, and the state department of education continuously studies facts and conditions pertaining to the apportionment of school funds.

Research Bulletins Now Available

- Teachers' Salaries and Salary Trends in 1923.* Vol. I, No. 3, May, 1923. 116 p. Price per single copy, \$1.00.
- The Problem of Teacher Tenure.* Vol. II, No. 5, November, 1924. 40 p. Price per copy, 25 cents.
- Public School Salaries in 1924-1925.* Vol. III, Nos. 1 and 2, January and March, 1925. 72 p. Price per copy, 50 cents.
- The Ability of the States to Support Education.* Vol. IV, Nos. 1 and 2, January and March, 1926. 96 p. Price per copy, 50 cents.
- Efficient Teaching and Retirement Legislation.* Vol. IV, No. 3, May, 1926. 72 p. Price per copy, 25 cents.
- Major Issues in School Finance—Part I.* Vol. IV, No. 5, November, 1926. 32 p. Price per copy, 25 cents.
- Major Issues in School Finance—Part II.* Vol. V, No. 1, January, 1927, 64 p. Price per copy, 25 cents.
- Salaries in City School Systems, 1926-27.* Vol. V, No. 2, March, 1927. 64 p. Price per copy, 25 cents.
- The Scheduling of Teachers' Salaries.* Vol. V, No. 3, May, 1927. 64 p. Price per copy, 25 cents.
- The Advance of the American School System.* Vol. V, No. 4, September, 1927. 32 p. Price per copy, 25 cents.
- School Records and Reports.* Vol. V, No. 5, November, 1927. 132 p. Price per copy, 50 cents.
- Creating a Curriculum for Adolescent Youth.* Vol. VI, No. 1, January, 1928. 80 p. Price per copy, 25 cents.
- The Principal Studies His Job.* Vol. VI, No. 2, March, 1928. 68 p. Price per copy, 25 cents.
- The Advance of the Teacher Retirement Movement.* Vol. VI, No. 3, May, 1928. 56 p. Price per copy, 25 cents.
- Practices Affecting Teacher Personnel.* Vol. VI, No. 4, September, 1928. 52 p. Price per copy, 25 cents.
- Can the Nation Afford to Educate Its Children?* Vol. VI, No. 5, November, 1928. 48 p. Price per copy, 25 cents.
- Can the States Afford to Educate Their Children?* Vol. VII, No. 1, January, 1929. 44 p. Price per copy, 25 cents.
- The Principal and Progressive Movements in Education.* Vol. VII, No. 2, March, 1929. 60 p. Price per copy, 25 cents.
- Salary Scales in City School Systems, 1928-29.* Vol. VII, No. 3, May, 1929. Price per copy, 25 cents.
- Vitalizing the High-School Curriculum.* Vol. VII, No. 4, September, 1929. 104 p. Price per copy, 25 cents.
- The Principal as a Supervisor.* Vol. VII, No. 5, November, 1929. 84 p. Price per copy, 25 cents.
- The Questionnaire.* Vol. VIII, No. 1, January, 1930. 52 p. Price per copy, 25 cents.

A SURVEY is a scientific inquiry which obtains facts about the present efficiency of a school system, and on the basis of these facts offers constructive proposals for desirable improvements. . . . Actual administration, supervision, and instruction are professional in character only when they are carried on in the light of such facts and proposals as a survey would provide, and, accordingly, all teachers, supervisors, and administrators must do survey work. This is merely saying that the technique of the survey is essentially a part of the proper technique of administration, supervision, and teaching.—Jesse B. Sears, *The School Survey*.
