

APR 28 1930

VOL. VIII, NO. 3

MAY, 1930

Research Bulletin

OF THE

National Education Association

A Self-survey Plan for State School Systems

Part II: Handbook

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	92
Scope and Purpose of the Handbook.....	93
Organization of Discussion	93
Use of Reference Material.....	93
Discussion of Table 1 (Attendance Laws and Their Enforcement).....	94
Discussion of Table 2 (Child Labor Laws).....	100
Discussion of Table 3 (Pupil Personnel and Adjustment).....	104
Discussion of Table 4 (Teacher Training and Supervision).....	107
Discussion of Table 5 (Certification of Teachers).....	113
Discussion of Table 6 (Employment and Contracts).....	120
Discussion of Table 7 (State Salary Laws).....	124
Discussion of Table 8 (Professional Organizations).....	126
Discussion of Table 9 (Teacher Retirement Systems).....	128
Discussion of Table 10 (Sources of School Revenue).....	133
Discussion of Table 11 (Apportionment of State School Funds).....	138
Discussion of Table 12 (Material and Equipment).....	142
Discussion of Table 13 (State Board of Education).....	146
Discussion of Table 14 (State Department of Education).....	149
Discussion of Table 15 (Higher and Adult Education).....	152
Bibliography	156

FOREWORD

THE self-survey plan for state school systems is presented in the Research Bulletins for March and May, 1930. The May issue is a handbook for use with the checklists contained in the March number. The self-survey has been prepared in response to many requests received by the Research Division for a method of evaluating state school systems. The association of secretaries of state education associations made a special request for such a plan. It offers the people of a state an opportunity to make a non-technical, continuing, and organized study of their state school organization. It can be used by professional groups without extensive special preparation and by lay groups with a minimum of expert guidance. The self-survey plan does not remove the need for an occasional general appraisal by disinterested experts from without the state. It does provide a means by which the needs of the schools may be considered continuously rather than spasmodically.

This handbook, with its accompanying references, aims to reflect a composite judgment of the great majority of American educators. In order to secure material for this composite, the Research Division staff has ransacked the extensive literature of state school administration, including over one hundred state school surveys and a similar number of theses, monographs, and books. From this scrutiny certain criteria of an efficient state school system were derived. These were submitted to the criticism of scores of school administrators and most of the leading writers on state school administration. The suggestions of these experts were then incorporated in the checklists presented in the March Research Bulletin.

However, the Research Division is far from suggesting that the self-survey in its present form embodies perfection. But it has been brought to the point where it needs to be tried in the fire of actual use. It is expected that such use will reveal desirable additions and modifications. Definite suggestions for revision will be welcomed.

This self-survey plan should find a field of wide usefulness in the work of state departments of education, of state education associations, of teachers colleges and graduate schools of education, and of lay groups anxious to study and improve their state systems of education.

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

A Self-survey Plan for State School Systems

Part II: Handbook

THIS HANDBOOK is intended to be used in connection with the checklists contained in the March, 1930, number of the Research Bulletin. The checklists and the handbook together comprise a self-survey plan for evaluating the administrative efficiency of a state school system. Detailed directions for using these two bulletins are presented in the March bulletin, pages 57 to 61.

Scope and Purpose of the Handbook

The discussion presented in the handbook parallels the criteria set up in the checklists. Generally speaking, the handbook separately discusses each criterion from these three points of view:

1. The implications of the criterion are analyzed. This includes, where necessary, explanation of terms used, indication of relationships to other criteria, special directions for applying the criterion to given situations, and suggestions for further study of the issues involved.
2. The importance and validity of the criterion are established. This often includes a brief summary of arguments in favor of the proposed criterion and excerpts from authoritative sources bearing on the point. It also frequently includes a summary of existing conditions with respect to the criterion and a summary of progress towards its general acceptance in state practice.
3. A list of references bearing on the criterion is given.

The purpose of this handbook is indicated by the above description of what it contains. It is intended to explain and to supplement the checklists. It will help those who use the self-survey to make a discriminating, rather than an arbitrary, evaluation of their state school system. It points out desirable objectives and suggests means by which they may be attained.

Organization of the Discussion

The organization of the handbook requires a short explanation. It is divided into fifteen principal units, each unit dealing with the

same subject as the corresponding one of the fifteen checklists. Thus, the first unit of this handbook, dealing with attendance laws and their enforcement, parallels the first of the checklists which deals with the same topic.¹ *

The fifteen chief units of the handbook are each further subdivided into numbered sections dealing with specific phases of the general topic. The numbers of these sections correspond to the numbers of the individual criteria which make up the checklists. Thus, the very first section of the handbook deals with the school census and this discussion corresponds to the first criterion in the first checklist which asks, "Is an annual or continuing school census on a state-wide basis required by law?"

The numbered sections of the handbook are, generally speaking, organized on a uniform plan of which the first section is typical. First, the issue involved is stated in question form: "*Why should an annual or continuing school census on a state-wide basis be required by law?*" Second, the meaning and purpose of a school census is indicated. Third, the most important arguments favoring a school census are advanced. Fourth, these arguments are substantiated by references to authoritative discussions and to successful practice. Fifth, the extent to which the United States as a whole is able to meet this criterion is roughly indicated. Sixth, references to further reading on this point are given. Not all of the criteria have been discussed in as much detail as the one just described and occasionally several have been combined and discussed as a single unit. In general, however, the organization indicated above is followed in presenting the discussion of each criterion.

Use of Reference Material

The series of numbers listed at the end of each section of the discussion and the occasional numbers in parentheses in the body of

¹ See March, 1930, *Research Bulletin*, page 62.

the discussion refer to the numbered bibliography beginning on page 156. Each numbered reference consists of two parts. The first number, in heavy black type, refers to the publication in the bibliography bearing the same number. The second number, in ordinary light type and separated from the first by a colon, is a page reference. To illustrate, the reference 194: 366 just below in connection with the ages to be included in a school census would be read: "page 366 of the reference numbered

194 in the bibliography." Turning to the bibliography one finds that 194 is the number of the report of the Oklahoma survey by the United States Bureau of Education. On page 366 of this reference, then, is found a recommendation concerning the ages to be covered by the school census. Other references are to be similarly interpreted.

References cited in the discussion which are particularly significant or comprehensive are marked with an asterisk.

Discussion of Table 1

Attendance Laws and Their Enforcement

1. *Why should an annual or continuing school census on a state-wide basis be required by law?*—A school census is an orderly count of the children of school age in a given area. It may well include such items as age, sex, race, schooling, health, residence, and nationality. Information regarding the residence, migration, literacy, and nationality of the parents is also secured by the school census in some states. The school census is a business-like stock-taking of the numbers and status of our most valuable asset—the oncoming generation. It is the only sure basis for efficient control and enforcement of the attendance and child labor laws.

While there is not absolute agreement upon the ages which ought to be covered by the school census, the ages 5 to 18 would meet with most general approval. This is the age range recommended by the surveys of Oklahoma (194: 366)¹, Vermont (23: 106), Arkansas (183: 105), Virginia (215: 77), and New York (225, Vol. 2: 292), as well as by Cubberley in his hypothetical Osceola School Code (45: 185-187). The United States Bureau of Education in its survey of South Dakota (190: 48) recommended the inclusion of ages 5 to 21 and the tabulation of statistics according to the following age ranges: 5 to 18, 6 to 21, 8 to 16, 6 to 14, and 14 to 18.

Every state school law now includes mention of a school census. Thirty-nine states require an annual school census, five states take a school census every two years and three states require enumeration of their children of school age only at five year intervals. (94: 14.)

The fact that thirty-nine states have already met this criterion does not necessarily mean that the school census laws of each of these states are fully adequate, or that their practical administration leaves no room for improvement. If a state can check this criterion in the "Yes" column, the next step should be to examine the school census law and its administration in the light of the discussion of this topic found in the citations below. Generally speaking, each of the other questions in this checklist and in the self-survey as a whole could be profitably studied in this way.

References. 23: 106; 30, Vol. 1: 162; 45: 185-7; 46: 687-9; 56: 83, 189; 64: 64-5; 68: 13-18*; 74: 153; 88: 20; 94: 14-15; 137: 67; 187: 18; 189: 111; 190: 48-9; 194: 295; 196: 50-1; 201: 99; 215: 28-9, 77; 224, Vol. 1. 3.¹

2. *Why should school units be encouraged to establish and maintain public kindergartens?*—There is growing recognition of the educational importance of the early years of childhood. The changing American home

¹ See above for explanation of the system of references used in this handbook.

and family life, especially in the cities, further accentuates the need for attention to pre-school education. Many states empower local school units to establish kindergartens, though frequently this permission is restricted by requiring a petition from the people of the district or a referendum to a school election, or by limiting the permission to cities or other large districts. The lower limit of the legal school age is fixed at 4 years in 4 states, at 5 years in 18 states, at 6 years in 23 states, at 7 years in 1 state, and at 8 years in 1 state. (46: 458.)

Twenty-nine states permit any local district to establish and maintain kindergartens. All of the remaining 15 states, which recognize kindergartens by statute, limit the areas in which they may be conducted at public expense, eight permitting public kindergartens in cities and towns only. (68: 5-6.)

References. 31: 3; 45: 13; 46: 458; 68: 5-6; 143: 4; 159: 9; 175: 23, 118; 189: 124-5*; 191: 214: 5-6; 215: 28.

3. *Why should the law require all normal children of seven years and over to be enrolled in school?*—This issue lies at the very foundation of the American school system. Our theory of political democracy implies that the state is not only obligated, by considerations of equity and self-preservation, to provide a system of free schools at public expense, but also that the state must require the attendance of all children at such free public schools or their equivalent. On this principle our educational institutions have been built up and are now maintained and until it is proved fallacious it cannot be abandoned.

With respect to the precise age at which the compulsory attendance laws should begin to take effect there is very general agreement that the sixth year should, as a rule, mark the transition from voluntary to compulsory attendance. At the same time, it is recognized that there are a few areas in almost every state where geographic or climatic conditions prohibit the regular attendance of six-year-olds. Cubberley (46: 689-690) summarizes the trend of thought as follows, "The tendency toward school attendance legislation in this country is clearly toward requiring at-

tendance . . . on the part of all children between seven and eight and fifteen to sixteen years of age."

The lower age limit of compulsory attendance is 6 years in 2 states, 7 years in 28 states, 8 years in 18 states, and 9 years in 1 state. (94: 5).

The average minimum age for compulsory attendance is 7.36 years. Survey commissions in Delaware (64: 64), Alabama (191: 99), and Virginia (215: 75) have recommended that six years be established as the lower legal age limit for compulsory school attendance.

States in which children may enter Grade I at six years of age, but are not required to do so until the age of eight, create for themselves a difficult educational situation. The great majority of eight-year-olds will be found in Grade III, but there will be a small group of this age who are just beginning their schooling. This group, at the normal rate of progress, will always remain two years behind the mass of their fellow pupils and constitute a serious problem in retardation. One of the purposes of a good attendance law is to encourage homogeneous classes, but where there is a wide discrepancy between permissive and mandatory entrance ages, the law fails to achieve this purpose. (94: 34)

References. 1: 18; 11: 91-2; 30, Vol. 1: 20; 43: 241; 45: 190; 46: 689-90; 56: 80-1; 64: 64; 74: 31-9*; 94: 5, 35*; 114: 84; 137: 66-7; 167: 45; 169: 41; 175: 23, 118; 180: 37, 83; 183: 105; 190: 41; 191: 85-99; 194: 294; 195: 8, 33; 215: 74-6; 224, Vol. 8: 204, 206.

4. *Why should full-time school attendance at least through age 16 be required of all normal children?*—This criterion involves the same fundamental issues as are discussed in connection with item 3, above. The plea that children may be needed before the age of sixteen to help on a full-time basis in the support of the family is unsound. The relief of poverty is a state function. It is not a responsibility which can properly be delegated to children. No child should be deprived of a complete educational opportunity because of the poverty of his parents.

Sixteen is the average maximum age for compulsory regular school attendance in the United States and this age has been recommended as the legal school-leaving age in the surveys of Indiana (88: 20, 109), Arizona (187: 18, 20), South Dakota (190: 41), and Utah (201: 167). The criterion of 16 years as the school-leaving age is therefore entirely reasonable and below rather than above an attainable standard. The compulsory regular school age limit is 18 years in 5 states, 17 years in 5 states, 16 years in 31 states, 15 years in 3 states, and 14 years in 5 states (94: 5-6).

In addition to, or as a substitute for, age limitation most states specify certain educational standards, such as: completion of high school course (4 states), completion of elementary school course (39 states), attendance for a specified number of years or ability to read and write (7 states). Educational standards for leaving school, if clearly defined and reasonably stringent, meet with general approval from practical school people. In the case of an occasional child who graduates from high school before age sixteen, the attendance requirement would, of course, be waived. When a state has progressed to the point where good educational minimum standards for school-leaving can be enacted, the need for age standards is less marked. For the present, a combination of age and educational standards is generally regarded as best.

References: 23: 30, 42, 66; 30, Vol. 1: 20; 43: 241; 45: 190; 46: 689-90; 56: 101-2, 227; 64: 64, 69; 74: 31-9; 88: 20, 109; 94: 5-6, 10; 114: 84; 137: 66-7*; 187: 18, 20; 190: 41; 191: 87-8; 195: 8, 50; 196: 50, 60-1; 201: 83, 167; 215: 74-8; 224, Vol. 8: 204, 206; 225, Vol. 2: 55-6.

5. *Why should a system of compulsory continuation schools be maintained at least up to age 18?*—States which require full-time attendance up to age 18 should record an affirmative answer to this question.

The value of continuation schools may fairly be said to have been proved by experience. The part-time or continuation school is an effective method of further adapting the school organ-

ization to the needs of individuals. It also draws the approval of employers and workers because it increases the vocational efficiency of young workers and helps them to become oriented in the fields of industry or commerce. It offers an opportunity to give young workers citizenship training at a time when the adjustment of the youth to new conditions makes such training especially necessary.

This rather general approval is reflected in the school legislation of many states. The establishment of part-time or continuation schools is optional with the local district in seven states. In all other states the maintenance of such schools is mandatory on local districts under certain conditions. Part-time or continuation schools are often required by law in districts with more than a certain population or in districts where more than a certain number of children of specified ages are employed, or in districts where the establishment of such schools is ordered by the state superintendent or by the state board of education.

References. 43: 245; 46: 689-90*; 58: 35, 40; 74: 91; 94: 8-9; 98: 21; 135: 94; 156: 3-4, 122; 159: 11; 167: 45; 175: 23, 118; 179: 4-5; 182: 22-3; 187: 18-19; 190: 77; 191: 273; 194: 23; 196: 25; 201: 167; 215: 77; 224. Vol. 1: 143.

6. *Why should all schools be maintained at least eight months?*—The fundamental answer to this question is the same as that already given to question 3, above. A reasonable school term for all children is one important element of that equality of opportunity which Herbert Hoover asserts is "a fixed ideal of American individualism." There are still six states which require a school term of six months or less. A child in a six months school is two full years of schooling behind the child in an eight months school by the time the latter is in the eighth grade. Many teachers, especially in rural districts, are being asked to achieve the impossible; to teach in from three to seven months what is officially acknowledged to be a fair assignment for eight or nine months or more. Eight months is set here as a reasonable standard for immediate attain-

ment in every state. Most states should exceed this standard and, in fact, nine states have already done so. Many authorities such as the survey staffs in Indiana (10: 210), Kentucky (11: 87), Maryland (56: 204), Delaware (64: 71), Wyoming (117: 41), North Carolina (119: 77), and others recommend a minimum term of nine months.

Twenty states now meet this standard or exceed it. Six states, have a minimum term of seven months; one, of six months; two, of five months; and one each, of four and three months respectively. (94: 6.)

References. 1: 228; 10: 20, 100, 210; 11: 9, 87; 23: 30, 35; 43: 235; 45: 13; 47: 584; 56: 204, 64: 71; 65: 26-7, 95-103; 88: 15; 94: 6; 97: 39; 117: 41; 119: 77; 120, Part 1: 22-3*; 135: 97; 137: 66-7; 139: 114; 142: 173; 179: 98, 208; 180: 35-81, 118-19, 197; 182: 158; 183: 9, 103; 187: 43; 189: 109; 190: 293; 191: 509-11; 194: 200, 364; 195: 32-3; 201: 100; 215: 27, 64-5*; 224, Vol. 8: 201-2.

7. *Why should the appointment of an attendance officer be required by law in each school unit?*—This question does not mean that every local administrative unit, however small, should have its own special attendance officer. It does mean, however, that no area in the state should lie outside the territory of some field officer for the enforcement of the attendance laws, whether such officer be appointed on a district, county, state, or other basis. The right of the state to require school attendance is fully recognized at law. Education is a natural duty owed by parents to their children and the enforcement of a compulsory education law does not invade the natural right of the parent to govern and control his children. But compulsory education is not only a right of the state. It is also a duty which the state owes alike to the child and to its own preservation and welfare. The best educational theory and practice agree that complete fulfillment of this duty requires special officers, by whatever name known, to encourage and, where necessary, to compel regular attendance. Only three or four states now lack legislation for the selection of attendance officers. (94: 16; 102: 702.)

References. 10: 208; 11: 158, 165; 19: 33; 30, Vol. 1: 20, 158-9; 45: 195; 46: 691; 56: 169; 64: 91; 65: 28; 94: 16; 102: 702; 137: 68; 183: 9; 187: 19, 111; 189: 112; 190: 41; 196: 61; 215: 77-8; 224, Vol. 8: 43; 225, Vol. 2: 155-6.

8. *Why should school authorities control the appointment of attendance officers?*—By "school authorities," as used in this connection, is meant the state, county, or district school boards. Good administrative practice requires that appointments of all school officers should be made by the controlling boards upon the nominations submitted by its professional executive officer—the district, county, or state superintendent. Merely to provide attendance officers (question 7, above) is not sufficient guarantee of proper enforcement of the attendance laws. It is important to consider by whom these officers should be appointed and the general nature of the qualifications which they should possess (question 9, below). On the first of these points, educators generally agree that both in practice and in theory the educational rights of children are best protected when all educational functions, including the wise enforcement of compulsory attendance, are lodged with educational authorities. Any other practice leads to divided authority and uncoordinated policies. This principle of unified control has been recognized in the laws concerning the appointment of attendance officers in thirty-three states (102: 705). In the other fifteen states educational authorities do not have full control over the officers charged with enforcing compulsory attendance laws.

References. 19: 44, 47; 45: 207; 46: 691; 56: 199-200; 94: 16; 102: 705; 196: 61, 65.

9. *Why should professional or educational qualifications be required of attendance officers?*—Professional qualifications should be required of these workers because they are entrusted with an important professional responsibility. The old conception of the job of the "hookey-cop" has been changed in progressive communities to that of an intelligent, skilled, and sympathetic social worker with professional training and professional outlook.

Progressive school officials now recognize that compulsory education is not limited to the problems of truancy and non-attendance. The root of the difficulty in any particular case may lie in the school itself, the home, the community, the attendance laws, or even in the peculiar personality of the child. (102: 705) In many cities and in at least one state the term "attendance officer" is seldom used and those who enforce the attendance laws are known as "visiting teachers" or "home and school visitors" whose function is to coordinate the work of industry, the home, and the school for the better educational adjustment of the children.

At present only eleven states provide by statute any qualifications for persons charged with the administration of compulsory education laws. Of these only five set minimum educational standards. (102: 702.)

References. 1: 229; 56: 169; 74: 86-90; 134: 351, 102: 702, 705.*

10. *Why should the state department of education include a person to whom is assigned the supervision of attendance?*—In a few of the less populous states the work of state attendance supervision may call for only a portion of the time of someone in the state office. In other states a corps of workers will be needed. But in all states it is important that the local authorities receive some assistance and supervision in the enforcement of attendance. Lacking this central supervisor, some communities are likely to become lax in the administration of the attendance laws to the detriment of the children and the state. It is difficult in some places for a local attendance officer to enforce the law against his neighbors, and this difficulty is increased in many states by the fact that the local officer is not a professional worker but a political or semipolitical appointee. Recommendations for state attendance officers are included in many state school surveys, such as those of Kentucky (1: 228), Indiana (10: 195), West Virginia (30: 47), Alabama (191: 88), Oklahoma (194: 276), Utah (201: 32), and Texas (224, Vol. 8: 206).

Recent studies of the personnel of state departments of education show that special state

officers with the designated function of attendance supervision were found in one state in 1890, in three states in 1910, and in eight states in 1925. (158: 66.)

References. 1: 228-9; 10: 194-5; 30, Vol. 1: 46-7; 43: 249; 74: 100-1; 158: 66; 191: 88; 194: 276; 201: 32; 224, Vol. 8: 206.

11. *Why should there be a uniform statewide system of attendance records and reports?*—Considerations of economy, efficiency, and accuracy discourage local diversity in attendance records and reports. It is generally agreed by students of the question that the state should set up minimum needs in these records, should print the necessary record forms, and distribute them to the districts. This would make possible complete and comparable reports on school statistics from the local units to the state. Furthermore, in setting up its system of records and reports, the state should have in mind the legitimate requests for information coming from the Federal Office of Education and should prepare to make the statistical reports to the Federal Office with a maximum of accuracy and a minimum of labor. This procedure would not restrain the states and the various local communities from collecting any additional statistics which their special needs might make desirable.

References. 1: 4; 11: 21-2; 23: 41-2, 54, 30, Vol. 1: 18; 45: 186; 46: 688; 56: 17-18, 84; 68: 3; 74: 460*; 88: 21; 115: 94-5; 189: 43; 190: 49; 191: 511; 195: 33; 196: 65; 201: 99-100; 225, Vol. 2: 287.

12. *Why should non-public schools make attendance report to public school officials?*—Reports from all schools are a necessary element in enforcing compulsory attendance, child-welfare, and child labor laws. An accurate estimate of the state's educational problem and position is impossible without such reports. Already the laws of 27 states require reports from non-public educational institutions. The nature of the required reports vary. They are described merely as "statistical" in 9 states; "enrolment" only is required in 2 states; "attendance" only in 5 states; "enrolment and at-

tendance" only in 5 states; and "all reports required of public schools" in 5 states. (103: 107-108.)

References. 45: 211; 46: 713-5*; 56: 184; 64: 121; 103, 107; 121: 142; 194: 396.

13. *Why should the state department of education maintain a policy of continuous study and improvement of conditions and laws relating to attendance?*—The state department of education should exert the highest type of professional leadership in the state. It represents the interest of the schools before the legislature. It is of fundamental importance, therefore, that the department be fully aware of state needs in attendance enforcement and exert leadership in securing wise attendance legislation and effective enforcement.

The criterion implied in this question involves the whole question of the relation of the state educational authorities to an effective school system. This criterion has been incorporated, not only in the present discussion of attendance laws and their enforcement, but also, with some modifications, in the checklist for child labor laws (Table 2, question 14), pupil personnel and adjustment (Table 3, question 8), teacher training and supervision (Table 4, question 12), employment and contracts (Table 6, question 12), sources of school revenue (Table 10, question 15), apportionment of state school funds (Table 11, question 5), material equipment (Table 12, question 9), higher and adult education (Table 15, question 12).

The general administrative principles which apply to all of these questions are similar and can most conveniently be presented at this point. Public education in the United States is organized on a state basis. The fundamental unit of control is the state. This does not mean that in practice the local districts should not exercise a wide measure of autonomy in the

administration of their schools. The state should delegate to the local school districts and institutions those functions which can best be discharged on a local basis retaining always the right to re-allocate functions when changing conditions demand. The detailed assignment of functions to the local school units and to the state varies, and should vary, from state to state. But experience in city schools and in corporation management clearly indicate certain principles of general application. The state board of education, acting always through its executive officers, should have general inspectorial and supervisory duties throughout the educational system of the state. It should see that the school laws of the state are enforced and it should advise the legislature of needed changes in these laws. Acting on the advice of its professional employees, the state board of education should co-ordinate the educational program of the state into an effective unit, minimizing duplication of effort and extending educational services as widely as possible. Such basic matters as certifying teachers and establishing minimum standards of safety and sanitation for school buildings should be subject to the regulations of the state board of education. In all of these matters, the board should demand and use the advice of its professional executive, the state superintendent, and his staff. This advice should be based upon clear understanding of educational principles, a wide acquaintance with practice of other states, and an intimate and thorough knowledge of conditions in the schools. This means that the state department of education will be, among other things, a fact-gathering and research agency bringing together and interpreting the basic data upon which a comprehensive educational system may be built.

References. 46: 689; 74: 100-101; 201: 101.

Discussion of Table 2

Child Labor Laws¹

1. *Why should there be a minimum age of 16 for employment of children?*—This criterion does not apply at times when schools are not in session or to domestic and agricultural service at home after school hours. Practical experience and scientific study have shown the injurious effects of the employment of children at early ages. Too early labor results in depriving the child of a sufficiently solid educational foundation to equip him for maximum or even normal productivity in the industrial world. As a result he goes through life handicapped not only by lack of the fundamentals of a general education, but also by lack of specialized training to qualify him for any skilled work. Moreover, he is deprived of the opportunity for the recreation necessary for proper moral and mental development. His normal growth may be impeded and his health injured in other ways.

The committee on Physical Standards for Working Children, appointed by the U. S. Children's Bureau, recommended that the minimum age for the entrance of children into industry should be not younger than 16, recognizing that due to the special demands upon the vitality of the growing child during the period of pubescence he should be protected from the physical and nervous strain which entrance into industry entails. The educative value of certain types of work followed under competent guidance is fully recognized, but the labor in which children are frequently employed is far from educational in the best sense of the word. The standards suggested in this section are not inconsistent with the use of work as one aspect of a complete education. They do, however, condemn the employment of children under conditions where wages and production, rather than education, are the major objectives.

The minimum age for employment under most of our state laws is 14, but there is a tendency to raise this age especially for work during the school term or during school hours.

However, at present only two states have a minimum age of 16 and only five have established a minimum age of 15 for work during school hours. It should be noted, however, that many more children stay in school after the age of 14 than would be required to do so under the law, and that such a raising of the standard as has been put into effect in a few states does not appear to be impracticable. In Great Britain the present government proposes to raise the school leaving age to 15 in 1931. Local authorities in England already have the right to raise the age to 15 and some cities have done so.

References. 38: 366-373; 62: 1-33, 45, 120; 110: 350-370; 206: 19-29.

2. *Why should 18 be the minimum age for employment in mines and quarries?*—Work in mines and quarries has always been recognized as dangerous and as especially injurious to the health of young workers. The abuses incident to the employment of very young children and women in the coal mines of England and Scotland, shown in the Report of the Children's Employment Commission submitted to Parliament in 1842, resulted in the first regulation of the work of children in mining in Great Britain. In this country the first state laws (Pennsylvania, 1870 and Illinois, 1872) prohibiting the work of children in especially dangerous occupations applied to work of very young children in mines. Practically all the important mining states now have a minimum age of 16. A few have advanced the age to 17 or 18, and in view of the special dangers of the occupation a minimum age of 18 may certainly be regarded as the reasonable minimum standard of protection which should be sought.

References. 72: 70-83; 206: 31-2.

3, 4. *Why should physical examinations of working children be required?*—The child going to work between 14 and 18 is in need of

¹ Acknowledgments are due the United States Children's Bureau for cooperating in the preparation of this section.

special protection if he is to arrive at full maturity with good health and a well-developed body, for in this critical period in his physical development he must meet the unusual demands of rapid growth and physiological readjustment. Raising the age for entrance into industry and prohibiting the employment of children in occupations recognized as especially injurious give only partial protection. In order to prevent the working of children who are not in fit condition and to prevent them from entering or continuing to work in unsuitable occupations, the law should require that before entering industry children must meet certain standards of normal development and physical fitness. The employed child should be reexamined periodically during the first few years of his working life. Remediable physical defects should be discovered and their correction urged. Children should be excluded from occupations which might aggravate an existing tendency to weakness in any particular direction.

Tentative standards for such examinations have been formulated by the Committee on Physical Standards for Working Children, appointed by the United States Children's Bureau. This committee also urges further scientific study of the effect of different kinds of work upon the health and physique of the adolescent child.

References. 62: 46-53; 206: 23-4; 211: 1-20.

5, 6. *Why should the hours of labor of children be limited to 8 hours per day and 44 hours per week?*—The employment of children and adolescents for long hours not only tends to be detrimental to normal physical development and often definitely injurious to health, but also deprives them of the opportunity for continued education and for the recreation necessary for developing and perpetuating in the individual the fundamental physical, mental, moral, and social capacities of the race. The growing body is peculiarly liable to overstrain, and children are more likely than adults to be injuriously affected by the fatigue, nervous exhaustion, or physical irritations inseparable from many kinds of work at which they

are employed. With an 8-hour day now an accepted maximum for adult labor, with a growing demand for the 5-day week for grown men and women, and with a more or less chronic condition of adult unemployment it seems only reasonable to demand an even shorter work day than 8 hours for adolescents who are certainly less able than adults to stand up successfully under the physical and mental strain of industrial life. Many states have the 8-hour day and a few have a 44-hour week for children under 16, but the regulation of hours of work of minors between 16 and 18 years of age, also in need of protection from overstrain, is far less common.

References. 38: 242-6; 66: 3-14, 100-120.

7. *Why should children under 18 be required to have employment certificates for work?*—To give real protection to children, a child labor law, in addition to setting up certain standards of age and of physical and educational requirements and limiting the types of work that children may do, must also provide administrative machinery for its enforcement. The most effective method has been found to be through the requirement that a child, before he can be legally employed, must obtain a permit for the work showing that the conditions of the law have been met. In order to obtain this permit he should present proof that he is of the age required by law and has complied with the standards of education and physical fitness set up by the law. The person authorized to issue certificates is usually the local superintendent of schools or some one designated by him. In addition, in order to make possible a certain degree of supervision over the child after he goes to work, this certificate should be mailed to the employer, and the employer required to keep it on file and to return it to the issuing officer as soon as the child leaves his employ. When the certificate is returned, the issuing officer knows that the child is no longer at work and can notify the school attendance officer who can then, if necessary, see that the child returns to school while he is unemployed. Before the child can legally go to work for another employer, he

should return to the issuing office for another certificate.

Reference. 212: 3-38.

8. *Why should the work of children under 18 in hazardous employments be prohibited?*—It is generally recognized that the work of minors should be as far as possible restricted to the "safe areas of industry" and that in the years when they are peculiarly liable to accidents and susceptible to overstrain and industrial poisons, they should not be permitted to engage in occupations unusually hazardous or especially injurious to their health. Youth itself is an industrial hazard and the natural heedlessness and the undeveloped muscular coordination of boys and girls under 18 subject both themselves and their associates to undue risks.

Nearly all the states have some restrictions upon the employment of children under 16 in dangerous industrial occupations. Nevertheless the statistics of accidents to minors in states where records are kept show that legislative protection is insufficient to prevent injury to thousands of young workers. The extension of legislative protection to minors between 16 and 18 years of age is far less common, but is much needed. This need is demonstrated by a study of industrial accidents to minors made by the United States Children's Bureau in 3 states (Wisconsin, Massachusetts, and New Jersey) where the laws give young workers a considerable degree of protection. It was found that there were proportionately more accidents, and more severe injuries, to minors 16 and 17 years of age than to those under 16, who were more adequately protected by the law, or to those of 18 years or over who had more experience, more nearly mature judgment, and better powers of muscular coordination.

References. 38: 515; 62: 53-8; 209: 1-3, 63-90, 110-19.

9. *Why should there be an 8 year educational standard which a child must fulfill before receiving a work permit?*—The lack of education among working children was the first evil of child labor to be recognized in the

United States and the first for which legislative remedies were sought. Early laws required merely that the employed child should attend school for a certain number of weeks during the year. Later a literacy requirement, and still later a grade standard, became common. With the increased recognition of the desirability of a certain minimum of educational opportunity and equipment for all children, the grade standard was felt to be necessary particularly because of two large groups of children in our industrial population. First, immigrant children of non-English-speaking races, because of the handicap of language, reach working age while still in very low grades. Second, in certain parts of the country children from mountain or other districts remote from schools tend to migrate to our industrial towns and cities too late to obtain a reasonable minimum of education before they become eligible for a work permit. Although these two groups are becoming fewer the necessity for stressing the grade requirement is still present. It may be that in the future further advances will be sought along the line of raising the age as well as the grade standard for children going to work.

References. 38: 377-9; 206: 24-5, 33-5.

10. *Why should the employment of children under 18 at night be prohibited?*—The serious physical strain and moral danger surrounding the work of children at night have long been recognized. The findings of the investigations of the International Association for Labor Legislation, as well as of many other organizations, showing the harmful effects of such employment upon the health of women, apply with still more force to the employment of children. Recovery from fatigue is obtained chiefly through sleep, and sound sleep during the day time is rarely possible in the homes of most working people in industrial cities. Furthermore, lack of sunlight is injurious to health while constant work under artificial light increases liability to eye-strain and accident. The first of the International Labor Conferences held in Washington in 1919 recommended to its members the enactment of laws forbidding the employment

of children under 18 at night, with a limited number of exceptions for those between 16 and 18. In the United States the prohibition of the work of children under 16 at night is found in most state laws but few of our states as yet prohibit night work for both boys and girls up to 18 years of age. A prohibition up to this age should be looked upon as merely a reasonable standard of protection for these young workers.

The prohibited hours "between 7 p.m. and 6 a.m." are suggested because these are the usual standards in child labor laws of the more advanced states. The lengthening of the span of the prohibited hours is to be desired, however, not only as providing a longer period for rest or recreation but as an administrative aid in enforcing the hours of labor restrictions. New York has the highest standard of all the states in this respect, prohibiting the employment of children under 16 in factories between 5 p.m. and 8 a.m. The extension of the prohibition to both boys and girls up to 18 years of age is widely recognized as desirable, though at the present time it is found in few of our state laws.

References. 38: 288-94; 66: 259-87.

11. *Why should child labor in agriculture be regulated?*—The work of many a child in agriculture is not limited to "chores" and "helping" outside school hours at farm tasks suited to his strength. It is often arduous labor and in many parts of the country is a potent cause of irregular attendance at school. Moreover, with the development on an extensive scale in many communities of commercialized agriculture, such as the raising of truck crops, berries, sugar beets, etc., large numbers of children are working on farms under conditions similar in many ways to those in manufacturing and other industries in which the employment of children is regulated by law. As yet few states have child labor laws which adequately protect these child workers. Surveys made by the U. S. Children's Bureau between 1920 and 1924, presenting a cross-section of the work of children in typical farming areas in different sections of the country, included approximately 13,500 children under

16 years of age doing farm work in 14 states. These child workers were employed both on home farms and as hired workers. The latter group was drawn either from the immediate vicinity of the farm, from a near-by city, or from the children of migratory workers. These and other studies show that the detrimental effects of farm work for children under certain circumstances include possibilities of physical injury, the physical strain of long hours at monotonous tasks, bad housing conditions of migratory workers, and serious interference with schooling.

In most states the child labor laws do not apply effectively to farm work. The adaptation of a system of legal regulation to this kind of employment and its administration presents serious difficulties. Sometimes, but not often, local school authorities take responsibility for the attendance at school of children in migratory families who come in for a few months to work the crops. Strict enforcement of adequate school attendance laws, the prevention of work at too early ages for excessive hours and at too arduous tasks, and some method of meeting the problems of the schooling and housing of migratory workers are essential elements in any program for protecting children from harmful agricultural labor.

Reference. 207: 1-81.

12. *Why is there need for legal regulation of child workers in street trades?*—Street work has been one of the last types of child labor to receive consideration and it is still far less adequately regulated than the work of children in factories and stores. A boy does not have to leave school in order to sell newspapers, but for this very reason papers are sold by many young children who ought not to work except at tasks that are educationally valuable. The average age of all the newspaper sellers in a survey made by the U. S. Children's Bureau in 7 cities was about 12 years and from one-tenth to one-fifth in the different cities were under 10 years of age. This study, like many other surveys of children in street work, revealed many children working under extremely unfavorable conditions. Although the work of delivering newspapers on routes in residential

districts was found to be relatively unobjectionable, selling papers on the street, peddling goods, and shoeshining were often found to involve long hours, often late at night, and in surroundings distinctly undesirable for immature persons.

The lack of protection afforded these children is due to some extent to the fact that in many states the child-labor laws are interpreted to apply only to the child who receives wages or other return from an employer. The "merchant," however young, who works "on his own" is held to be outside their scope. Although New York passed the first state law regulating the work of children in the street-trades about 25 years ago, at the present time laws applying specifically to children engaged on their own account in street work are in effect in only 20 states, and some of these apply only to the larger communities in the state.

Experience shows that the legal provisions essential to even moderately successful control of the street-trades problem include: a specific law or regulation applying to the street worker, a badge system, and placing of responsibility for badge-issuing, inspection, and enforcement definitely upon a single official.

Reference: 208: 1-74

13. *Why should the issuance of employment certificates be supervised by some state authority.*—An essential feature of the efficient administration of an employment-certificate system is supervision by some competent and

properly equipped state agency. Without such supervision it is impossible to secure any degree of uniformity in methods or standards of issuing employment certificates by local officers in the different communities of a state. The law may be well enforced in one community while in another community within the same state children may be given employment certificates without having produced adequate evidence of age, of education, or of physical condition. They may be allowed to work without obtaining certificates at all. Yet in theory all employees in the state are required to meet the same standards. The assistance of centralized supervision is needed by local issuing officers both in interpreting the law and in working out efficient methods of procedure, and experience has shown that a well organized system of supervision is essential to enforcement of state-wide child labor laws.

References. 204: 32-44; 212: 23-30.

14. *Why should some state agency maintain a policy of continuous study and improvement of conditions relating to child labor laws?*—In the absence of Federal regulation of child labor conditions, it devolves upon the several states to assume this responsibility. The latent power in the nation's children is its most valuable natural resource. To conserve and to capitalize this primary natural resource and to protect it from all forms of waste and exploitation is the most important duty facing the officials of any American state.

Discussion of Table 3

Pupil Personnel and Adjustment

1. *Why should a state-wide study of age-grade progress be made at least biennially?*—An age-grade-progress study involves the preparation of a table or tables comparing the age of each pupil with his grade and his grade with the number of years he has been in school. These age-grade-progress tables are then studied and the findings evaluated. (74: 325.) Such surveys have proved their usefulness in city school administration and are now well

established in practically all cities as a necessary routine procedure in child accounting. There is every reason to suppose that such studies would be equally valuable as a basis for attacking problems of state school administration. In some states such studies are now made at regular intervals and the results have been favorably reported. The state-wide age-grade study will not supplant the local city or county studies but it has a special use of its

own in the comparison of various administrative units and various methods of coordinating the work of different educational levels. The state-wide study also gives a complete large-scale picture of the adjustment of the courses of study to the ability of the pupils.

Where maladjustments are discovered, remedial measures can be begun; but until the location of the difficulty is accurately known any attempt at improvement is bound to be clumsy and of doubtful effectiveness. The harmful results of avoidable retardation in the progress of pupils through school are well-known. Retardation causes distinct educational loss to the child, may give rise to unfortunate habits and emotions associated with repeated failure, increases the difficulty of instruction, makes the conduct of socialized activities more difficult, encourages a low standard for normal and gifted pupils, and by necessitating much repetition of schooling, weighs heavily on the taxpayer's pocketbook. It seems reasonable, therefore, that the state school officials should omit no opportunity to alleviate the evils of retardation. A regular state-wide age-grade study is an important step in this direction.

References. 1: 14; 30, Vol. 2: 43, 44; 45: 31; 61: 46*; 74: 325*; 98: 81; 116: 43; 189: 128; 194: 296-9; 195: 52; 201: 99; 224, Vol. 1: 140, 225; 225: Vol. 6: 21; 151-4.

2. *Why is there a need for regulations covering maximum and minimum sizes of classes?*

—In all state-wide regulations of this type; a high degree of flexibility is necessary. But, while providing for exceptions to meet unusual special conditions, a state regulation which forbids the maintenance of classes above or below reasonable limits is desirable. The following statements illustrate the general trend of opinions: an enrolment of more than 200 pupils per secondary school teacher is condemned in the West Virginia survey (30, Vol. 1: 219); the Maryland survey suggested 40 pupils in average daily attendance as the maximum number for one elementary school teacher (56: 204); an enrolment of more than 70 pupils for two teachers has been condemned in Oregon (142: 92); the position of Swift and Goldthorpe in their study of

school finance in the South is "that the largest number of pupils which one competent and well-trained teacher can handle effectively is from 25 to 35" (180: 2); the Oklahoma survey recommended a maximum of 30 pupils in average attendance per teacher in city schools (194: 291); the Arkansas recommendation was 35 pupils per room (195: 42); and the Texas survey set a maximum of 40 pupils, a preferred maximum of 30 pupils, and a minimum of 12 pupils per teacher, unless "exceptional conditions such as climate, topography, or sparse settlements" warrant a smaller number (225, Vol. 3: 166). The wide variety among these recommendations indicates that the fixing of exact limits is a question best decided in the light of special conditions in each state. The important thing is that the question be made a subject of careful study through the state and that there be a well-founded state policy in the whole matter. Any effective method of control is sufficient to justify a "Yes" answer on this criterion.

References. 23: 107; 30, Vol. 1: 219; 46: 465-6; 56: 204; 74: 128; 135: 171; 142: 77, 92-3; 164: 6, 51; 171, Vol. 1: 10; 180: 2; 194: 291; 195: 42; 201: 137-8; 225, Vol. 3: 164, 166.

3. *Why is there a need for regulations covering the minimum enrolment of schools?*—

This question, like the one which precedes it, should be flexibly interpreted. The objections usually urged against the very small school include:

1. Very small schools handicap the pupil by failing to supply the stimuli of cooperation, competition, and large-group social participation.

2. Very small schools handicap teachers because each teacher is required to handle an unreasonable diversity of subjects. Under such conditions it is almost impossible for the teacher to secure a thorough and up-to-date grasp of any one subject. Furthermore, since inexperienced teachers ordinarily begin work in a small school, this burden falls on those who are least able to bear it.

3. The very small school finds it impossible to meet the diverse curricular needs of its pupils. Libraries, shops, and gymnasia are necessarily either absent or extremely limited and wide enrichment of the program of studies is virtually impossible.

4. The very small school is financially uneco-

nomical. From the state viewpoint, the overhead costs are high.

5. The existence of very small schools often acts as a barrier to the establishment of larger and more economical units of school administration and support.

Some states meet this problem by a method of apportioning state aid which penalizes unnecessarily small schools. In others, public maintenance of schools with an enrolment below a certain minimum is forbidden by statute or by regulations of the state board. Still another check on the small school is provided in some states by giving some central (state or county) educational authority discretionary power to establish, suspend, or consolidate districts. Any method of control which is effective is sufficient to justify a "Yes" answer on this criterion.

References. 11: 121; 30, Vol. 1: 223; 46: 466; 56: 218-19; 64: 53, 198; 65: 39, 40; 97: 4; 98: 41; 123: 68, 69; 179: 183; 180: 160; 181: 100; 191: 237; 194: 290, 291; 195: 55; 56; 225, Vol. 3: 164, 166.

4. *Why should the law require local units to provide special school facilities, where necessary, for handicapped children?*—This question involves the American principle of equality of opportunity,—a principle best represented, though imperfectly as yet, in the free public school. In the case of handicapped children—those who because of mental or physical disability cannot fit into or profit from the ordinary school program,—the state's duty to provide educational opportunity is especially clear. Humanitarian, economic, and democratic considerations all urge that these children be educated, insofar as possible, for happy, self-reliant citizenship. Children with defects of vision, hearing, or speech should be given special instruction and treatment. Special equipment, including transportation, is needed for crippled children, and mentally deficient children require especially skilled and understanding instruction.

There are three ways by which the state can discharge its obligation to educate the handicapped child.

1. It may require local communities to establish special classes wherever a defined need for them exists.

2. It may give special state financial aid or support for local classes for handicapped children.

3. It may provide state schools or contracts with private schools or schools outside the state for special education of its handicapped children.

Ordinarily, a combination of the three methods is used to best advantage. In all such undertakings the educational authorities should cooperate closely with state and local boards of health, industrial accident commissions, and similar bodies. In cities, special classes for handicapped children are generally maintained; smaller communities may need to combine for the purpose of providing such opportunities or, when that is impossible, may care for such pupils on an individual basis.

References. 30, Vol. 1: 158; 43: 344*; 45: 83; 46: 701*; 64: 201; 74: 41, 430; 92: 417, 418; 93: 1, 3-13; *189: 42; 201: 50; 216: 41-4; 224, Vol. 1: 140; 225, Vol. 2: 293.

5. *Why should the educational work of reform schools be under the direction of the state board or department of education?*—This recommendation is in line with desirable centralization of educational authority as discussed in question 8 of table 1, above. It is now widely recognized that the basic function of the institutions is reformatory rather than coercive; educational rather than penal. This point of view makes it quite logical that educational authorities should direct the educational work of these schools.

References. 19: 15; 23: 152; 30, Vol. 1: 48; 45: 208; 139: 24; 189: 36; 190: 12-3, 22-3; 191: 56; 194: 122, 123; 225, Vol. 2: 287.

6, 7. *Why should the appointment of school physicians and nurses, wherever needed, be required by law?*—Most local school districts now recognize that the standards implied in these questions are essential to the welfare of their children. In rural areas, school nurses and school physicians are often employed by the county or other comparable school unit.

Where school nurses are needed and are not provided, it ought to be possible for the state educational authorities to require their employment by law. Such a requirement is an aspect of the legitimate activities of the state in fixing minimum standards of health, welfare, and education.

The United States Bureau of Education, in its survey of Oklahoma said:

One of the most helpful agents in promoting health in the public schools is the school nurse. By inspecting the schools frequently she discovers communicable diseases in their incipient state and thus prevents epidemics. . . The school nurse is an almost indispensable factor in a well-balanced school. (194: 299)

Concerning medical service, the Virginia survey commission recommended:

The minimum to be considered should be such provision as would permit the medical inspection of school children at least once a year by competent persons. It should be remembered, however, that mere medical inspection can produce only information and advice. Medical inspection without medical supervision and provision for medical care must always be like a machine without power. (215: 195)

In the life of a state as of an individual, there is no substitute for health. The importance of the early years in laying a basis for a successful and healthful life can hardly be over-stated. It seems obvious that the state has a very definite interest in seeing to it that health services are available to all its school children.

References. 10: 208, 209; 11: 158, 159; 19: 89-90; 43: 265; 45: 134; 46: 542-3, 695*; 56: 200; 64: 153; 88: 110, 111; 92: 418; 93: 2; 114: 56; 135: 99; 179: 147; 191: 318; 192: 51; 194: 299, 323; 195: 45, 50; 201: 142-3; 215: 195-6; 221: 6; 222: 26-31*; 224, Vol. 1: 208-9; 225: Vol. 2: 243, 293.

8. *Why should the state department of education include a person to whom is assigned the supervision of conditions relating to the health, welfare, and adjustment of pupils?*—

Since schools exist for children, it follows that conditions relating to child welfare should have first attention from the school officials. In every state department of education a person is needed who is directly responsible for studying child health; for exerting leadership and offering advice on child adjustment and welfare problems; and for enforcing and interpreting state laws on this topic. This officer should work in cooperation with state health and labor officials.

The number of state departments of education which include one or more persons specially assigned to the fields child welfare and health is increasing. In 1890 there was only one state department of education with such an official and in 1910, only three. By 1926, however, there were seven state departments of education employing a director of attendance and child welfare and fifteen employing a director of physical education and health service. (158: 66-67; 45: 311; 46: 705-15)

References. 11: 154; 19: 28; 23: 211; 30, Vol. 1: 47, 158; 45: 31; 46: 700, 705; 74: 431; 97: 188*; 114: 34; 116: 60; 139: 24; 158: 66-7; 181: 50; 191: 318; 192: 51; 201: 48, 49; 215: 196; 222: 26-7; 224: Vol. 1: 160, 162; 225, Vol. 2: 243, 255, 284.

Discussion of Table 4

Teacher Training and Supervision

1. *Why should teacher-training classes in connection with high schools be abandoned in favor of state normal schools and teachers' colleges?*—The high school training class for teachers performed, during the formative period of many state school systems, a very valuable service. But educators now generally agree that the preparation received in the high school training class is now insufficient and that no substantial reason can be found for the continuation of this work. As education becomes more complex and more signifi-

cant a more severe and lengthy preparation is necessary. No one today is satisfied with the services of a physician with no better than high school education. Why should such a standard be longer recognized for teachers?

Although some of the older state school surveys commended the high school training classes as temporary substitutes for normal schools, recent surveys and writers condemn their continuance as a stumbling-block in the development of adequate training facilities. The North Carolina commission referred to

the teacher-training classes as "a temporary and unsatisfactory arrangement" which "should never be permanently endorsed." (120, Part II: 154.) Parkinson reports that in South Carolina these classes "came into existence without a sponsor and passed out of existence without an advocate" (133: 84). A recent Vermont study characterizes them as "expensive to operate and unnecessary" and recommends their discontinuance in that state (172: 90). Even as early as 1922 the United States Office of Education recommended that they be immediately abandoned in Oklahoma (194: 151). The Virginia Education Commission made a similar recommendation in 1920, declaring that the policy of maintaining teacher training courses in high schools "is thoroughly unsound and should be totally abandoned." (215: 157.)

The principal objections urged against high school normal classes are:

1. They do not possess the equipment or staff to give training adequate to modern needs.
2. As makeshifts, they retard the development of better types of training institutions.
3. Since they train rural teachers almost exclusively they tend to increase the already over-numerous cleavages between rural and urban America (193: 17).
4. There is no state in the Union so poverty stricken that it cannot afford to abolish the high school training class in favor of normal schools.

The chief school officials of the various states generally disapprove of such makeshifts for a state teacher-training policy as high school normal classes and low-grade county normal schools. Replies of these officials to a questionnaire on this subject showed that only two chief state school officials unreservedly approve high school normal classes and county normal schools. Thirty-four expressed disapproval of these institutions and nine approved them merely as temporary expedients. (124: 98-9.)

Reliance on high schools as teacher training institutions is slowly declining among the states. The peak of their popularity was reached in 1924 when they were recognized in the laws of 24 states. (193: 66.) Since 1924 they have declined in importance. Estimates place the number of students now enrolled in such classes at not over 30,000.

References. 11: 185-6; 17: 20; 23: 119-20; 37: 75*; 45: 146; 46: 599-600*; 49: 89; 58: 43; 99: 130; 115: 63; 120, Part II: 154*; 124: 98-9; 133: 82-4; 172: 90, 96; 190: 219; 191: 356; 192: 56; 193: 17, 65-6; 194: 151; 195: 22; 200: 108; 215: 157; 219: 7; 224, Vol. 8: 244; 225, Vol. 4: 65-94, 197-100; 226: 64.

2. *Why should high school graduation be required for admission to all institutions accredited by the state for teacher training purposes?*—This criterion is not meant to exclude special or mature students whose preparation is necessarily irregular or deficient. Nor is it meant to condemn the imposition of more stringent standards. But it should be fixed as a minimum. The reasons for setting the high school graduation standard for admittance coincide with the reasons given above for the abolition of high school normal classes. Indeed, it is chiefly the existence of these classes which necessitates setting up the standard at all. The fact that there are over four million young people enrolled in high schools makes the standard entirely reasonable and practical. Requiring high school graduation as a minimum prerequisite is now the general practice for all professional training institutions. High school graduation insures some intellectual and moral selection. It is not sound economy to spend state money giving advanced normal school training to those who are not prepared to receive it. It is true that normal schools in America began as secondary institutions, but since 1900 they have steadily assumed collegiate status in accord with the general elevation of educational standards. (99: 295). It is sometimes feared that higher admission standards will reduce registration but experience generally shows these fears to be groundless. (184: 278.) Many states have set up intellectual, moral, and physical requirements in addition to high school graduation and there is little doubt among educators that all states are now ready to move up to the latter standard at least. Such a recommendation was advanced as the result of state-wide studies of teacher preparation in Wisconsin (7: 10), Kentucky (49: 89), Vermont (172: 92), and other states.

References. 7: 10; 17: 4; 45: 143; 46: 591-2, 610; 49: 89; 56: 73-4; 65: 121; 78: 14-16; 99: 295, 396; 106: 947; 111: 69; 117: 49; 151: 13-14; 172: 92-3; 184: 270, 278; 189: 175; 190: 237; 192: 55-6; 199: 55; 200: 98, 176; 202: 189; 215: 150; 224, Vol. 8: 248.

3. *Why should teacher-training institutions offer varied curricula leading to specialized positions?*—Teaching is now recognized as a specialized job and a state teacher-training program should recognize this fact by differentiating the preparatory curricula. The specialization may be accomplished either between institutions or within them, depending on the particular needs of the state concerned. In each of the differentiated courses there will necessarily be found a considerable common content. The degree of specialization must also be worked out to fit individual cases.

One of the oldest types of differentiation in training is that between secondary and elementary school teaching. Differentiated courses for rural teachers have also undergone an interesting development during the last twenty-five years. The trend of specialization in this field is indicated by the increasing number of institutions offering specialized rural teachers' training courses. In 1905, only 3 institutions in the country reported special rural courses. In 1912, 27 institutions out of 50 studied; in 1925, 74 institutions out of 139 studied; and in 1927, 123 institutions out of 149 studied offered special courses for training rural school teachers. (193: 66-68.)

Some differentiation of courses is recommended by all published surveys which deal with teacher training and, when adopted, the policy of differentiation appears to be successful. Some complaint arose in Pennsylvania after differentiated courses were introduced, but an investigating committee, finding that the chief complaint came when students prepared in one specific field were permitted to accept appointments in other fields for which they lacked preparation, declared that "the policy of specializing . . . is essentially sound." (134: 224.) This suggests that an adjustment between supply and demand, not only in the profession as a whole but also in each type of

service, is a highly desirable accompaniment to a differentiated training program.

References. 1: 230; 5: 25-6*; 10: 237; 11: 169; 17: 157-8; 46: 612; 56: 57; 64: 39; 65: 119; 78: 133-4; 99: 392; 101: 65-7*; 106: 948*; 111: 63-5; 133: 241; 134: 224*; 151: 22; 165: 40, 43; 177: 120; 184: 270; 190: 297; 191: 360; 193: 4, 12-13, 19-21, 52, 66-8; 201: 274; 202: 189; 224, Vol. 6: 88; 226: 70.

4. *Why is a separate board of control for each state normal school or teachers' college undesirable?*—A unified policy of teacher-training is needed in every state. Such policy can be guaranteed only when all public institutions which exist primarily for training teachers are brought under unified control. Experience shows that separate boards often lead to undesirable competition among the institutions for funds and students. The adjustment of the supply of teachers to the demand, the prompt modification of the work of any one institution to meet changes in state-wide policy; the calculation and comparison of unit costs, the formulation of an equitable teacher-training budget—all these require unified control of all teacher-training institutions under one central board. The proper kind of unified control will encourage local initiative while preserving state minimum standards and developing a state-wide program of teacher preparation.

The details of organization for this central board are not fully agreed upon by educational authorities. Conditions in different states probably require different types of control. The normal schools and teachers colleges may be placed under one governing board while the other higher institutions retain their separate boards as was recommended in the Oklahoma survey (194: 136). Another possibility is the administration of all the higher institutions by a single board which, however, has no organic connection with the state board of education. A third type which is recommended more frequently than either of the two preceding consists of a state board of education which controls elementary, secondary, normal, and higher schools. Surveys made in some states have recommended placing con-

trol of the teacher-training institutions under the state board of education. Indiana (10: 252), West Virginia (30, Vol. 4: 117), and Mississippi (114: 354) surveys are examples.

The extent to which normal schools and teachers colleges are under the control of the state board of education is indicated below, as of 1926 (unpublished questionnaire study, reported in part in 106: 944-948).

State board has full control.....	17 states
State board controls high school normal classes only	6 states
State board has interest and control through advisory relationships, certification rules, or overlapping memberships	5 states
State board has no control	13 states
Other miscellaneous types of organization	7 states

References. 7: 9; 10: 252; 11: 188-9; 17: 179; 19: 15; 30, Vol. 4: 7, 117*; 46: 610-11*; 56: 215; 65: 125; 78: 155, 183; 99: 388, 90; 106: 946-7; 114: 354; 117: 96-7; 124: 119, 124; 133: 254; 134: 234*; 169: 102; 189: 41, 169; 190: 224, 291; 191: 362, 509; 192: 9-10; 193: 50; 194: 136; 195: 20-1; 200: 179; 215: 160; 218: 123; 224: 343; 226: 11-12, 19.

5. *Why should free placement services be available to graduates of state teacher-training institutions?*—In 1914, Learned and Bagley, in their well-known study, *The Professional Preparation of Teachers for American Public Schools*, stated the following principle:

"The [teacher-training] institution's obligations are not fully discharged until a properly prepared teacher is successfully at work" (99: 396).

Other surveys have made recommendations in keeping with this point of view. The educational survey of Wyoming made by the U. S. Bureau of Education in 1917, pointing out that "a state employment bureau is a saving to teachers, . . . and enables school authorities to get impartial accounts of a teacher's efficiency," recommended the establishment of a state teachers' employment bureau (117: 97). Approval of such a project was also given in studies of teacher preparation in Ohio (124: 114; 17: 179). Missouri (78: 40), Arizona (189: 162), Colorado (196: 13),

Utah (201: 48), and Texas (224, Vol. I: 161).

That it is the duty of the state to equip its public schools with the necessary teachers is a generally accepted principle. If this principle is carried to its logical conclusion it will be seen that the state must be responsible for every step in the process, including not only training but selection of candidates and placement of graduates as well. In discharging the last-named function, the state or some state institution should provide a method by which teachers may find the best field for their services and local officials the best teachers for their schools.

The development of free placement services is comparatively recent. Wisconsin was one of the first states to make such services available. In 1909 the board of normal school regents of that state established a clearing house to serve school boards and normal school graduates. In 1925 seven state departments of education included teacher placement among their functions (5: 51), and in four of these a member of the staff was definitely assigned to the placement service (188: 66). Many individual training institutions have also developed placement and follow-up services for their graduates.

The inclusion of this criterion implies no criticism of the placement services provided in some states by semi-public agencies, such as state education associations. This service is of particular value in states where the state agencies are not in a position to develop state placement service. Even when the state has developed placement facilities the presence of both state and private agencies may be of mutual benefit.

While the question in the check list is phrased so as to call for entirely free placement services it should be recognized that there is not perfect agreement on this point. Some who have studied the question believe that a nominally small fee may well be charged. In states where state controlled placement services are already functioning successfully and are charging a small fee this question should be checked in the "yes" column and an appropriate note made in the space provided for that purpose.

References. 5: 30, 51-3*; 17: 179; 43: 215; 78: 40, 174; 99: 396; 117: 95, 97; 124: 114*; 151: 32; 189: 162; 193: 31; 196: 13; 201: 48*; 224, Vol. 1: 161-3.

6. *Why should tuition be free in public teacher-training institutions?*—There is some dissent from the implication of this question,—not so much a matter of principle as of expediency. That is, when the funds from public sources are inadequate to maintain the desirable functions of a teacher-training institution, many administrators prefer to supplement the public funds by tuition or other student fees rather than to curtail the effectiveness of the institution. But, if possible, they would prefer to maintain free tuition. The argument is sometimes raised that the acceptance of free tuition is degrading to the profession, but it is doubtful whether this claim is seriously considered by any considerable group of educators. A survey of teacher-training in Pennsylvania thus summarizes what appears to be the more general attitude of educators and the public.

The theory has been generally accepted throughout the country that the public should supply this type of education in view of the fundamental importance of the public school service.... On the whole the states that have been most generous in this respect are also states in which the work accomplished by the public schools has been demonstrably superior. (134: 207.)

The struggle to make the public schools entirely free runs all through the history of education in the United States. Only with difficulty were rate-bills abolished from the elementary schools. In more recent years the principle of free education has been successfully extended to the secondary level. Now the struggle centers in the public colleges and universities, and in this area, as elsewhere, the logical extension of the democratic principle of equal opportunity demands that public education shall be entirely free at all levels. This is the attitude taken by practically every recent state teacher-training study including those of Ohio (17: 179), Wisconsin (7: 9), Louisiana (165: 85), and others.

It appears doubtful, however, whether much progress is being made towards securing free tuition in teacher-training institutions.

Speaking of higher education in general, the United States Bureau of Education reports that "tuition and other fees have been raised everywhere in greater or less degree." (188: 10.)

References. 7: 9; 17: 179; 134: 207; 165: 85; 188: 10.

7. *Why should the curriculum of teacher-training institutions include a definite program of social development?*—Social activities in modern elementary and secondary schools have as definite a place in the curriculum as arithmetic, reading, or writing. Consequently such activities should be reflected in the programs of progressive normal schools and teachers colleges. Not only do teachers find ability in social activities useful in their professional work but they can also be carried over into the out-of-school life of the teacher (5: 30). Bagley points out that the organization of social training "is especially necessary in professional schools, for the teacher's influence as a person profoundly influences large numbers of embryo citizens during the most impressionable years of life." (177: 27.)

The answer to question 7 is doubtless "yes" to a greater or less extent in every state. But although this question is necessarily in some degree equivocal, its importance commands a place in the checklist on teacher-training. It is a subject to which attention can profitably be directed and re-directed.

References. 5: 30; 172: 81-2; 177: 27*; 194: 158.

8. *Why should there be a uniform, permanent, and continuous census of teachers and their qualifications?*—Only when the state has available accurate and current statistics in regard to its teaching force can it plan intelligently for its maintenance, replenishment, and improvement. State school officials ought not to be forced to guess at any important point in their work especially when it is a relatively simple matter to obtain the facts.

The problem of teacher supply and demand is one of the most serious problems now confronting the teaching profession. Either an undersupply or an oversupply of teachers has a harmful effect on the efficiency of a school

system. In the former case either teachers with inadequate preparation must be hurriedly marshalled into service with consequent lowering of standards, or else some schools must be closed. In the case of an oversupply there is great economic waste both to the state and to the trained teacher who is unable to find a position. The resulting intense competition for positions encourages unethical practices, is likely to force salaries downward, and discourages the most capable and ambitious candidates from undertaking the preparation for teaching. A speedy solution to this problem is vital to the educational progress of any state. An inescapable first step in the solution is the maintenance of an accurate teacher census. But the problem of supply and demand is only one of many which can be studied by such a census.

It is not surprising, therefore, that a dozen leading authorities on state school administration and many state school surveys, such as those of Kentucky (1: 230), Ohio (17: 179), and California (19: 27), recommend a continuing census of teachers.

References. 1: 230-1; 17: 179*; 19: 27; 34: 112; 45: 33; 46: 638; 78: 184; 101: 69; 115: 92; 124: 114*; 193: 50*; 201: 346.

9. *Why should every teacher in the state be directly responsible, for educational work performed, to a superintendent, principal, or supervisor?*—The criterion implied in this question cannot be met by a mere requirement that all teachers must file a report with a state or county official, or by a statute empowering some remote official "to visit schools and teachers." A "yes" answer should be given to this question only when all rural and town teachers receive the benefit of supervisory help and guidance just as do the teachers in most well-organized cities. The number of supervisors needed in a given state will depend on a variety of local conditions. Recommendations on this point, as given by state school surveys, differ considerably. The Indiana and Oklahoma surveys recommend one supervisory assistant for each county (10: 206; 180: 82), the Maryland survey a minimum of one supervisor for every hundred teachers (56: 168) and the Wyoming, Colorado, Illinois,

and Minnesota surveys one supervisor for thirty teachers (117: 99; 179: 99, 208; 181: 151).

References. 10: 206; 11: 158; 19: 49; 23: 62; 30, Vol. 1: 126; 45: 48-9; 46: 678*; 56: 168; 64: 90; 65: 116; 88: 53-4, 110; 97: 83; 114: 299; 115: 52, 59; 117: 99; 120: 138*; 133: 251; 134: 342; 139: 15; 171, Vol. 1: 79; 179: 99, 208; 180: 82; 181: 151; 184: 199; 189: 162; 190: 295-6; 192: 56; 193: 60; 194: 363; 195: 39; 196: 87; 201: 232; 202: 132; 215: 216; 218: 125-8*; 224, Vol. 8: 18.

10. *Why should reading circles, demonstration schools, helping teachers, and teachers' institutes be used in rural schools if the personnel available for direct supervisory work is inadequate?*—The above question is conditional. That is, it should not be applied to those states which already provide, either by law or by the size and nature of the administrative units, a good system of rural school supervision. Where a good state supervisory program is in effect, the decision as to the particular type of help needed in a given district can be made on an individual basis. Only where large numbers of teachers throughout the state are receiving inadequate supervision is it necessary to use reading circles, institutes, model schools, and similar devices on a permanent state-wide basis.

Where adequate state supervision prevails these devices may be employed temporarily or in given localities, as needed. Where good supervision does not prevail these devices may, in part, temporarily take its place.

The principles outlined above have, in general, been followed in the practices of our states. When the state school systems were in the formative stage, the use of reading circles and institutes was widespread. As the state school systems developed those generalized methods of supervision were discontinued or minimized in their state-wide aspects and took their places as phases of a single coherent supervisory system extended over the state. In states with a relatively undeveloped supervisory program the generalized methods on a uniform state-wide basis still serve a useful purpose.

References. 5: 168; 6: 45*; 7: 11; 19: 64; 23: 62; 45: 178, 182-3; 46: 679-80*; 101: 89; 106: 946, 948; 117: 98; 133: 242; 155: 228-9; 171, Vol. 2: 14; 184: 213; 189: 182; 190: 238; 192: 57; 193: 61; 194: 237; 196: 78; 198: 12, 25, 27*; 200: 104; 202: 189; 225, Vol. 1: 71.

11, 12. *Why should the state teacher-training institutions or the state department of education, or both, have a definite program of improvement in teacher-training facilities and of continuation training for beginning teachers?*—Volumes have been written to call attention to the fact that "the teacher makes the school" and it is now universally realized that improvement of the teaching force depends in part on better training before entrance to the profession and better in-service training afterwards. Plainly, the responsibility for this important work rests either with the state department of education or the state teacher-training schools.

In some states the two agencies are closely allied in a single program.

Discussion of Table 5

Certification of Teachers

1. *Why is two years beyond high school a minimum desirable for all initial elementary school certificates?*—State school surveys and writers on state school administration are practically unanimous in approval of this minimum. Says one writer: "No important recommendation or proposal regarding training requirements for teaching has been made within the last ten years which contemplated a minimum training of less than two years beyond the high school for elementary teachers" (124:108). Other writers describe the two-year training period beyond high school, as "standard training," (175:118) "generally conceded" (7: 10) and as "a dominant standard" (23:122). A few (101:68) question the validity of setting the minimum standard for elementary teachers below that of high school teachers. But all agree that two years training or more is desirable for even the lowest grade of elementary certificate. It

A recent survey (218: 100-102) of opinion among the directors of 138 state normal schools and teachers colleges showed that all but one favored the principle of continuation training. All but 12 of these schools either had or were planning to begin a program of continuation training for their graduates. The offering of in-service training for teachers is in line with the general development of adult education, a topic which is discussed more fully in Table 15.

State departments of education frequently exert considerable influence on the follow-up training of teachers in service by means of the requirements established for the renewal of certificates. A recent study of 38 states shows that in 30 of them the state department establishes training requirements for teachers in service as a condition for certificate renewal.

References. 17: 182*; 19: 27; 30, Vol. 4: 115-16*; 34: 114; 46: 301; 78: 184; 99: 390; 124: 82-3, 125; 133: 252; 151: 32, 34*; 192: 57; 193: 34, 202: 189; 201: 43; 218: 100-2, 133-4*; 225, Vol. 1: 72.

is not generally recommended, however, that this standard be instantaneously imposed on a low standard state. Rather, the state should build up to and beyond this standard over a period of years.

The progress of the states toward this criterion is clear.

In 1921, only four states required some training beyond high school graduation for all elementary certificates. In 1926, twenty-three states had such a requirement. (41:16). In many states only a temporary certificate of a low grade can now be secured without standard preparation.

References. 1: 61; 7: 10; 10: 35-6, 227; 11: 170-2; 17: 4, 154*; 23: 122; 30, Vol. 1: 108; 34: 99; 37: 78; 40: 21; 41: 12, 16*; 46: 637; 47: 585; 49: 66; 52: 36-7; 56: 58; 64: 39; 99: 131; 101: 68, 109-10; 117: 103; 120: 132; 124: 108*; 125: 4; 133: 222; 134: 231; 155: 226; 156: 120; 171, Vol. 1: 54;

172: 39-40*; 175: 118; 187: 37, 40; 189: 40; 190: 213, 221; 191: 354, 356; 192: 57, 62; 194: 283; 195: 18, 24; 196: 23; 197: 131; 200: 177; 201: 44; 202: 10; 215: 169-70; 224, Vol. 8: 161; 226: 65.

2. *Why is four years beyond high school a desirable minimum for all initial secondary school certificates?*—Practically unanimous agreement exists among students of state school problems and among state school officials that the minimum training desirable for even the lowest grade of high school certificate is four years beyond high school. This agreement is illustrated by the following quotations:

It is commonly understood as the goal to be aimed at . . . that high school teachers should have passed through college with a certain amount of special training in the particular branches they are engaged in teaching. (64: 39)

There seems to be general agreement in practice throughout the country as to what constitutes minimum standard amounts of training for elementary and for secondary teachers. . . . For the latter it is graduation from a four-year college with some specialization in high school branches. (133: 222)

It is not generally recommended that this standard be instantaneously superimposed on a low-standard state. State school surveyors and others generally recommend a gradual building up to this standard and even beyond over a period of years. (46: 637; 190: 219; 10: 227-8).

That this four-year course should include some professional training is universally agreed, although the exact amount and kind of training is seldom described. Practice, as well as theory, varies greatly on this point. The amount of professional training required for the certificate based on college graduation varies, among the forty-eight states, from none to twenty-four hours. Fifteen hours of professional courses is the average requirement, and eighteen hours is the most commonly found requirement. (14: 68)

The degree to which the states are achieving the criterion for high school teachers is indicated by the fact that in 1927 twelve states required four years of college work, and eighteen more required two or more years. (9: 154).

References. 1: 61; 7: 10; 9: 154; 10: 227-8; 11: 170; 14: 67-8, 71; 17: 109; 19: 69-71; 23: 107; 40: 21; 46: 633, 637; 56: 62; 64: 39; 98: 95; 99: 132; 101: 109-10; 114: 165; 120: 132; 124: 108-10; 133: 222; 134: 159; 155: 226; 156: 120-1; 165: 23; 172: 38; 175: 118; 189: 103; 190: 219; 192: 62; 194: 394; 195: 18; 196: 74; 215: 173; 224, Vol. 3: 83; 226: 131-2; 227: 9-10.

3. *Why should the state have exclusive authority in certification?*—The following arguments favor unification of certifying authority (28: 221-222.)

1. Local certifying officials are too much subject to pleas for patronage and other forms of political and personal pressure.

2. Local certification hinders the free movement of teachers from community to community.

3. Local certification is an unsurmountable barrier to the development of inter-state reciprocity in certification.

4. Local certification results in grossly unequal teaching staffs in the various local units.

5. State licensing for lawyers and physicians is accepted as desirable. Why not for teachers also?

6. State certification co-ordinates properly with state teacher-training, state minimum salaries, state-wide tenure laws, and state retirement systems.

7. State certification is in line with the historical development of our state school systems (46: 622-628; 43: 216-218).

8. State certification alone makes possible a far-sighted program of adjustment between the supply of, and the demand for teachers.

For these reasons, a unified certification policy in the hands of state officials is widely recommended. Local school units, however, may be encouraged to set up standards of competency in excess of the general state-wide certification requirements. (46: 624.)

There appears to be good evidence for the statement that, "at the present rate of development it appears likely that in ten years more we shall have almost absolute state control of certification." (43: 222-223.) In 1926, there were thirty-six states in which no local certificates were issued while in four others the authority of local units in this respect was inconsiderable. This is a striking contrast to the situation in 1903, when there was state control of certificates in only 5 states (41: 19).

References. 7: 50-1; 10: 230; 11: 59, 175; 17: 179; 19: 66; 23: 116; 30, Vol. 1: 108; 40: 14; 41: 16-19; 43: 220-2; 45: 149; 46: 628, 638; 49: 46; 53: 97; 56: 65, 160; 57: 188; 64: 85; 99: 347; 101: 97-8, 101*; 114: 287; 115: 63-4; 117: 103; 124: 111-13*; 125: 4; 133: 212; 151: 19; 165: 85; 171, Vol. 2: 8; 172: 93; 174: 38; 189: 40; 190: 213; 191: 354; 192: 59-60; 194: 285; 195: 24; 196: 22; 201: 44; 215: 162.

4. *Why should the requirements for certificates be set by the state board of education rather than by statute?*—The needs of a state for trained teachers vary from year to year. This variation is the result of many constantly changing factors. The best interests of the schools frequently demand prompt adjustment between the supply and demand for teachers. Therefore it is unwise for state legislatures to attempt to formulate into law the details of certification requirements. The legislature may, however, very properly set up by law minimum and general standards, leaving the interpretation, application, and upward revision of these standards to the State Department of Education. Experience shows that the special knowledge and careful research which are necessary bases of sound certification requirements are not developed in a hurried legislative session.

The actual practice of the states is indicated by the following quotation:

The school law of Arizona disposes of certification in a brief six lines. That of Wyoming takes two pages to assign the control of this function to the state department of education. New York's law contains three pages on qualification and certification of teachers. Illinois lengthens it to five and others go further still. But even in the most extreme case the details left for regulation by administrative authorities are very numerous. (43: 218.)

The length of the law governing certification is, however, an imperfect evidence of its appropriateness. Generally speaking, the certification law ought to do these two things: fix minimum standards and empower the board of education to interpret these standards into rules and regulations and to set higher standards when deemed advisable.

References. 7: 51; 11: 175; 41: 5-6; 43: 219; 55: 206; 57: 218-20; 99: 347-8; 117: 103; 125: 4; 133: 214, 165: 85; 172: 92; 179: 99, 209; 180: 35, 83; 181: 150; 182: 112; 183: 102; 189: 40; 190: 295; 194: 393; 195: 24; 196: 22; 201: 45; 224, Vol. 8: 21.

5. *Why should there be special certificates for administrators and supervisors?*—The administration and supervision of schools are heavy responsibilities. Persons not fitted by training and experience to engage in this work should be excluded from it. Although this work is guided by the same general principles as all education, it calls for types of activity somewhat different from those involved in classroom teaching. The recent development of the various branches of educational science increases the demand for specialization. Ability to do successful classroom teaching does not guarantee ability to serve as administrator, and *vice-versa*. Authorities agree, therefore that special requirements should be established for the certification of administrators and supervisors.

This question and the two which follow raise the whole issue of specialization *versus* simplification in state teacher certification programs. While it is true that an extremely differentiated plan of certification may lead to undesirable complexities, the varying requirements for different types of educational work should be recognized in the certification system. It is not possible to have every educational worker fully prepared to discharge the duties of every position in the entire field. It is necessary to choose a middle ground between over-simplification and unnecessary complexity of certificates. The two principles which must be reconciled are stated by Lewis in these terms:

The number and names of certificates should be reduced to a minimum.

The terminology of the certificate should, so far as possible describe the attainments and the rights of the holder. (101: 98.)

A recent survey of certification laws and regulation shows that twenty states issue certificates for administration and supervision. The minimum requirements usually include completion of a four-year college course. Ten

states require graduate study for certain administrative or supervisory certificates. (41: 24.)

References. 1: 230; 10: 226; 11: 169; 19: 66; 30, Vol. 1: 107-8; 41: 24; 43: 226; 45: 163; 46: 633, 637*; 50: 46; 51: 64*; 56: 55; 57: 41; 64: 179; 101: 98; 115: 92; 120: 170-1; 125: 4; 133: 102, 134: 159; 165: 23; 168: 401; 171, Vol. 2: 9-10; 194: 286; 195: 24; 201: 44-6; 202: 12; 224, Vol. 1: 80; 225, Vol. 7: 124.

6. *Why should special certificates be required for teachers of special subjects and classes (e. g., music, art, etc.)?*—The recognized principle of specific training and special certificates for specific types of educational service applies here just as it does in connection with item 5, above. This is especially true in those subjects which require special talents as well as special training (art, music, etc.). The general principle governing such differentiation has been thus described:

A sound certification system will provide as many kinds of certificates as there are kinds of school work calling for specific and prolonged preparation. (11: 169.)

This criterion should not be interpreted as favoring lower standards for teachers of special subjects and classes. It means only that different but equivalent requirements should be set up for different types of educational work. The wide recognition of the need for special certificates is shown by the fact that in 1926, 45 states issued one or more special certificates. (41: 21.)

References. 7: 99-100; 10: 225-6; 11: 169-70; 14: 94; 40: 18; 41: 11, 21*; 43: 226; 45: 169; 46: 632; 56: 208; 64: 175; 81: 98; 95-8; 125: 4; 171, Vol. 2: 9-10; 191: 354; 194: 286; 195: 24-5; 201: 45-6; 202: 12; 215: 169.

7. *Why should secondary certificates be differentiated as to validity among the various school subjects?*—This is another clear case of the principle of special preparation for special work. Competency to teach mathematics may not mean competency to teach social science and a knowledge of wood-working is not a necessary accompaniment of a knowl-

edge of French. In the ordinary training course no teacher can become familiar with more than a few of the subject-matter fields covered by a modern high school program of studies. It is not fair to the pupils or to the teachers to allow a person who is well equipped in one subject to teach another subject in which he may be totally unprepared. Many authorities recommend that high school certificates be limited in validity to one or two groups of closely related subjects.

The small high school creates a difficult problem in this connection. The groups of subjects must be arranged so that a teacher may secure proper preparation in them and at the same time so that a degree of specialization will not be set up which the small high schools cannot finance. The proposal to differentiate high school certificates is relatively new but it has been cordially received by educators and incorporated in the recommendations of a number of state school surveys. This statement from the Mississippi survey report is typical: "A certificate should be limited to . . . the subject of instruction which the candidate is specially prepared to teach" (114: 287). In a state survey of higher education it was declared that:

The high schools of the country are full of college graduates who specialized to a certain extent in one or more fields of study and were subsequently called upon to teach in another field. College graduation is no adequate guarantee of ability to teach any or all subjects in secondary schools. The requirement of graduation from college or normal school or its equivalent should therefore be supplemented by a minimum program of preparation required of each teacher in the several fields of high school work (227: 9-10).

Nineteen states now issue specialized high school certificates to college graduates. This number is greater than it was a few years ago and other states have declared the adoption of this policy to be part of their program for the immediate future. (14: 90, 94.)

References. 7: 115; 10: 228; 14: 89-90, 94*; 23: 107; 40: 18; 41: 23; 46: 633; 56: 69-70; 99: 346; 114: 285-7; 124: 123; 125: 4; 133: 256; 165: 23-4*; 171, Vol. 2: 9; 174: 46; 194: 286; 195: 24-5; 201: 46; 215: 167-8; 226: 132; 227: 9-10.

8. *Why should the validity of life diplomas lapse if the holder discontinues educational work for a period of years?*—States which do not issue life diplomas will mark this question "does not apply."

The world is always changing and with it change the schools, their curriculum, their philosophy, their methods. For this reason it is generally thought desirable to set a limit to the validity of the life diploma in case the holder retires from active service for an extended period. A typical recommendation on the point occurs in the Vermont teacher training survey:

The indefinite certificate should be valid as long as its holder teaches, but should lapse after a period of five years' inactivity in teaching. After having lapsed it should be renewable only on presenting to the state board of education satisfactory evidence of fitness for teaching. Additional professional or equivalent training should be required as evidence. (172: 94.)

The question of the ultimate desirability of issuing a life diploma at all raises other issues—issues on which little agreement at present exists among educational leaders. There is evident, however, a clear approval of the practice of having all certificates validated at intervals of several years and of requiring evidences of professional growth before this validation will be made. The life diploma question, like so many other educational issues, can not be properly considered without due regard to other related elements, the chief of which are tenure laws, retirement laws, and training and supervisory facilities.

Of the 44 states which issued life diplomas in 1926, only six limited the persistence of the diploma after the holder retired from teaching. In two of these states the persistence was three years and in four states it was five years. (25: 18.)

References. 14: 94; 25: 18-19; 36: 628; 106: 948; 46: 629, 638*; 125: 4; 172: 94*; 174: 46; 201: 46.

9. *Why should equivalent training and experience secured in other states be recognized as a basis for certification?*—Some inter-state movement of teachers is highly desirable. New ideas are thus circulated and broader view-

points gained. For this reason a state should not, under the mistaken policy of "protecting home talent," exclude competent teachers from other states by a Chinese wall of certification. On the contrary, "The evil effects likely to arise from a 'protected' teaching profession should be counteracted by attracting a small percentage of teachers from outside the state." (201: 346.)

Students of this subject and practical state school administrators agree that the certificates of other states should be recognized at full value, but that such reciprocity should never involve the lowering of essential standards in the receiving state. A simple way to accomplish this end is to authorize the state superintendent of public instruction to make reciprocal agreements with authorities in other states whereby certificates may be issued to applicants who are holders of certificates in those states, provided that the essential requirements of those states are not below the requirements of the receiving state. This was recommended by the General Education Board in its survey of Maryland (56: 206) and Delaware (64: 178).

The very great variations among states in certification terminology as well as in certification standards are doubtless important reasons why progress in securing reciprocity has been slow. Twenty-eight states now authorize recognition of certificates from other states. (41: 11.)

References. 9: 154-5; 41: 10-11, 27*; 43: 223-4; 45: 150; 46: 634, 638*; 56: 206; 64: 178; 106: 948; 171, Vol. 2: 10; 190: 239-40; 201: 346.

10. *Why should there be a minimum age of at least 18 years for certification?*—In states where certification standards are high a minimum age requirement is not needed, since a reasonable minimum age is practically assured by the period of advanced training required. It is true that age alone is not a good criterion of teaching competency, but it is better than no criterion. In states where low certification standards prevail, the minimum age requirement serves a useful purpose by excluding those who lack the maturity and life-experience necessary to command the respect of their pupils.

The importance of a minimum age limit is further emphasized by Anderson as follows: "Four tenths of the pupils in [Wisconsin] rural schools are taught by immature teachers not old enough to be given the responsibility of suffrage, yet charged with the greatest responsibility placed upon any group of public servants in our commonwealth" (7: 38). A law or regulation fixing a minimum age must be enforced to be effective. Thus, the South Dakota survey in 1918 found that in spite of a law fixing 18 as the minimum age for certification, questionnaires answered by rural teachers contained the names of 29 teachers under 17 years of age and of 53, who were just 17. (190: 210.)

There is a clearly marked tendency to establish a minimum age limit for certification. Only twenty-three states had such limits in 1920, whereas in 1926 thirty-seven states had minimum age requirements for all certificates. The age most commonly fixed is eighteen years, although four states issue certificates to persons as young as seventeen years and one state sets a minimum age of sixteen. (41: 278-279; 40: 241-242.)

References. 7: 38; 40: 31-2, 242; 41: 278; 43: 227; 56: 209; 57: 188; 64: 183; 171, Vol. 1: 54; 172: 104; 174: 38; 190: 210; 192: 62.

11. *Why should candidates for initial certificates be required to give evidence of moral character?*—Most states have laws which provide for the dismissal and cancellation of certificates of teachers convicted of immoral or otherwise unprofessional behavior. However, much damage may be done before these traits are detected and it seems desirable to set up moral character as a prerequisite to certification. The chief difficulty of this criterion is the problem of defining morality. It is doubtless true that in practice the requirement excludes only those with the most serious lapses of morality, and yet such should be excluded as far as possible.

Evidence of moral character is now required for all certificates in thirty-two states. (41: 278-279.)

References. 40: 6; 41: 278-9; 43: 227-8; 171, Vol. 2: 8; 174: 38.

12. *Why should a health certificate be required for all initial teachers' certificates?*—Authorities believe that this criterion serves a dual purpose. In the first place it protects children from the dangers of coming into daily and intimate contact with teachers who are suffering from dangerous communicable diseases. Second, since teaching is a restrictive vocation which makes distinct demands on the nervous and physical system, a preliminary health examination may prevent the applicant from entering a type of work which would be detrimental to his health and impair his efficiency. The relation of this criterion to desirable regulations affecting sick-leave and retirement for disability is obvious.

Fifteen states now have physical requirements for all certificates. The stringency of the requirement varies from one general certificate of good health to an annual physical examination. Contagious diseases (especially tuberculosis) and defects of speech, vision, and hearing are the chief objects of concern. (43: 230; 41: 278-279.)

References. 41: 278-9; 43: 230; 101: 109; 174: 38.

13. *Why is evidence of training a better basis for certification than examination?*—Teachers' examinations are of doubtful reliability in predicting teaching success. They are often of such a type that they show merely ability to retain a quantity of factual material for a few hours. Furthermore, it has frequently been demonstrated that examinations are not reliably graded. For instance, seven superintendents were asked to grade, independently, a teacher's examination paper in each of the following subjects: history, geography, reading, and arithmetic. The variation in the seven grades assigned each paper was from 44 to 91 percent in history, from 57 to 88 percent in geography, from 57 to 85 percent in reading, and from 65 to 88 percent in arithmetic. (41: 14.) Similar experiments have been conducted many times with results which indicate the inaccuracy of the ordinary type of examinations.

On the other hand, the practice of issuing certificates upon evidence of training results in keeping the applicant under the observation of the faculty of a teacher-training institution

for an extended period. Students who show little aptitude for teaching can be discouraged from entering the profession. Or, if their unfitness for teaching be entirely obvious, they may be dismissed from training and started in other lines of work where they will have a better chance to succeed. Such a policy benefits both the candidates and the children in the schools.

The nature of the demand for trained teachers rather than examined teachers is shown by the following facts from one southern state:

In 1924-25 the graduates of normal schools and colleges held 72 percent of the positions in schools with six or more teachers, 61 percent of all positions in city schools, 46 percent of all positions in long-term counties; non-graduates of teacher-training institutions held 96 percent of the positions in one-teacher schools. (151: 20.)

In other words the children attending the rural schools were the ones most discriminated against by an antiquated state certification policy.

Twelve states have eliminated examinations as a method for certifying teachers and several others have perfected plans to do so at an early date. In fifteen states some certificates may still be obtained on examination alone without any requirement of academic or professional qualifications. (192: 61; 151: 20.)

References. 10: 229; 11: 173-4; 30, Vol. 1: 107-8; 40: 19; 41: 11-12, 15*; 43: 228-9; 46: 634, 636*; 49: 45-6; 56: 160; 57: 188; 58: 43; 64: 85; 99: 269, 363; 101: 98, 103; 117: 47; 124: 113; 125: 4; 151: 20; 155: 224; 171, Vol. 1: 50; 174: 42-3*; 184: 224; 187: 37; 189: 41; 190: 294; 191: 356; 192: 61; 196: 23; 201: 44; 219: 16.

14. *Why should certification on the basis of teacher-training work in high school be discontinued?*—The high school training class undoubtedly served a useful purpose in earlier days when state control of teacher-training was undeveloped and when teaching was still largely undifferentiated from schoolkeeping. Although the training given in these classes was certainly better than no training whatever, the immaturity of the students, the lack of materials, the poorly paid and poorly prepared instructors made them far less satisfac-

tory than the state normal schools which are now found in nearly every state.

In view of improved transportation and communication facilities and of the great increases in national wealth and income educators generally assert that there is no state which now needs high school teacher-training classes and that all states should abolish these classes as soon as possible. This recommendation applies both to the training given in a regular four-year high school and to the fifth or post-graduate year of teacher-training offered in connection with a high school.

In 1920, twenty-one states recognized high school teacher-training courses as meeting requirements for one or more certificates. By 1926, six of these states had discontinued the practice. (41: 26; 40: 24.)

References. 17: 180; 37: 75-9; 40: 24; 41: 26; 58: 44; 99: 269; 125: 4; 192: 56; 194: 379.

15. *Why should all initial certificates be valid only for a limited time?*—In teaching, as in every other vocation, the surest test is the test of experience. Neither examination nor records in training institutions predict continued teaching success with absolute certainty. For this reason, authorities agree that all initial certificates should be limited in validity to a period of a few years. Under a proper system of supervision, the small percentage of teachers who are failing badly in their work will become known. If their defects are irremediable they will not be recommended for renewed certificates and their connection with the profession will cease when the initial certificate expires. If, on the other hand, the work of the beginning teacher is successful or can be made so, the supervisor will so certify and a new certificate, valid for a longer period of time, will be issued.

Thirty-seven of the forty-eight states comply with this criterion as far as all elementary school certificates are concerned. (25: 18.) A few of these, however, issue initial certificates for high school teachers which are valid for life.

Among the states which require some experience for an indefinite or life certificate, there is a wide range in the amount of experi-

ence required. The average minimum teaching experience required by the 44 states granting life diplomas for a life diploma valid in elementary schools in 32 months. The range is from no experience to 15 years experience. (25: 18.)

References. 25: 18; 41: 28; 43: 226; 45: 158; 46: 637; 78: 39-40; 99: 349; 101: 98; 107: 115; 60, 92; 125: 4; 172: 94; 189: 40; 190: 239-40; 196: 23; 197: 131; 201: 46; 215, 170.

16. *Why should equivalent minimum certification standards be required of rural and city teachers?*—The principle of equal educational opportunity is involved in this question. The rural child has an equal right with the city child to a trained teacher. Insofar as certification standards can provide for this equality, they should do so. This does not mean that rural school teachers should receive training identical with that of the urban teacher. But while differing needs of the two groups can and should be recognized all agree that the training of neither should be inferior.

Only five states now issue special certificates for rural schools which require an inferior degree of preparation than is demanded for a certificate of state-wide validity. (41: 42-260.)

References. 30, Vol. 1: 108; 41: 42-260; 99: 269; 115: 59; 172: 92; 200: 76.

17. *Why should practice teaching or experience be required for all certificates?*—The old theory that "anybody who knows a subject can teach it" is no longer acceptable. The field of high school certification is its latest stronghold, but it is rapidly being displaced even there. Because good teaching is becoming a science as well as an art, because it is a profession for which training is needed, and be-

cause the primary interest of all teachers should be pupils and not subject-matter, the introduction of practice teaching into the preparatory course of all teachers whether of elementary or secondary grades, is highly desirable.

Nineteen states now require practice teaching for the high school certificate granted to college graduates. Four other states recommend it. In 1925 only seventeen states required or recommended practice teaching as a part of the training for high school teachers. (14: 70-71.)

References. 14: 70-71*; 23: 107; 58: 46; 88: 49; 114: 286; 172: 92; 174: 45; 202: 11; 225, Vol. 4: 99.

18. *Why should teachers in non-public schools meet requirements essentially equivalent to those required of public school teachers?*—Trained and competent teachers are undoubtedly the most important aspect of the program of education which the state provides. It is logical, therefore, that in order to protect its legitimate interests in the educational welfare of children, the state should not permit private schools to employ as teachers persons who fail to meet reasonable standards. If the private or parochial schools wish to go beyond the state minimal standards for public school teachers they are then fully privileged to do so; the state is satisfied if its standards are not undermined. Four states require that teachers in non-public schools must hold valid certificates and seven others have legislation which requires in general terms that non-public schools "must be taught by a competent teacher." (103: 107)

References. 43: 231; 45: 212; 46: 714-5*; 57: 268; 103: 107; 171, Vol. 3: 35-6; 186: 428; 194: 369.

Discussion of Table 6

Employment and Contracts

1. *Why should beginning teachers be employed for a try-out period?*—It is generally conceded that, while the best interests of children demand a stable teaching profession, a period of try-out is necessary before teachers are given an indefinite appointment. During

this period the teacher should be under supervision of a constructive type. The factors which condition teaching success are so many, so varied, and so inter-related that the prediction of success is necessarily uncertain. Since experience must be the final test of teaching

ability, a try-out period for beginners is necessary. With respect to the optimum duration of the trial period, opinions differ slightly. Various authorities recommend periods of from 1 to 5 years, with 3 years as the most commonly suggested probationary period. The try-out period of service has been recommended by school surveys and by the country's leading authorities on school administration. In most states a try-out period is required by the nature of the certification system, which requires that all initial certification be valid for a limited term. (See also Table 5, question 15.)

A state that can answer this question in the affirmative should not rest satisfied that there is no room for further improvement. Further related points that might be considered include:

1. Are beginning teachers getting a fair chance to make good through the right kind of helpful supervision?
2. Is this supervisory help available for both rural and urban teachers?
3. Are desirable connections made between this try-out supervision and the pre-service preparation of the teacher?

Similarly each of the succeeding questions might be developed into a series of related investigations which, collected together, would give a complete picture of the contractual relationships of teachers and employing boards in the state.

References. 5: 231; 7: 109; 8: 139; 27: 22; 45: 174; 46: 648; 48: 51-2; 83: 38; 86: 205; 87: 211*; 91: 142*; 101: 357; 128: 151-2; 192: 56; 215, Part 1: 147-8.

2. *Why should an indefinite appointment be required after a satisfactory period of trial service?*—An indefinite appointment means that each teacher is employed as long as his efficiency and value to the schools remain unimpaired. Annual applications and re-elections are no longer necessary, the presumption being that the position will be open to the teacher as long as efficient service continues. Teachers cannot work at highest efficiency when they are compelled to scramble for a position every year. The annual election is required in few other forms of responsible public service. Almack and Lang report that "there is more sickness among teachers, and more

cases of nervous breakdown during the period of suspense attending the annual election than at any other time during the year." (5: 218.) The experience of other nations shows that the extensive annual migrations of American teachers are unnecessary. (128: 156-158.) There is no evidence that the practice of indefinite appointments tend to retard the development or decrease the efficiency of the teaching staff. Indeed, the evidence available shows that increased security of position has been accompanied by higher professional standards (86: 206-212). For these reasons, we find that leaders in school administration favor an indefinite appointment after a successful try-out period. In order to avoid the annual election of all teachers it is necessary in most states to enact statutes legalizing the indefinite contract. Unless this is done, the courts have generally held that contracts must be on an annual basis (4: 126).

References. 4: 125-6; 5: 218, 231; 7: 109; 8: 139; 45: 174; 46: 648; 48: 52; 83: 37-8; 86: 205; 87: 211; 91: 143; 101: 356-7; 128: 151-2, 156; 192: 55; 215, Part 1: 247-8.

3. *Why should continued employment be made contingent on a reasonable program of study or other forms of improvement?*—The scientific aspects of education are developing rapidly. New methods of teaching are constantly being devised, new equipment is being perfected, new subject matter is being developed, and new objectives are being proposed. Children have a right to the best teaching available and an out-of-date teacher cannot give the most effective service of which he is capable. The need for continuous growth is no less urgent in teaching than in law or medicine. Educational leaders agree that boards of education should, either explicitly or implicitly, be empowered by law to require their employees to make a reasonable effort to keep up with educational progress and to make continued employment depend on continued improvement. Continuity of service is thus based on professional growth and efficient work.

References. 5: 231; 7: 109; 46: 648; 86: 205; 87: 210; 88: 110; 91: 143.*

4. *Why should it be possible for teachers on indefinite appointment to be dismissed for incompetency or other good causes?*—The only sound reason for state legislation governing the employment and contracts of teachers is better teaching service. There is universal agreement, therefore, that under no conditions should it be made difficult to discharge a teacher whose unfitness for his work can be demonstrated.

In 1924 a survey of opinion among ten professional and lay groups as to valid causes for dismissal showed that the following causes were then generally held to be valid by five or more groups (128: 165):

1. Proved lapse of moral character
2. Continued inability to maintain discipline
3. Proved insubordination
4. Manifest or proved physical disability
5. Lack of sympathy with children

Statutory causes for teacher dismissal which were frequently named in state laws in 1926 include: "inefficiency" in 23 states, "willful neglect of duty" in 23 states, "immorality" in 22 states, "misconduct" in 11 states, "incompetency" in 10 states, "good and sufficient reasons" in 9 states, and "tuberculosis" in 9 states. (8: 99)

References. 4: 64-5; 8: 98-101*, 139-40; 45: 175; 46: 648*; 48: 52; 83: 38; 86: 206; 87: 211*; 91: 142-3; 128: 151-2, 159-65; 215, Part 1: 147-8.

5. *Why should the power to dismiss be in the hands of the appointing body?*—The board of education is responsible to its constituency for an efficient school system and must see that school executives and teachers work to that end. Inefficient teachers should be removed and their places taken by those who are properly qualified. Although in practice boards of education wisely delegate large powers in the appointment and removal of teachers to professional executives and act only on their recommendation, it is generally conceded that final authority to appoint and dismiss teachers must rest with the board of education. The courts, too, have generally held that the power to appoint implies the power to dismiss. (2: 61; 13: 53.) Good schools depend on a unitary authoritative control by repre-

sentatives of the people and their executives. To divide administrative authority by delegating power to dismiss teachers to any other official is unsound.

References. 8: 102-3, 139; 45: 174; 46: 648; 48: 53; 83: 38; 86: 205; 87: 211*; 91: 142-4.

6. *Why should the law require a notice of dismissal?*—It is generally agreed that, in cases where a teacher appears to have failed in his duty, the proper immediate remedy of the board is not immediate dismissal, but suspension with a notice of future dismissal if investigation shows the charges to be well-founded. This delay gives an opportunity for a dispassionate investigation and is fair to all concerned. The reasons for dismissal should be clearly stated in writing. Such procedure fully protects the children against undesirable teachers on the one hand and capricious or political control of their schools on the other.

The recommended period of notice before dismissal varies, but a period of thirty days is probably as satisfactory as any.

References. 5: 231; 8: 103-5, 139; 45: 174; 46: 649*; 48: 52-3; 83: 38; 86: 206; 87: 211*; 91: 143.

7. *Why should an appeal to the state educational authority be permitted?*—The issues involved in the dismissal of a teacher sometimes become intensely personal. Under such circumstances, neither of the parties involved is capable of assuming an unprejudiced attitude. In view of this fact authorities generally agree that the interests of both the children and the teacher should be protected by the right of appeal to the state educational authority. That this appeal should be to a professional rather than a judicial body is recognized not only by educators, but by the courts as well. (4: 126.) The right of a teacher to appeal to a court of competent jurisdiction on a question of law or fact already exists and cannot be abridged. But, the dismissal of a teacher should be, in most cases, a professional rather than a legal matter. Furthermore, experience shows that when an appeal to a professional authority is provided teachers seldom choose to carry the case before the courts. Ordinarily, an appeal to a professional officer

is more dignified, more expeditious, less complicated and more satisfactory than that to a court. Thus, of forty-nine appeals involving the contractual status of teachers and school boards in New Jersey between 1909 and 1929, only five were carried to the courts and forty-four to state educational authorities.

References. 4: 127; 5: 231; 8: 105-9, 111, 139; 45: 175; 46: 649*; 48: 53; 83: 39*; 86: 214; 91: 144.

8. *Why should the laws governing teachers' employment and contracts be state-wide in their application?*—Discrimination in legal rights between teachers in rural and urban communities is one of the undesirable circumstances which tends to drive the best and most experienced teachers away from rural schools. In those states which have lower certification standards for rural schools than for urban schools and in those states where faulty administrative machinery deprives rural children of the benefits of a constructive supervisory program, it may be temporarily inexpedient immediately to extend the principle of indefinite appointment during satisfactory service to rural communities. The improvement of the contractual status of teachers is so closely connected with the improvement of supervision, training and certification, (see Tables 4 and 5) that it is unwise to consider them apart from each other. Authorities agree, however, that the rights of children in rural communities to well-trained, experienced teachers and progressively supervised schools should be respected. State-wide laws to encourage a stable teaching profession are one step in this direction.

References. 5: 230; 7: 9, 11; 27: 22; 45: 174; 83: 38; 86: 206; 91: 143; 128: 154; 215, Part 1: 147.

9. *Why should the violation of a contract by a teacher be accompanied by definite penalties?*—The relationship between the teacher and the employing board is reciprocal. Both have certain rights and both have certain duties which they owe to each other and to the children whom they serve. If the teacher may expect continuous employment during good

service, the board ought also to be protected against the small percentage of teachers who are willing to violate a contract to teach during a stated period. The most prevalent cause of violated contracts is the custom which obtains in some communities of delaying the election of teachers until the term is over or even later. This practice results in a confused and anxious scramble for position by the teachers, in hasty and poorly founded judgments by employing boards, and in resultant harm to the schools and the children. Most of these difficulties could be avoided by abolishing the annual election of experienced teachers, or when this is impossible, by holding elections at a reasonably early date.

When a teacher asks to be released from a contract for good reasons the board should make every effort to accede to the request. It is now the practice of many boards of education willingly to release teachers who have greater professional opportunities than they can offer. But, if there is not sufficient time for the board to secure an acceptable substitute the teacher should not ask for, and the board should not grant, a release.

Any teacher who violates a contract is acting in an unethical manner. Because of the few teachers who are willing to destroy their professional good name in this way, many authorities recommend and state laws sometimes require that the violation of a contract be accompanied by definite penalties. Loss of status, loss of salary, and revocation of certificate are most commonly suggested as penalties.

References. 4: 101-06; 8: 140*; 83: 38.

10. *Why should the state department of education maintain a policy of continuous study and improvement of the factors affecting the teachers' contracts and the stability of the teaching profession?*—A stable teaching profession means better schools and increased efficiency in teaching. The interest of the state in these objectives should be conserved through the work of the state department of education. The department should know the facts concerning the turnover and migration of teachers in the state and should

be working towards a program of professional stability. For a general consideration of the function of the state department of education in improving school conditions throughout the

state see the discussion of question 13 of Table 1, page 99.

References. 34: 104; 115: 92; 195: 28; 196: 77.

Discussion of Table 7

State Salary Laws

1. *Why should there be state laws or regulations governing the minimum amount of teachers' salaries?*—Educational authorities recognize, in state minimum salary laws, one means of improving the condition of the small rural schools. The low salary of the rural school teacher is one of the reasons why rural school teaching is done very largely by relatively untrained, relatively inexperienced, and relatively young teachers. A properly constructed and administered state minimum salary law helps to remedy, in part, this disadvantageous position. In respect to salaries as in other respects the rôle of the state should be constantly to level up conditions in the less progressive districts, to act in an advisory capacity in developing new procedures, to secure, as nearly as may be, an equal (though not identical) educational opportunity to every child, and to prescribe minimal conditions below which no local school unit may be allowed to fall.

The Virginia Education Commission and Survey Staff pointed out that, although a fixed salary schedule for the whole state is impractical, a minimum annual salary should be fixed. (215: 147) The Kansas School Code Commission refers to a minimum state salary schedule as "an important guarantee of an adequate minimum program of education." (171, Vol. 2: 41) The Kentucky survey pointed out that "while boards of education employing teachers holding standard certificates should not be permitted to pay them less, they should be permitted to pay such teachers more than the state minimum." (11: 176) This last point is especially important. Every care should be taken in wording the minimum salary law and later in enforcing it that there be no encouragement given backward districts to consider the minimum salary as a maximum.

The arguments in favor of state minimum salary legislation have been summarized by Grimm as follows:

1. Every teacher worth being in school work is worth a compensation based on the level of social and economic justice.
2. The state should see that public servants who are carrying out an important function are adequately compensated.
3. The state must require the payment of adequate salaries in order to provide effective teaching service for all children;
4. A minimum salary law is needed to professionalize teaching;
5. Minimum salary legislation has proved successful elsewhere;
6. Our State Constitution promises good educational opportunities for all children (69: 11-13)

The average salary of all teachers is still considerably below the average salary of all gainfully employed persons. The salaries of rural school teachers in particular are far below the average income of other workers. State minimum salary legislation is one aspect of the nation-wide demand for good teachers, decently paid.

In some states the method prescribed by law for distributing and expending the state school fund is such that, without direct legislation on the subject, there is in effect a state minimum salary. Such is the case, for instance, in California where all state school funds and sixty percent of all county funds must be spent for teachers' salaries. This provision, coupled with the methods of fixing the amount of school revenues and of apportioning state and county school funds practically assures a minimum salary.

References. 1: 239-40; 5: 243-4; 10: 46-9, 225, 231-2; 11: 60, 175-6; 30, Vol. 1: 108; 46: 654-5; 49: 88-9; 53: 188-9; 56: 211; 57: 196; 64: 186-9; 69: 11-13; 114: 108; 119: 79; 120: 12; 133: 257; 171, Supplement,

Vol. 2: 41; 172: 95; 179: 99, 207; 180: 35, 76; 182: 107; 190: 294; 191: 516; 192: 55; 194, 394; 287; 195: 24-5; 201: 341, 202: 181; 215, Part 1: 147.

2. *Why should state minimum salary regulations prescribe salaries which increase with experience?*—Authorities agree that the best type of state salary regulations goes beyond the statement of a flat minimal requirement. There should be in addition, a graduated schedule which will encourage experienced teachers to remain in their work. Experience is a valuable asset in teaching. Every time an experienced teacher leaves the profession the state and the nation lose the investment in training and the value of the experience embodied in that teacher. It is the part of wisdom for a state to conserve these values through properly devised state salary regulations.

Evenden in presenting the essential features of a state salary law, states that there are nine elements "which are generally enough accepted to be called principles." The second of these principles is stated thus;

The more successful experience a teacher has had in the particular field in which he is working, other things being equal, the more salary he should receive. (53: 188)

Practically every state school survey which deals with state salary laws recognizes specifically the correctness of the principle of salary recognition for successful experience.

References. 5: 245*; 7: 12; 10: 49, 231; 11: 60, 177; 46: 656; 53: 188-90*; 56: 211; 57: 196; 64: 185-7; 101: 290; 114: 320; 171, Supplement, Vol. 2: 41; 179: 99, 209; 180: 35; 192: 56; 194: 287; 195: 25; 201: 341; 215, Part 1: 147.

3. *Why should state minimum salary regulations prescribe salaries which increase with training?*—Where different grades of certificates represent different amounts of training and experience, the state minimum salary schedule may be graduated according to the certificate held, and the state with such regulation would answer "Yes" to this question.

Other things being equal, a well-trained teacher works more efficiently, and therefore

is worth more, than an untrained or poorly trained teacher. The welfare of the schools demands that teachers be encouraged to secure the best training available. Authorities uniformly agree that a state minimum salary law, graduated according to training as well as experience, is one means of encouraging teachers to undergo proper training for their work before entering the profession and to continue their training in service. The Kansas School Code Commission refers to a minimum salary law prescribing training and experience increments as "an essential for recruiting and maintaining an adequate teaching staff." (171: Supplement, Vol. 2: 41.) Evenden includes salary increments for training as the first of nine generally accepted principles of state salary schedules (53: 188).

References. 1: 240; 5: 244; 10: 58; 11: 175; 30: 99, 107-8; 46: 636, 656-7; 49: 89; 53: 188-90*; 56: 211; 57: 196; 64: 185-7; 69: 12; 99: 269; 101: 293; 114: 108; 133: 257; 171, Supplement, Vol. 2: 41; 172: 94; 179: 99, 209; 180: 35, 76; 181: 144; 182: 107; 190: 294; 191: 516; 192: 55; 194: 287; 195: 25; 201: 341; 202: 181; 215, Part 1: 147.

4. *Why should apportionments from state funds be made to enable local units to comply with the state minimum salary laws?*—It is of little value to have state minimum salary regulations if local conditions make their enforcement impracticable. The setting up of an effective minimum salary schedule by state authority implies that the state will help to carry it out by granting the necessary aid. The state has a right to set minimum standards, but it should adopt a mode of enforcing these standards which will be fair to all communities. Authorities agree that when a minimum salary law is enacted, the state's contribution to the local school units should be set at an amount large enough so that when added to a reasonable local tax it will meet the cost of these minimal salaries. In Pennsylvania, for instance, the state pays a certain percent of the state minimum salary schedule. California meets the situation in another manner by requiring that all state apportionments and 60 percent of all county apportionments

must be used for the payment of teachers' salaries.

This criterion is widely accepted by students of state school finance and administration. Evenden in listing the essential features of a state salary law declared:

The state should assume a much larger proportion of the maintenance cost of the public schools than has been customary. Since teachers' salaries form by far the largest item in the cost of maintenance of a school system, and since it is also the item through which the greatest influence for bettering the schools may be exerted; it would seem that the state might well start a program of increased financial support in connection with a state-adopted (minimum) salary schedule. (53: 194).

Grimm, writing of conditions in Illinois, states that:

State minimum salary regulation accompanied by more financial aid from the state seem prerequisite to the fulfillment of the constitutional promise of efficient schools for all of our children in Illinois (69: 11).

References. 1: 237-9; 5: 244; 30, Vol. 1: 325; 31: 91; 46: 654-5*; 47: 585; 52: 72; 53: 194*; 57: 165, 175-6; 69: 11; 114: 320; 119: 85; 120: 5; 121: 78; 123: 41-2; 134: 145; 135: 171-3; 143: 47; 164: 51; 169: 60-1; 171, *Supplement*, Vol. 2: 41; 179: 100, 209; 180: 35, 83; 181: 152, 177, 188; 182: 107; 201: 491; 225, Vol. 3: 144.

5. *Why should local districts be authorized to grant sabbatical leave with part or full pay?*—A sabbatical leave is a permit to be absent from duty for a stated period (usually one year) with some salary and following an extended period (usually seven to ten years) of faithful and satisfactory service. Many institutions granting sabbatical leave specify in some de-

tail what the recipient is expected to do during the year. Travel, study, research, and writing are frequently specified.

Three advantages which the schools receive from such leaves of absence are: (1) a longer period of service is encouraged, (2) better service is rendered because of the recreation and new viewpoints obtained, and (3) more desirable working conditions attract more applicants for teaching positions, with a wider range of selection and consequent improvement in the staff.

Authorities agree that more effective teaching will result when local school systems grant leaves of absence for travel, study, and other forms of professional improvement. Wherever necessary the state laws should be amended to make sabbatical leaves of absences on full or part pay legal.

References. 1: 67; 5: 285; 30, Vol. 1: 54-6; 129: 4-5*.

6. *Why should local units be authorized to grant sick leave with pay?*—Advantages which the children in schools receive from the policy of granting sick leave with pay are both direct and indirect. Directly, the granting of sick leave with pay removes children from the handicap of being taught by teachers with lowered vitality and decreases the danger of contagion from teacher to pupil. Indirectly, more desirable working conditions attract more applicants for teaching positions, giving a wider range of selection and consequent improvement in the staff. Wherever necessary the state laws should be amended so as to make the granting of sick leave on pay legal.

References. 5: 283-4; 28: 72-3; 52: 74.

Discussion of Table 8

Professional Organizations

1, 2. *Why is a high percent of membership in state and national education associations one indication of a progressive state school system?* Membership in voluntary professional organizations on the part of an individual teacher indicates a strong probability that:

1. The teacher regards his work as a worthwhile professional undertaking.

2. The teacher plans to continue in the profession.

3. The teacher will receive professional publications and other broadening contacts which are not available to non-members.

Each of these characteristics,—professional outlook, continuous service, and professional reading and contacts distinguish a superior teacher. Furthermore, the presence in the state

of a strong, well-organized professional group in itself facilitates a program of study and improvement of the schools. It is fair to conclude therefore, that membership in professional organizations is a significant factor in determining states school efficiency.

The percentages specified in questions 1 and 2 of this checklist are more or less arbitrarily fixed. They do not represent a final ideal but are chosen as convenient points along the way for comparative purposes. Fifty percent membership or better in the National Education Association was achieved by five states during 1929, while 90 percent membership or better in the state education association was attained by ten states. This is in striking contrast to the situation which existed less than a decade ago when there was only one state which could meet either of these criteria.

References. 67: 2-4; 70: 88; 71: 98; 82: 28-9.

3. *Why should a state education association employ a full-time secretary?*—A full-time executive secretary makes possible a vigorous, continuous, unified and progressive policy for the association. A full-time secretary enables the association to render many services which would otherwise be impossible. Volunteer and part-time service while better than none, is far less desirable. This does not mean that all states are ready to take immediately the progressive step of employing a full-time secretary. But it should be an ultimate objective for all states. This office has experienced a remarkable growth. In 1911 only one state education association employed a full-time secretary. By 1915 the number had increased to 4, by 1920 to 7, by 1925 to 30, and by 1930 to 36 states. (82: 24-25; 67: 14)

References. 5: 82-3; 67: 14; 82: 42.

4. *Why should a state education association adopt a code of ethics for the teaching profession of the state?*—The possession of a code of ethics is specified by many authorities as one of the criteria by which a profession is differentiated from non-professional vocations. There is general agreement that formulation of a code of ethics is an important activity of education associations. Granrud found that this problem was given second place in importance

by a body of competent judges among fifty-four problems with which state education associations were concerned. (67: 57-58) The problem which received first place was a general statement concerning the internal organization and administration of the association. The high importance thus attached to the code of ethics justifies its inclusion here.

Reference. 67: 57-8.

5. *Why should a state association publish a journal?*—A journal is the most effective means through which state education associations may reach their memberships. Through this agency they may unify the profession, introduce new teaching methods and materials, incline public opinion more favorably to desirable school legislation, develop morale, interpret the schools to the people, and in general give a tangible expression of the service of the association to every member. Recognition of the value of the journal is widespread among officers of state education associations and a journal is now published by every state association employing a full-time paid secretary and by three other states. Only nine state associations now fail to publish a journal and in four of these states a journal issued by the state department of education carries some education association news and announcements.

References. 5: 82-3; 67: 39-40; 82: 42, 123; 184: 249.

6, 7, 8. *Why is the work of committees of state associations important?*—In many states the work of committees sponsored by the state education association is an important means of improving schools. The continuous work of an important committee comes in time to have a great cumulative effect. In addition, the stimulus of membership in a group which is actively at work on its professional problems is felt throughout the educational system. The problems on which state education associations should work through committees and otherwise are classified as those which deal with teaching problems (e. g. guidance, curriculum revision, character education), those which directly concern teacher welfare (e. g. retirement, salaries, teaching load), and those which are concerned with state school finance and administration (e. g. school finance, units of school administration). These three main fields

f study are well represented in the work of practically all of the state education associations.

References. 5: 82-3; 67: 15.

9. *Why should a state education association hold an annual convention, either state-wide or by districts?*—The annual convention of teachers, either state-wide or by districts, is

an important factor in a progressive state school system for almost the same reasons as given for the state education journal. (See question 5, above.) In addition, the values of personal contact with fellow-workers, of inspiration derived from group meetings, and of transacting the business of the association are important.

References. 67: 36-9; 82: 15-16.

Discussion of Table 9 Teacher Retirement Systems

1. *Why should a state-wide teacher retirement system be established?*—A sound retirement law protects children from teachers rendered incompetent by disability or advanced age. It sets up a business-like plan for the automatic retirement of such teachers. It frees school boards from the obligation which they frequently feel to continue the employment of teachers after advanced age has reduced their efficiency in the classroom. Such benefits are of vital significance to the public welfare.

On the other hand, a retirement system makes it unnecessary for teachers to continue working beyond their time. It provides them with a reasonable competence in old age which they may accept without apology. The allowance paid a retired teacher is in no sense a gratuity or a matter of charity as many of the "pension" plans of the past have been. It is as much the teacher's as the salary he receives during his actual service. He has fully earned it and he may accept it without question.

A sound teacher retirement law tends to attract capable young people into the teaching profession. It better compensates them for the relatively low remuneration which teachers generally receive. It offers a better guarantee of promotion within the profession since it sets up a practical means whereby school executives of advanced age may be regularly retired. It raises the tone of the whole profession by freeing its ranks of those incapacitated by old age.

A sound teacher retirement system tends to retain capable teachers in the service. It makes it unnecessary for them to seek other employment than teaching to provide for old age. It

makes each year of teaching service a step toward independence in old age.

A sound teacher retirement system increases the efficiency of teachers while they are in service. It tends to lengthen the period of the teacher's efficiency by relieving his mind of the fear of destitution in old age. It makes it possible to invest in study, travel, and other things which are an essential part of teacher's equipment, without endangering the provision made for the later years.

A sound teacher retirement system means a saving to the public in the long run. It protects the public from the waste of school plants manned by superannuated teachers. It makes unnecessary the enactment of ill advised and costly "pension" laws which are frequently the alternative. All of these valuable returns are furnished to the public at a minimum cost. The modern joint-contributory retirement systems, organized on the actuarial reserve plan, require only one-fourth as much in public appropriations as did the "pension" systems of the past. (126: 160)

The adoption of a sound teacher retirement system is in accord with the best thought of the day. Hundreds of the country's best known and most efficient business concerns are adopting retirement plans which embody principles essentially the same as those advocated for teacher retirement systems. As the National Industrial Conference Board states:

Many of the largest industrial enterprises, including commercial and financial institutions, railway and other public utility corporations, have established systems of service pensions for their superannuated employees. The list of such con-

cerns, already long, is constantly growing. (126: 161)

Workers in all types of public service are being brought under provisions of retirement systems.

A teacher retirement system is essentially a plan through which the public insures its children against the evils which result when such a plan does not exist. In short, a sound teacher retirement law is a straight business proposition in which two interested groups share the cost of supporting an enterprise which brings valuable returns to both.

References. 5: 257*; 22: 122; 35: 52; 46: 660; 54: 209; 76: 20; 77: 12; 84: 284; 100: 14-16; 112: 21-2; 126: 158-62; 132: 48*; 138: 33-4; 140: 591-2; 141: 221, 225-6; 152: 20-1; 153: 9-10; 161: 16; 217: 606.

2. *Why should membership be required of new teachers?*—A retirement system is primarily an efficiency measure. Its full advantage to the schools will be partly lost if only a portion of the teachers become members. The system should be open to the older teachers and they should be encouraged to join. Membership should be compulsory for new teachers, those who begin their teaching after the retirement system is put into effect. Under such an arrangement all teachers employed in a state will eventually be members of the retirement system. Entrance into the system of all new teachers at the time they begin their teaching is desirable for a number of reasons. Such a provision tends to stabilize the teaching profession, to give the new teacher a professional point of view, to lengthen the period of time over which deposits are made and thereby to increase the retirement benefits, to establish habits of thrift, and to build up an adequate reserve in the retirement fund. (126: 153)

References. 35: 53; 63: 48-9; 84: 284; 112: 23; 126: 153*; 132: 19, 48*; 217: 606, 608.

3. *Why should both teachers and public contribute to the support of the retirement system?*—The benefits of a sound teacher retirement system accrue both to the public and to the teachers. Because of this common interest a joint-contributory plan of support; that

is, a plan whereby both teachers and the state make regular deposits in the retirement fund is appropriate. The joint financial interest of both the public and the teacher in a retirement system tends to produce a spirit of business-like cooperation between the public and the teachers in developing the plan. The outcomes are likely to be more satisfactory than when the cost is borne solely by the state or by the teachers. Seventeen of the twenty-two statewide teacher retirement systems now in operation are financed jointly by the teachers and the public. Two are free pension systems; that is, they are entirely paid for from public funds, and three are supported by the teachers alone. (77: 17). In recent years the trend in the development of teacher retirement systems has been in the direction of the joint-contributory plan.

References. 5: 266-7; 22: 123*; 55: 111; 63: 5-6; 77: 17; 112: 22; 113: 95, 431; 132: 48*; 161: 17; 126: 154-55*.

4. *Why should the retirement law state the method of determining the deposits to be made by the teachers and the payments to be made by the public?*—The deposits to be made by the teacher and the payments to be made by the public, should be specified in the act creating the retirement system, and should continue as stated until changed by the retirement board on the basis of actuarial investigation. Too often in the past the deposits to be made by the teacher have been specified, while the amount of the public's payments has been left indefinite. The method of determining such payments should not be left to chance but should be definitely described. The state itself should then obey the requirements of the retirement law. The mutual nature of the benefits of a teacher retirement system imply that both parties should feel responsibility for its maintenance on a sound basis. The state requires banks, insurance companies, and similar institutions to obey laws concerning the financial reserves they must carry. It should similarly enact and obey the laws necessary to the solvency of the teacher retirement system.

When these provisions are followed it is possible for both the teachers and the state to know the amount of each year's deposit or pay-

ment and to budget these items along with other known expenditures. The retirement system is thus able to anticipate and to meet its financial obligations. The required amounts will be available at the time a teacher retires.

In order to meet this criterion it is not essential that the organic act should inflexibly fix in detail the method of determining the teacher's deposits and the state's payments. A general description of the method may be preferable, thus leaving the retirement board free to make necessary adjustments on the basis of actuarial advice. (21: 147; 126: 154.)

Fifteen of the twenty state-wide teacher retirement systems which are wholly or partially supported from teachers' deposits state the amount to be deposited by the teacher. Many of these, however, are sufficiently flexible so that necessary adjustments may be made by the retirement board. Among the nineteen state-wide teacher retirement systems receiving support from public funds, nine state the amounts to be received from this source, allowance being made for adjustments that may later be necessary. Seven describe the method of determining the amounts to be received from public funds. In three states such payments are not definitely prescribed.

References. 54: 147; 126: 154; 127.*

5. *Why should the retirement system be 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 retirement system may be financed according to either of two plans. One may be called the reserve plan. Under this method the amounts necessary to purchase the retirement allowances guaranteed are carefully built up concurrently during the period of teaching service. The cost of retirement has been provided for at the time the teacher retires. Under the second, or cash disbursement plan, no financial provision is made for the retirement of the teacher until the time for his retirement arrives. The cost of the retirement allowance promised is paid from appropriations, usually from public funds, made from time to time during the teacher's period of retirement.

Both the reserve plan and the cash disbursement plan have their respective advantages and disadvantages. However, the weight of authority at present clearly points to the reserve plan as the safest and as more closely in accord with sound administrative principles. In proposing the criterion of a retirement system based on the reserve plan it is recognized that there are in operation a few illustrations of the cash disbursement policy. Whether these examples of the cash disbursement retirement system will be permanently successful yet remains to be seen. As concerns future retirement legislation the weight of theory as well as of recent retirement legislation favors the reserve plan.

This plan is favored because it appears to offer the surest guarantee of the payment of the promised allowance. Under the reserve plan, the money to pay the retirement allowance is available when the teacher retires. Under the cash disbursement plan it must all be obtained through public appropriations made from time to time after the teacher retires.

In a retirement system nothing takes the place of security. A plan which has the necessary funds on hand at the time the teacher retires, seems to meet this crucial test better than one which, after the teacher retires must secure the money needed through special appropriation.

References. 5: 269*; 21: 145; 113: 336, 436; 126: 155; 132: 13-15*.

6. *Why should teachers be permitted to withdraw their deposits if they leave service prior to retirement?*—Each teacher's deposits should be considered his personal property and should be at his disposal, together with interest accumulations, if he withdraws from teaching service. His deposits should be considered a savings account until the amount is transferred into the retirement fund at the time of retirement upon an annuity.

The number of retirement systems which incorporate this principle has increased during the last decade. (132: 44.) Eleven of the twenty state-wide teacher retirement systems supported partly or wholly by teachers' deposits provide for the return of such deposits

upon withdrawal from teaching service. (127.)

References. 5: 269; 21: 142; 22: 125; 46: 662; 113: 221-32*; 126: 155; 127*: 132: 44, 49; 161: 18.

7. *Why should a teacher's deposits be payable to his heirs or estate in case of death prior to retirement?*—In case of death the deductions from the teacher's salary which have been deposited in the retirement system should, together with the interest accumulated, be payable either to his designated beneficiary or to his estate. These deposits should be looked upon as a trust fund which belongs to the teacher and as a means whereby every teacher is able to build up an estate. Under no circumstances should a teacher forfeit his rights in this fund.

There has been a steady trend during the last twenty-five years towards the acceptance of this principle in practice. A majority of the state-wide teacher retirement systems which are supported entirely or in part by teacher's deposits now provide for the payment of the accumulated deposits with interest to his heirs or estate in case of death prior to retirement. (127; 132: 45.)

References. 22: 125; 46: 662; 84: 285; 126: 155; 127*: 132: 45, 49*; 161: 18.

8. *Why should an age for compulsory retirement be fixed?*—A considerable proportion of the recently enacted retirement laws specify seventy as the compulsory age for the retirement of all teachers. The weight of retirement theory, and to a growing extent that of practice, argues that a retirement system is more likely to promote general school efficiency and the welfare of children if the law specifies an age beyond which teachers may not remain in service. Without such a provision the retirement system may fail to accomplish its purposes in an appreciable number of cases. Some teachers may wish to remain in service too long, with the result that the paths of promotion are blocked and the efficiency of the service is lowered. It is doubtless true that the fixing of the compulsory retirement age may in exceptional instances, cause the retirement of teachers or school executives who, in spite of advanced age, are still wholly competent. The

benefits which may come from allowing such exceptional teachers to continue in service will probably be more than offset by the far larger numbers who are likely to continue in service too long if a compulsory age for retirement is not stated. This is particularly true if some advanced age such as seventy is fixed. The number of teachers and school executives who are able properly to discharge the exacting duties of the classroom or the school executive's office after seventy is probably not large.

References. 21: 146; 113: 394-6; 126: 154; 127*: 149: 84; 150: 128; 161: 18; 176: 63*.

9. *Why should a periodic actuarial investigation of the retirement system be made?*—The amounts to be paid into a retirement system in order to guarantee the benefits promised, are based upon careful actuarial calculations. These calculations, based upon past experience and exact facts, constitute the best prediction which can be made as to what amounts and rates should be fixed. From time to time it may be necessary to revise these estimates in order to preserve the financial soundness of the system. Such revisions usually involve comparatively small changes in the amounts and rates paid. In order that these small but important revisions may be made from time to time periodic actuarial investigations are necessary. Nine of the state-wide teacher retirement laws now in effect provide for such investigations at from three to five year periods. These accountings are essential to guarantee the financial solvency of retirement systems organized on the actuarial reserve basis.

References. 16: 12-13*; 84: 286; 113: 353; 126: 155; 127*: 132: 17, 48; 157: 43.

10. *Why should provision be made for retirement for disability?*—The presence in classrooms of teachers whose effectiveness has been seriously lowered by physical disability is bound to have a detrimental effect upon the children involved. Such a possibility is guarded against when a retirement system provides for a disability allowance for all teachers who become disabled after a reasonable period of service. The provision of such an allowance makes it practical for school boards to retire

promptly teachers who become disabled. It makes it unnecessary for such teachers to continue to work under a serious physical handicap.

Most of the retirement systems established during the last decade provide retirement for disability. (132: 40.) Practically all of the twenty-two state-wide teacher retirement systems now include such a provision. The better organized systems usually provide that teachers who become disabled after a reasonable period of service receive: (1) an annuity representing the actuarial equivalent of the teacher's accumulated deposits; and (2) a pension from the state which increases the total disability allowance up to an adequate amount, usually somewhat proportionate to length of service, but somewhat less than the allowance the teacher would have received had he continued in service sufficiently long to qualify for regular retirement.

Certain safe-guards are necessary to protect the disability allowance feature from abuse. Proper physical standards should be enforced at the time of entrance into the profession. Practically all of the sound retirement systems require a minimum period of service, usually from ten to fifteen years, before a teacher may qualify for disability retirement. (127.) On the other hand, it is recognized that school efficiency demands that the number of obstructions placed in the way of retiring disabled teachers should be kept to the minimum. (22: 126; 21: 142-3, 46: 662; 84: 285; 113: 189). During the last decade there has been a tendency to reduce the number of years of service required before a teacher may be retired for disability. (132: 41.)

References. 5: 266; 20: 94; 24: 143; 46: 662; 63: 10-11; 113: 172, 174*; 126: 155; 127*; 132: 40, 49; 157: 35; 161: 18; 176: 78, 81*.

11. *Why should public funds be used to pay for prior-service benefits?*—It is usually impractical to enact a retirement system without making some provision for teachers who have already rendered extended service and for whom no provision has been made for retirement. It is also impractical for these teachers, many of whom have probably received relatively low incomes during their service, to meet

the cost of paying for such service allowances as may be granted because of service rendered previous to the enactment of the retirement system.

The alternative is for the state to assume the obligation of financing such prior service allowances as are provided for these older teachers. The amount of this obligation is usually large when considered as a total. When its cost is spread over a period of thirty years or more, however, the requirement in any one year is not excessive.

The retirement system which neglects this problem or which pays the cost of prior service allowances out of the deposits of teachers without prior service is on the road to bankruptcy. This problem of providing for prior service should be frankly faced at the time the retirement system is put into effect.

A majority of recently enacted teacher retirement systems pay for the prior service retirement allowance from public funds. When to this is added the allowance regularly due on the basis of service following the enactment of the retirement system, not only are the older teachers provided reasonable protection, but the retirement system is kept on a sound financial basis. A majority of the retirement systems enacted during the last ten years have provided for the financing of prior service benefits along the general lines suggested above. (132: 17.)

References. 63: 9; 96: 15-16*; 113: 443; 126: 156; 127*; 132: 17, 48*; 176: 129-30.

12. *Why should provision be made for co-operative or reciprocal relations with other sound teacher retirement systems?*—The efficiency of the schools demands that nothing should prevent the free exchange of teachers between different states. Such an interchange of administrative and teaching personnel provides a desirable commerce of progressive ideas and educational practices. It should be possible for a properly qualified teacher to render service in any state of the United States or its territories, without being penalized by a reduced retirement allowance due to change of service from one jurisdiction to another. Complete application of this principle must await the enactment of sound retirement legislation

in all states. It is, of course, impossible to include states with unsound systems or with no retirement systems in any reciprocal arrangements worked out. Every sound retirement system, however, should provide for cooperation

with other sound systems and should look forward to the time when all states will have such systems.

References. 20: 97*; 96: 12-13; 140: 591-2*; 161: 20-21; 176: 58-9.

Discussion of Table 10

Sources of School Revenue

1. *Why should the state board of education control the investment of the permanent school fund?*—Two issues are involved in this question: first, whether permanent school funds should be controlled by state authorities; and second, if state control is in effect, whether the state board of education is the proper agency for handling the fund. The majority of school finance experts assume an affirmative position on both of these issues. With respect to state versus local control, experience clearly favors the former. State control is the safer and more economical procedure. When the public school endowments were first created the control of all school lands and their proceeds was, in many states, vested exclusively in local, county, or township jurisdictions. But so unsatisfactory and wasteful was this arrangement that it has been avoided, modified, or abandoned in all but one state. However, in fourteen states small portions of the permanent school funds are still locally administered. (43: 295.) In some states a constitutional amendment is necessary before this criterion can be met.

Since both theory and practice point to state control of the permanent school fund, it seems logical that the agency to which the care and investment of these funds is committed should be the agency which is most interested in their preservation. This would in most cases be the state board of education. It should be added, however, that this criterion may need to be modified in those states where the state board of education is but poorly developed. The criterion applies most clearly in states with a modern type of state school organization such as is outlined in the discussion of Tables 13 and 14 below.

References. 43: 295; 46: 411; 178: 120*; 179: 241*; 180: 39; 182: 129; 191: 496; 201: 462.

2. *Why should the investment of the per-*

manent school fund in bonds of the state be prohibited?—Largely because this and similar safeguards have been neglected, the permanent school funds in many states have dwindled to an insignificant fraction of their former potential value. Swift, who has written the standard history of these funds summarizes thus:

The permanent funds and the proceeds which should have been added to them have been cared for so carelessly, diverted, squandered, wasted, and embezzled so shamefully that what ought to be a magnificent endowment, whose income would today be yielding an appreciable relief from taxation, has dwindled to an almost negligible sum, or exists as a permanent State debt on which interest is paid out of taxes levied on the present generation. (178: 11).

It may be too late to take steps to regain the losses from the state permanent school funds, but if so the obligation to safeguard the fraction which remains is all the more heavy. Experience shows that one way in which the state school funds have been lost has been through lending them to the state itself in return for state bonds or other obligations. When this has been done the money has frequently never been returned to the funds and constitutes in many states, a fictitious permanent school fund, uncollectible, unredeemable, and unnegotiable, and in reality nothing more than an additional source of taxation (136: 339). For these reasons the permanent school fund should not be used to purchase bonds of the state itself or, for that matter, diverted from its original purpose in any other way.

References. 43: 296-7; 46: 411; 167: 68-9*; 178: 156*; 179: 98-9, 208-9; 180: 39; 181: 150-2; 183: 41-2; 191: 496; 201: 462; 224, Vol. 2: 74.

3. *Why should all losses from the permanent school fund be made good from income or special appropriations?*—This is merely another method of safeguarding what is left of

the public school endowments and of fulfilling the obvious intention of the laws which created these funds. Even with the most careful management losses from the funds are possible and in the rare cases where losses occur they should be at once replaced in actual cash or negotiable securities so that the funds suffer no further diminution. This procedure was recommended in the survey of Alabama (191: 496) and is in effect in several states, including New York (178: 349).

References. 46: 411; 178: 128, 349*; 191: 496.

4. *Why should a unified state education budget be prepared?*—The preparation of an education budget is required by board rules in some states, by statute in others, and by custom in others. Whatever method is used the budget should be carefully evolved as a financial expression of the whole educational program of the state. It should recognize the needs of all parts of the school system, should anticipate revenues, and show clearly how much money is needed and for what purposes. An educational budget is one of the recommendations frequently made by state school surveys. The survey of Arkansas by the United States Bureau of Education points out that "the importance of having and living up to a budget is no less in educational affairs than in the conduct of other public or private business. Furthermore, the preparation of a budget furnishes an additional reason for a unified state system of education." (195: 13.) Experience indicates that failure to prepare a co-ordinated education budget opens the way for probable conflicts among school interests and that the result of such conflicts in the long run is an inevitable loss of public confidence in the state educational leaders and their policies.

References. 11: 201; 17: 180; 23: 150; 56: 185; 64: 93, 122; 134: 126, 138; 177: 16; 180: 124-5*; 181: 2, 195; 182: 126; 183: 69; 194: 365; 195: 12-13.

5. *Why should the total amount of state school aid be determined in such a way that it increases with increased attendance or other similar measures of educational need?*—School attendance is probably one of the best measures of educational need but if a state adjusts the amount of state aid in accordance with any

other measure of needs it should be classed as meeting this criterion. The amount of money available for education should vary with the need. California is a satisfactory illustration of what is meant by this statement. In that state the amount of state school aid for any given year is fixed at \$30.00 for each unit of average daily attendance in the year preceding. This amount is determined by the State Superintendent of Public Instruction and must then be transferred from the general funds of the state to the school funds. An arrangement of this type obviates the necessity of organizing a campaign for state school support every time the legislature meets. It helps to form a continuous educational policy because the school aid can be accurately predicted and depended upon. It also protects the schools from shortsighted and politically motivated "economy" campaigns.

What happens when the state school aid is fixed rather than flexible is well described by Swift:

The law provides no assurance that the state will furnish a sum adequate to pay the subsidies called for in the provisions of the act. On the contrary, the law specifically provides that in case the state fund is not sufficient . . . the state grants shall be reduced proportionately . . . The schools are promised aid for certain projects, they undertake these projects, the moneys promised by the state are not forthcoming, and state aid is prorated . . . Such uncertainty directly and immediately affect the stability and continuity of school policies and school standards. (179: 62, 198).

Practically all school finance authorities agree with this point of view and assert that a flexible state school fund which increases with school needs is an important element in providing good schools.

References. 46: 432-3; 119: 55; 117: 67; 123: 29; 135: 61*; 136: 279-80; 143: 47; 164: 45; 169: 126; 171, *Supplement*, Vol. 2: 35; 179: 62, 198; 180: 77-9, 126; 181: 34-5, 195; 182: 108; 187: 83-4; 194: 69; 215: 284.

6. *Why are constitutional maximal limitations on local or state school taxes undesirable?*—A constitutional provision is always difficult to change, especially when this involves possible increases in public expenditures. No matter how essential the need may be, the inertia of a constitutional provision may delay ad-

justments for years. No one can see far enough into the future to set arbitrary and permanent limits to the development of public education. It follows that constitutional school tax limitations are unwise.

In many states, the constitutionally imposed school tax limits are themselves in direct conflict with another section of the constitution which orders the legislature to provide a system of public schools "free and equally open to all." In many states the local school districts are not only being called upon to bear a larger and larger share of total school costs but through constitutional tax limitations it is impossible for any but the largest and wealthiest districts to maintain good schools. These limitations, often fixed years ago when schools were undeveloped and pioneer conditions prevailed, hamper the development of a state school system adequate for modern conditions of life.

References. 1:231; 43: 311; 89: 259*; 136: 359*; 167: 57; 179: 98, 129; 180: 35, 81, 127; 182: 39; 183: 54-5; 194: 364; 195: 8; 215: 278.

7, 8. *Why should the general property tax be supplemented by state, personal, and business income taxes?*—This question embodies the major recommendations made by a committee of the National Tax Association appointed to prepare a plan for a model system of state and local taxation (130: 400-700). The general principles involved in the model plan have been widely approved by economists and taxation experts. It is safe to say that the plan represents a consensus of the best modern theory and practice in taxation.

With respect to the personal income tax, the committee declared:

This tax is better fitted than any other to carry out the principle that every person having taxable ability shall make a reasonable contribution to the support of the government under which he lives. It is as fair in principle as any tax can be. Under proper conditions it can be well administered by an American state. . . . It is a form of taxation which meets with popular favor at present. (130: 437).

Again, with respect to the business income tax, the committee said:

. . . we are convinced that a properly constituted

business tax must be included in our proposed system of taxation. . . . The committee is not recommending anything novel to American experience, but is merely proposing to reorganize upon a rational and equal basis a form of taxation that is now prevalent. . . . It may be well to add that . . . there are precedents in the legislation of other countries. (130: 452).

Sweeping condemnations of the practice of relying principally on the general property tax have been made by many noted tax specialists and no well-known student of taxation gives the general property tax unqualified approval. Seligman for instance declares that "the general property tax in the United States is a dismal failure" (160: 31), and that "the general property tax as actually administered is beyond all doubt one of the worst taxes known in the civilized world." (160: 62.) Quotations to a similar effect might be multiplied almost indefinitely. It therefore seems logical to suggest that a supplementary tax on income is the next step in advance over taxation of property exclusively.

Improved methods of taxation have a definite relation to an effective state school system. Good schools cannot be created merely by the application of faith, hope, and charity. Financial support is also necessary and, since public funds are derived almost entirely from taxation, the schools can never be adequately financed if the methods of taxation are ineffective. Accordingly we find in practically all state school surveys some reference to the financing of education and many of these surveys, such as those of Kentucky (1: 251, 49: 82) and Indiana (88: 111) recommend the enactment of an income tax law.

References. 1: 251-5; 30, Vol. 1: 320; 31: 81; 46: 425-7; 49: 82-4; 57: 150; 88: 111; 89: 256; 344, 379-81; 114: 322; 115: 41; 119: 59; 121: 80; 130: 429-66*; 136: 351; 142: 79; 143: 20, 47; 147: 124, 149; 156: 160-1; 160: 649*; 164: 50; 166: 161-2; 167: 76-7; 171, Vol. 1: 32-5; 175: 157-9*; 179: 98-9, 207-8; 180: 32-3, 79, 194-5; 181: 147-8; 182: 209; 183: 100; 191: 506; 194: 69; 195: 10; 201: 497-8; 224, Vol. 2: 69.

9. *Why should there be a permanent state tax commission or tax commissioner?*—A state tax commission is a central authority which assesses, levies, and collects all state taxes, (in-

cluding income, inheritance, property, and other taxes) and which has general supervisory powers over the assessment of all property subject to local taxation. The criterion implied in this question is not met by a state with a nominal or ex-officio tax commission or commissioner the activities of which are limited to perfunctory annual approval of local assessment rolls. Before answering this question in the affirmative one should consider whether there is a state tax commission which really conserves the interest of the state in a just and effective tax system.

The desirability of a permanent tax commission in every state is no longer a matter for argument among recognized authorities on public finance. It is universally accepted. For instance, committees of the National Tax Association have repeatedly urged the creation of such bodies with resources and authority to enable them to do effective work. (130: 463, 104: 363-376.) The committee on a model system of taxation mentioned above states that no system of taxation "can be expected to give satisfactory results in states which refuse to place in the hands of some permanent central authority the administration of taxes upon incomes and inheritances, the original assessment of certain classes of property, and general supervisory power over the assessment of all property subject to local taxation." (130: 463.)

In 1921 state tax commissions were nominally organized in states (160: 610), but it is said that in over half of these the board is merely a perfunctory approving body and in only a half dozen states are the commissions adequately paid, efficiently selected, or endowed with any real power (89: 245).

References. 89: 245; 97: 3; 104: 363-76; 120: 10; 130: 463*; 135: 24-5, 101-2; 136: 356; 156: 161-2; 160: 610*; 169: 86; 175: 157; 179: 98-9; 180: 127; 191: 506; 225, Vol. 3: 71.

10. *Why should all local school units be required to levy a school tax?*—This question need not be applied to the smallest states which present a special problem because of their limited areas (e. g. Rhode Island, Delaware). Other states, whether or not they have a large amount of state school aid, should be able to

answer this question in the affirmative. If the amount of state aid is small the local districts should be required to levy a tax sufficient to maintain a reasonable educational program. If the amount of state aid is relatively large, the local districts should still be required to levy a tax at some fixed legal minimum rate in order to maintain local public interest in the school. This does not mean that the minimum rate should become a maximum (See question 6, above). Nor does it mean that small local school districts represent ideal units for school taxation. Experience shows, however, that if the local unit (district, county, town, or township) does not contribute to school support there is grave danger of public apathy towards public education. State school aid should not be regarded as a benevolence which the community needs only to accept and then forget. Whether the amount of state school aid be large or small a minimum local tax is generally thought desirable. Thus in Kentucky the mandatory local school tax law of 1920, was described "as a landmark in the educational history of the state" (11: 142) and such a law has been recommended by numerous authorities.

References. 11: 142; 43: 311; 179: 128-9; 180: 35-6, 58, 127; 181: 192; 182: 36-9; 183: 52; 194: 364; 195: 9; 224, Vol. 2: 124.

11. *Why should school boards of all tax-levying school units be fiscally independent?*—Fiscal independence, as applied for instance to a city school district, means that the school board independently determines the city school budget and levies or orders levied a tax sufficient to meet the educational needs of the city as expressed in the budget. When a school board is fiscally independent there is no danger of arbitrary alterations in the school budget by a town council, mayor, city finance committee, or any other non-educational board or person. The board of education is directly responsible to the public which it serves. Fiscal independence is right in principle for it recognizes that the school is not a municipal or county department but a separate unit of the state.

The principle of fiscal independence has not yet been universally accepted but it "has been urged generally by those who may be regarded as authorities in educational administration and

finance." (46: 440.) Their conclusions are based upon experience and upon comparative studies of city school costs. Frasier compared schools in 71 cities having fiscally dependent school systems with 91 cities having fiscally independent school systems. He found that, while there was considerable overlapping, "a fiscally independent school system has a better chance to achieve success than one in which the finances are in the hands of the city government." (60: 81.) McGaughy studied school costs in 178 fiscally independent and 97 fiscally dependent city school systems. He found that the costs to the community of the schools administered under the two forms of organization were approximately equal. (108: 55-56.) Other studies have yielded similar conclusions. That is, there is no evidence that fiscal independence leads to extravagance while there is evidence that it makes for better schools.

Theory, experience, and scientific investigations combine in favoring fiscal independence for city, county, and district school boards. Most of the arguments advanced against fiscal independence erroneously assume that schools are municipal or local activities whereas it is an established principle that education in the United States is a state responsibility.

References. 10: 203; 30, Vol. 1: 129; 46: 439; 56: 163-4; 60: 83-7*; 64: 88-9; 108: 46, 55-6; 114: 35; 136: 181, 193; 175: 181-2*; 180: 193; 182: 192-3; 190: 35-7; 194: 88-9; 215: 262.

12. *Why should non-public schools, not conducted for profit, be exempted from taxation on building and grounds used for instructional purposes?*—The justification of this criterion rests on the fact that private and parochial schools relieve the state and local districts of considerable public expense. Of course, educational institutions which are conducted for profit should not be exempted from taxation. Nor is it reasonable to exempt all the property of an educational institution with many other non-educational activities merely because a part of that property is used for non-profit educational purposes. But if the state department of education or other state authority can be shown that the property in question is really used for educational purposes and that no person or corporation derives profit from its use it is fair

to exempt it from taxation. Such general exemption, however, will not extend to assessments for local improvements. (186: 265.)

Provisions to this general effect are incorporated in the Constitutions of 32 states. (103: 102.)

References. 45: 212; 46: 714, 717*; 103: 102; 186: 265.

13. *Why should the law prohibit bonding for current operating expenses?*—It is manifestly unjust to incur an indebtedness on the future for the everyday expenses of the present. School bonds should be issued only for purposes of major capital outlays. Bonds are devices for spreading the cost of large-scale and permanent improvements over a long period of time, so that the wealth of the future may contribute to the payment for improvements which are valuable not only today but also in the future. If bonds are issued to pay current expenses on a long-term basis they represent an unjust extortion of money from future citizens. If bonds are issued for a short term they are disadvantageous because they must soon be paid back and the interest charges represent a clear loss. Hence, bonds issued for the payment of current expenses are either unjust to the future or unwise for the present. Issuance for such purposes should be prohibited.

This statement does not condemn the occasional practice, where it is necessary, of short-term borrowing by school boards. Nor should this question or the preceding discussion be interpreted as questioning the issuance of school bonds for purchasing sites, or for erecting, repairing, furnishing, expanding, improving, or insuring school buildings, or (in cases of unusual necessity) for refunding outstanding indebtedness.

The laws of nearly all states forbid bonding for current expenditures. However, in 1921, 13 states permitted school districts to use the money raised by bonds for general maintenance of schools and 4 states permitted bond money to be used to pay teachers' salaries. (59: 22.) These practices were condemned by the surveys of Oklahoma (194: 112), Illinois (220: 47), and Florida (57: 97).

References. 43: 311; 57: 97; 59: 16*; 64: 139; 136: 153*; 194: 112; 220: 47.

14. *Why should school district bonds be of the serial type?*—Bonds are classified, according to the way in which the principal matures, as *term* and *serial*. A term bond issue is payable only at maturity. If a district borrows, say, \$20,000 for twenty years by issuing term bonds the entire principal and interest will fall due twenty years from date of sale and must be paid then and not before. To meet this obligation the district ordinarily levies a special tax each year, the proceeds of which are placed in a sinking fund. If the sinking fund is invested it should be sufficient, with interest, to pay the debt.

Serial bonds, on the other hand, mature over a period of time; that is, a certain number of bonds are redeemed each year. Both term and serial bonds ordinarily require a special tax to redeem them, but only the term bonds require a sinking fund. With serial bonds the special tax collected each year is immediately used to redeem the portion of the total bond issue which falls due at that time. With term bonds the interest charge is constant; with serial bonds the interest charge is constantly decreasing. (46: 531, 59: 78, 136: 163.)

State school finance surveys including those of New York (175: 190) Illinois, (179: 99) and others universally recommend the serial type of bond issue. Fowlkes (59: 78-84) has summarized the advantage of serial bond issues. Theoretically, the total payments should be the same under either the serial or sinking-

fund plan. But actually serial bonds are more economical because they command a better market than term bonds. The dangers of loss, mismanagement, or actual misuse of the sinking fund used to redeem term bonds make the latter a poorer investment for the buyer and consequently more expensive for the district issuing them. Furthermore, serial type bonds are administratively and politically advantageous. Among the states which have enacted laws requiring that school bond issues be retired on a serial basis are Massachusetts, New Jersey, North Carolina, Wisconsin, and Ohio. (59: 83.)

References. 46: 531; 47: 590; 57: 100; 59: 78-84*; 64: 139-40; 88: 64; 89: 472, 515*; 136: 163, 5*; 159: 191; 175: 190; 178: 79, 83*; 179: 99; 180: 196-7; 182: 44; 183: 56-7; 187: 109; 194: 115; 201: 445; 220: 31.

15. *Why should the state department of education maintain a policy of continuous study of the most effective and equitable methods of securing revenue for schools?*—Proper fiscal policies are fundamental to a successful state school system. For this reason the chief state school official and his staff should take a definite interest in the matter of school revenues in particular and public revenues in general. The general functions of a state board and department of education are more fully described and additional references are given in the discussion of question 13 of Table 1, page 99.

Discussion of Table 11

Apportionment of State School Funds

1. *Why should a minimum local school tax-rate be fixed?*—This question has been answered from the revenue point of view in the discussion of item 9, Table 10, above. The minimum local school tax has significance and value also from the point of view of apportionment of the state school funds. The purposes for which a state school fund may be created and distributed are three:

(a) To participate in the support of education by tapping large-scale sources of revenue which are not readily available to the local units.

(b) To stimulate local units to provide good

schools by making the state aid a reward for effort.

(c) To equalize the burdens and benefits of education among the local units.

Most of the systems for the apportionment of state school funds which are now in use combine all three of these purposes. However, the general trend, both in theory and practice, is to emphasize the principles of participation and equalization and to minimize the purpose of stimulation.

Whether the system of apportionment emphasizes participation, stimulation, or equali-

zation, however, a fixed minimum local school tax is a necessary element in the whole scheme of state school finance. If the purpose of the state fund is to participate in local school support it must have some local support as a basis. Again, if its purpose is to stimulate local school units through rewards for good conditions the state fund will be apportioned, in general, to the units with the higher school tax-rates. Finally if the principle of equalization be accepted the fixing of a minimum local school tax-rate is a necessary first step in arranging for a minimum program of equality in educational opportunity. It appears entirely reasonable to ask every local unit to make a certain minimum effort to support education and then for the state as a whole to make up whatever more is needed to carry out the minimum program (30, Vol. 1: 241).

References. 10: 182; 11: 197; 30, Vol. 1: 237, 341; 39: 709-10; 47: 570; 56: 175; 57: 180; 114: 320; 117: 73; 119: 55; 120: 12; 122: 96; 123: 17*; 135: 5; 164: 40; 169: 155-6; 175: 174; 179: 98, 208; 180: 38, 80; 181: 151; 182: 111; 183: 65; 194: 364; 195: 9; 201: 481; 223: 338; 225, Vol. 1: 240.

2. *Why should there be an equalizing apportionment which recognizes differences in local financial ability to support schools?*—Investigations have repeatedly shown that localities differ enormously in their ability to buy education for their children. For instance, the recent survey of Utah showed that in order to raise a sum of approximately \$70.00 per child, one district would need to levy a tax on the true valuation of its property of only 4.35 mills while another district could raise this amount only by a tax of 25.39 mills. When inequalities in assessments were added to these estimates the differences were even more striking (201: 435). Similar illustrations for other states may be drawn from almost any one of the state school surveys which touch on school finance problems. It has become quite evident that the only way to equalize these inequalities is to apportion the state school aid, or part of it, so that the wealthier communities receive proportionately less and the poorer communities receive proportionately more from the state.

Out of these conditions there has gradually been evolved the principle of equalized educa-

tional opportunity. The equalization principle as applied to education means that every child must be offered a reasonable educational opportunity and that no community shall bankrupt itself to provide this opportunity. Putting this principle into practice necessitates expert advice and direction. Reduced to its essentials however, the operation of the equalization principle involves: (a) the fixing of a minimum educational program to be provided throughout the state, (b) estimating of the cost of this minimum program, (c) fixing a minimum local tax-rate, (d) discovering the amount needed in each local unit which, when added to the amount raised by the minimum local tax, will provide the minimum educational program.

There are few points on which more unanimous agreement among educators is evidenced than on the essential justice and wisdom of the equalization principle. It is this principle which lies back of the slogan, "The wealth of the state must educate the children of the state." The equalization principle has been incorporated in the recommendations of one state-survey after another and it has been adopted in practice, at least to a limited degree, by all but three states (13: 23).

Although practically every state can meet the criterion implied in this question, it does not follow that conditions in these states with respect to the state school fund apportionment are perfect. In many states the total amounts of the state school funds are so small as to have a negligible effect in equalizing educational opportunity throughout the state. In others, large portions of the state school moneys are still apportioned on antiquated and thoroughly discredited bases. This criterion therefore should bring into the self-survey the whole question of the adequacy and effectiveness of the state aid provided for educational purposes. The other questions in the checklist may similarly become the starting point for more extensive investigations.

References. 1: 241; 10: 181-2; 11: 140-1; 13: 23, 63, 208; 23: 145; 30, Vol. 1: 324-5; 31: 91; 39: 705; 43: 303-5; 44: 252; 46: 472-84; 47: 570; 56: 175; 57: 153; 88: 93, 113; 97: 44; 114: 318; 119: 55; 120: 13; 121: 39; 122: 90, 93-4; 123: 16*; 134: 13, 121; 135: 8, 33; 136: 302-3; 139: 25; 143: 21-2; 156: 163;

159: 264; 164: 37; 167: 52; 169: 25; 171, Supplement, Vol. 2: 6; 175: 174; 179: 78, 207, 285; 180: 18, 65, 130, 183; 181: 152, 181; 182: 82, 158, 204; 183: 107; 187: 94; 192: 41; 194: 43; 195: 10; 201: 473-4; 215: 280; 225, Vol. 3: 110-18*.

3. *Why should the state apportionment amount to at least 20 percent of the operating cost of public schools?*—The proportionate participation of the state in school support is a question upon which various opinions exist. Pittinger points out that up to 1920 the United States Bureau of Education, in its state school surveys, usually recommended that the State should provide about one-third of the total expenditures for school maintenance. (136: 278) More recent studies, however, have reached the conclusion that the proper share of costs to be assumed by the state could not be determined arbitrarily and uniformly. Swift, however, after pointing out the necessity for making a special study of each State, concludes that "upon the basis of present conditions it seems safe to say that the proportion of the total expenditure to be borne by the state would range far beyond the suggested one-third perhaps leaving little more than one-third to be borne by the local unit." (181: 191) Cubberley states that most students of educational finance would agree that under modern conditions of wealth distribution from 40 to 60 percent of the maintenance cost for elementary and secondary education ought to come from state sources. (46: 436) While the necessity of avoiding sweeping generalizations is recognized, it appears entirely safe to assert that no state should contribute less than 20 percent of the total cost of education; states should contribute a far greater proportion of the total cost.

Determination of the amount which a given state should contribute to public education is a task for which expert technical assistance is necessary. However, assuming complete acceptance of the equalization principle, the essential factors in fixing the amount of financial support needed from the state are two in number. First, other things being equal, the higher minimum state-wide educational program is fixed the larger will need to be the amount of the state equalization fund. Second, other things being equal, the greater the differences

which exist among local school units with respect to their ability to pay for schools the greater the state equalization fund will need to be.

Recent state school finance studies distinguish two methods of distributing state aid. The "small fund" method awards poorer communities more than wealthy communities. The "large fund" method which is at present used by most of the states gives financial aid to local units according to their educational need. The ability of the local district to pay for the support of schools is not considered. The effectiveness of the large fund method increases with the proportionate amount of the state school fund. If the state assumed the entire support of public education, the large fund method would completely equalize the minimum educational program in all parts of the state. As long as the large fund method is used, therefore, the larger the percentage of state aid, the better degree of equalization. (123: 25).

The states differ widely among themselves in the proportion of total school revenue which they contribute. In the United States as a whole in 1925-26 only 15 percent came from state sources. In Delaware 81.5 percent was the state's contribution; in Kansas, 0.2 percent. Three states contributed less than 1 percent, twelve states contributed less than 5 percent, 35 states contributed less than 25 percent, only one state contributed over 40 percent. Practically all authorities on school agree that, under present conditions and considering the nation as a whole, state contributions to public schools are not yet sufficient in amount to provide children with an educational opportunity fully adequate to modern needs.

References. 1: 233; 10: 184-5; 11: 143-4; 23: 144; 30, Vol. 1: 319-22, 325; 46: 436*; 57: 153; 117: 102; 120: 28; 135: 18; 136: 279-80*; 143: 24; 167: 47; 169: 112; 171, Supplement, Vol. 2: 5; 175: 175; 179: 87, 99, 209; 180: 29, 77, 192; 181: 146, 191*; 182: 107; 183: 89; 187: 90; 189: 63; 190: 56; 194: 67; 196: 45; 202: 126; 225, Vol. 1: 239.

4. *Why should census or enrolment statistics as bases for apportionment be avoided?*—Cubberley in his pioneer study of state aid pointed out nearly a quarter of a century ago that ap-

portionment of state school funds in terms of school census or enrolment statistics represented a primitive step in the development of state school finance. (44: 250.) Census data are of little value in determining the need of local units for education largely because varying density of population brings about great disparity in the cost of education per child. The census basis is equally unsatisfactory from the point of view of stimulating local effort. It offers no incentive to any community to do anything beyond getting every possible child enumerated so that the state aid may be greater. Once the children are on the census rolls, a short-sighted and penurious community may neglect to educate them. Administratively, too, the plan has its disadvantages. Private and parochial school children for whom the community makes no provision whatever at public expense are counted in the census. Furthermore falsifications of the census returns are likely to be made and when made are difficult to detect. Most of the objections to the use of school census data apply with equal force to the use of the enrolment basis for apportioning state school funds.

With these and other considerations in mind the use of school census and enrolment data for apportionment purposes has been severely condemned by many school surveys and other authoritative statements. After studying Wisconsin conditions, Superintendent Callahan concluded that "the school enrolment as a basis for the distribution of state school funds would fail dismally to provide equality of educational opportunity." (18: 29.) The Maryland survey of 1916 concluded that "apportionment on the basis of population aggravates inequalities instead of mitigating them." (56: 135.) Singleton, in his study of Georgia school finance, states that the census basis of apportionment, "although one of the most commonly

employed in the United States, is no longer defended even by those states which employ it." (164: 6.) Sowers condemns the census basis as "inequitable and unscientific" (167: 71). Swift and Goldthorpe in their studies of educational finance in the South describe the school population basis as "ineffective, unjust, antiquated, and disastrous" (180: 128). Pittinger states that the effect of the census basis of apportionment has been "to stimulate non-attendance, cheap teaching, and local inertia." (136: 329.)

However, these antiquated methods of apportionment are in many cases fixed in the state constitution and are therefore difficult to abolish in spite of their general condemnation. Baldwin in 1927 reported that the "enumeration" basis was in use in some degree in 30 states.

References. 1: 238; 10: 179; 11: 137; 13: 21-2; 19: 89; 23: 145-6; 30, Vol. 1: 325; 31: 91; 39: 707*; 43: 301; 44: 250-1*; 46: 483-4; 47: 584-5; 56: 175-6; 64: 75; 88: 94*; 97: 46; 114: 320; 117: 101; 122: 92; 123: 14*; 135: 38-40; 136: 329; 139: 28; 164: 6; 167: 71-2; 169: 27; 171, Supplement, Vol. 2: 12; 179: 76; 147, 284; 180: 18, 65, 128, 197; 181: 118, 193; 182: 111, 204; 183: 105; 187: 83; 189: 63; 190: 56; 191: 499; 192: 38; 194: 364; 195: 10; 196: 46; 201: 471; 202: 128; 215: 282; 223: 338-9; 225, Vol. 3: 110-11.

5. *Why should the state department of education conduct a systematic and continuous study of the effect of the system of state apportionments on the welfare of the schools?*—See discussion of item 13, Table 1, page 99, for consideration of the general principle implied in this question.

References. 23: 146; 120: 13; 180: 77; 181: 192.

Discussion of Table 12

Material and Equipment

1. *Why should the state department of education include a division of schoolhousing or a school architect?*—Financial, sanitary, and educational considerations justify the assumption of some degree of state leadership and control in the matter of schoolhouse construction. The present value of school property in the United States is estimated at \$6,000,000,000. School buildings represent a large and increasing investment of public money and it is definitely to the interest of the state that this investment be wisely made. King and Updegraff estimated that in seven years the School Buildings Bureau of Pennsylvania had saved the state over \$700,000 while the expense of the Bureau was only \$75,000. (97: 188.)

The best investment in school plants also means the provision of the safest, most healthful school buildings and equipment and the best adaptation of the buildings to the needs of children as formulated by a progressive educational outlook. In order to assume the proper measure of leadership and control over school buildings the state should provide for the inclusion of a division of schoolhousing in its department of education. The precise function of such a division will vary from state to state. The purposes of the Division of School Buildings and Grounds in Arkansas are illustrative (79: 94):

1. To prepare plans of school ground development.
2. To furnish generalized building plans to rural and village school officials.
3. To furnish preliminary sketches of floor plans for larger buildings which present special problems.
4. To check architects' plans for school buildings on request.
5. To advise school officials as to plans for remodeling, repairing, and altering school buildings and as to interior arrangement, furniture, and equipment.
6. To advise teachers and superintendents as to interior arrangement, furniture, and equipment.

A well devised and executed program of state leadership in school building matters will not result in curtailing local initiative in desirable directions. The larger school districts

remain free to develop their own plans in accordance with their needs and facilities. The state will merely assert its right to fix minimum standards of safety, sanitation, and educational adequacy and will stand ready to assist and advise the local authorities and architects in going beyond these minima and in developing new types of building construction.

States which have a division of schoolhousing or a school architect in the state department of education will answer question 1 of Table 12 in the affirmative. This answer should not be interpreted as proof that conditions are perfect with respect to state control of school buildings. This question naturally leads one to inquire how the division is functioning, whether it receives adequate financial support for its important work, whether it has good working relations with related state departments and with other divisions in the state department of education, and whether the personnel of the division is adequate in numbers and training. The other questions in Table 12 may also be analyzed in a similar fashion.

Practically all general state school surveys include a reference to the desirability of providing for state leadership in school building matters. The recommendations of the 1926 survey of Utah by the United States Office of Education are typical:

The next decade will be a critical one so far as building is concerned, and an adequate building department in the office of the state superintendent will undoubtedly pay for itself many times over. (201: 393.)

Complete or partial administration of the state regulations governing school buildings is not always delegated to the state board of education, but the trend is clearly in that direction. The arguments in favor of giving control in matters of school buildings to the state board of education rather than to any other state authority are:

1. All state school matters should be centralized in one body—the state board of education.
2. State educational authorities are comparatively free from political complications.
3. Other state authorities consider the school as only one, and perhaps a minor, aspect of

their work; the school official thinks primarily in terms of the school. He is free to devote entire attention to its needs.

In 1910 state school building control was vested, completely or partially, in the state board of education in only 13 states; in 1915, in 20 states; in 1920, in 36 states. Not all of these 36 states, however, have recognized the importance of this work by creating a separate division or appointing a director of schoolhouse planning.

The number of specialists in school buildings in state departments of education has steadily increased from none in 1910 (158: 66), to seven in 1924 (192: 22), eleven in 1925 (192: 16), twelve in 1926 (158: 66), and fourteen in 1929.

References. 10: 96, 195; 11: 23; 19: 27; 30: 338*; 43: 260; 46: 524*; 57: 56; 64: 54; 75: 50; 79: 94; 97: 188; 114: 34; 171, Vol. 3: 64; 177: 17; 180: 37, 82; 181: 151; 183: 104; 189: 45; 190: 68; 191: 61-2; 192: 67; 194: 366; 195: 17; 196: 15; 201: 393; 215: 237; 225, Vol. 5: 117.

2. *Why should the state board or state department of education set minimum standards for school buildings?*—This activity of the state educational authorities may be considered as one aspect of the general principles of elevating and equalizing educational standards. Good schools are maintained with difficulty in poor buildings and even the best schools may be improved by better buildings and equipment. Either by statute or regulations the state should require that every building erected for school purposes be structurally sound and safe and that the lighting, ventilation, heating, sanitation, water supply, and fire protection be conducive to health, safety, and educational efficiency. The state should not, of course, exert control over the style, design, special facilities, and cost of school buildings. It is not the proper function of the state to suppress originality or to impose a dead monotony on the school buildings. But it is a very proper function for it to see that all school buildings reach a reasonable minimum of adequacy and safety. (46: 523-4.)

This criterion has been widely endorsed by state school surveys, by writers on school administration, and by the general trend of state

practice. Frequent revision of state school-building codes and liberal and intelligent interpretation of them are equally desirable.

References. 10: 210; 11: 80; 19: 15; 23: 151; 30, Vol. 1: 126; 46: 523*; 47: 585; 56: 160; 57: 120; 64: 86; 75: 50; 97: 15-17; 117: 35; 134: 358; 135: 95; 139: 119; 169: 89; 171, Vol. 3: 64; 177: 17; 179: 258-9; 180: 38, 130; 183: 65; 191: 122; 192: 67; 194: 398; 201: 394*; 224, Vol. 1: 210; 225, Vol. 5: 121.

3. *Why should there be a state school-housing code?*—The answer to this question is implied in the discussion under questions 1 and 2, above. The advantages of having a school-housing code are fairly obvious. It makes readily available to local school boards and architects the standards, regulations, and laws to which their buildings must conform. It will also supply an abundance of reference and suggestive material to help in planning new buildings or in remodeling old ones.

References. 57: 37; 46: 522*; 80: 118.

4, 5. *Why should free textbooks be supplied in elementary and secondary schools?*—The provision of free textbooks is now generally accepted by educational experts as one criterion of the administrative efficiency of a school system. These are the chief arguments advanced in favor of free texts:

1. Free textbooks represent only another aspect of the provision of free schools. In a system of public schools a child should not be required to furnish textbooks any more than he should be required to pay a share of the teachers' salaries or the fuel bill. The textbook, the plant, the teacher are essential parts of our American free schools. If one questions the use of public funds for textbooks he logically must question the whole structure of American public education.
2. Free textbooks encourage efficient teaching and a prompt beginning of each term's work. There is no need to wait for pay-day or until the child can get to the bookstore, or until a shipment of new books arrive. The free books can be distributed on the opening day and school work can be started at once. The delay due to unavailability of textbooks is most serious in the rural schools where bookstores are hard to reach and where short terms and irregular attendance make a prompt beginning of school work especially desirable.
3. A large variety of supplementary books is more easily secured under the free plan. The

best school work cannot be done where only one book is available, and yet it is difficult to persuade parents to purchase more than one book for each subject. To furnish both textbooks and supplementary books at public expense obviates the entire difficulty.

4. Closely related to the above argument is the assertion that it is generally easier to change free textbooks than those supplied by parents. Continuous developments in teaching methods and a broadened and enriched curriculum cannot be easily secured if antiquated textbooks are used. And yet unless the books are furnished free, parents who do not understand the educational issues involved, are likely to declare that "the old books are good enough until the children know everything that is in them." The whole difficulty is transcended when textbooks are free.
5. When textbooks are furnished free to all children, the difficult problem of dealing with indigent children is entirely avoided. It is unfair to stigmatize certain children as "charity pupils," and yet unless books are supplied to all at public expense the unpleasant distinction is bound to be made. The practice of furnishing textbooks free only to children whose parents claim indigence is a relic of the old charity school concept of colonial days. It penalizes pride and rewards mendacity.
6. Compulsory school attendance and free textbooks naturally go together. Compulsory attendance implies the provision of the necessary educational machinery. All children of specified ages must attend school and neither they nor their parents have any choice in the matter. In view of these facts it is only common justice to furnish the child with the tools of education. Attendance is practically valueless unless books are available.
7. Other arguments advanced in favor of free textbooks are that they are necessary for the child whose parents are of the migratory laborer type, that they are easier to keep clean, that buying in large quantities saves money, that they encourage regular attendance and regular preparation, that they are kept in better condition than most second-hand books, and that they furnish a splendid opportunity to teach respect for public property.

Among the arguments advanced against the principle of free textbooks are the following: that it discourages home libraries and pride of ownership, that it is unsanitary, that it denies pupils an opportunity to study during vacations, that it encourages carelessness, that it increases taxes and diverts money from teachers' salaries, that it imposes unpleasant custodial

duties on teachers and interferes with instruction, that it represents undesirable state paternalism, and that free clothing is the logical sequel to free textbooks. It will be seen that most of these contentions are really arguments against improper administration of free textbooks rather than against the provision of such.

The provision of free textbooks on a state wide permissive basis dates back to 1878; on a mandatory basis to 1884 (46: 572). The city of Philadelphia first provided free textbooks in 1818 (46: 570). Since these early steps the free textbook plan has made sure and steady headway. (185: 6.) By 1896 there were nine states with mandatory free textbook laws and twelve states with laws permitting local districts to supply textbooks at public expense. A decade later there were twelve mandatory laws and sixteen permissive laws on this subject. By 1916 there were fifteen mandatory and seventeen permissive states, by 1926, twenty mandatory and twenty-three permissive states.

References. 30, Vol. 1: 114; 46: 571*; 56: 173; 57: 269; 64: 165; 81: 2*; 135: 97; 171, Vol. 3: 14; 179: 100, 209, 285; 180: 76; 181: 193; 182: 113; 185: 23-5, 192: 64; 194: 366; 196: 15; 215: 111; 224, Vol. 1: 303; 225, Vol. 2: 404.

6. *If the adoption of textbooks is on a state-wide basis, why should the state board or state department of education be the adopting authority?*—The evaluation and selection of textbooks is a professional undertaking. Whatever lay body, state or local, adopts textbooks should base its actions on the advice of competent professional workers. If professional advice is secured and followed there is no need for a special and separate textbook commission, since all that such a commission should do can be done more effectively by the state board of education and its expert advisors in the state department. There is no apparent reason why textbooks should be controlled by a separate board any more than the certification of teachers or the establishment of building standards. This, of course, presupposes an effective state department of education, exercising professional functions, recommending legislative action to the state board of education and in close touch with educational needs of every

part of the state. In states which lack such organization it may be better temporarily to have a special textbook commission (see discussion of Tables 13-14 on state board and state department of education).

Of the twenty-five states having state-adoption of textbooks eleven designate the state board as the adopting authority; eleven have special textbook commissions; and three employ other agencies. (185: 15.) The tendency to charge the state board of education with the function of selecting textbooks where state-wide adoption prevails seems to be growing in favor.

References. 30, Vol. 1: 113; 46: 559*; 57: 269; 171, Vol. 3: 10; 185: 16-18, 35*; 189: 50; 192: 63; 195: 13; 201: 19.

7. *Why should state textbook adoptions be on a multiple list basis?*—The prescription of a single list of textbooks for all pupils and schools in any large area is educationally unsound. A single list fails to provide for differences in the needs, abilities, and interests of pupils, for differences in the training and methods of teachers, for differences in local needs and conditions, and for differences in types of school organization. All of these important differences are provided for by the multiple list plan which gives approval to a number of generally satisfactory books for each grade and subject and then leaves the local unit to choose from among the approved books. The general principle governing this matter has been well set forth in several state school surveys. Thus, the United States Bureau of Education in its survey of Alabama stated that "in order that the list of textbooks may be as helpful as possible, it should not only provide for uniformity but it should also leave room for flexibility." (191: 263) One of the most recent surveys, that of Florida, indicated as one of the immediately needed items of school legislation a "change in the textbook selection law, allowing a selective group of books on each subject rather than an exclusive selection." (57: 56.)

The multiple list principle has been adopted in 8 states. (185: 12-13.)

References. 11: 16; 43: 286; 57: 56; 64: 89; 185: 18-19, 64*; 191: 263; 192: 64; 215, 102.

8. *Why should small local units be combined for the purpose of purchasing standard school supplies?*—The individual purchase of school supplies by small districts is generally both economically and educationally wasteful. Buying in large lots saves money because the purchase price is lower and because the amount of clerical work is reduced. A centralized purchasing agency is also in a good position to evaluate the competing materials and equipment available, to choose wisely, to check up on delivery, quality, and quantity, and to protect the school funds from the raids of irresponsible firms and agents. Ordinarily the county or other comparable unit is the best agency for handling the purchasing of school supplies.

References. 46: 574; 57: 273; 8: 17; 88: 104.

9. *Why should the state department of education act in an advisory capacity in connection with the purchase of school supplies?*—Anyone who will glance through the advertising sections of some of the education journals (e.g. *The American School Board Journal* or *The Nation's School*) will be struck at once with the range and complexity of choices involved in the purchase of school equipment. Rural, village, and town school officials need help in evaluating, testing, and purchasing equipment. Even in large cities, the officer in charge of purchasing school supplies might often profit by advice and information which the state could best supply. An efficient school equipment advisor in state departments of education would doubtless save thousands of dollars every year which are now wastefully expended for useless or inappropriate equipment. Recommendations to this effect have been incorporated in many state school surveys. The Florida survey specifically commended the work of the department of education in that state in issuing suggested lists of laboratory equipment and urged the extension of this practice to school supplies for other subjects. (57: 273.)

References. 57: 272; 134: 109; 179: 285; 180: 38; 181: 193; 183: 65.

Discussion of Table 13

State Board of Education

1. *Why should the state board of education be predominantly a lay body representing the state at large?*—Experience in city school administration clearly indicates that boards of education should be non-professional. They should represent the broad aspects of public educational policies and should delegate the professional execution of these policies to their paid professional executives. It is not the proper function of the state board to supervise instruction, evaluate textbooks, accredit schools, prepare courses of study, or approve building plans. These are duties which require the full-time attention of a professional executive and his staff. An additional danger in a professional board is that the members will come to represent their own educational interests to the exclusion of all others. This involves the possibility of contention and special pleading in the work of the board. If special professional interests need to be consulted the chief state school officer can readily obtain their opinions and transmit them to the board.

According to Tupper, "Recent state surveys conducted by the General Education Board, the U. S. Bureau of Education, and special commissions of educational experts concur in recommending . . . the lay board." (187: 8.) The recommendation of the West Virginia survey on this point which is typical of many others is as follows: "It is recommended that the board of education be made up wholly or largely of lay members distinguished for their civic leadership and spirit of public service. The practice of assuming that any certain part of the membership of the state board should be engaged in educational work is not to be commended." (30: 48.)

References. 10: 163, 190; 11: 151; 19: 12; 23: 149; 30, Vol. 1: 27, 48*; 43: 151; 46: 290; 56: 10; 64: 14, 18, 83; 90: 4; 99: 68; 107: 186; 117: 83; 139: 18; 158: 150; 162: 29; 171, Vol. 3: 7; 187: 8; 189: 158; 190: 23; 191: 56; 192: 9; 195: xiii; 196: 12; 201: 10-11, 15; 215, Part 1: 242-4; 224, Vol. 1: 155; 225, Vol. 2: 264.

2. *Why should the state board of education contain no ex-officio members?*—The time of members of an ex-officio board is necessarily

taken up with their primary official duties. Their interest in the state school system is necessarily only a secondary one. There are two types of ex-officio membership: lay and professional. Both are undesirable. The disadvantages of professional membership have been pointed out in the discussion of the preceding question. Ex-officio lay membership has the additional disadvantage that the incumbent is likely to be changed at any state election. The Indiana survey report declares that "as a matter of common experience, ex-officio boards do not command public confidence." (10: 162.) The Texas survey report asserts that ex-officio boards of education "are now becoming obsolete and will some day be held as archaic as they are crude and primitive in form." (224, Vol. 1: 154.) These statements are typical of the attitude of educators generally.

References. 10: 162; 11: 11, 149; 19: 12, 14; 23: 149; 30, Vol. 1: 27, 48; 43: 149-50; 46: 287*; 56: 156; 57: 29-30; 64: 14; 90: 4; 107: 186; 114: 12-13; 117: 83; 139: 17; 145: 43; 158: 8, 22; 162: 29; 187: 9; 192: 8; 196: 12; 201: 10-11; 215, Part 1: 243; 224, Vol. 1: 154-5.

3. *Why should the board of education consist of more than 4 and less than 10 members?*—There may be efficient state boards of education which do not meet this criterion but such boards are efficient in spite of the handicap involved in too large or too small membership. The principle of a board of education of more than 4 and less than 10 members is administratively sound. Recommendations to this effect occur in practically every state school survey which deals with the topic at all. The recent survey of Utah by the United States Bureau of Education is typical in stating that, "present practice in the United States, as well as accepted theory, favors state boards of education composed of from five to nine members." (201: 12.) Boards with three or four members are exposed to the danger of domination by one man—either within or outside the board. Boards with more than nine members tend to be too large to secure the most expeditious action. The argument for large boards is generally based on the mistaken idea that the

larger the board the more special interests can be represented. However, it is not a legitimate purpose of the board to "represent" special interests in this way. For all proper purposes a few members can represent the general public interest in education quite as well as many. In 1890 the median membership of 29 state boards of education was 5 members; in 1910 the median membership of 32 boards was 6.5 members; in 1925 the median membership of 41 boards was 7 members. Thus, the trend in size of state boards of education is clearly towards boards of seven members. About two-thirds of the states can meet this criterion. (158: 9.)

References. 10: 190; 11: 152; 19: 12; 23: 149; 30, Vol. 1: 28, 48; 43: 149; 46: 291; 57: 30; 90: 4; 99: 67; 107: 186; 114: 32; 117: 84; 139: 29; 158: 23, 150; 162: 29; 187: 9; 189: 158; 190: 23; 191: 56; 192: 8; 194: 389; 196: 12; 201: 12; 215, Part 1: 245; 224, Vol. 1: 155.

4, 5. *Why should terms of office overlap and be at least 5 years?*—These requirements reduce the possibility of political interference and lead to continuity of policy. At the same time, they are flexible enough to allow for conservative alterations in policy as need arises. A term of office five or more years in length is recognized as desirable by all authorities. Learned and Bagley describe the board of from five to seven members appointed or elected at large for long terms as "the most successful form of educational control yet devised for a democratic community." (99: 67.) The actual length of term recommended varies from state to state. A five-year term was recommended for Vermont (23: 152), a six-year term for Indiana (10: 191), and West Virginia (30, Vol. 1: 29), a seven-year term for California (19: 12), and Maryland (56: 156), an eight-year term for Arizona (189: 158) and South Dakota (190: 23), a nine-year term for Utah (201: 19) and Texas (124: Vol. 1: 155) and a twelve-year term for Alabama (191: 56). A term of less than five years, however, has never been recommended in any of the standard literature of state school administration.

Closely related to the long term of office is the desirability of having members' terms overlap one another. The best experience indicates definitely that changes in the member-

ship of a state board of education "should be so arranged that a majority of the board remains constant, one member retiring each year or two or three each alternate year . . . Frequent changes on a state board of education, especially changes affecting a majority of the board, are particularly unfortunate. There should always be a sufficient number of hold-over board members to orient new ones and to insure continuing educational policies." (201: 12.) Recommendation for overlapping terms for state board members occur also in the surveys of Colorado (196: 12), Arizona (187: 10), Washington (139: 18) and many other states. At present the term of office of elective or ex-officio state board members is usually either 2 or 4 years. Not counting thirteen state boards which are ex-officio in character, the usual term of office of members is 5 or 6 years. The term of office is less than five years in about a dozen states and is more than six years in about six states. (158: 12; 90: 10.)

References. 10: 191; 11: 150, 152; 19: 12; 23: 149, 152; 30, Vol. 1, 29; 43: 49-50; 46: 291; 56: 156; 57: 30; 73: 54; 90: 4; 99: 67; 107: 186; 114: 13, 32; 117: 84; 139: 18; 158: 12-13, 23, 150; 162: 29; 187: 8-10; 189: 158; 190: 23; 191: 56; 192: 8; 194: 389; 196: 12; 201: 12, 13, 17-19; 215, Part 1, 244; 224, Vol. 1: 155.

6. *Why should members of the state board of education be removed during their term of office only on proved charges of malfeasance or other specified derelictions?*—This standard has the same purpose as the preceding ones; viz: the prevention of arbitrary removal from office and insuring reasonable continuity of policy. This requirement also gives members a feeling of responsible freedom which is necessary for the best service to the state. If the proper type of citizens are selected for state board membership, malfeasance and incompetency in office will be extremely remote contingencies. Removals for political or personal reasons are contrary to the welfare of the schools and should be made impossible by the statute or constitutional provision creating the state board of education.

References. 19: 12; 23: 150; 43: 150; 46: 291; 90: 5.

7. *Why should service on the state board of education be without regular salary?*—If

members are paid travelling expenses, or a small *per diem* for a fixed maximum number of days, or an annual honorarium of less than \$500 the answer to this question is "Yes." This question does not apply to ex-officio members of the board, if any.

Service on a state board of education ought to be regarded as a public honor rather than as a salaried position. The disadvantages of paying regular salaries to board members are evident from a study of parallel experience in city school administration. A high salary constitutes a temptation for a board of education to attempt work which it ought to delegate to its paid professional executive. A small salary, on the other hand, exerts little attraction for the best type of member and exerts a very strong attraction for petty politicians and office-seekers. All the work which a state board of education ought to perform can be done in less than a dozen meetings a year. There is no need for a full-time salary for such service.

Endorsement of the principle of non-salaried board members is found repeatedly in state school surveys and in authoritative treatises on state school administration. The following pronouncement of the West Virginia survey is typical of many others:

Most of the states follow the plan of allowing expenses and a small *per diem* payment, the maximum number of days for which such *per diem* may be paid being fixed by law. Neither authorities in school administration nor practice in progressive states sanctions the payment of salaries to members of the state board of education. The objection raised to compensating the board with a regular salary in addition to necessary expenses . . . are that the office may be sought by inefficient and unscrupulous persons with neither the desire nor the ability to render service, and that the office may be used in payment of political debts to candidates seeking a salary or social and political prestige. The service of public-spirited citizens cannot be evaluated in terms of compensation, and the payment of a salary above a reasonable *per diem* and necessary expenses is not justified by theory or practice. (30: 30).

School surveys in Delaware (64: 84), Mississippi (114: 32), Wyoming (117: 84) and many other states reiterate this viewpoint.

Only two states fail to meet the standard of an unsalaried state board of education (158: 16) but a misguided movement to place the state board on a salaried basis is occasionally begun in other states.

References. 19: 12; 23: 149; 30, Vol. 1: 30*; 46: 292*; 57: 30; 64: 84; 90: 5; 99: 67; 107: 186; 114: 32; 117: 84; 158: 150; 171,

Vol. 1: 71, Vol. 3: 7; 189: 158; 190: 23; 191: 56; 192: 9; 196: 17; 201: 19; 224, Vol. 8: 21.

8. *Why should the board hold at least four fixed meetings a year?*—There are a few state boards of education of the older "ex-officio" type which have no fixed meetings. In one such nor, the secretary of state, and the state superintendent the latter wrote in 1924, "I have been in the office of superintendent of public instruction for eleven years. Thus far I have not had a meeting of the state board of education." (158: 109.) While such a policy may temporarily work out satisfactorily it is administratively unsound and sooner or later is sure to lead to difficulties. A dormant board is not the only alternative to an over-busy board. A professional autocracy may be as harmful to the schools in the long run as lay interference in educational administration. The state board should have fixed meetings at such intervals as will enable it to represent the people of the state in formulating a general educational policy, in selecting executives, examining and approving budgets, and in receiving reports of progress.

Reference. 90: 5.

9, 10, 11. *Why should the board appoint, remove, and fix the salary of the chief state school officer?*—Here again we can turn to the abundant corroborative experience of most city school systems and of certain state school systems for justification of the criteria proposed. Three methods of securing a chief state school officer are in use: (1) election by popular vote, (2) appointment by the governor, (3) appointment by the state board of education. The latter is by far the best method. Election by popular vote necessitates political campaigning; makes for a short term of office; fixes a salary, usually inadequate, by law; limits the field of choice to state, community, or party lines; and makes the office itself a segment of the party machine. None of these conditions are desirable in a professional office. Appointment by the governor is open to similar objections, since it subjects the state school state where the board consisted of the government officers to the possibility of political dictation and places too much power in the hands of a busy individual. The chief state school officer ought to be appointed by the agency to which he is responsible, the board of education. The arguments in favor of state board appointment

do not imply any reflection upon the many able state superintendents who have come into office by popular election or gubernatorial appointment. General experience however clearly favors the method of state-board appointment.

The opinion of educators is almost unanimous in favor of the state board of education appointing the chief state school official. In 1921 a study revealed that the appointive method was securing state superintendents with longer training, longer educational experience, and higher salaries than the elective method. (15: 35, 61, 89.) In 1923, MacCracken found that 18 important state school surveys unanimously favored this method. (107: 187.) In 1925 opinions of 41 state school officials and 35 experts in school administration were collected. This study showed that of 17 possible types of state school organization overwhelming approval was given to the type consisting of a state board of education without ex-officio members and a chief executive school officer appointed by the state board. (158: 89-103.)

Popular election is still the most commonly used method of selecting the state superintendent, although appointment is gaining in favor. About one-fourth of the states now select their chief state school official by state board appointment. Twelve states changed their methods of securing a state school official between 1890 and 1925. Of these, seven adopted the method of state board appointment (158: 26-28; 90: 23).

References. 10: 192; 19: 14; 23: 150; 30, Vol. 1: 34, 50; 43: 142, 148; 46: 281, 292, 296*; 56: 158, 159; 64: 16-18, 83-84;

73: 55; 90: 5; 99: 65; 107: 186-7; 114: 32; 117: 86; 139: 18, 29; 144: 24, 29; 145: 43*; 158: 27, 38, 151*; 162: 29; 171, Vol. 1: 57-9; 180: 37, 82, 197; 187: 10-11; 189: 159; 190: 23; 191: 56; 192: 8-9; 194: 389; 195: 16; 196: 19-25; 201: 19-20; 215, Part 1: 245, 248; 224, Vol. 1: 158.

12. *Why should the state board of education act as a board for vocational and agricultural education in the Federal program?*—Vocational and agricultural education should not be isolated and independent aspects of the state educational program. The simplest way to secure a unified policy with respect to these activities is to place them under the direction of the state board of education rather than under a separate and independent board. There may well be a division of vocational education within the state department of education, but it should be definitely a part of the state system of education. The unified plan is used by most of the states which have accepted the provisions of the various acts of Congress granting Federal subsidies for vocational and agricultural education. The general principle governing the matter is that special boards for special aspects of the state program of education are undesirable because they create rivalry for funds, cause a scattering of effort, and are likely to lead to duplication of expenditures. (158: 24.)

References. 10: 118, 120, 191; 11: 12, 150; 19: 14, 26; 23: 151; 30, Vol. 1: 32; 46: 294; 73: 54; 90: 5; 114: 32; 158: 24, 150; 190: 13, 22; 191: 56; 224, Vol. 7: 111; 225, Vol. 8: 266.

Discussion of Table 14 State Department of Education

1. *Why should the state superintendency be open to all without regard to residence?*—Residence qualifications are vestiges of the political history of the state superintendency. They are seldom imposed in states where the position is filled by appointment by the state board. The chief state school officer should be selected on merit from the country at large. This has long been the practice in choosing city school superintendents and presidents of colleges and universities. The fact that this policy is impossible under the popular election method is one of the strongest arguments against the use of that method for choosing the chief state school of-

ficer. The people of the state are entitled to the best educational leadership their money will buy and this cannot always be secured when residence requirements interfere. The protection of "home interests" is no part of a sound state educational policy. This need not mean that professionally qualified residents of the state are excluded from consideration, but it should always be possible to select from outside the state if the best interests of the schools demand.

Endorsement of this principle is found repeatedly in the literature of state school administration. The Arkansas survey recommen-

dations are typical:

In the appointment of the commissioner of education the state board of education should canvass the entire United States and endeavor to select a man of successful experience in large enterprises and of broad vision in educational affairs, who is capable of assuming a position of leadership which will carry the citizens and the teachers of the state unitedly to the consummation of the great task ahead. (195: 16.)

The recommendations of the surveys of Colorado (196: 19), Utah (201: 27), and Virginia (215, Part 1: 247) are to a similar effect.

References. 23: 150; 30, Vol. 1: 36; 43: 148; 46: 292; 57: 30; 90: 4; 107: 187; 114: 18*; 117: 86; 139: 20; 145: 150; 158: 151; 162: 29; 171, Vol. 2: 10; 180: 197; 187: 10-11; 189: 159; 190: 24; 191: 57; 192: 11; 194: 374; 197: 16; 201: 23, 27; 215, Part 1: 247.

2. *Why should the term of office of the state superintendent be either indefinite or for at least 4 years with opportunity for re-appointment?*—States in which the chief school officer is appointed for an indefinite term should answer "Yes" to this question. Desirable practice in respect to term of office is thus summarized by former U. S. Commissioner of Education J. J. Tigert (90: 5).

The term of office should have no reference to the change of officers connected with the partisan government of the state. It should be indefinite or for a period of years long enough to make possible the consistent development of administrative policies.

The weight of competent opinion, as shown in the recommendations of state school surveys and elsewhere, agrees almost unanimously as to the need for longer or indefinite terms for state superintendents. "The typical state superintendent barely comes to the climax of his personal touch with the field by the conclusion of his term," says Cook (43: 143). "The term of office should be either indefinite or of a sufficient number of years to make possible the consistent and unhampered development of a constructive educational program," states Reeder (145: 43). Similar statements could be reproduced from the recommendations of surveys in Indiana (10: 164), West Virginia (30: 36) and many other states.

There is a trend toward longer or indefinite terms for state superintendents. The term of less than four years which in 1890 prevailed in 27 states is now the exception. Indefinite ap-

pointments are now the rule in 4 states and over half the states use a term of four years or more for their chief state school officers. (144: 28; 158: 29; 171: 63).

The actual tenure of office from 1896 to 1923 has been studied by Reeder. He reports that the 48 states had 257 state superintendents in a period of 27 years. The average tenure for the United States as a whole then is approximately 5 years. The individual states vary widely from this average. One state secured an average tenure for its chief school officers of only 2.7 years. Only four states reported an average tenure of over ten years. (145: 43)

References. 10: 164; 11: 20; 23: 150; 30, Vol. 1: 36, 50; 43: 143*; 46: 292; 64: 123; 90: 5; 99: 65; 117: 85-86; 145: 43*; 144: 29; 158: 32, 151; 171: 61, 63; 187: 10-11; 189: 159; 190: 17; 191: 57; 201: 22; 215, Part 1: 248.

3. *Is the salary of the chief state school official adequate?*—Other things being equal, a state is likely to secure the kind of educational leadership it is willing to pay for. The professional insight, skill, and executive ability demanded of a state school officer are not common enough to be purchased cheaply. The capable state superintendents in the country who are giving themselves to their office at a financial sacrifice are the exceptions which prove the rule. Most of our chief state school officers are decidedly underpaid. In many states the state superintendent is paid less than dozens of high school principals and scores of city superintendents within the state and nominally under his leadership. The increased demands of the office and the general advance of other educational work to a more adequate remunerative basis justifies emphasis on this criterion.

What constitutes an adequate salary for the chief state school official will depend to some degree on special conditions existing in the various states. It is impossible and undesirable to name an amount which would apply to the United States as a whole. A rough estimate of what such salary should be in any state may be derived from consideration of salaries actually paid to the superintendents of the larger cities in the state and to the heads of the state institutions of higher learning. The salary status of the chief state school officer ought not to suffer by comparison with such positions. It ought to be commensurate with the dignity and importance of his office. This represents true

economy. Money spent for competent administration is money saved.

The median salary of state school superintendents was \$2050 in 1890, \$3000 in 1910, and \$4750 in 1925. The lowest salary paid in 1925 was \$1800 and the highest \$15,000. The trend of salaries for the state school officer is clearly upward but in most states the salary is still insufficient. (158: 32)

References. 10: 193; 11: 20; 23: 151; 30, Vol. 1: 37*; 43: 145; 46: 275; 90: 6; 145: 43; 158: 47, 151; 162: 30; 171, Vol. 1: 63; 180: 37, 82, 197; 183: 104; 187: 10; 190: 17; 191: 57; 194: 374; 195: 15; 201: 24, 28*; 215: Part 1: 247.

4. *Why should the state superintendent be required by law to be a professional educator?*—Where the state superintendent is appointed by the state board of education this requirement may generally be taken for granted. But since the elective method of selecting the state superintendent is still widely used it seems desirable to set some standard of fitness for the office. The principal functions of the office should be control and leadership. Since the state school officer is placed in a position of direct authority over local school officials he should be a person of professional training and experience.

A superintendent with a professional background can best supply the type of democratic leadership needed in a state school system. Summarizing the situation in 1925, Reeder states, "It has been all too true that almost anyone who could run the political gauntlet and get elected might hold the office . . . an office which admittedly has greater potentialities than any other educational office in the state and which therefore should have for its incumbents the most eminent educational leaders." (145: 43.) A number of states have adopted legal qualifications for eligibility to the state superintendency. A study reported in 1924 (144: 23) gives professional requirements as then in effect for elected state superintendents. These included school experience only in 2 states; either college graduation or school experience only in 3 states; college graduation, school experience, and a valid teaching certificate only in 2 states; college graduation and school experience only in 4 states; and other miscellaneous qualifications in 7 states.

References. 11: 19; 23: 150; 30, Vol. 1: 36; 43: 144*; 46: 280; 57: 30; 139: 18-19*; 145: 43; 158: 40-1*; 171, Vol. 2: 10; 196: 20, 93; 201: 79; 215, Part 1: 246.

5. *Why should the state department of education provide for suggested courses of study and similar helps for schools?*—This criterion does not imply that state departments of education should promulgate an inflexible state course of study for all schools in the state. Nor is it intended to restrict in any manner the activities of local school units in preparing and revising courses of study and similar material. However, there will for a long time to come be much service of a suggestive, coordinating and advisory nature which a modern well-equipped state department of education can render in connection with course of study making. Particularly in the rural districts of most states, the help and guidance of the state department is useful. The generally accepted ideal for the state's participation in course of study control is thus stated by Cubberley (46: 319-320):

There are large opportunities for state guidance through a state study of conditions and needs. Careful studies made in a state might easily reveal conditions that ought to be changed or improved. . . . The remedy for any such undesirable conditions lies first in a clear statement as to the facts, and then in the formulation, in conjunction with the school superintendents of the state, of standardized core curricula, and the issuance of these for trial use. . . . Insofar as a state department of education can give leadership of this type it will prove both useful and helpful. . . . A slow but progressive uniformity in main essentials, with large liberty as to details, is probably the line along which we can travel with greatest safety and effectiveness.

References. 19: 28; 23: 152; 30: Vol. 1: 46-7; 56: 161; 189: 162; 194: 90; 27; 158: 151; 202: 189; 224, Vol. 8: 142-3.

6. *Why should the state department of education prepare a uniform system of recording receipts and expenditures for use by local units?*—Effective modern state school administration is based as far as possible on objective facts. Pure guesswork is reduced to as small a minimum as possible and where judgments must be rendered they are made in the light of the best statistical data available. A uniform state-wide accounting system is an important phase of the fact-securing activities of a state department of education. It alone makes possible reliable comparative studies between com-

munities, detects waste or misuse of school funds, provides a basis for trustworthy budget estimates, and enables the state to make proper reports to the Federal Office of Education.

References. 19: 26; 23: 151; 30, Vol. 1: 46; 46: 298; 56: 17; 57: 84; 120: 12; 121: 106; 147: 89; 156: 164; 158: 150; 159: 130; 164: 51, 58; 173: 113; 179: 99, 209; 180: 83; 182: 112; 187: 12, 93; 190: 23; 191: 59; 194: 369; 224, Vol. 2: 132.

7. *Why should the state department of education include personnel sufficient to discharge all generally recognized educational functions?*—Among the functions which, in most states, should be performed by a state department of education are: the application and general interpretation of the school laws, general supervision of the various branches of education, enforcement of accepted standards of school hygiene and safety, certification of teachers, interpretation of the schools to the public, collection and dissemination of pertinent statistics, apportionment of the state school fund in accordance with the law, and conducting of original investigations in education on a state-wide basis. All states in fact do something along most of these lines but, in answering question 7 of table 14, one should consider whether what his state does is merely in the nature of superficial routine or represents a real attack on the problems involved. Only in the latter case should a "Yes" answer be given to this question.

The matter of personnel of a state department of education has been investigated by many state school surveys and special investigations. In general, these studies have found that most state departments are far from complete in the members, differentiation, qualifications, and salaries of their staff. The number of staff members needed may vary greatly from

state to state. The important point is that there should be enough capable workers to carry out the purposes for which the state department of education exists.

The median size of staff of all state departments of education is increasing steadily. In 1890 the median staff had only two members; in 1900, three members; in 1910, five members; and in 1925, twenty-three members. (158: 52-53) Not only have state departments grown in size, but they have also increased in proportion to the number of pupils served. In 1890 the average state had nearly 100,000 elementary and secondary pupils for each member of the staffs of state departments. In 1910 there were only 33,000 pupils and in 1925 only 12,000 pupils per staff member. (158: 57) Furthermore, the functions of this increased personnel have been enlarged. Among the functional designations found in state departments of education in 1925 which were unknown in 1910 are: teacher-placement service, retirement service, school building inspection, visiting teacher service, Americanization, research, health service, and a wide variety of functions in the various phases of vocational education. (158: 66-67)

All of the foregoing facts and considerations justify the conclusion that the trend is clearly towards more adequately staffed state departments of education. A state which wishes to be abreast of progress in this respect will do well to consider whether its state department has a staff sufficient in numbers to carry out its important work.

References. 10: 193-5; 11: 153; 19: 26; 23: 150; 30, Vol. 1: 45; 56: 161; 64: 18; 73: 56; 90: 6; 114: 19; 139: 29; 158: 148*; 162: 30; 171, Vol. 2: 10; 187: 11; 190: 19, 25; 191: 58; 192: 14; 194: 374-5; 195: 15, 16; 196: 21; 201: 33; 224, Vol. 1: 160.

Discussion of Table 15

Higher and Adult Education

The first seven criteria in Table 15 parallel rather closely the first seven questions in Table 13, which deals with the state board of education. Most of the statements there made apply also to the board or boards for higher institutions. The repetition of these standards in connection with this table does not have reference to the issue whether state control of elementary

and secondary education and of higher education should be exerted by separate boards. Experience with unified control of public education at all levels is as yet too limited to permit extensive generalizations. Whether the state board of education should have jurisdiction over the higher institutions as well as over the elementary and secondary schools of the state

is still an open question. In most states, however, control of higher education is at present vested in a separate board or boards. For this reason the inclusion in the self-survey of certain criteria for these boards appears desirable. These criteria are given in questions 1 to 6, inclusive, of Table 15. They should be applied only where the higher institutions and the elementary-secondary schools are under different boards. They are discussed here only briefly. For a more complete discussion refer to pages 146 to 149.

1. *Why should the term of office of members of the controlling board or boards of state higher institutions be at least seven years?*—If the term of office of all members of all controlling boards of state higher educational institutions is seven years or more or for an indefinite period of time this question should be answered in the affirmative. The chief value of the long term of office is that it provides for continuity of policy and avoids political entanglements. Members should also be eligible for reappointment.

The survey of Alabama stated that long terms "lend dignity to the office, resulting generally in attracting better men to fill vacancies" (191: 433). Terms of seven to nine years were recommended by the surveys of West Virginia (30, Vol. 4: 8), Kansas (226: 29) and Florida (57: 418). Eight years was recommended in the surveys of the Universities of Nevada (197: 28) and Arizona (203: 4). Nine years was recommended in Utah (201: 264) and Texas (224, Vol. 6: 344). None of the recognized authorities on the subject favor a term of less than seven years. For further discussion and references, see page 147.

References. 30, Vol. 4: 8; 45: 100; 57: 415; 418; 191: 433; 197: 28; 201: 264; 203: 4; 224, Vol. 6: 344; 226: 29.

2. *Why should there be at most ten members on the controlling board or on each of the controlling boards of state higher institutions?*—The theory underlying this criterion is discussed under question 3 of Table 13. It was there pointed out that a relatively small board can transact the public business most expeditiously. The only argument for an extremely large board is the plea that it is more representative of special interests in the state. But the representation of special interests in

this way is not one of the proper functions of a state board. The members should each represent the state as a whole in shaping the policy of its higher educational institutions. For further discussion and references see page 146.

References. 30, Vol. 4: 8; 45: 100; 46: 348; 57: 383; 124: 127; 191: 433; 197: 14, 24; 201: 264; 224, Vol. 6: 344; 226: 23, 29.

3. *Why should members of the controlling board or boards of the state higher educational institutions be selected from the state at large?*—The institutions which the state entrusts with the conduct of higher education are not local institutions. They discharge a function of importance to the whole state and their control should therefore be vested in a board selected from the state at large. Eligibility based on residence in a particular section of the state should not be considered. (57: 383) "Personal fitness for the position," (45: 100) should be the sole requirement for eligibility to membership in the controlling board of an educational institution. Considerations of sex, residence, or political and religious affiliation are not appropriate bases of selection.

References. 45: 100; 46: 348; 57: 383; 189: 41.

4. *Why should the terms of members of the controlling board or boards overlap?*—The advisability of overlapping terms has been pointed out in the discussion of item 5 of Table 13. The overlapping term insures a sufficient number of holdover board members to orient new ones and to stabilize policies. This practice also renders it difficult for any single state administration to appoint a controlling faction. Overlapping terms for members of boards of control for higher educational institutions have been recommended in surveys in Alabama (433), Nevada (28), Utah (263) and other states. For further discussion and references see page 147.

References. 45: 100; 46: 348; 191: 433; 197: 14, 28; 201: 264; 203: 4; 224, Vol. 6: 344.

5. *Do members of the controlling board or boards serve without regular salary?*—If reasonable travel expenses and a per diem for a limited number of days are paid, or if an honorarium of not over \$500 a year is paid this question should be answered in the affirmative. It does not apply to ex-officio members, if any. The discussion of item 7, Table 13 has stated

the reasons why service on a state board of education ought to be regarded as a public honor rather than as a salaried position. These reasons apply equally well to service on a board for higher educational institutions. For further discussion and references see pages 147-8.

6. *May members of the controlling board or boards be removed during their term of office only on proved charges of malfeasance and other specified derelictions?*—The purpose of this standard is to prevent arbitrary removal of board members during their term of office. It gives members a sense of responsible freedom which is necessary to the best service to the state. For references and further discussion of this point as it applies to state boards of education see page 147.

7. *Why should the state board of education have the power to control degree-selling or otherwise irresponsible educational institutions?*—This is part of the legitimate and necessary control of the state over private enterprise in education. To maintain proper standards, especially in connection with the granting of professional degrees, is a duty which the state owes to its constituents. In carrying out this duty the state board of education is the logical agency. As Cubberley points out, many states have enacted "blue-sky" laws to protect the buyers of stocks and bonds and it is entirely proper to apply the same idea to the buyers of the external evidences of an education. (46: 353) Such control will tend to protect legitimate private higher education from unfair competition, protect national and foreign students from fraud, and safeguard the educational standards of the state. Such control is frequently recommended by state school survey commissions and other authorities. In ten states the state board of education must approve the articles of incorporation for private higher institutions and in seven states the board is empowered to visit and inspect these institutions after their establishment and to revoke the license to confer degrees if prescribed standards are not complied with. (12: 39, 51)

References. 12: 58; 46: 353; 95: 19; 196: 17-18; 202: 62; 215, Part 1: 51.

8. *Why should it be legal to expend public funds for public junior colleges?*—Although there is some disagreement as to the exact form

it should take and the position it ought to occupy, the junior college is now regarded by most authorities as a desirable school unit. As such, it is entitled to financial recognition. Although lack of funds prevents the establishment of junior colleges in many districts, it is not implied that in such districts junior colleges should be established to the financial detriment of the elementary and high schools.

The necessity of considering the state school program as a whole is clearly indicated by the following recommendation from the Texas survey:

"The logic of the situation would lead one to the conclusion that the cost of junior college should be borne in part by the community and in part by the state. This recommendation, however, would be made only on condition that adequate provision is made by the state for the support of state educational institutions already in existence." (224, Vol. 3: 79) The principle of local initiative would imply that there should be nothing in the law to prevent a community with adequate school resources from establishing a junior college in addition to elementary and secondary school opportunities and maintaining it out of public funds.

References. 19: 72; 43: 338; 46: 351*; 95: 12; 98: 120; 171, Supplement, Vol. 2: 31; 181: 2, 115; 224, Vol. 3: 79.

9. *Why should the law which provides for the establishment of local junior colleges fix minimum prerequisites in terms of financial resources or enrolment?*—This criterion is a corollary to the preceding one. Local enthusiasm for a "college" should not be permitted to hamper the established program of elementary and secondary schools. Nor should it be permissible to establish a junior college where the need for such an institution is very limited. For these reasons it has been found advisable to include in the law providing for junior colleges definite minimum requirements in terms of financial ability and future enrolment.

The general form and extent of these minimum requirements should probably vary from state to state. The Texas survey recommended a minimum property valuation of \$10,000,000 and a minimum high school enrolment of 400 pupils. (224, Vol. 3: 79) The law now in effect in California requires a minimum equal-

ized assessment of \$25,000,000 and an average daily attendance of 1000 high school pupils for the formation of new junior college districts.

That this criterion is generally accepted is indicated by the tendency of state legislatures to restrict the establishment of junior colleges to districts which can adequately support such institutions. (95: 13)

References. 43: 338; 95: 13; 98: 119; 224, Vol. 3: 79.

10. *Why should the state enact legislation to encourage adult classes in English and citizenship?*—Civic efficiency, upon which democratic government depends, requires that every adult should be literate in the English language and should be somewhat familiar with the principles of his government. No state is safe for democracy as long as illiteracy and gross civic ignorance is found within its borders. Such conditions are not local problems but are of vital concern to the welfare of the state as a whole. The adult education programs of many states are already projected far beyond universal literacy and the Americanization of aliens. The adult education movement as a whole is attempting to meet some of the problems created by increased leisure and is worthy of state encouragement and support. But the provision of adult classes in English and citizenship wherever needed are essential to any state educational program which serves a fundamental social objective. The ways in which such classes may be encouraged and helped by the state are many and no special method is suggested in this criterion. A state may answer the criterion in the affirmative if it really recognizes the importance of the problem and is taking definite action to meet it.

The general attitude of educational leaders on this subject is shown by the following joint recommendations by the Department of Adult Education of the National Education Association and the National Council of State Superintendents in July, 1929:

The creation in all state departments of education of a division of adult education. . . The enactment of legislation making adult education an integral part of the public school program of each state and . . . providing adequate financial support therefor.

References. 2: 4; 43: 355; 46: 367*; 95: 13; 148: 328; 201: 357; 213: 265*.

11. *Why should the law authorize boards of school trustees to permit the use of school buildings as community centers?*—The wider use of the school plant is favored by educational authorities because:

1. It creates community interest in the schools and makes for a friendly attitude.
2. It enables the schools to render additional service to a group which cannot be reached during regular school hours.
3. It enables school officials to understand the community background of their pupils.
4. It secures the greatest return on the public's investment in school buildings and equipment. Public school buildings belong to the public and so long as the educational program is not hampered the public should be able to use the schools and their equipment.
5. It raises the moral, intellectual, and social level of the community.

For these reasons the law should permit local school boards to allow the use of the buildings under their control for community centers. The report of the National Education Association's Committee on Community Relations illustrates the typical attitude of leading educators concerning the use of the school buildings for public purposes:

Therefore, be it resolved, that it is the sense of this body, (1) that all public school governing boards should formulate a definite, fact-based community-use policy and make adequate provision for its practical realization, however modest the beginning in any school system may of necessity be, (2) that the community-use department of public school systems be staffed by persons having the qualifications required for their special duties, (3) that all regular services and activities in the field of community relations be adequately budgeted at the same time and in connection with the annual budgeting of other school activities, and that a special appropriation be made to provide, so far as can be anticipated, for new community activities which may arise and become standardized during the fiscal year. . . (29: 234).

References. 29: 234; 148: 329; 189: 86*.

12. *Why should the state department of education or some other competent official body maintain a policy of systematic study and improvement of higher and adult education?*—This question has been partly answered in the discussion of item 10, above. The general function of the state in education is presented in the discussion and references of item 13. Table 1, page 99.

References. 30, Vol. 4: 115.

Bibliography

1. ADAMS, JESSE E. *A Study in the Equalization of Educational Opportunities in Kentucky*. Bulletin of the University of Kentucky, Vol. 20, No. 9. September, 1928. College of Education, Bureau of School Service, University of Kentucky, Lexington, Kentucky. 268 p.
2. ALDERMAN, L. R. *Public Education of Adults in the Years 1924-1926*. U. S. Department of Interior, Bureau of Education, Bulletin 1927, No. 18. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C. 26 p.
3. ALEXANDER, CARTER. *Some Present Aspects of the Work of Teachers Voluntary Associations*. Teachers College, Columbia University, Contributions to Education, No. 36. Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City. 1911.
4. ALLEN, IRA M. *The Teacher's Contractual Status as Revealed by an Analysis of American Court Decisions*. Teachers College, Columbia University, Contributions to Education, No. 304. Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City, 1928. 147 p.
5. ALMACK, J. C. AND LANG, A. R. *Problems of the Teaching Profession*. Houghton Mifflin Co., Boston, 1925. 340 p.
6. ALMACK, J. C. *Reading for Professional Advancement*. Educational Progress, Vol. 6, No. 3, May, 1927. Houghton Mifflin Co., Boston.
7. ANDERSON, C. J. *Status of Teachers in Wisconsin*. State Department of Public Instruction, Madison, Wisconsin, 1923. 156 p.
8. ANDERSON, EARL WILLIAM. *The Teacher's Contract and Other Legal Phases of Teacher Status*. Teachers College, Columbia University, Contributions to Education, No. 246. Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City, 1927. 180 p.
9. ASHBAUGH, E. J. "Need of Uniformity in Certification of High School Teachers." *School Life* 12: 154-5; April, 1927.
10. BACHMAN, FRANK P. *Public Education in Indiana*. General Education Board, New York, 1923. 304 p.
11. BACHMAN, FRANK P. *Public Education in Kentucky*. General Education Board, New York, 1921. 213 p.
12. BARTLETT, LESTER WILLIAM. *State Control of Private Higher Education*. Teachers College, Columbia University, Contributions to Education, No. 207. Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City, 1926. 95 p.
13. BALDWIN, ROBERT DODGE. *Financing Rural Education*. Rural Education Series, Vol. I. Rural Service Press, Stevens Point, Wisconsin, 1927. 210 p.
14. BENNETT, RAYMOND D. "Standards for Certification of High School Teachers." *Educational Research Bulletin* 7: 67-71, 89-94; February, March, 1928.
15. BROWN, M. E. *A Quantitative Study of the Methods of Selection and the Training and Experience of the State Superintendents of Public Instruction*. Unpublished masters' thesis. George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee. June, 1921.
16. BUCK, GEORGE B. "Actuarial Problems Incident to the Organization and Management of Teachers' Retirement Systems." National Council of Teachers' Retirement Systems. *Proceedings*. Boston, Mass. February 27-29, 1928. p. 11-15.
17. BUCKINGHAM, B. R. *Supply and Demand in Teacher Training*. Ohio State University Studies, Vol. 2, No. 15, Bureau of Educational Research, Monograph No. 4. Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, March 15, 1926. 182 p.
18. CALLAHAN, JOHN. *Equalizing Educational Opportunity in Wisconsin*. Department of Public Instruction, Madison, Wisconsin, 1924. 62 p.
19. CALIFORNIA SPECIAL LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION. *Report*, as Authorized by Senate Concurrent Resolution, No. 21 by the Forty-third Session of the Legislature of California. California State Printing Office, Sacramento, California, 1920. 96 p.
20. CARNEGIE FOUNDATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF TEACHING. *Fifteenth Annual Report of the President and of the Treasurer, 1920*. Carnegie Foundation, 522 Fifth Avenue, New York City. p. 87-100.
21. CARNEGIE FOUNDATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF TEACHING. *Nineteenth Annual Report of the President and of the Treasurer, 1924*. Carnegie Foundation, 522 Fifth Avenue, New York City. p. 137-157.
22. CARNEGIE FOUNDATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF TEACHING. *Seventeenth Annual Report of the President and of the Treasurer, 1922*. Carnegie Foundation, 522 Fifth Avenue, New York City. p. 121-143.
23. CARNEGIE FOUNDATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF TEACHING. *A Study of Education in Vermont*. Bulletin No. 7, 1914. Carnegie Foundation, 522 Fifth Avenue, New York City. 241 p.
24. CARNEGIE FOUNDATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF TEACHING. *Twentieth Annual Report of the President and of the Treasurer, 1925*. Carnegie Foundation, 522 Fifth Avenue, New York City. p. 143.
25. CARR, WILLIAM G. "The Life Diploma in the United States." *Sierra Educational News* 24: 18-20; April, 1928.
26. CARR, WILLIAM G. "Teachers Salaries: A Guide to Literature and Problems." *Sierra Educational News* 26: 22-7; June, 1928.

27. CARR, WILLIAM G. "Teacher Tenure in California." *Sierra Educational News* 24: 21-24. September, 1928.
28. CARROTHERS, GEORGE E. *The Physical Efficiency of Teachers*, Teachers College, Columbia University, Contributions to Education, No. 155. Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City, 1924. p. 61-76.
29. CARROTHERS, GEORGE E. "Report of the Committee on Community Relations." *Proceedings* 64: 233-9; 1926. National Education Association, Washington, D. C.
30. CAVINS, LORIMER V., Director. *Survey of Education in West Virginia*. State Board of Education, Charleston, West Virginia, 1928. 4 Vols.
31. CAVINS, LORIMER V. AND BOWMAN, EDGAR L. *The Financing of Education in West Virginia*. State Board of Education, 1925. 94 p.
32. CHARTERS, JESSIE ALLEN. "Problems in Adult Education." *Educational Research Bulletin* 8: 207-11; May 15, 1929. College of Education, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.
33. *The Children's Amendment*. Organizations for Ratification of the Child Labor Amendment, 532 Seventeenth Street, Washington, D. C.
34. CLARKE, CLARENCE L. *Tenure of Teachers in the Profession With Special Reference to Wisconsin*. Alumni Press, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1928. 144 p.
35. CLARK, F. B., SANDELL, MARY, AND JAMES, W. A. "Report on a Proposed Teachers Retirement System for Texas." *Texas Outlook* 10: 52-4; January, 1926.
36. CLARK, HAROLD F. *The Effect of Population upon the Ability to Support Education*. Bulletin of the School of Education, Vol. 2, No. 1, Bureau of Cooperative Research, School of Education, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana, September, 1925. 29 p.
37. COFFMAN, LOTUS D. *Teacher Training Departments in Minnesota High Schools*. General Education Board, 61 Broadway, New York. 1920. 92 p.
38. COMMONS, JOHN ROGERS, AND ANDREWS, J. B. *Principles of Labor Legislation*. Harper and Bros., New York City, 1927. 616 p.
39. COOK, A. S. "The Equalizing Principle in State School Support." *Proceedings* 66: 705-13; 1928. National Education Association, Washington, D. C.
40. COOK, KATHERINE M. *State Laws and Regulations Governing Teachers' Certificates*. U. S. Department of Interior, Bureau of Education, Bulletin, 1921, No. 22. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C. 244 p.
41. COOK, KATHERINE M. *State Laws and Regulations Governing Teachers' Certificates*. U. S. Department of Interior, Bureau of Education, Bulletin, 1927, No. 19, Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C. 296 p.
42. COOK, KATHERINE M. *Some Essentials of a State's Supervisory Program for the Improvement of Instruction*. U. S. Department of Interior, Bureau of Interior, Bureau of Education, Rural School Leaflet, No. 43. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C. 9 p.
43. COOK, WILLIAM A. *Federal and State School Administration*. Thos. Y. Crowell Co., New York, 1927. 373 p.
44. CUBBERLEY, ELLWOOD P. *School Funds and their Apportionment*. Teachers College, Columbia University, Contributions to Education, No. 2. Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City, October, 1905. 255 p.
45. CUBBERLEY, ELLWOOD P. *State and County Educational Reorganization*. Macmillan Co., New York City, 1927. 257 p.
46. CUBBERLEY, ELLWOOD P. *State School Administration*. Houghton Mifflin Co., Boston, 1927. 773 p.
47. DAWSON, HOWARD A. *Financial Support of Education in Arkansas*. State Department of Education, Little Rock, Arkansas, 1926. 75 p.
48. DEFFENBAUGH, W. S. *Administration of Schools in the Smaller Cities*. U. S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Education, Bulletin, 1922, No. 2. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C. 75 p.
49. DONOVAN, HERMAN LEE. *A State's Elementary Teacher-Training Problem (Kentucky)*. Contributions to Education, No. 17, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1925. 93 p.
50. EIKENBERRY, DAN H. "Professional Requirements for Principals of High Schools." *School Life* 14: 46-9; November, 1928.
51. EIKENBERRY, DAN H. *Status of the High School Principal*. U. S. Department of Interior, Bureau of Education, Bulletin, 1925, No. 24. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C. 71 p.
52. ELSBREE, WILLARD S. *Teacher Turnover in the Cities and Villages of New York State*. Teachers College, Columbia University, Contributions to Education, No. 300. Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City, 1928. 88 p.
53. EVENDEN, E. S. "Essential Features of a State Salary Law." Seventh Annual Schoolmen's Week, Proceedings. *University of Pennsylvania Bulletin* 21: 1-336; October 2, 1920. University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa. Also, *Educational Review* 60: 205-15; October, 1920.
54. FLEMING, S. E. "The Retirement Fund—An Efficiency Measure." *Washington Education Journal* 8: 208-9; March, 1929.
55. FLEMING, S. E. "Sources of support of the New Retirement Plan." *Washington Education Journal* 8: 111-12; December, 1928.
56. FLEXNER, ABRAHAM AND BACHMAN, FRANK P. *Public Education in Maryland*. General Education Board, New York, 1916. 230 p.

57. FLORIDA EDUCATIONAL SURVEY COMMISSION. *Official Report to the Senate and House of Representatives, Florida State Legislature*. State of Florida, Tallahassee, Fla., April 2, 1929. 743 p.
58. FOGHT, H. W. *The Rural School System of Minnesota. A Study in School Efficiency*. U. S. Department of Interior, Bureau of Education Bulletin 1915, No. 20. Washington, D. C. Government Printing Office. 56 p.
59. FOWLKES, JOHN GUY. *School Bonds*. Bruce Publishing Co., Milwaukee, 1924. 176 p.
60. FRASIER, GEORGE W. *Control of City School Finances*. Bruce Publishing Company, Milwaukee, 1929. 132 p.
61. FREDEN, G. F. *Age-Grade Progress Indices for the Public Elementary Schools in Iowa*. University of Iowa Studies, Studies in Education, Vol. 2, No. 2, First Series, No. 128. April 1, 1927. University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa. 52 p.
62. FULLER, RAYMOND G. *The Meaning of Child Labor*. A. C. McClurg and Co., Chicago, 1922.
63. FURST, CLYDE, AND KANDEL, I. L. *Pensions for Public School Teachers*. Bulletin 12, 1918. Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 522 Fifth Avenue, New York City, 85 p.
64. GENERAL EDUCATION BOARD. *Public Education in Delaware*. General Education Board, 61 Broadway, New York City, 1919. 202 p.
65. GENERAL EDUCATION BOARD. *Public Education in North Carolina*. Report of Public School Commission, New York, 1921. General Education Board. 137 p.
66. GOLDMARK, JOSEPHINE. *Fatigue and Efficiency: A Study in Industry*. Russell Sage Foundation, New York City, 1912.
67. GRANKUD, JOHN. *The Organization and Objectives of State Teachers Associations*. Teachers College, Columbia University, Contributions to Education, No. 234. Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, 1926. 71 p.
68. GREENE, HARRY A. *The School Census*. University of Iowa Extension Bulletin No. 121. College of Education Series No. 11. University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa, April 1, 1925. 23 p.
69. GRIMM, L. O. "The Regulation of Salaries of Teachers by State Authority." Illinois State Teachers Association, Springfield, Ill., 1929. Mimeographed. 13 p.
70. "Growth of Education Associations." *Journal of the National Education Association* 18: 88; March, 1929.
71. "Growth of Education Associations." *Journal of the National Education Association* 19: 98; March, 1930.
72. HAMMOND, J. L., AND HAMMOND, BARBARA. *Lord Shaftesbury*. Harcourt Brace and Co., New York City, 1924.
73. HARRIS, T. H. "Organizing a State School System for Effective Service." *Elementary School Journal* 24: 54-9; September, 1923.
74. HECK, ARCH O. *Administration of Pupil Personnel*. Ginn & Co., Boston, 1929. 479 p.
75. HEER, A. L. "State Approval of School Buildings, Equipment, and Sites." *American School Board Journal* 72: 49-50; June, 1926.
76. HENDON, TELFAIR. "Teacher Retirement." *New Mexico School Review* 8: 20; February, 1929.
77. HENDRICKS, E. L. "Pensions for Teachers." *Missouri School Journal* 47: 12-13; January, 1929.
78. HILL, C. M. *A Decade of Progress in Teacher Training*. Teachers College Contributions to Education, New York City, No. 233. 1927. 219 p.
79. HIRST, C. M. "Problems and Programs of Schoolhouse Building in Arkansas." *American School Board Journal* 74: 94, 140; January, 1927.
80. HOLMES, WARREN S. "A Survey of State School Building Codes." *American School Board Journal* 79: 56, 118; September, 1929.
81. HOOD, W. R. *Free Textbooks for Public School Pupils*. U. S. Department of Interior, Bureau of Education, Bulletin 1923, No. 50. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C. 14 p.
82. HOSMAN, EVERETT M., Editor. *State Teachers Organizations*. National Association of Secretaries of State Teachers Associations, 1926. 206 p.
83. HOUSMAN, IDA E. "High Spots in Framing a Tenure Law." *American School Board Journal* 70: 37-9; March, 1925.
84. HOUSMAN, IDA E. "A Preparatory Program for Retirement Legislation." *Educational Review* 73: 284-7; May, 1927.
85. HUNT, C. W. *The Cost and Support of Secondary Schools in the State of New York*. Volume 3 of the Educational Finance Inquiry Commission, American Council on Education, New York. Macmillan, 1924. 107 p.
86. HUNTER, FRED M., Chairman. "A Report of the Tenure Committee of One Hundred of National Education Association." *Proceedings* 66: 204-15; 1928. National Education Association, Washington, D. C.
87. HUNTER, FRED M. "Teacher Tenure in the United States." *Proceedings* 65: 208-37; 1927. National Education Association, Washington, D. C.
88. INDIANA RURAL EDUCATION SURVEY COMMITTEE. *Report*. State Superintendent of Schools, State House, Indianapolis, Indiana, March, 1926. 130 p.
89. JENSEN, JENS P. *Problems of Public Finance*. Thomas Y. Crowell Co., New York City, 1924. 606 p.
90. KALBACH, L. A., AND NEAL, A. O. *Organization of State Departments of Education*. U. S. Department of Interior, Bureau of Education, Bulletin 1920, No. 46. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C. 48 p.

91. KANDEL, ISAAC L. "Tenure of Service of Teachers." *Teachers College Record* 26: 127-44; October, 1924.
92. KEENE, C. H. "A State Program in Education for Health." *School and Society* 20: 415-29; October 4, 1924.
93. KEESECKER, WARD W. *Digest of Legislation for Education of Crippled Children*. U. S. Department of Interior, Bureau of Education, Bulletin, 1929, No. 5. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C. 11 p.
94. KEESECKER, WARD W. *Laws Relating to Compulsory Education*. U. S. Department of Interior, Bureau of Education, Bulletin, 1928, No. 20. Washington, D. C. Government Printing Office. 70 p.
95. KEESECKER, WARD W. *Review of Educational Legislation 1926-1928*. U. S. Department of Interior, Bureau of Education, Bulletin 1929, No. 27. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C. 20 p.
96. KERSHNER, W. E. "How to Meet the Liability for Prior Service." National Council of Teachers' Retirement Systems, *Proceedings*. Dallas, Texas. February 23-24, 1927. p. 13-16.
97. KING, LEROY A., AND UPDEGRAFF, HARLAN. *A Survey of the Fiscal Policies of the State of Pennsylvania in the Field of Education*. Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Harrisburg, 1922. 207 p.
98. KOOS, LEONARD V., Director. *Secondary Education in California: Report of a Preliminary Survey*. California State Department of Education, Sacramento, California. 1929. 128 p.
99. LEARNED, W. S., AND BAGLEY, W. C. AND OTHERS. *The Professional Preparation of Teachers for American Public Schools*. Bulletin 14, 1920. Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 522 Fifth Avenue, New York City. 475 p.
100. LEE, CHARLES A. "A Teacher Retirement System." *Missouri School Journal* 47: 14-16; February, 1929.
101. LEWIS, ERVIN EUGENE. *Personnel Problems of the Teaching Staff*. Century Co., New York, 1925. 460 p.
102. LIEBLER, C. C. "Qualifications and Compensation of Persons Charged with the Enforcement of Compulsory Education." *Elementary School Journal* 27: 695-706; May, 1927.
103. LISCHKA, CHARLES M. *Private Schools and State Laws*. National Catholic Welfare Conference, Bureau of Education, 1312 Massachusetts Ave., Washington, D. C. 296 p.
104. LORD, SAMUEL. "Administration of Laws of Taxation of Property." *Proceedings of the National Tax Association*. 1911. National Tax Association, New York, 1912. p. 363-76.
105. MCCAHAN, DAVID. *State Insurance in the United States*. University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia, Pa. 1929. Chapter 10, "Pension Funds." p. 137-75.
106. MCCONNELL, J. M. "Judicious Control of Teacher-Training by State Department of Education." *Proceedings* 65: 944-8; 1927. National Education Association, Washington, D. C.
107. MCCracken, THOMAS C. "The State Board of Education." *Journal of the National Education Association* 12: 185-7; May, 1923.
108. MCGAUGHY, J. R. *The Fiscal Administration of City School Systems*. Vol. V of the Educational Finance Inquiry Commission, American Council on Education, The Macmillan Company, New York, 1924. 95 p.
109. MAHONEY, JOHN J. *Americanization in the United States*. U. S. Department of Interior, Bureau of Education, Bulletin 1923, No. 31. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C. 42 p.
110. MANGOLD, GEORGE BENJAMIN. *Problems of Child Welfare*. Macmillan Co., New York City, 1924.
111. MEADER, J. L. *Normal School Education in Connecticut*. Teachers College, Columbia University, Contributions to Education, No. 307. Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City, 1928. 96 p.
112. MELIN, LILLIAN. "The Retirement Fund." *National League of Teachers' Associations Bulletin* 12: 21-3; April, 1929.
113. MERIAM, LEWIS. *Principles Governing the Retirement of Public Employees*. D. Appleton and Company, New York City. 1918. 477 p.
114. Mississippi Survey Commission, M. V. O'SHEA, Director. *Public Education in Mississippi*. State Department of Education, 1926. 362 p.
115. Missouri School Survey Committee. *Facts Concerning Public Education in Missouri*. Supplement to Seventy-fifth Report of the Public Schools of the State of Missouri. State Superintendent of Public Schools, Jefferson City, Mo., 1924. 139 p.
116. MOEHLMAN, ARTHUR B. *Child Accounting*. Friesema Brothers Press, Detroit, Michigan, 1924. 205 p.
117. MONAHAN, A. C. and COOK, K. M. *Educational Survey of Wyoming*. U. S. Department of Interior, Bureau of Education, Bulletin 1916, No. 29. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C. 120 p.
118. MOORE, MARGARET DJENAN. *State Provisions for Americanization*. Unpublished Master's Thesis, George Washington University, Washington, D. C., 1923.
119. MORRISON, FRED W. *Equalization of the Financial Burden of Education Among the Counties of North Carolina*. Teachers College, Columbia University, Contributions to Education, No. 184. Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City. 88 p.

120. MORRISON, FRED W. AND OTHERS. *Report on the Public School System of North Carolina. Parts I-III.* State Educational Commission, Raleigh, N. C., 1927. 269 p.
121. MORRISON, HENRY C. *Financing of Public Schools in the State of Illinois.* Volume 9 of the Educational Finance Inquiry Commission, American Council on Education, New York. Macmillan, 1924. 162 p.
122. MORT, PAUL R. "Equalization of Educational Opportunity." *Journal of Educational Research* 13: 90-103; February, 1926.
123. MORT, P. R. *State Support for Public Schools.* Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, 1926. 104 p.
124. MYERS, ALONZO F. *A Teacher Training Program for Ohio.* Teachers College, Columbia University, Contributions to Education No. 266. Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City, 1927. 144 p.
125. MYERS, GEORGE E. "Report on Judgments of Certain Educational Leaders Concerning Tendencies in Classification of Teachers." *Better Schools Bulletin* 10: 4; September, 1929. Ohio State Department of Education, Columbus, Ohio.
126. NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION, Research Division. "The Advance of the Teacher Retirement Movement." *Research Bulletin* 6:149-204; May, 1928. 203 p. National Education Association, Washington, D. C.
127. NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION, Research Division. Research Bulletin which will deal with certain issues in teacher retirement. In preparation. National Education Association, Washington, D. C.
128. NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION, Research Division. "The Problem of Teacher Tenure." *Research Bulletin* 2: 141-75; November, 1924. National Education Association, Washington, D. C.
129. NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION, Research Division. *Sabbatical Leave for Public School Teachers.* Report prepared by the Research Division for the Representative Assembly. National Education Association, Washington, D. C., July, 1927. 31 p.
130. NATIONAL TAX ASSOCIATION. "Report of the Committee Appointed to Prepare a Plan of a Model System of State and Local Taxation." *Proceedings*, Chicago, 1919. National Tax Association, New York, 1920, p. 426-70.
131. O'SHEA, M. V. *A State Educational System at Work (Mississippi).* Bernard B. Jones Fund, 1927. 368 p.
132. PALMER, NIDA PEARL. *Pension Systems for Public School Teachers.* U. S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Education Bulletin, 1927, No. 23. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C. 90 p.
133. PARKINSON, BURNEY L. *The Professional Preparation and Certification of White Elementary and Secondary Public School Teachers in South Carolina.* Bulletin of the University of South Carolina, No. 184. June 1, 1926. University Extension Division, University of South Carolina, Columbia, S. C. 270 p.
134. Pennsylvania Committees on Appropriations and Subsidies, High Schools, Normal Schools, Rural Schools, Teachers' Institutes. *Educational Surveys* 1925. Department of Public Instruction, Harrisburg, Pa. 398 p.
135. Pennsylvania Commission to Study the Distribution of State Subsidies to School Districts. *Report.* Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Harrisburg, Pa. 1927. 302 p.
136. PITTENGER, BENJAMIN FLOYD. *An Introduction to Public School Finance.* Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston, 1925. 372 p.
137. PITTENGER, B. F. "Suggestions for the Revision of Compulsory School Attendance Laws." *Texas Outlook* 13: 66-8; June, 1929.
138. PROSSER, CHARLES A. and HAMILTON, W. I. *The Teacher and Old Age.* Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston, Mass., 1913. 140 p.
139. Public School Administrative Code Commission of the State of Washington. *Report*, delivered to the Governor and the Legislature, January 11, 1921. Olympia, Washington. 117 p.
140. PYRTLE, E. RUTH. "Efficient Teaching and a Retirement System." *School and Society* 28: 591-92; November 10, 1928.
141. PYRTLE, E. RUTH. "Report of the Committee on Retirement Allowances." *Proceedings* 67: 217-27; July, 1929. National Education Association, Washington, D. C.
142. RAINEY, HOMER P. *A Study of School Finance in Oregon.* Commonwealth Review of the University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon. Vol. 7, No. 3, July, 1925. 132 p.
143. RAINEY, HOMER P. *The Distribution of School Funds in the State of Oregon.* University of Oregon Publications, Education Series, Vol. 1, No. 1. University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon. December, 1926. 48 p.
144. REEDER, WARD G. *The Chief State School Official.* U. S. Department of Interior, Bureau of Education, Bulletin 1924, No. 5. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C. 67 p.
145. REEDER, WARD G. "Reorganizing the Office of the Chief State School Official." *American School Board Journal* 71: 43, 150; August, 1925.
146. REEDER, WARD G. "State Control of Private and Parochial Schools." *School and Society* 17: 426-9; April 21, 1923.
147. REEVES, FLOYD W. *The Political Unit of Public School Finance in Illinois.* Volume 10 of the Educational Finance Inquiry Commission, New York. Macmillan, 1924. 166 p.
148. "Report of the Commission on Coordination in Adult Education." *Proceedings* 65: 327-32;

1927. National Education Association, Washington, D. C.
149. "Retirement for Age." *School and Society* 22: 84; July 18, 1925.
150. "The Retiring Age." *Journal of Education* 108: 128; August 27, 1928.
151. ROBINSON, WM. MCKINLEY. *Preparation of Teachers*. U. S. Department of Interior, Bureau of Education, Bulletin 1927, No. 36. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C.
152. ROCH, JENNIE. "Need for a Retirement System." *Journal of the Louisiana Teachers Association* 6: 20-1; March, 1929.
153. ROCH, JENNIE. "What Is A Teachers' Retirement Fund?" *Journal of the Louisiana Teachers Association* 6: 9-10; April, 1929.
154. ROGERS, JAMES F. *School Health Work, 1926-1928*. U. S. Department of Interior, Bureau of Education, Bulletin, 1929, No. 8. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C. 18 p.
155. ROSIER, JOSEPH. "Report of the Committee on Standards, Requirements and Credits of Teachers in the Service." *Proceedings* 64: 223-30; 1926. National Education Association, Washington, D. C.
156. RUSSELL, WILLIAM F., HOLY, T. C. *The Financing of Education in Iowa*. Volume 8 of the Educational Finance Inquiry Commission, American Council on Education, New York. Macmillan, 1925. 279 p.
157. SAVAGE, HOWARD J., AND COGSWELL, EDMUND S. *A Retirement Plan for Colorado Public Schools*. Bulletin No. 22, 1928. Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 522 Fifth Avenue, New York City. 72 p.
158. SCHRAMEL, HENRY E. *The Organization of State Departments of Education*. Ohio State University Studies. Bureau of Educational Research Monographs, No. 6. Ohio State University Press, Columbus, Ohio. 171 p.
159. SEARS, JESSE B. AND CUBBERLEY, ELLWOOD P. *Cost of Education in California*. Volume 7 of the Educational Finance Inquiry Commission, American Council on Education, New York. Macmillan, 1924. 353 p.
160. SELIGMAN, EDWIN R. A. *Essays in Taxation*. The Macmillan Company, New York, 1925. 806 p.
161. SHAW, ALBERT M. "Retirement Allowances," *National League of Teachers' Associations Bulletin* 12: 15-21; April, 1929.
162. SHEFFER, W. E. "Improvement in the State Department of Education." *Kansas Teacher* 28: 28-30; November, 1928.
163. SIES, RAYMOND W. "Legal Regulation of Minimum Salaries for Teachers." *Educational Review* 35: 10-31; January, 1908.
164. SINGLETON, GORDON G. *Responsibility for the Support of Education in Georgia*. Contributions to Education No. 181. Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City, 1925. 56 p.
165. SMITH, JAMES MONROE. *The Training of High School Teachers in Louisiana*. Teachers College, Columbia University, Contributions to Education No. 247. Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City, 1926. 101 p.
166. SOWERS, DON C. *The Financing of Public Higher Education in Colorado*. University of Colorado Studies, Vol. 14, No. 2, University of Colorado, Boulder, Colo., September, 1924. 102 p.
167. SOWERS, DON C. *The Financing of Public School Education in Colorado*. University of Colorado Studies, Vol. 14, No. 1, University of Colorado, Boulder, Colo., June, 1924; September, 1924. 93 p.
168. "State Certification of Elementary School Principals." Seventh Yearbook, *Bulletin* 7: 391-401; April, 1928. Department of Elementary School Principals, National Education Association, Washington, D. C.
169. State of Connecticut, Division of Research and Surveys of the State Board of Education. *Financing Education in Connecticut. A Proposed Plan to Enable the State of Connecticut to Meet More Adequately Its Educational Responsibility*. State of Connecticut, Hartford, 1927. 198 p.
170. State of Indiana, Department of Public Instruction. *Value of Rural School Supervision*. Educational Bulletin, No. 84. Prepared under the direction of Henry Noble Sherwood, State Superintendent of Public Instruction. Indianapolis, Indiana, 1926.
171. State School Code Commission of Kansas. *Report*. State School Code Commission, Topeka, Kansas, 1929. Volume I, 88 p.; Volume II, 156 p.; Volume III, 99 p.
172. STEELE, ROBERT MCCURDY. *A Study of Teacher Training in Vermont*. Teachers College, Columbia University, Contributions to Education No. 243. Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City, 1926. 111 p.
173. STOOPS, R. O. *Elementary School Costs in the State of New York*. Volume 2 of the Educational Finance Inquiry Commission, American Council on Education, New York. Macmillan, 1924. 123 p.
174. STOUTEMYER, J. HOWARD. "Facts and Fallacies in the Certification of Secondary School Teachers." *Educational Administration and Supervision* 15: 38-45; January, 1929.
175. STRAYER, GEORGE D. AND HAIG, ROBERT M. *The Financing of Education in the State of New York*. Volume 1 of the Educational Finance Inquiry Commission, New York. Macmillan, 1923. 205 p.
176. STUDENSKY, PAUL. *Teachers' Pension Systems in the United States*. D. Appleton and Company, New York City. 1920. 460 p.
177. Survey Commission, W. C. Bagley, Chairman. *Report on the Louisiana State Normal College. The Louisiana Polytechnic Institute, The Southwestern Louisiana Institute*. State Department of Education, Baton Rouge, La., 1924. 233 p.

178. SWIFT, FLETCHER HARPER. *Public Permanent Common School Funds in the United States*. Henry Holt and Co., New York, 1911. 493 p.
179. SWIFT, FLETCHER HARPER AND OTHERS. *Studies in Public School Finance—Vol. III. The Middle West, Illinois, Minnesota, South Dakota, with a Supplement on Alaska*. University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota, 1925. 329 p.
180. SWIFT, FLETCHER H. AND GOLDTHORPE, J. H. *Studies in Public School Finance. The South: Arkansas, Oklahoma, Alabama, Tennessee*. Research Publications of the University of Minnesota. Education Series No. 4, Minneapolis, Minnesota, 1925. 224 p.
181. SWIFT, FLETCHER H. *Studies in Public School Finance. The West: California and Colorado*. Research Publications of the University of Minnesota. Education Series No. 4, Minneapolis, Minnesota, 1923. 221 p.
182. SWIFT, FLETCHER HARPER, GRAVES, RICHARD A. AND TIEGS, ERNEST WALTER. *Studies in Public School Finance, The East: Massachusetts, New York, New Jersey*. Research Publications of the University of Minnesota, Education Series No. 2, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota, 1923. 205 p.
183. SWIFT, FLETCHER HARPER. *The Public School Systems of Arkansas*. Part II, "Public School Finance." United States Department of Interior, Bureau of Education, Bulletin, 1923, No. 11. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C. 110 p.
184. TAYLOR, W. S. *Development of Professional Education of Teachers in Pennsylvania*. J. P. Lippincott Company, Philadelphia, Pa., 1924.
185. TIDWELL, CLYDE. *State Control of Textbooks with Special Reference to Florida*. Contributions to Education No. 299. Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City, 1928. 78 p.
186. TRUSLER, HARRY R. *Essentials of School Law*. Bruce Publishing Co., Milwaukee, Wisconsin, 1927. 478 p.
187. TUPPER, C. RALPH. *A Survey of the Arizona Public School System*. State Board of Education, Phoenix, Arizona, 1925. 112 p.
188. U. S. Department of Interior, Bureau of Education. *Biennial Survey of Education, 1924-1926*. Bulletin 1928, No. 25. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C. 1204 p.
189. U. S. Department of Interior, Bureau of Education. *Educational Conditions in Arizona. Report of a Survey by the U. S. Bureau of Education*. Bulletin 1917, No. 44. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C. 1918. 200 p.
190. U. S. Department of Interior, Bureau of Education. *The Educational System of South Dakota*. Bulletin 1918, No. 31. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C. 304 p.
191. U. S. Department of Interior, Bureau of Education. *An Educational Study of Alabama*. Bulletin 1919, No. 41. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C. 522 p.
192. U. S. Department of Interior, Bureau of Education. *Manual of Educational Legislation*. Bulletin, 1926, No. 22. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C. 67 p.
193. U. S. Department of Interior, Bureau of Education. *Professional Preparation of Teachers for Rural Schools*. Bulletin 1928, No. 6. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C.
194. U. S. Department of Interior, Bureau of Education. *Public Education in Oklahoma*. Bulletin 1923, No. 14. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C. 1922, 420 p.
195. U. S. Department of Interior, Bureau of Education. *The Public School System of Arkansas*. Bulletin 1923, No. 10. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C. 79 p.
196. U. S. Department of Interior, Bureau of Education. *Report of an Inquiry into the Administration and Support of the Colorado School System*. Bulletin 1917, No. 5. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C. 93 p.
197. U. S. Department of Interior, Bureau of Education. *Report of a Survey of the University of Nevada*. Bulletin 1917, No. 19. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C. 184 p.
198. U. S. Department of Interior, Bureau of Education. *Some Essential Viewpoints in Supervision of Rural Schools*. Bulletin 1929, No. 3. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C. 80 p.
199. U. S. Department of Interior, Bureau of Education. *State Higher Educational Institutions of Iowa*. Bulletin 1916, No. 19. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C. 223 p.
200. U. S. Department of Interior, Bureau of Education. *The State Higher Educational Institutions of North Dakota*. Bulletin 1916, No. 27. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C. 204 p.
201. U. S. Department of Interior, Bureau of Education. *Survey of Education in Utah*. Bulletin 1926, No. 18. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C. 510 p.
202. U. S. Department of Interior, Bureau of Education. *A Survey of Educational Institutions of the State of Washington*. Bulletin 1916, No. 26. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C. 228 p.
203. U. S. Department of Interior, Bureau of Education. *Survey of the University of Arizona*. Bulletin 1922, No. 36. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C. 89 p.
204. U. S. Department of Labor, Children's Bureau. "Standards Applicable to the Administration of Employment Certificate Systems." *Administration of Child Labor Laws—Part V*. Children's Bureau Publication, No. 138. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C.
205. U. S. Department of Labor, Children's Bureau. *Child Labor—Facts and Figures*. Bureau Publication No. 197. Revised edition of Publica-

- tion No. 197. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C. In press.
206. U. S. Department of Labor, Children's Bureau. *Child Labor—Outlines for Study*. Bureau Publication No. 93. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C.
 207. U. S. Department of Labor, Children's Bureau. *Children in Agriculture*. Bureau Publication No. 187. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C.
 208. U. S. Department of Labor, Children's Bureau. *Child Workers on City Streets*. Bureau Publication No. 188. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C.
 209. U. S. Department of Labor, Children's Bureau. *Industrial Accidents to Employed Minors*. Bureau Publication No. 152. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C.
 210. U. S. Department of Labor, Children's Bureau. *Legal Regulation of the Employment of Minors, Sixteen Years of Age and Over*. Children's Bureau Leaflet, Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C.
 211. U. S. Department of Labor, Children's Bureau. *Physical Standards for Working Children*. Bureau Publication No. 79. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C.
 212. U. S. Department of Labor, Children's Bureau. *Standards and Problems Connected with the Issuance of Employment Certificates*. Bureau Publication No. 116. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C.
 213. UTNE, THEODORE. "Adult Education from the State Point of View." *Proceedings* 66: 265-7; 1928. National Education Association, Washington, D. C.
 214. VANDERWALKER, NINA C. *Kindergarten Legislation*. U. S. Department of Interior, Bureau of Education, Bulletin, 1925, No. 7. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C. 32 p.
 215. Virginia Education Commission and Virginia Survey Staff, Alexander Inglis, Director. *Virginia Public Schools: A Survey of a Southern State School System*. Education Series Vol. VII. World Book Co., Yonkers, New York, 1920. 400 p.
 216. WALLIN, J. E. WALLACE. *The Education of Handicapped Children*. Houghton Mifflin Co., Boston, 1924. 394 p.
 217. WANNEY, ANNE R. "Reasons for a Teacher Retirement System." *School and Community* 14: 606, 608; December, 1928.
 218. WHITNEY, F. L. *The Growth of Teachers in Service*. Century Co., 1927. New York. 300 p.
 219. WILEY, G. M. *The Teaching Personnel in Village and Rural Schools, 1923-24*. University of the State of New York Press, Albany, New York, 1925. 24 p.
 220. WILLETT, GEORGE M. *The Public School Debt in Illinois*. Volume 11 of the Educational Finance Inquiry Commission, American Council on Education. Macmillan Co., New York, 1924. 97 p.
 221. WOOD, THOMAS D. (Editor) *Health Improvement in Rural Schools*. Report of the Joint Committee on Health Problems in Education of the National Education Association and the American Medical Association. Press of the American Medical Association, New York City, 1922. 52 p.
 222. WOOD, THOMAS D., AND ROWELL, HUGH GRANT. *Health Supervision and Medical Inspection of Schools*. W. B. Saunders Co., Philadelphia, Pa., 1927. 637 p.
 223. WORKS, GEORGE A. "The Relation of the State to the Support of Education." *Elementary School Journal* 27: 335-43; January, 1927.
 224. WORKS, GEORGE A. (Director) *Texas Educational Survey Reports*. Austin, Texas Educational Survey Commission, 1925. 8 vols.
 225. WORKS, GEORGE A. AND OTHERS. *Rural School Survey of New York State*. Joint Committee on Rural Schools, Ithaca, N. Y., 1922. 8 vols.
 226. ZOOK, G. F., COFFMAN, L. D. AND MANN, A. P. *Report of Survey of State Institutions of Higher Learning in Kansas*. U. S. Department of Interior, Bureau of Education Bulletin 1923, No. 40. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C. 160 p.
 227. ZOOK, GEORGE F. *Report of the Higher Educational Institutions of Arkansas*. U. S. Department of Interior, Bureau of Education Bulletin 1922, No. 7. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C. 17 p.

UNTIL within a recent period educational programs evolved through force of circumstances and along lines of least resistance rather than through the intelligent development of preconceived plans. Now they are deliberately formulated, projected, and executed. Program making has come to be an essential feature of educational administration. The newest, best approved, and most effective method of formulating a program is through a survey that discloses conditions, reveals tendencies, points out deficiencies, indicates needs, and suggests remedies.—John W. Abercrombie.
