

COLLEGIATE ACCREDITATION BY AGENCIES WITHIN STATES

BY

FRED J. KELLY
Chief, Division of Higher Education

BENJAMIN W. FRAZIER
Senior Specialist in Teacher Training

JOHN H. McNEELY
Senior Specialist in Higher Education

ELLA B. RATCLIFFE
Chief Educational Assistant

Bulletin 1940, No. 3

Federal Security Agency - - - - Paul V. McNutt, Administrator
U. S. Office of Education - - - - John W. Studebaker, Commissioner

United States Government Printing Office - - - - Washington - - - - 1940

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, Washington, D. C. - - - - Price 25 cents

Contents

| | Page |
|---|------|
| FOREWORD..... | ix |
| Chapter I. Introduction..... | 1 |
| Purpose of study..... | 2 |
| Definition of accreditation..... | 2 |
| Nature of material, methods of collection, and sources..... | 3 |
| Limitations of the study..... | 4 |
| PART I. HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT | |
| Chapter II. Accrediting by Voluntary Agencies..... | 7 |
| Standardization of entrance requirements..... | 8 |
| College Entrance Examination Board..... | 9 |
| Accrediting of secondary schools..... | 9 |
| Accrediting in higher education on a national basis..... | 9 |
| Association of Collegiate Alumnae and American Association of University Women..... | 10 |
| Southern Association of College Women..... | 12 |
| National Association of State Universities..... | 12 |
| Association of Land-grant Colleges and Universities..... | 13 |
| Association of American Universities..... | 13 |
| National Conference Committee on Standards of Colleges and Secondary Schools..... | 15 |
| United States Bureau of Education..... | 16 |
| Classification of universities and colleges by United States Bureau of Education..... | 17 |
| Study of standards by Committee on Higher Educational Statis- tics of United States Bureau of Education..... | 18 |
| American Council on Education..... | 19 |
| Accrediting in higher education on regional basis..... | 20 |
| North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools..... | 20 |
| Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools..... | 21 |
| Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools..... | 22 |
| New England Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools..... | 23 |
| Northwest Association of Secondary and Higher Schools..... | 23 |
| Accrediting of teacher-training institutions..... | 23 |
| American Association of Teachers Colleges..... | 23 |
| Summary of findings..... | 24 |
| Chapter III. Accrediting by State Agencies..... | 26 |
| New York..... | 26 |
| Supervisory organization for education..... | 27 |
| University of the State of New York..... | 28 |
| Financial requirements for incorporation of academies and colleges..... | 29 |
| Academic standards for incorporation and registration of colleges..... | 31 |
| Registration of institutions outside of New York..... | 34 |
| Recent changes in requirements for registration..... | 34 |
| Incorporation and registration of junior colleges..... | 36 |
| Incorporation and registration of professional schools—medicine..... | 36 |

| Chapter III—Continued. | Page |
|--|------|
| Connecticut..... | 38 |
| Incorporation and approval of colleges..... | 38 |
| Incorporation and approval of junior colleges..... | 40 |
| Approval of institutions for certification of teachers..... | 41 |
| Virginia..... | 41 |
| Certification of teachers..... | 42 |
| State board of examiners and inspectors..... | 43 |
| Registration of institutions by State department of education..... | 44 |
| Illinois..... | 46 |
| Recognition of higher institutions for teacher certification..... | 46 |
| Approval for establishment of public junior colleges..... | 48 |
| Accrediting of higher institutions by University of Illinois..... | 48 |
| Iowa..... | 51 |
| Approval of higher institutions for certification of teachers..... | 51 |
| Accrediting of junior colleges..... | 55 |
| Accrediting of higher institutions for transfer of credits..... | 56 |
| Intercollegiate standing committee..... | 57 |
| Missouri..... | 58 |
| Approving institutions for certification of teachers..... | 58 |
| Accrediting institutions for transfer of credits..... | 61 |
| Accrediting of junior colleges by University of Missouri..... | 62 |
| Summary of findings..... | 64 |
| Chapter IV. Accrediting of Professional Schools..... | 65 |
| Medicine..... | 65 |
| Standardization of medical education..... | 66 |
| Closing of low-grade medical schools..... | 68 |
| Standardizing of technical specialties..... | 70 |
| Group hospitalization..... | 70 |
| Survey of medical schools..... | 70 |
| Association of American Medical Colleges..... | 71 |
| Federation of State medical boards..... | 72 |
| Dentistry..... | 72 |
| National association of dental faculties..... | 73 |
| Dental faculties association of American universities..... | 73 |
| Dental Educational Council of America..... | 73 |
| American Association of Dental Schools..... | 75 |
| Law..... | 76 |
| American Bar Association..... | 77 |
| Association of American Law Schools..... | 79 |
| Pharmacy..... | 83 |
| American Council on Pharmaceutical Education, Inc..... | 83 |
| Library science..... | 86 |
| American Library Association..... | 86 |
| Music..... | 87 |
| National Association of Schools of Music..... | 87 |
| Optometry..... | 87 |
| International Association of Boards of Examiners in Optometry..... | 88 |
| Forestry..... | 89 |
| Society of American Foresters..... | 89 |
| Engineering..... | 90 |
| Engineers' Council for Professional Development..... | 90 |

CONTENTS

v

| | Page |
|--|------|
| Chapter IV—Continued. | |
| Theology..... | 90 |
| American Association of Theological Schools..... | 90 |
| Other fields of professional technical training..... | 92 |
| Architecture..... | 92 |
| Additional associations of professional schools..... | 92 |
| Summary of findings..... | 92 |
| (PART II. EXISTING PRACTICES BY AGENCIES WITHIN STATES) | |
| Chapter V. State Accreditation Organizations..... | 97 |
| Types of accrediting organizations..... | 97 |
| Unified, bipartite, and tripartite organizations..... | 99 |
| Intercollegiate committees and State college associations..... | 100 |
| Legally empowered and voluntary accrediting agencies..... | 101 |
| Legally empowered agencies which delegate authority..... | 102 |
| Agencies accrediting on voluntary basis..... | 103 |
| Accrediting agency as institution or governing board in— | |
| State's system of higher education..... | 104 |
| State university as accrediting agency..... | 105 |
| Governing board as accrediting agency..... | 105 |
| Primary duties of State departments of education serving as accrediting agencies..... | 106 |
| Departments possessing legal powers over higher education..... | 107 |
| Departments without legal powers over higher education..... | 108 |
| Summary of findings..... | 108 |
| Chapter VI. State Accreditation of Teacher-Education Institutions..... | 110 |
| General nature of accreditation..... | 110 |
| Growth of the movement..... | 111 |
| Purposes of accreditation..... | 113 |
| Special problems in organization of State accrediting agencies..... | 114 |
| Legal provisions for approval or accreditation..... | 115 |
| State boards and departments of education responsible for accreditation..... | 116 |
| Representation of State board or department in cooperative accreditation organization..... | 119 |
| Financing accrediting activities..... | 120 |
| Personnel of State boards and departments of education engaged in accreditation..... | 121 |
| Composition, selection, tenure, and salaries of officers..... | 121 |
| Growth in size and effectiveness of State department staffs..... | 122 |
| Relationships to State administrative control of institutions, and to teacher certification..... | 122 |
| Relationship to overhead administrative control of institutions..... | 122 |
| Relationship to teacher certification..... | 126 |
| Procedures in accreditation..... | 130 |
| Initial accrediting procedure..... | 130 |
| Visitation of institutions..... | 131 |
| Institutional reports to accrediting agencies..... | 133 |
| Supplementary or incidental means of appraising institutions..... | 134 |
| Special problems in accrediting procedures..... | 137 |

| | Page |
|---|------|
| Chapter VI—Continued. | |
| Standards for accrediting..... | 139 |
| Extent to which detailed standards have been adopted..... | 139 |
| Nature and contents of standards..... | 140 |
| Fields or types of work for which institutions are accredited..... | 142 |
| Methods of formulating and revising standards..... | 143 |
| Lists of accredited institutions..... | 147 |
| Number and classification of accredited institutions..... | 147 |
| Determination of the standing of out-of-State institutions..... | 152 |
| Extent of changes in State accredited lists..... | 155 |
| Summary of findings..... | 156 |
| Chapter VII. State Accreditation of General Collegiate Institutions. | 163 |
| States having accrediting agencies in general collegiate field..... | 164 |
| Agencies accrediting general collegiate institutions..... | 165 |
| Agencies accrediting public junior colleges..... | 166 |
| Internal organizations of agencies for performing accreditation function..... | 167 |
| Accrediting organizations of State departments of education..... | 167 |
| Accrediting organizations of State universities..... | 167 |
| Accrediting organizations of State college associations..... | 168 |
| Accrediting organizations of intercollegiate standing committees..... | 169 |
| Relationships of accrediting agencies with other agencies or organizations..... | 169 |
| Method of defraying costs of accrediting operations..... | 170 |
| Standards used by agencies in accrediting institutions..... | 171 |
| Practices of agencies in adopting standards..... | 171 |
| Procedures and practices in formulating standards..... | 173 |
| Practices of agencies in revising standards..... | 174 |
| Methods employed by agencies in appraising institutions..... | 175 |
| Initial reports filed by institutions with agencies..... | 175 |
| Visitation by agencies in appraising institutions..... | 175 |
| Requirement by agencies of annual reports from institutions..... | 177 |
| Issuance of accredited lists of institutions..... | 178 |
| Accredited lists of institutions..... | 178 |
| Extent of revision of accredited lists..... | 179 |
| Number of institutions on accredited lists of State agencies..... | 179 |
| Institutions included in accredited lists on probationary basis..... | 180 |
| Out-of-State use of accredited lists of State agencies..... | 182 |
| Summary of findings..... | 183 |
| PART III. ISSUES, PROBLEMS, AND A CONCLUDING PROPOSAL | |
| Chapter VIII. Issues and Problems Involved in the Accrediting Movement. | |
| Difficulties arising from extent of the accrediting movement..... | 187 |
| The transition from quantitative to qualitative standards..... | 187 |
| Implied responsibility of State to assure the satisfactory standards of colleges the State establishes or charters..... | 196 |
| Inadequacy of present State accrediting agencies..... | 200 |
| Complications growing out of dual responsibility for educating teachers and certifying them..... | 201 |
| Relation of the State to national professional organizations..... | 202 |
| Transfer of credits for student work from one institution to another both within a State and between States..... | 203 |

CONTENTS

VII

| | Page |
|---|------|
| Chapter IX. A Concluding Proposal..... | 206 |
| A proposal for strengthening the accrediting activities within each State..... | 207 |
| Plan A. Accrediting by the State board or department of education..... | 208 |
| Plan B. Accrediting by the State board or department of education through a special arm created with the cooperation of the institutions of higher education..... | 209 |
| Plan C. Accrediting by a special commission or board set up by the cooperative action of the institutions and agencies concerned..... | 209 |
| Duties of State accrediting agency..... | 211 |
| Summary of the principal reasons for the proposal..... | 212 |
| Selected References..... | 215 |

Foreword

During the meeting of the National Council of Chief State School Officers, December 1937, the following resolution was passed: "Resolved, that the Office of Education be requested to recommend standards which may be used by the departments of education in the several States for the accreditation of post-secondary institutions."

After careful consideration of this resolution by the Office of Education it seemed clear that to recommend standards which might be applicable to the many kinds of post-secondary institutions in the several States would be inadvisable if not impossible. The assumption that standards should be the same in the several States is, first of all, open to question. Furthermore, standards for accreditation are undergoing radical revisions at the hands of those associations which have devoted most time and study to the problem. It would be bad procedure to recommend standards to the State departments of education if such recommendation would serve to slow up the processes of revision of standards now going on.

On the other hand, the question of accreditation of institutions of higher education was recognized as of very great importance. It was further recognized that State departments of education should be keenly interested in it and should probably participate in the processes of accreditation to a larger extent than at present. The Office was therefore desirous of responding as helpfully as possible to the resolution. At the request of the Office of Education an Advisory Committee was appointed to confer with the Commissioner with respect to the most appropriate procedures to follow. This committee consisted of Supt. Walter F. Dexter of California, Com. Ernest W. Butterfield of Connecticut, Supt. Eugene B. Elliott of Michigan, Supt. Lloyd W. King of Missouri, and Supt. Sidney B. Hall of Virginia. This committee met on May 9 and 10, 1938. Attending the meeting also were President Harry M. Gage of Coe College, Iowa, as Chairman of the Commission on Higher Institutions of the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, and Chancellor Oliver C. Carmichael of Vanderbilt University, Tennessee, as Chairman of the Commission on Higher Institutions of the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. At the conclusion of a 2-day meeting the following expressions of opinion and recommendations were adopted by the committee:

1. It is the opinion of the committee that the issue of most basic importance is the relation of State departments of education to the movement of accreditation in general. This relationship is recognized to involve not alone the problem of accrediting institutions for the training of teachers but includes also the State department's share in the responsibility for

- developing in each State an adequate and economical system of education, including higher education. It is recommended, therefore, that as a first responsibility of the Office in carrying out the resolution of the Council of Chief State School Officers a study should be made of the problems and issues involved in the whole function of accreditation with a view to helping the State departments see more clearly the part they may be able to play in solving the complicated problem of accreditation.
2. It is the opinion of the Committee that new colleges seeking the degree-granting privilege should be established by a State only after study and report concerning them has been made by some designated State educational agency. We, therefore, recommend that the Office of Education make a study of existing practices in this regard, and present to the Council of Chief State School Officers recommendations for legislation or other action looking toward the desired end.
 3. It is recommended that both for the establishment and for the accreditation of junior colleges of all types, the Office of Education shall recommend criteria, including objectives, philosophy, and methods of appraisal such as shall encourage flexibility and adaptation to existing educational needs. In connection with the above recommendation, the hope is expressed that a compilation and consolidation of standards as used by various associations may be made, thus enabling the State departments of education to apply in practice such of these definite, concrete, quantitative standards as they care to.
 4. It is the opinion of the committee that State departments of education should have a peculiarly close relationship to the work of the State teachers colleges and normal schools. It is recommended, therefore, that the Office of Education secure from each chief State school officer his opinion of the adequacy or inadequacy of each of the standards used by the American Association of Teachers Colleges when these standards are applied to the State teachers colleges in his State.
 5. It is recommended that the Office of Education make a study of and report concerning private business and trade schools and colleges, from the point of view of their accreditation by the State.
 6. It is recommended that a study be made of the problem of standardization and accreditation of special types of private schools such as those for music and for dramatic art.
 7. It is recognized by the Committee that a close relationship exists between the functions of the State departments of education and those of other accrediting bodies. It is recommended, therefore, that as the Office of Education proceeds with its studies it confer at appropriate times with representatives of the standardizing agencies and boards of licensure concerned.
 8. In order to acquaint the Chief State School Officers of the several States with the proposed activities of the Office of Education in carrying out the resolution, it is recommended that a report of the procedures contemplated be sent to all Chief State School Officers for their criticism and that the studies be made in the light of the comments made by the Chief State School Officers.

In the light of these statements and recommendations it was decided that the Office of Education would undertake first to canvass the basic issue of accreditation and try to discover where the State

department of education in general fits into the whole scheme of accreditation.

The bulletin herewith is the result of that undertaking. It has been a cooperative enterprise participated in by four members of the staff with Fred J. Kelly, Chief of the Division of Higher Education, serving as coordinator. A report of progress was made to the Chief State School Officers at their annual meetings in December 1938, and December 1939, and helpful criticisms were made by a number of these officers. We wish to acknowledge, however, particular appreciation of the services of the members of the Advisory Committee.

The manuscript was then completed in tentative form, and steps taken to secure criticism of it before publication. These steps included: (1) mimeographing the summary of findings appearing at the close of each chapter, and the whole of Part III, *Issues, Problems and a Concluding Proposal*. (2) Submitting these mimeographed parts to two conference groups of State superintendents of education, and one conference group of representatives of national and regional accrediting associations, as well as to many individuals. The criticisms thus received proved helpful.

It is hoped that this study may be followed by others which will deal with the remaining recommendations of the Advisory Committee.

BESS GOODYKOONTZ,
Assistant U. S. Commissioner of Education.

Collegiate Accreditation by Agencies Within States

Chapter I. Introduction

A FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLE of the American Government is that education is a function of the States. The States are responsible for higher education as well as elementary and secondary education.

Accordingly, the States have established publicly controlled universities and colleges to provide higher education for the people. In addition, the States have authorized privately controlled institutions to be established within their borders by granting charters of incorporation to them for the same purpose. A further obligation rests on the States. That obligation is to assure that the higher educational services furnished by the institutions established under the authority of the State shall be of a satisfactory quality.

The States have adopted various plans in their yet modest beginning toward fulfilling this obligation. Among the most common is the accreditation of the institutions within the State. This plan in general consists of the appraisal of the physical plant, financial resources, staff, equipment, and cognate facilities of each institution to ascertain whether they are adequate to assure a recognized minimum quality of higher education.

Accreditation is a complex undertaking. It involves many intricate problems. In the first place, higher education includes a number of different fields of instruction. While the majority of institutions in the several States limit their services to the general collegiate field, others conduct work in professional or technical fields, including law, engineering, medicine, business, agriculture, dentistry, and the like. Accreditation in the general collegiate field represents one of the chief concerns of the State because of the predominant number of institutions engaged in providing this type of higher education. The States, however, are responsible for examining and licensing practitioners in each of the professions. Involved in this function is the problem of the accreditation of the professional schools which train the candidates applying to take the examinations.

In the second place, the States because of their responsibility for elementary and secondary education have a vital interest in the quality of training received by the public-school teachers. It is the practice in practically all the States to require teachers to secure

State certificates before being permitted to teach in the public schools. Most of the States have established their own teacher-education institutions. A large proportion of the publicly and privately controlled institutions in all of the States engaged in the general collegiate field also carry on teacher education. Moreover, the two fields are closely interrelated. Of special importance, therefore, is State accreditation of the teacher-education work provided by the institutions.

In the third place, voluntary or extra-legal associations have arisen and entered the domain of accreditation. These associations accredit institutions either on a regional or Nation-wide basis depending on the scope of their organization. They are for the most part under the control of the institutions themselves, faculty members in the institutions, or practitioners of the professions. There are at present approximately 25 such national, regional, and professional associations, each of which accredits institutions either in the general collegiate field or in one of the professional or technical fields. State accreditation is further complicated by this situation.

Purpose of study.—It is the purpose of this study to analyze some of the phases of accreditation of higher educational institutions, especially from the viewpoint of the responsibilities of the States. An account of the historical development of accreditation by State, regional, and Nation-wide agencies will be given. The existing practices of agencies within States accrediting teacher education and general collegiate institutions will be described for a selected list of 30 States.¹ In addition, there will be presented an appraisal of the issues and problems involved in the accreditation movement.

Selection of the States in which the existing accrediting practices are described was made with the specific objective of showing representative variations of State accreditation. A certain number of States were selected from each of the geographical sections of the country so as to present a picture for the Nation as a whole. Among the States were those with large populations and with small populations. Furthermore the selection included States having many higher educational institutions under either public or private control and States having only a few institutions. More than 75 percent of all the institutions in the country are located in the States comprising the study.

Definition of accreditation.—In analyzing the different phases of accreditation, a number of obstacles have been encountered. Foremost among them was the determination of whether a certain agency

¹ The 30 selected States are: California, Colorado, Connecticut, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Montana, Nebraska, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Texas, Utah, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and Wyoming.

or agencies within some of the States were actually engaged in the accreditation of the institutions. There were several causes of this uncertainty. One was that the agency or agencies were conducting one or more phases of accreditation, but did not regard themselves as accrediting organizations. Another was the fact that the accreditation being conducted by an agency frequently overlapped other educational activities being performed by the same agency so that it was difficult to distinguish them. Still another was a general confusion in the interpretation of the term "accreditation."

In consequence, it was necessary to define accreditation as used in the present study. Accreditation in its complete sense includes the following: (1) The prescription of minimum standards which the institutions must meet in order to be accredited; (2) the visitation or inspection of the institutions to ascertain whether they are complying with the minimum prescribed standards; and (3) the issuance or publication of a list of accredited institutions. Among the States there were some in which the agencies carrying on accreditation were actually performing only one or two of these functions instead of all of them. For the purposes of this study such agencies have been classified as conducting State accreditation. The extent to which each of the several functions was being performed partially or wholly by them will be shown in the report.

Nature of material, methods of collection, and sources.—The material for the study consists of data bearing on the different phases of accreditation.

In order to facilitate the gathering of the material from the States, a schedule of information was prepared containing 47 items together with numerous sub items covering the many detailed aspects of the subject. Supplementing the schedule, a large amount of documentary material was gathered for use in the study, such as legal provisions of the State conferring authority upon the accrediting agency, rules and regulations adopted by the agency, standards used in accrediting the institutions, lists of accredited universities and colleges, report forms used by accredited institutions when reporting to an accrediting agency, and any available research studies applicable to accreditation.

Since the study was undertaken at the request of the National Council of Chief State School Officers and in cooperation with that organization, much of the data were sought through visitation to the State departments of education in each of the 30 States. State universities and other institutions participating or interested in accreditation were also visited. The material was collected principally by field trips made by three staff members of the Office of Education. Each of the States was visited by one or more of the staff members. Through personal interviews with officers in the State departments and institutions items in the schedule were filled in and other information obtained regarding

the historical development of accreditation. Inquiry into local conditions affecting the conduct of the accrediting program of the individual States was also made. Another means used in some instances to secure specially required material for the study was through correspondence with officers of the departments, institutions, and other agencies.

In addition, a comprehensive study of the literature in the field of accreditation was made. Included in this literature were the annual proceedings of higher educational associations of various types, of professional associations conducting accreditation in the several professional fields, and of publications of regional accrediting organizations. Annual reports of certain State departments of education issued over a period of years were another source of data.

Limitations of the study.—Of necessity only brief treatment has been given in the study to the relationship of State accreditation to other State regulatory or supervisory functions over higher education. Among the latter is State regulation or supervision of the chartering and establishing of new institutions, the granting of degrees or diplomas by institutions, the certification of public-school teachers, the licensing of professional practitioners, and similar activities. Accreditation also has relationships to collegiate admission practices, graduation requirements, and other phases of the internal administration of higher educational institutions. It has been possible to treat such relationships only in a limited way.

PART I

Part I
HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT

5

Chapter II. Accrediting by Voluntary Agencies¹

DURING THE last quarter of the nineteenth century there were many influences converging to bring about the demand for standardization in higher education.

The loose way in which the power to confer degrees was given had resulted in many institutions being incorporated as colleges that possessed little approaching such an institution except the name. So great was the number of colleges of this type at the beginning of the twentieth century, that William R. Harper, president of the University of Chicago, in an address at the meeting of the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools in 1900, estimated that 20 to 25 percent of the chartered colleges in the United States "are doing work of a character a little removed from that of an academy."

With the growth of facilities in transportation, students were transferring from one institution to another and from one section of the country to another, and wanted to have their credits earned at one college accepted at another.

The State universities and the privately endowed universities were building up their graduate departments and felt the need of determining the institutions both within and without the State whose graduates might be safely admitted to the universities as candidates for advanced degrees.

State departments of education were being pressed for recognition of the teacher-training work done in the colleges of the State as qualification to teach without examination.

There was no uniformity in the requirements for entrance demanded by the colleges. Each institution had its own variety that differed from that of the rest. The introduction of the elective system had served to increase the confusion, and the high schools were suffering

¹ The documents consulted in the preparation of this chapter consisted very largely of the annual reports of the proceedings of the associations concerned. Before printing, the material regarding each association was submitted to an officer of the association for approval.

Other documents consulted were:

Annual Reports of the U. S. Commissioner of Education from 1870 to 1918, and Biennial Surveys of Education of the Office of Education, 1918 to 1934.

A Classification of Universities and Colleges with Reference to Bachelor's Degrees 1911, (not printed), by Kendrick C. Babcock, Specialist in Higher Education U. S. Bureau of Education.

An Explanatory Statement in Regard to "A Classification of Universities and Colleges with Reference to Bachelor's Degrees (Special Publication of the U. S. Bureau of Education, whole number 501, 1912), by P. P. Claxton.

Present Standards of Higher Education, by George E. MacLean; U. S. Bureau of Education Bulletin, 1913, No. 4.

Resources and Standards of Colleges of Arts and Sciences, by Samuel P. Capen; U. S. Bureau of Education Bulletin, 1918, No. 30.

Early Annual Reports of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching 1905-1914.

in the attempt to instruct their students in the manifold subjects required of their graduates to enter college.

Out of the problems arising from the diversity of entrance requirements grew the first efforts toward standardization.

The account of the attempts to standardize higher education given in the following pages is intended to show briefly the development of the movement from its beginning to the present time. Although the study of which it forms a part is concerned primarily with accrediting as carried on by State agencies, voluntary organizations have contributed so greatly to the movement that any historical account of accrediting would be incomplete without mention of their activities.

Standardization of Entrance Requirements

The scope of the movement for uniform entrance requirements is indicated by the large number of organizations that interested themselves in the subject. In the Annual Report of the Commissioner of Education for 1896-97, are listed 23 different types of organizations dealing with the problem, among them associations of colleges and secondary schools, State teachers associations, high-school teachers associations, special committees in various sections, and the National Education Association.

The colleges of New England were the first to take united action toward a uniform entrance standard, as the result of a conference held in December 1879, at Trinity College, Connecticut. The achievements of this and other conferences of similar nature led in 1886 to the formation of the New England Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools, to advance "the cause of liberal education by the promotion of interests common to colleges and preparatory schools." The organization of other associations regional in scope, with similar objectives, followed soon after. The College Association of Pennsylvania was formed in 1887, and the following year changed its name to "Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools of the Middle States and Maryland." Among its purposes was "to consider the qualification for candidates for admission to colleges and methods of admission." The North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools and the Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools of the Southern States were founded in 1895. In addition to the regional associations, the colleges in various States formed organizations, like the Ohio College Association, the Missouri College Union, and the Association of Colleges of South Carolina, whose purposes, although local in scope, were similar to those of the organizations covering wider areas.

The work of these regional and local associations led to the development of a national movement for uniformity in admission require-

ments. The National Education Association had during the nineties two committees reporting on entrance requirements. The first, the Committee of Ten, appointed in 1892, asserted that the colleges should adapt their requirements to the secondary schools after these schools had been put upon a sound educational basis. Another committee of the association, the Committee on College Entrance Requirements, appointed in 1895, presented in 1900 a report covering a 4-year investigation of entrance conditions and ways and means of securing uniformity. The conclusions reached by the committee constituted the first step on a national scale toward bringing the high schools and colleges throughout the country into cooperation.

College Entrance Examination Board.—An effective agency in bringing about uniformity in the administration of entrance requirements was the College Entrance Examination Board, organized November 17, 1900, by a small group of representatives of universities and colleges located in the Middle States and of secondary schools chosen by the Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools of the Middle States and Maryland. The purpose of the board was to secure the adoption of uniform definitions of the subjects required for college admission. This it accomplished through the issuance of statements of the ground which should be covered in the various subjects in the secondary schools and its college admission examinations, which soon came to be accepted by colleges and universities throughout the country as alternatives to their own.

Accrediting of secondary schools.—Although prior to 1900 there were in the Middle West, where admission to college by certificate had been in effect for a quarter of a century, several State university systems of accrediting secondary schools, and in the East institutions that accepted certificates from certain preparatory schools for admission, the first successful organized movement to secure uniformity in the standards of the schools themselves was by a group of New England colleges, which in May 1902, formed the New England College Entrance Certificate Board. The following year the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools drew up requirements for accrediting secondary schools, and published its first accredited list in 1904. The Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools of the Southern States issued its first list in 1911, and the Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools of the Middle States and Maryland not until 1928.

Accrediting in Higher Education on a National Basis

Several important bodies concerned with the maintenance of proper standards in higher education were created in the last years of the nineteenth and the early years of the twentieth centuries. The National

Association of State Universities was formed in 1896, and the Association of American Universities and the Association of Land-Grant Colleges in 1900. Of these, only the Association of American Universities entered definitely upon standardizing activities, and it not until considerably later. Two of the great educational foundations were also established at this time, the General Education Board and the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

The General Education Board, formed in 1902, contributed to the standardizing movement by gathering and classifying data concerning colleges and granting subsidies to those that were most promising.

The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching was incorporated in 1905 as an agency to administer the system of retiring allowances for college teachers provided in the gift of Andrew Carnegie. To carry out the wishes of the donor of the gift, the foundation was under the necessity of determining the institutions whose teachers should be eligible to receive pensions. The diversity of standards of institutions calling themselves colleges complicated this task, and in deciding what should constitute a college for its purposes the foundation adopted the definition of a college already legally established in the State of New York, thereby giving great publicity to this definition, which follows:

An institution to be ranked as a college, must have at least six professors giving their entire time to college and university work, a course of four full years in liberal arts and sciences, and should require for admission, not less than the usual four years of academic or high-school preparation, or its equivalent, in addition to the preacademic or grammar school studies.

For a time it was thought that the foundation would act as a standardizing agency for colleges, but its efforts were confined to the approval of institutions eligible for the Carnegie pensions.

Association of Collegiate Alumnae and American Association of University Women.—The Association of Collegiate Alumnae (now the American Association of University Women) was founded in 1882, "to unite alumnae of different institutions for practical educational work"; also, as added to the constitution in 1899, "for the collection and publication of statistical and other information concerning education, and in general for the maintenance of high standards in education."

The association was organized by a small group of women graduates of eight colleges, and the constitution provided for future admission to membership of women who had received a degree from a college, university, or scientific school approved by the association. At first admission was granted principally upon a personal basis, but as applications began to increase, in order to accomplish its purposes, the association felt the need of setting up requirements for the approval of the institutions whose graduates were seeking to become members.

Early requirements which it set up for institutional membership stipulated that members of the faculty should not be called upon to give preparatory instruction; that the institution must have definite requirements for admission; and that at least 25 women must have received degrees prior to application for membership.

In 1896 the association organized a committee on corporate membership whose work it was to formulate a method of examining institutions. It was instructed to consider only institutions which had graduated at least 50 women, which possessed an endowment of \$500,000, and which had no preparatory department organized under the government or instruction of the college faculty. An elaborate set of schedules bearing on the faculty, students, finances (1) for a college of arts and science and (2) for a university, entrance requirements, certificates from accredited schools, examinations, curricula, and kind of "required work," was prepared for the use of the committee in examining institutions.

In 1904 the committee on standards presented, and the association accepted, recommendations for changes and additions in the schedule issued in 1896. Among the noteworthy additions was one calling for "a reasonable recognition of women in governing boards, in faculties, and in the student body; and proper provision for the intellectual and social needs of women students." Another was that "There shall be 50 alumnae who have applied for membership in the association." These provisions were to be given first consideration in accepting new institutions.

For many years the association made its own investigations of the academic and financial status of institutions applying for membership, but in 1910 it voted to accept the judgment of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching in these matters, leaving for its committee on standards special consideration of the provision made by the institutions of suitable conditions for women. Accepted institutions were required to have—

reasonable recognition of women in the faculty and in the student body, material provision for their intellectual and social needs; salaries of women on the faculty to be approximately the same as those for men in the same grade; a coeducational institution to have a dean or adviser of women above the rank of instructor; weight to be given to the fact where women are on the board of trustees, especially in a women's college.

It has been the practice of the association to continue to recognize the work of some other accrediting agency in setting up academic standards, while continuing to apply its own additional tests. In 1912, it voted to consider for membership the institutions in Class I of the classification made by the United States Bureau of Education. Finding the criterion in this classification too difficult to apply, in 1916, it changed its requirements of academic standards to include

the institutions on the list of the Association of American Universities. To this list it voted, in 1919, to supplement the lists of the regional accrediting associations, a practice which it continued until 1929, when as the American Association of University Women it returned to its former practice of recognizing only the institutions accredited by the Association of American Universities

Southern Association of College Women.—This was an organization founded in 1903, "to unite college women in the South for the higher education of women * * * to raise the standard of education for women; * * * to develop preparatory schools and to define the line of demarcation between preparatory school and college." For 18 years the association exercised influence on the standards of the colleges for women in the South by the publication annually of a report on the organization, standards, and practices of those institutions. In 1921 this association united with the Association of Collegiate Alumnae, the enlarged organization becoming the American Association of University Women.

The association now approves institutions through its national Committee on Membership and Maintaining Standards, which consists of leading women educators. Requirements for approval include:

I. The approved rating of the following agencies according to the character of the applying institutions:

Association of American Universities
American Association of Teachers Colleges

II. Compliance with the standards of the American Association of University Women in regard to the status of women in the student body, on the faculty, in the administration, and on the board of trustees; adequate provision for the living conditions and social life of the women students; proper protection for community health, including periodical medical examinations and facilities for the care of students in the case of illness; sound physical education, and provision for the guidance of women students by women with administrative and faculty rank.

In addition, the association recognizes only those degrees for which at least 50 percent of the work offered is of a liberalizing, nontechnical character.

National Association of State Universities.—At its annual meeting in 1905, the National Association of State Universities appointed a committee to report upon standards for the recognition of American universities and for the A. B. and higher degrees. After a 3-year study the committee presented a definition and a set of standards for colleges covering the following points: (1) amount of work for the bachelor's degree; (2) qualifications of teachers and

institutional facilities; (3) equipment, (a) libraries for undergraduate and (b) graduate work; laboratories; (4) time units for degrees; (5) scope of curriculum; (6) provision for recognition and committee on standards. These standards were adopted at the meeting of the association in 1908 and at the request of the association, Kendrick C. Babcock, specialist in higher education of the United States Bureau of Education, during the years 1911 to 1913, visited and reported upon a number of State universities. Upon the resignation of Dr. Babcock from the bureau in 1913, the investigations were discontinued and the matter of classifying the universities was dropped.

Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities.—The participation of the Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities in the standardizing movement was, and has since been, manifested chiefly through the adoption of resolutions accepting the reports and recommendations of its various standing committees on many different phases of land-grant college education, together with the discussions held at its annual meetings.

Association of American Universities.—The Association of American Universities, though reluctant at first to undertake to standardize colleges, has become one of the most important accrediting agencies in the country. The association, with an initial membership of 14 universities, was founded "for the purpose of considering matters of common interest relating to graduate study." One of these interests concerned the conditions under which students might become candidates for higher degrees at American universities, or might receive advanced credit for work done in other institutions. This necessitated a knowledge of the institutions themselves.

Until 1913, the association took no action with reference to the approval of institutions, although it had been under pressure from various sources to do so. Its attempt to have the United States Bureau of Education make a classification of colleges had failed. As no agency could be found to undertake the work, the association felt the necessity of doing so.

In 1904 the University of Berlin adopted a regulation which limited the institutions in the United States from which it would accept credit toward the doctor of philosophy degree to the institutions comprising the membership of the Association of American Universities. Others of the German universities attended by large numbers of American students did likewise. Feeling this action to be unjust to many other universities and colleges in the United States, the association appointed a committee to consider and report upon means to correct it. Not being possessed of the facilities to make a list of higher educational institutions whose degrees might be regarded by the association as of equal value to those conferred by institutions comprising its member-

ship, the committee recommended that a list of accepted institutions be made up of the following groups:

- (1) The members, present and future, of the Association of American Universities.
- (2) Those other institutions on the accepted list of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- (3) Those institutions which are not included in the accepted list of the Carnegie Foundation because they are in some sense sectarian, as defined in the terms of the fund, but otherwise conform to its standards of acceptability.

The association accepted the report of its committee, and in 1913 submitted to the German ministeries of education a list of 119 institutions, with the recommendation that for the present they recognize not only the bachelor's degrees conferred by the members of the Association of American Universities, "but also the degree of those other American colleges and universities which are certified by this foundation as of equivalent standing but excluded from its accepted list for other than educational reasons."

Following the publication of this list as its first approved list, the association indicated its future policy in accrediting by appointing a committee on classification of colleges, which later submitted a scheme for rating colleges which divided them into three groups as follows:

Group A.—Institutions whose graduates should ordinarily be admitted to the graduate schools of this association for work in lines for which they had adequate undergraduate preparation, with a reasonable presumption that advanced degrees may be taken with the minimum amount of prescribed work and in the minimum time prescribed. Students who choose work in lines for which their undergraduate course has not prepared them adequately must expect to take more time and do additional work.

Group B.—Institutions from which only those graduates of high standing in their classes who are individually recommended by the department of undergraduate instruction corresponding to that in which they propose to do their graduate work may be admitted on the same basis as graduates from institutions in Group A.

Group C.—Other institutions whose graduates should be admitted to graduate schools, but with the presumption that more than the minimum time and minimum amount of work will be ordinarily required for an advanced degree.

The committee recommended the circulation of the list among the association's members, to be used privately for 1 year as a provisional list, with a view to revision and subsequent publication. After several years of experimenting with this scheme of classification, the association published its first list of accepted colleges, incorporating in a single approved list all institutions falling within the three groups.

The association has made several changes in its criteria for approving colleges. In 1924 it accepted "in a general way" the statement of principles and standards proposed by the American Council on Education, but still considered "the performance of recent graduates of insti-

tutions in the graduate and professional schools of the country to be fundamental in determining whether the institution should be included in the approved list of the association." Recent changes, the last approved at the annual meeting of the association in November 1938, have revealed increasing elasticity in interpreting the criteria for accrediting. The association announced that it "has no standards or definite rules and specifications to be applied in an exact and mechanical fashion. What it tries to do is to find out what the institution does and whether the work is well done."²

At the 1938 meeting also, the committee on the classification of universities and colleges announced that it was undertaking a study of the teachers colleges with a view to their accrediting.

National Conference Committee on Standards of Colleges and Secondary Schools.—In 1906 the various educational associations interested in high-school and college relations and standards organized the National Conference Committee on Standards of Colleges and Secondary Schools, as a means of keeping in touch with the problems and progress of each other. The associations composing the committee were the National Association of State Universities, the regional associations of colleges and secondary schools, the College Entrance Examination Board, and the New England College Entrance Certificate Board. The membership was later increased by the addition of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching and the United States Commissioner of Education, *ex officio*. After the creation of the Association of American Colleges in 1918, that organization also became a member.

The National Conference Committee on Standards of Colleges and Secondary Schools, in a resolution adopted at its first formal meeting in 1907, stated as its purpose "to consider requirements for admission, matters of mutual interest to universities, colleges, and preparatory schools, and such other questions as may be referred to it by the associations." One of the early acts of the committee was to propose a unit measurement for the high-school course. In conference with officers of the Carnegie Foundation, the Committee defined a unit, as applied to secondary-school work, as "a year's study in any subject in a secondary school, constituting approximately a quarter of a full year's work," with further explanation as follows:

This statement is designed to afford a standard of measurement for the work done in secondary schools. It takes the 4-year high-school course as a basis and assumes that the length of the school year is from 36 to 40 weeks, that a period is from 40 to 60 minutes in length, and that the study is pursued for 4 or 5 periods a week; but under ordinary circumstances, a satisfactory year's work in any subject cannot be accomplished in less than 120 sixty-minute hours, or their equivalent. Schools organized on a different basis can nevertheless estimate their work in terms of this unit.

² Proceedings and addresses of the fortieth annual conference, November 10-12, 1938. p. 26.

The committee adopted this definition at its conference October 1, 1909. Almost at once colleges and universities in all sections of the country began stating their requirements for admission in terms of the "Carnegie unit," as it came to be known.

A resolution adopted at one of the earliest conferences urged the organizations comprising the committee "to collect data concerning, and to study the subject of standardization of colleges and universities." It recommended that "in the transfer of collegiate students, the following points be considered in determining the standing of the colleges or universities concerned: (1) Requirements for admission, (2) the grade and amount of work required, (3) the number and qualifications of the instructors and the proportion of instructors to students, (4) the separation of the collegiate faculty from the government and the instruction of a preparatory department, (5) the acceptance of the graduates by the graduate schools, (6) equipment, and (7) endowment.

Other questions dealing with entrance requirements, the transfer of college credits, the secondary-school curriculum, etc., engaged the attention of the committee until it ceased its functions in 1923. An important part of its activities was concerned with the terminology in secondary and higher education, undertaken at the suggestions of the United States Commissioner of Education.

United States Bureau of Education (now U. S. Office of Education).—Prior to issuing its first approved list, the Association of American Universities had sought to have the United States Bureau of Education undertake the responsibility of classifying colleges. The bureau had been publishing a list of higher educational institutions with certain statistical data concerning them in the Annual Reports of the Commissioner of Education since 1870. At first the only criterion for inclusion in the list was that institutions be authorized to confer degrees, and all colleges were included in one group; but in 1880 the institutions were separated into coeducational institutions and colleges for men, and "institutions for the superior instruction of women." In the latter group were included institutions most of which conferred degrees but some of which did not. Later this group was divided into Class A and Class B colleges for women, which division continued until 1911, when this classification was abandoned and all universities and colleges were combined in a single list. At the same time a very limited standard was established for listing, the rule under which the new list was made up being that the institutions "must be authorized to grant degrees; must have definite standards of admission; must give at least two years' work of standard college grade; and must have at least 20 students in college status."

Although the very meager requirements for listing institutions as colleges made by the Bureau of Education could not be considered

an attempt to standardize or classify institutions, they represented a somewhat feeble step in that direction.

Classification of universities and colleges by the United States Bureau of Education.—At a conference of deans of graduate schools held in connection with the annual meeting of the Association of American Universities, November 1910, the need for a classification of colleges and universities made by some responsible agency came up for special consideration. Because of its position as a Federal office, unhampered by institutional, State, or sectional prejudices, and whose judgment would be accepted both here and abroad, it was decided to request the United States Bureau of Education to undertake the task. After due consideration, the bureau agreed to do so, and assigned to the work Kendric C. Babcock, recently appointed specialist in higher education.

In view of the impossibility of visiting and examining all of the universities and colleges concerned within any reasonable length of time, other means of obtaining information had to be devised. It was therefore decided to base the proposed classification primarily upon the practice of the graduate and professional schools in granting credit to the graduates of the colleges and universities. This information, secured by visits made by Dr. Babcock to the leading graduate schools and in conference with their officers, was supplemented by information obtained from interviews with officers of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching and the General Education Board, the education officers in a number of States, and also by the data on colleges and universities throughout the country possessed by the Bureau of Education.

The classification, made after 10 months of investigation, divided the 344 institutions listed into four groups, as follows:

Class I.—Institutions whose graduates would ordinarily be able to take the master's degree at any of the large graduate schools in one year after receiving the bachelor's degree, without necessarily doing more than the amount of work regularly prescribed for such higher degree.

Class II.—Institutions whose graduates would probably require for the master's degree in one of the strong graduate schools somewhat more than one year's regular graduate work. * * *

Class III.—Institutions whose standards of admission and graduation are so low, or so uncertain, or so loosely administered, as to make the requirement of two years for the master's degree probable. * * *

Class IV.—Institutions whose bachelor's degree would be approximately two years short of equivalency with the standard bachelor's degree of a standard college as described above. * * *

The classification, containing as it did only a little more than half the colleges of the country, was intended to be tentative only. A few copies of it were printed and sent in the fall of 1911 to the deans of graduate schools and several other educational officers, to obtain

their criticisms and suggestions. With the assistance thus afforded, a revision was made in the method of grouping the institutions and some of the institutions changed to another group from the one in which they were first placed, and the revised classification was sent to the printer. The first grouping of institutions was not intended to be made public, being in tentative form, but this fact seemed not to have been understood, and knowledge of the classification soon became common. Some of the colleges listed in groups lower than the one to which they thought they belonged protested strongly against the Bureau of Education undertaking to classify colleges. The fact that the classification related only to the recognition by graduate schools of the bachelor's degrees conferred by the institutions and not to the merits of the institutions in other respects, was entirely overlooked. The feeling engendered by the classification was so great that before the revision could be printed, the President of the United States directed the Bureau of Education to withhold its publication.

In 1913 a different administration was in control of the Government. The Association of American Universities addressed a communication to the new President, in which was stated the value to that association of the classification, and requested him to remove the bar to its publication. This he failed to do, and the association thereupon made provision for making its own classification. It appointed a committee, of which Dr. Babcock, then dean of the college of arts and sciences of the University of Illinois, was made chairman, to prepare an accredited list of institutions, made up on the same basis for approval as used in the Bureau of Education Classification, that of the success of students in graduate work.

Study of standards by the Committee on Higher Educational Statistics of the United States Bureau of Education.—The United States Office of Education (formerly Bureau of Education) has not undertaken to classify colleges and universities since the failure of its first attempt. During the year 1914-15, however, the bureau organized a committee made up of representatives of the principal associations dealing with higher education to discuss the advisability of preparing a classification, and if found desirable to suggest methods of procedure. The committee included representatives of all the leading organizations interested in college standards, including the Association of American Universities, the National Association of State Universities, the American Medical Association, the Society for the Promotion of Engineering Education, the Association of American Colleges, the United States Commissioner of Education, and the specialist in higher education of the Bureau of Education.

At a meeting on May 3, 1915, the committee concluded that it was undesirable to make a classification of colleges, but thought that in place of a classification the status of institutions might be shown by statistical comparisons. The committee therefore decided to make a study and a presentation of the resources and equipment, and so far as possible of the educational and administrative efficiency of higher institutions, on the showing of which it was believed universities could make their own classifications. The Committee on Higher Educational Statistics planned to study and report separately data regarding different types of institutions, such as colleges of arts and sciences, schools of engineering, teachers colleges, etc. It completed, however, only the study relating to the colleges of arts and sciences. Further work was interrupted by the participation of the country in the World War. The completed study, under the title "Resources and Standards of Colleges of Arts and Sciences", was published as Bureau of Education Bulletin, 1918, No. 30.

American Council on Education.—The American Council on Education was created as an emergency agency during the World War to coordinate the activities of the colleges growing out of the needs of the war. Later it was established on a permanent foundation. Among its early activities was an attempt to coordinate the work of the different accrediting agencies. In connection with its annual meeting, May 6 and 7, 1921, it held a joint conference with the National Conference Committee on Standards of Colleges and Secondary Schools, to determine a method of bringing about greater uniformity in college standards and accrediting procedures. The conference adopted a report of a special committee on policy, which recommended that common statements of standards for higher educational institutions be prepared and submitted to the principal accrediting agencies. It approved the American Council on Education as the coordinating agency for further conference, for formulation and dissemination of common standards, and for promoting the proposed unification.

The Committee on Standards appointed by the council, in accordance with the recommendation of the joint conference, was composed of one member each from the associations which made up the National Conference Committee and in addition a representative of the Methodist Episcopal Church, the Catholic Education Association, the Indiana State Department of Education, the Society for the Promotion of Engineering Education, the American Council on Education, and the Bureau of Education. As this committee took over the position in the standardizing field formerly occupied by the National Conference Committee, that body ceased to function after its annual meeting in 1923.

The Committee on Standards prepared standards for colleges which were adopted at the meeting of the American Council on Education in May 1922. Later it formulated standards for junior colleges and teachers' colleges and normal schools, which were adopted in 1924. It then sent copies of the standards to all the leading accrediting agencies, several of which, including the Middle States Association, the Southern and Northwest Associations, several church boards of education, and a number of State departments of education adopted them without change; others adopted them with modifications applicable to conditions existing in their constituencies.

The American Council had never purposed to become an accrediting agency. It therefore prepared no lists of institutions accredited as meeting the standards which it issued. The standards served as principles for the guidance of accrediting agencies for a period of 12 years. In 1935 feeling that the standards had served their purpose, the council discontinued them.

Accrediting in Higher Education on a Regional Basis

One of the earliest attempts to standardize colleges on a regional basis was that of the Conference of Chief State School Officers of the North Central and Western States, which met at Salt Lake City in November 1910 and adopted seven requirements for a standard college.

At first the regional associations of colleges and secondary schools concerned themselves chiefly with the problems of the secondary schools, but after about a decade or so they began to turn attention also to the standards of colleges.

North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools.—Admission to membership itself in the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools necessitated the fulfillment of certain standards, the constitution adopted in March 1895, denying membership to any college or university requiring for admission less than 15 units of secondary school work as defined by its commission on secondary schools; or to any college or university which conferred the doctor of philosophy or doctor of science degree for less than 3 years of graduate study.

As early as 1901, the association had a commission on accredited schools, one of whose tasks was the formulation of standards for accrediting secondary schools, and later the compilation and publication of a list of accredited schools, which it completed in 1904. In 1906 the scope of the commission's work was broadened to include the standardization of colleges, and in 1910 there was included in the constitution of the association the provision that "After April 1, 1912, no college or university shall be eligible to membership which is not on the list of accredited colleges of the association." It was not until

March 21, 1913, however, that the commission was able to publish its first standards and accredited list.

In order to facilitate the work of accrediting, the association in 1916 created a separate commission on institutions of higher education, which in 1917 presented a set of standards for junior colleges. In 1918 it completed the preparation of standards for teacher-training institutions and published accredited lists of teacher-training institutions as well as junior colleges.

After some years of listing the teacher-training institutions separately, the association decided to transfer such of them as were able to meet the standards for colleges to the accredited college list. Transfers were made from year to year until 1934, when the separate listing of teachers colleges was abandoned.

In 1923 the association adopted, with certain modifications, the standards for colleges recommended by the American Council on Education. With only slight changes it continued these standards in effect until 1934, when a special committee which had been making a study on the revision of standards for a number of years presented a report recommending a new policy in accrediting. In place of a set of specific standards by which to judge institutions, the committee recommended the adoption of a policy of accreditation that provided for the evaluation of the program of an institution applying for membership through the use of a number of criteria of institutional excellence.³

The new policy relative to the accrediting of institutions of higher education adopted in 1934 has continued in effect by the association, and has served to stimulate other accrediting agencies in liberalizing their requirements for accrediting in a similar way.

Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools — The Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools of the Southern States, now the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, at its annual meeting in 1897 adopted bylaws which established the conditions under which colleges would be admitted to membership. They provided that no college would be admitted that gave preparatory instruction in any subject as part of the college organization, or that did not hold written examinations for admission in the subjects and in the scope prescribed by the association in these bylaws.

The work of the association for a number of years was concerned largely with efforts to separate college from high-school work, and to securing uniform entrance requirements and examinations. Effective in 1910, the bylaws provided that no college belonging to the association should maintain a preparatory school as part of its college

³ For a statement of these general principles see ch. VIII, p. 194.

organization, but, if maintained, such a school "should be kept rigidly distinct in students, faculty, and discipline." The measurement of entrance requirements was stated in terms of the "Carnegie unit," 14 units being specified for full college admission. Conditions under which special students should be admitted to college were also given.

The first college standards were replaced in 1923 by the adoption of standards which accorded in general with the principles for accrediting colleges recommended by the American Council on Education. Standards for junior colleges based on those of the council were adopted in 1924.

A list of teachers colleges accredited under the standards set up for liberal arts colleges was published by the association in 1925. In 1929 this list was discontinued and the teachers colleges were thereafter included in the regular college list. For the purpose of judging the professional work of the teacher-training institutions, the association adopted two auxiliary standards.

With slight changes the standards based on those recommended by the American Council remained in effect until April 1939, when provision was made for accrediting colleges and junior colleges under entirely new sets of standards which, in accordance with the present tendency, provide a more flexible system for accrediting.

Besides accrediting institutions in its own membership, the association has, since 1924, published a list of nonmember colleges, whose standards approximate but do not meet the standards of the association, but "whose graduates may be selected as teachers by the accredited secondary schools of the association," and since 1930 lists of Negro colleges and junior colleges, dividing the institutions into classes A and B. The work of inspecting and accrediting Negro institutions was undertaken at the request of the institutions themselves.

Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools.—The question of the advisability of accrediting colleges in its territory did not come before the Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools of the Middle States and Maryland, now the Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, until 1917. In that year a special committee was appointed to consider and report upon the matter, and, if deemed advisable, to suggest methods of procedure. At the annual meeting of the association in 1919, the committee brought in a report recommending the adoption of the definition and standards for accrediting colleges then in effect in the State of New York, and upon acceptance of the report the association adopted a resolution creating a commission on institutions of higher education to carry on the work of accrediting.

After 2 years' study and inspection, undertaken with the aid of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, the

commission submitted its first list of accredited colleges of arts and sciences in 1921. In 1927 it began the listing of engineering schools.

In accordance with the action taken by other accrediting agencies, the association later substituted the standards for colleges recommended by the American Council on Education for its own, including those for junior colleges. It issued its first list of accredited junior colleges in 1932, and began the approval of teachers colleges in 1937.

At the annual meeting in 1938, the association adopted a set of criteria for accrediting in which the bases for approval follow the present trend, first noted in the action of the North Central Association in 1934, of establishing general principles rather than specific standards for accrediting.

New England Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools.—The New England Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools is the only one of the five regional associations which has not accredited colleges. The association approved a set of standards for colleges in 1923, and for junior colleges in 1929, adapted from those recommended by the American Council on Education, but it has never attempted to enforce them on its membership, treating them as advisory only.

Northwest Association of Secondary and Higher Schools.—The Northwest Association of Secondary and Higher Schools was the last of the regional associations to be established. Coming into existence in 1917, a few years prior to the beginning of the attempt by the American Council on Education to unify higher educational standards, the association was represented on the general committee which formulated the standards finally approved. The association adopted for accrediting institutions in its territory the standards recommended for the three types of institutions—4-year colleges, junior colleges, and teacher-training institutions—and has continued to use them without material change.

Accrediting of Teacher-training Institutions

American Association of Teachers Colleges.—The accrediting of teachers colleges has been a part of the activities of the American Association of Teachers Colleges almost from the foundation of the association in 1917. The association united in 1922 with the National Council of Normal School Presidents and Principals, a much older organization, whose meetings had been held for a number of years in connection with those of the North Central Association. The presidents of the teachers colleges had been active in the North Central Association. It was through the influence of this connection that the movement in the American Association of Teachers Colleges to accredit teacher-training institutions originated.

As early as 1919 the matter of classifying the constituent teachers colleges was taken up and provision made for classifying the colleges tentatively into three groups. At the 1923 meeting the constitution of the association was adopted and contained a provision for classifying its membership into four groups, according to the number of years of technical college work offered.

In 1926 the association adopted a set of tentative standards for accrediting teachers colleges. After revision in 1927, these standards were used in preparing a classified list of teachers colleges.

Revisions in the standards made at succeeding annual meetings have improved their form. At first most of the institutions were accredited with conditions, but the latest list, issued in 1939, shows no institutions failing to meet the requirements in full. Many of the institutions on the accredited list are also on the accredited lists of the regional accrediting associations.

Summary of Findings

The standardizing movement in higher education grew out of conditions existing during the latter part of the nineteenth century. Education in the United States was in a disorganized condition for some years following the Civil War. In but few States had a system of public education been established, and the functions of the different units of education in relation to each other had not been determined. The relation between the college and the secondary school, in particular, was in question. No clear understanding existed as to the province of the two institutions. The course of study in many institutions chartered as colleges was more nearly of high-school grade. College entrance requirements were in a hopeless state of confusion. The high schools themselves were groping their way, confounded by the attempt to prepare students in the great diversity of subjects required for college entrance.

As a result, associations composed of representatives of colleges and secondary schools were organized about that time in four regions of the United States—New England, the Middle, the Southern and the North Central States. In carrying out the purpose of these associations—to promote the interests of the high schools and colleges—the first task was to differentiate between the work of the two institutions. To do this it was necessary to determine what attributes an institution should possess to be designated a high school or a college. The associations therefore drew up specifications for the two institutions, in which the various items were stated largely in quantitative terms. The inspection by the associations of the schools and colleges to determine whether they met the specifications and the listing of the approved schools was a natural sequence.

The lack of information on the standards of the colleges of the country, offering as it did a serious problem in the selection of graduates of colleges for candidacy to higher degrees, led to the drawing up of standards and the accrediting of colleges by the national organization of graduate schools, the Association of American Universities. At first the criterion used by the association was the success of former graduates of colleges in completing work for advanced degrees in the minimum time. To this criterion was later added a set of quantitative standards similar to those used by the regional accrediting associations.

Because numerous agencies were accrediting colleges, each for its own purpose, the American Council on Education attempted to unify the standards of the different agencies. In 1922 it issued sets of principles and standards for accrediting colleges, junior colleges, and teacher training institutions which for about 12 years were used in whole or in modified form by many of the standardizing agencies of the country.

In the past 5 years, however, ideas concerning the proper requirements for a standard college have changed. In 1934 the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools adopted a new set of criteria for accrediting colleges, according to which an institution is "judged for accreditation upon the basis of the total pattern it presents as an institution of higher education," its facilities and activities being judged "in terms of the purposes it seeks to serve." In this new policy of accrediting, the old quantitative standards have been largely abandoned.

There is evidence that his new policy initiated by the North Central Association will shortly quite generally supplant the old. The Middle and the Southern regional associations have already adopted new requirements for accrediting, carrying out, albeit in somewhat less drastic measure, the same general principles used by the North Central Association. Likewise the Association of American Universities and several State departments of education have liberalized their requirements in a similar manner.

Chapter III. Accrediting by State Agencies ¹

IN THE several States, because of the different purposes to be served, different systems of accrediting have grown up, as is shown in chapter V. In some States accreditation is conducted by one or more agencies in order to ascertain from which colleges in the State students may be admitted to the university with advanced standing or as candidates for higher degrees. In most others it is conducted by the State department of education usually to ascertain from which colleges graduates may be certificated without examination as teachers in the public schools, but sometimes also to carry out a legal injunction constituting the department the agency responsible for the maintenance of educational standards in the State.

A historic account of the movement in all the States in which one or more agencies engage in accrediting would contain much that is repetitious. The following account, therefore, deals with accrediting as it has developed in six States, selected because of the different ways in which accrediting or approval of higher institutions is carried on.

The accrediting movement in nearly every instance began with the secondary school. As early as 1871 the University of Michigan began the first system of accrediting high schools, and shortly thereafter other State universities in the Middle West followed its example, patterning their systems after that of Michigan. As this study is concerned with higher education, only incidental reference is made to accrediting in the secondary field.

New York

The approval of educational institutions by a State agency, or by any agency, has been in effect in New York longer than in any other State in the Union. The University of the State of New York has been authorized from its foundation just after the close of the Revolutionary War to approve institutions applying to it for charters of in-

¹ The documents consulted in the preparation of this chapter consisted chiefly of State reports, including reports of State superintendents of public instruction, reports of State teacher examining boards, State school laws, and State university catalogs. Before printing, the section relating to accrediting in each of the six States included in the bulletin was submitted to the proper officer in the State department of education for approval.

Other documents consulted were:

Historical and Statistical Record of the University of the State of New York During the Century from 1784 to 1894, by Franklin B. Hough. Printed in 1885.

Historical Sketch of the Missouri College Union. Compiled from Original Sources, by T. Berry Smith, Secretary-Treasurer, 1906-1925.

A History of Junior Colleges in Missouri Since 1930 (an unpublished thesis for the master's degree at the University of Missouri), by Laura E. Wadsworth, 1937.

Minutes of the Missouri College Union (only a few of the records were available).

Minutes of the Intercollegiate Standing Committee of Iowa.

History of Teacher Certification in Virginia. A Review of the Laws and Regulations, 1870-1932, by Thomas D. Eason. (Unpublished thesis for the master's degree at New York University, 1932.)

corporation as colleges, academies, and schools. It has been required by law to visit and inspect the conditions and operation of every institution in the university and to require of each an annual report. By virtue of the legal powers bestowed on it the university engages in the most comprehensive accrediting activities of any educational organization in the United States. It registers for the approval of their courses not only institutions of higher education of all grades in the State of New York, but certain institutions in every State in the Union and in other countries of the world as well.

Supervisory organization for education.—The organization for the supervision of education in New York differs from that of all other States. A body incorporated in 1784, under the title "The Board of Regents of the University of the State of New York," legislates for the entire educational system of the State. The university includes as constituent members and has under its supervision all the public schools of the State and "all secondary and higher educational institutions which are now or may hereafter be incorporated in this State, and such other libraries, museums, institutions, schools, organizations, and agencies for education as may be admitted to or incorporated by the university."² The university is governed and all of its corporate powers are exercised by the board of regents.

The present law defining the power of the regents with respect to the incorporation of educational institutions is as follows:

Under such name, with such number of trustees or other managers, and with such powers, privileges and duties, and subject to such limitations and restrictions in all respects as the regents may prescribe in conformity to law, they may * * * incorporate any university, college, academy, library, museum, or other institution or association for the promotion of science, literature, art, history or other department of knowledge, or of education in any way, associations of teachers, students, graduates of educational institutions, and other associations whose approved purposes are, in whole or in part, of educational or cultural value deemed worthy of recognition and encouragement by the university. No institution or association which might be incorporated by the regents under this chapter shall, without their consent, be incorporated under any other general law.³

Under the broad cumulative powers conferred on them by the Legislature, the regents have set up ordinances and regulations for the supervision of education that ramify throughout all its phases. As summarized in the New York Legislative Manual for 1937, the powers of the regents are as follows:

[They] are authorized to exercise legislative functions concerning the educational system of the State; to determine its educational policies, and to make rules for carrying into effect the law relating to education and the powers of the university. They have exclusive power to incorporate educational institutions and organizations; they may confer degrees and regulate

¹ Education Law as amended July 1, 1934, art. 3, sec. 57.

² Education Law as amended to July 1 1936, sec. 59.

their issuance within the State; they have power to visit and inspect educational institutions of the State, conduct examinations therein and require reports therefrom; they register domestic and foreign educational institutions and fix the value of degrees, diplomas, and certificates from all parts of the world, when presented for entrance to schools, colleges, universities, and the professions; they may establish and stimulate extension work and conduct examinations and grant credentials therein, and they supervise the preliminary education requirements for admission to the practice of law, medicine, dentistry, veterinary medicine, pharmacy, optometry, podiatry, chiropody, engineering and surveying, architecture, and to practice as a registered nurse, a certified public accountant, and a certified shorthand reporter.

University of the State of New York.—The origin of the idea of a State university which offered no instruction but which as a department of the government supervised and controlled all of the State's educational work, is not definitely known, but it gained acceptance in New York immediately following the Revolutionary War.

The Board of Regents of the University of the State of New York was established and incorporated by an act of the legislature May 1, 1784. Although the act, later the same year amended, entitled "An act for granting certain privileges to the college heretofore called King's College, for altering the name and charter thereof, and erecting an university in this State," was passed primarily in the interest of King's College (by the act to be known thereafter as Columbia College), and only secondarily in the interest of the State, the sentiment toward the State university idea grew and took definite form within the next few years. King's College was defunct after the Revolution and, through the efforts of some of the chief State officers having connection with the college, sought to become the new State university.

If a university was to be established to control education in the State, the friends of the college felt that the foundation for such an institution had already been laid in the college. But by an act passed May 13, 1787, entitled "An act to institute a university within this State, and for other purposes therein mentioned," a State system of education administered by a body designated "The Board of Regents of the University of the State of New York," was definitely established and Columbia College became one of its units.

By constitutional provision in 1895, the name of the corporation was changed to "The University of the State of New York." At its head there are at present 12 regents, elected, 1 each year, by joint action of the legislature.

From their incorporation until 1904, the regents were in control of higher and secondary education only. Elementary education was conducted in the early days largely as a charitable enterprise by religious and private groups and did not come under State control

until 1812, when the legislature made regular provision for the common schools. The law of April 13, 1787, authorized the regents "to visit and inspect all the colleges, academies, and schools, which are or may be established in this State, examine into the state and system of education and discipline therein, and make a yearly report thereof to the legislature." It authorized them to confer degrees above that of master of arts, and empowered them to grant charters of incorporation to colleges and academies. The act creating a State system of common schools vested authority over it in a superintendent of schools, thereby separating the control of the higher and lower schools. This separation was rendered more complete in 1854, when the legislature established a department of public instruction and placed over it a State superintendent of public instruction.

The regents were instrumental in building up a large system of academies throughout the State. After the Civil War the public high school began to appear and gradually to take the place in the secondary field of education formerly occupied by the academies. The friction arising from the division of educational authority in the State was aggravated by the contention over the public high school. Various attempts to coordinate the work of the two education offices were made, which finally resulted in 1904 in the abolishment of the department of public instruction and the uniting of all the educational interests of the State under a department of education. The so-called "unification act" abolished the offices of the secretary of the board of regents and of the State superintendent of public instruction and conferred upon a commissioner of education all the powers formerly exercised by these two officers. It provided for the election of the first commissioner of education by the legislature to serve 6 years, following which he would be chosen by the board of regents to serve at their pleasure. By agreement between the board of regents and the commissioner of education at their first meeting, and later through legal enactment, the regents serve in a legislative capacity, while the commissioner of education acts as chief executive officer both of the regents and of the department of education.

Financial requirements for the incorporation of academies and colleges.—In the early days of education in this country it was more important to allow educational facilities to increase than to set up a standard which would restrict their growth, and thereby prevent the spread of educational opportunities badly needed in a new country. In New York many colleges and still more academies were chartered by the regents, by special acts of the legislature, and under the general incorporation laws of the State. The question of sufficient finances to open and continue the institutions applying for incorporation was the chief consideration affecting the granting of charters by the regents. In the case of institutions incorporated by the legislature and

more particularly those incorporated under the general law, charters were granted without even that consideration.

As early as March 23, 1801, the regents resolved that in future no academy ought to be incorporated unless it appeared that a proper building for conducting such an institution had been erected and paid for, that funds producing an annual net income of at least \$100 had been secured, that the source of income should never be diminished, and that the income should be applied only to the support of teachers of the academy. By 1815 the regents had raised the annual income from invested funds to \$250. At the same time the policy with respect to the incorporation of a college was "That no college ought to be established until suitable buildings have been provided and a fund created consisting of a capital of at least \$50,000, yielding an annual income of at least \$3,500."

By the middle of the nineteenth century the country was emerging from its inchoate state. Better educational institutions were needed. New York, through its board of regents, began to raise the financial requirements for incorporating colleges and academies. For nearly a century the board acted entirely without instruction from the legislature in the matter, but in 1853 the general assembly authorized the regents to establish general rules and regulations and to prescribe the requisites and conditions for the incorporation of any college, university, academy, or other institutions of learning. The regents thereupon ruled that before granting incorporation to a college, funds for such an institution to the amount of \$100,000, and, in addition, suitable buildings and equipment, must be provided. For academies they ruled that the property, including lot, buildings, library, and apparatus, should be not less than \$5,000, and the library and philosophical apparatus worth not less than \$500.

Thereafter the board made no increase in the financial requirements for colleges for many years, but in order to prevent persons not having the prescribed amount of resources to establish a college from seeking charters under the general incorporation law of the State, the legislature in 1882, on recommendation of the regents, passed a law prohibiting the incorporation of educational institutions under the general law unless first approved by the regents. In 1892 it passed another denying to any educational institution the right to secure incorporation under the general law. In the meantime, in 1889, it made the regents' requirements as to resources to be possessed by a college legal through the enactment of a law authorizing the regents to "prescribe the requisites and conditions for incorporating any educational institution, provided that they shall require besides provision for suitable buildings, furniture, and apparatus, an endowment of not less than \$100,000 for a college of arts, and not less than

\$50,000 for a medical college, and for any other institution for higher education means for its proper maintenance."

Although the law required the regents or their duly appointed agents to visit and inspect the conditions and operations of the institutions comprising the university and to require of each an annual report, there were toward the end of the nineteenth-century many institutions incorporated in the State greatly below the standard. Among them were some that had fulfilled the requirements for incorporation at the time they applied for charters, but had not been able to keep up the standard promised by their condition at that time. There were others that had been incorporated by the legislature without regard to the regents' requirements, and still others that had received charters under the general incorporation law. On the other hand, many institutions that had been incorporated in the State had dropped out of existence but were still being carried on the university list, while others still in existence had neglected to report and had been dropped from the list.

In presenting its report to the legislature in 1892, the board of regents called attention to these facts, and stated that it had completed the preparation of a new and fuller list of the incorporated institutions than had ever previously existed. Through visitation and inspection it proposed to eliminate from this list all institutions not in good standing, and to make an annual revision of the lists of institutions which it approved. The report urged the passage of laws setting up higher standards for college and university charters and providing penalties for the misuse of the terms "college" and "university" by unworthy institutions. These facts and recommendations led to the following enactment, on April 27, 1892:

No institution shall be given power to confer degrees in this State unless it shall have resources of at least \$500,000; and no institution for higher education shall be incorporated without suitable provision, approved by the regents for buildings, furniture, educational equipment, and proper maintenance. No institution shall institute or have any faculty or department of higher education in any place or be given power to confer any degree not specifically authorized by its charter; and no institution for higher education shall be incorporated under the provisions of any general act authorizing the formation of a corporation without grant of a special charter or individual application, and no corporation shall, under authority of any general act, extend its business to include establishing or carrying on any such institution.

Academic standards for the incorporation and registration of colleges.—So far, as has been apparent, the requirements for chartering institutions of academic and collegiate grade adopted by the regents or enacted into law by the legislature, had related only to financial resources, including property and physical equipment. This had resulted in the establishment as colleges of institutions whose

work was little removed from that of the secondary school. There was now felt a need to differentiate between the fields of higher and secondary work. The definition of a college used in the laws of the State, as an institution of higher education which is authorized to confer degrees, was no longer sufficient. In 1901 the regents enacted an ordinance giving the first definition of a college in which recognition was made of the academic standards of such an institution. This definition was later adopted by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching as the basis for accepting institutions to participate in its pension plan, and soon gained prominence throughout the country. The definition was as follows:

An institution to be ranked as a college must have at least six professors giving their entire time to college or university work, a course of four full years of college grade in liberal arts and sciences, and should require for admission not less than the usual four years of academic or high-school preparation, or its equivalent, in addition to the preacademic or grammar-school studies.

Beginning April 1905, all colleges desiring to be registered by the regents as meeting the requirements of an approved college were judged on the basis of this definition.

Reports of the department of education called attention to the difference between "incorporation" and "registration." Incorporation signified the granting of corporate powers to an institution engaged in educational work, evidenced by the granting of a charter; registration, the formal action of the regents in recognizing the fact that the corporation already created by them or the legislature was successfully engaged in educational work and was meeting the requirements of the regents as to standards.

Registration applied to the approval of institutions both for the admission of their graduates to teaching positions in the State and to the meeting of the preliminary requirements for professional licenses. Colleges were registered in two classes. A college of the first class was defined as one that required for admission 4 years of secondary-school work above 8 years of elementary instruction, and offered 4 full years of college work for graduation. A college of the second class was one that admitted on 3 years of secondary-school work but required 4 full years of college work. In 1906 a third classification was established—a college requiring at least 6 years of secondary and higher instruction in addition to an elementary course of 8 years. The second classification was changed in 1906 to a college having a 3-year curriculum based on 11 years of preparatory work.

In 1907 the following rule concerning registration of higher institutions was adopted by the regents:

A college, university, or professional school may be recognized for professional licenses and for university certificates, after submitting satisfactory written evidence, and after inspection in case the commissioner of education shall deem the same to be expedient (in which case the institution interested, if not located in this State, shall bear the expense of inspection), if it appears that it maintains standards of equipment and instruction, and possesses resources at least equivalent to those prescribed by the laws of this State.

Institutions * * * thus registered, and no other, shall be entitled to use the word "registered" after their name.

In 1908 the rule was amended to read as follows:

If it appears that it maintains approved standards of equipment and instruction, and possesses resources at least equivalent to those prescribed by the laws of the State, a college, university, or professional school may be registered by the board of regents for the purpose of having its work recognized for professional licenses and for university certificates; and other schools and educational institutions may be registered to such extent, for such purposes, and on such conditions as the regents shall prescribe. Admission to or continuance on the roll of registration shall depend upon furnishing all information requested and meeting the expense of such inspection as the commissioner of education shall deem advisable.

In 1917 the Association of Colleges and Universities of New York proposed certain changes in the requirements for registering a college. Although the specific changes suggested by the association were not made, they led to the substitution of the following definition of a college for that put into operation in 1901:

An institution to be ranked as a college must have at least 8 professors giving their entire time to instruction therein; must require for admission not less than 4 years of academic or high-school preparation, or its equivalent; and must maintain a curriculum of 4 full years of approved grade in liberal arts and sciences.

In 1917, also, the Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, formerly the Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools of the Middle States and Maryland, appointed a special committee to consider and report upon the advisability of accrediting colleges in the territory which it covered. The association included in its membership many of the institutions comprised in the University of the State of New York. Undoubtedly action in the association from the beginning has been largely influenced by the New York representatives. As indicative of the cooperative relations between the New York education office and the association was the practice of the regents and later of the department of education of including in their annual reports a report of the proceedings of the association. In 1919, when the committee of the association appointed in 1917 made its report, it recommended for adoption and use in accrediting colleges in the territory of the association the definition of the New York Department of Education and a set of standards which the

department was already using as a basis for registering colleges in New York. These standards were abandoned by both the New York Department of Education and by the association in 1923, in favor of those recommended by the American Council on Education.

Registration of institutions outside of New York.—The registration by the department of education of institutions in States outside of New York dates back a good many years. It was first undertaken in order that students from institutions in the State seeking teaching appointments and professional licenses should not be discriminated against by students coming from institutions in other States having lower requirements than those in New York.

In registering institutions outside the State the department of education is guided by the standards of the national and regional accrediting associations. It depends almost wholly on the accredited lists of the associations, but requires all institutions to meet the specific conditions of the department for the type of certificates for which they are registered. The department not only inspects institutions in the State but also any in other States that request inspection with a view to registration, and that pay the expense connected therewith. For the most part the institutions outside the State of New York registered by the department coincide with the lists of the accrediting associations. The department's registered lists include institutions located in every State of the Union.

The department has also maintained for a long time lists of institutions in foreign countries registered with the department, basing its approval for their registration on their catalog statements and other publications, government reports, correspondence concerning particular phases of the institution's work and on information obtained in various other ways, including official inspection where possible.

The Revised Rules of the regents makes failure for two consecutive years on the part of an institution to submit an annual report reason for conclusion that the institution has discontinued operations, and after due notice the regents may suspend its charter. The rules also authorize the commissioner of education, after notice and opportunity to be heard, to rescind registration of any institution that fails to maintain the standard of equipment and instruction required by the department, or to possess adequate resources, or to make the reports required by the department.

Recent changes in requirements for registration.—Various changes affecting the registration of institutions were put into effect by the department of education in 1928. Registration itself was changed from a formal action by the board of regents to an administrative act of the assistant commissioner for higher education, and was given a different definition. It was defined as the approval of courses of study in a college, university, or professional school for

acceptance toward a University of the State of New York credential. Under the new regulations, therefore, institutions are not registered as a whole but for individual courses of study. Institutions unable to meet in full the requirements for registration may be registered in part, for 1 or more years.

The new regulations also contained a different definition of a college, as follows:

A college is an institution offering a 4-year course in liberal arts and science, based upon an admission requirement of 4 years of secondary schooling (15 units) or its satisfactory equivalent, leading to a bachelor's degree in arts and science, and meeting the requirements for registration hereinafter set forth in these regulations.

A new section was added to the regulations for the registration of colleges, which prescribed conditions upon which summer-session courses would be registered.

For the purpose of registration, the regulations divided higher institutions into four classes: (a) Colleges, (b) professional schools, (c) technical schools, and (d) other schools, and defined each type of institution. A professional school was defined as "a school offering a course of study either (a) required or authorized by statute or by rules and regulations established in accordance therewith, for admission to licensure in and the practice of a certain profession, or (b) generally recognized as necessary for proper preparation to practice that profession." Under the classification of professional schools were listed schools of medicine, osteopathy, chiropody or podiatry, dentistry, oral hygiene, pharmacy, veterinary medicine, nursing, accountancy and business administration, optometry, architecture, law, engineering, and theology (which for the first time was given this recognition).

The classification of technical schools included art, music, agriculture, home economics, and forestry.

"Other schools" included "all institutions of higher education such as schools of education, religious education, and library science."

Regulations for the registration of each type of institution were given.

Regulations of the department of education adopted in 1936 contain revisions of the requirements for the registration of courses of study in colleges and junior colleges. According to the new regulations, a "College" means an incorporated institution offering a 4-year course in liberal arts or science, based upon an admission requirement of four years of secondary-school work (16 units), or the equivalent, leading to the bachelor's degree in arts or science"; a "Junior college" means an incorporated institution not conferring degrees, offering 2 years of work in standard college courses or 2 years of work in courses terminal in character of collegiate grade and quality, or offering both such standard and terminal courses."

Incorporation and registration of junior colleges.—In 1917, Sarah Lawrence College, at Bronxville, had made application for incorporation as a college in which the first 2 years only of a recognized college course would be given. As this offered the first occasion for consideration of the junior college in New York, it necessitated the setting up of regulations for the chartering and registration of such an institution. It was decided, therefore, to grant the charter to Sarah Lawrence College upon conditions similar to those for a 4-year college, so modified as to make them applicable to an institution offering half the amount of work given by a regular college.

The department of education has as yet set up no separate regulations for the incorporation of junior colleges, and chartering and registration are practically coincidental. In the regulations of 1928 a junior college was defined as an institution of the same character as the college, offering only the first 2 years of the 4-year course and conferring no degree. For registration the regulations provided that the junior college should meet all the requirements for the registration of a college except as to endowment, library, and instructors, each of which was designated as one-half of the requirements for a college. As in the case of colleges, deficiencies in certain requirements may be compensated for on the demonstration of the junior college to meet its announced objectives.

Schools of physiotherapy and business institutes were listed as higher educational institutions in 1936 for the first time, and the requirements for the registration of each stated. The term "business institute" refers to institutions that were formerly private business schools. These schools had raised the standard of their work so that they had reached a grade above that of the secondary school, and in the opinion of the commissioner of education were worthy to be classed as higher educational institutions. The business institutes in many respects approach the junior college, but they may not so designate themselves. They are in reality terminal professional business schools. Out of the 100 private business colleges in the State only 5 conform to the regulations for registration as business institutes.

Incorporation and registration of professional schools—Medicine.—The authority of the New York regents with respect to the incorporation of professional schools began in 1853. The power to incorporate colleges had not hitherto been understood to include medical colleges. While the regents had incorporated such institutions, they had done so under special powers conferred by the legislature in individual cases. The law of 1853 authorized the regents to grant charters for medical colleges when certain specific conditions should have been met. It made the colleges subject to visitation by the regents and required them to submit an annual report to the board.

It also authorized the regents to vacate the charter if the conditions prescribed in the law were not fulfilled within a specified period.

At first the possession of the degree of doctor of medicine conferred by the regents on the completion of study at the separate medical colleges was sufficient authority to practice. The right to examine and license physician was held also at this time by State and county medical societies. In 1860 the privilege of conferring their degrees was turned over to the boards of trustees of the several medical colleges, which, by appeal to the legislature, obtained through special enactment the authority also to license their own graduates. In 1872 the law empowered the regents to appoint boards of examiners to examine candidates for admission to the three types of medical practice then recognized, and upon favorable report by the boards, to confer the degree of doctor of medicine, the degree to constitute a license to practice. Another law in 1880 required the registration of all practicing physicians in the State, gave to those holding medical diplomas from incorporated medical colleges the right to practice, and repealed all authority to grant medical licenses except that of the regents, on examination conducted by the State board of medical examiners, provided for in the law. In 1893 the law gave the regents the sole right to register physicians and to issue licenses to practice medicine.

Educational requirements for admission to the study of medicine were first established by law in 1889. The statute prescribed the preliminary training of applicants, and enumerated the subjects in which examinations were to be held by the regents. Educational requirements for admission to medical practice were prescribed by law in 1896. As preparation for admission to medical study they specified graduation from a college registered by the regents, or the completion of a full course in a registered academy or high school, or preliminary education accepted by the regents as equivalent to such training. In 1909 the law was changed so that for admission to examination to practice the applicant must have completed the preliminary training prescribed by the rules of the department of education and a course in medicine at a school registered by the department.

Since the American Medical Association has been the recognized authority on the standards of medical education and licensure for the past 30 years, the New York State Education Department, in conformity with the practice throughout the country, accepts the ratings of medical schools made by that association. Its list of registered medical schools is identical with the approved list of the association. While in order to determine whether medical schools are maintaining a satisfactory standard the department is authorized to inspect them, it is seldom called upon to do so and exercises this authority only for the purpose of checking up on violations.

Other professions.—The State department of education has supervision over the admission to practice every profession recognized in the State, with the exception of law, which has always been under the jurisdiction of the court of appeals. It supervises the preliminary education, conducts all licensing examinations, through a board of examiners in each profession appointed by the commissioner of education with the approval of the regents, and issues both qualifying certificates for admission to the study of the professions and the licenses to practice them. It is assisted in framing the requirements for practice by a board of technical advisers appointed by it for each profession.

Prior to the setting up of standards by the national professional associations, the department drew up very minute requirements for the professions and inspected and approved professional schools of all types. At present, in professions in which there is no active national accrediting organization, the department continues to inspect and approve the schools. Where there is a universally recognized standardizing organization, as for medicine and law, the department accepts and registers the schools approved by those organizations, provided they meet the requirements of the New York laws governing the practice of the professions and of the department with reference to registration. When the laws or the regulations governing the practice of a profession change, as has been the case recently with architecture, engineering, pharmacy, and nursing education, the department requires the institutions formerly registered to reapply for registration and to meet the new requirements.

While the law has lodged authority for legal practice with the court of appeals, under the rules of the court, applicants for admission to study law must submit evidence of having completed 2 years of work in a college or university approved by the State department of education, or must meet an alternative requirement, and obtain a qualifying certificate issued by the commissioner of education, the same as in other professions. For admission to examinations for the bar, they must have graduated from law schools "which have been registered with and approved by the State department of education."

Connecticut

Incorporation and approval of colleges.—Unlike its neighbor New York, Connecticut until within somewhat recent years apparently did not feel the need to set up requirements for the regulation of higher educational institutions in the State. There were only a few universities and colleges in the State and they were generally recognized as standard institutions. The State teacher-training institutions were, and have been with one exception, under the direct control and supervision of the State board of education since their establishment. The

exception was the State Teachers College at New Britain, founded in 1849, when the first State board of education was defunct, and placed under its own board of trustees. Since 1865, when the State board of education was reestablished, the control of this school has also been vested in that body. With the rise throughout the country of new types of training offered by institutions claiming to be of college grade, Connecticut, lacking a law to control the granting of degrees, became the mecca for so-called diploma mills. Prior to the year 1931 charters for institutions of this type could be secured with the greatest ease. All that was necessary for their promoters to obtain the right to operate them was to secure articles of incorporation as business organizations.

A number of institutions of questionable character had obtained original incorporation in Connecticut. Others, driven out by stricter laws from other States had reestablished themselves in Connecticut. The reputation of the State for high educational standards began to suffer. The attention of the legislature was called to this situation by the State board of education and resulted in the passage of a law which, effective January 1, 1931, made it an offense punishable by a fine of not more than \$500 for "any person, school board, association or corporation" to confer any degree unless authorized by act of the general assembly, following the endorsement and recommendation of the State board of education.

In order to prevent defunct institutions from reopening and institutions for which charters had been granted but which had never been opened, from being set up in the State without compliance with the new law governing incorporation, the legislature further enacted in 1935, that—

No person, school board, association, or corporation that has heretofore been given authority to confer degrees, and which has not heretofore exercised such authority, shall confer any degree until the State board of education has decided that its organization and equipment is fully competent to meet degree standards. Degrees conferred in violation hereof are void and those conferring them may be penalized.

Under these two sections of the law the State is afforded protection from the establishment in the State of low-grade and fraudulent degree-granting institutions. Since the law went into effect, by recommendation of the State board of education, the general assembly has repealed the charters of a number of defunct degree-granting institutions, and has required other institutions which had not used their degree-granting right, to secure approval of the State board of education, if and when they were able and wished to secure the privilege. It has also authorized the establishment of three degree-granting colleges and six junior colleges, all of which are now in operation.

Before approving the application of persons applying for the incorporation of an institution with degree-granting powers, the State

board of education requires evidence of the possession of sufficient resources, equipment, and facilities. Data are required on income, endowment, and indebtedness of the proposed institution; on its classrooms, laboratories, and library; on the faculty, its training and service; on the course of study for the bachelor's degree in the particular field of study in which the institution will offer courses, as arts, science, engineering, etc.; on admission requirements; on registrations in each of the classes—freshman, sophomore, junior, and senior; and on relation to the college of preparatory department, if any, with reference to students, buildings, and discipline.

Incorporation and approval of junior colleges.—The conditions in the State that led to the passage of the law of 1931 for the control of degree-granting institutions concerned not only the institutions whose object was purely commercial, but a number of institutions in the State that offered various types of work, largely vocational, above high-school level but not of senior college grade. The State was in need of greater opportunities for education on the post-secondary level, which the latter institutions could help supply if their work could be raised to the proper standard. The need for increased higher educational opportunities of the character and scope commonly offered by junior colleges was evidenced by the enactment of a law in 1933 requiring the State board of education to consider the feasibility of converting the State normal schools into State junior colleges, and the alternative proposal of the board that, under rules and regulations to be set up by the State boards, towns, and cities, be permitted to establish and maintain junior colleges. Neither of these proposals was adopted, but the State board of education has cooperated, through encouragement and advice, with the private institutions desiring to establish themselves in the junior college field.

Immediately after the passage of the act of 1931, the board set up a definition and tentative standards for approving junior colleges, and voted to list in its annual directory such institutions in the State as had been inspected and approved. In the next directory, three institutions were listed as junior colleges.

In the light of several years' experience, the board, in 1935, revised its definition and standards, following therein the present general trend toward liberality. The new standards provide for continued approval, to be granted for 1 year only for the first 3 years, after which approval may be granted for a period of 3 years. They provide also for authorization to confer junior college degrees upon vote of the general assembly, following endorsement by the State board of education.

The board of education has construed the law with reference to the incorporation of degree-conferring institutions as covering also the

incorporation of junior colleges conferring the titles associate in arts and associate in science.

Approval of institutions for the certification of teachers.— Until 1922 most of the certificates to teach in the public schools of Connecticut were issued by local towns, each of which conducted its own examinations and set its own standards. No credits toward qualifications to teach from institutions either within or without the State were accepted, and certificates issued by other States were not recognized. In 1921 the legislature enacted a statute requiring that all future teachers' certificates be issued by the State department of education. Those already in effect were allowed to remain in force until they expired.

While the policy of accepting credits from colleges for certification has been in effect for some years now, the State board of education has established no formal criteria for the approval of institutions. It has ruled that for high-school certification a candidate shall possess a diploma of graduation from an approved college or university, or a diploma of graduation from a 4-year course of an approved State normal school or teachers college. It defines such institutions as "any Connecticut institution approved for certification purposes by the State board of education, or any degree-granting institution in another State or country accredited by the department of education of that State or country and maintaining standards at least equal to the Connecticut institutions which are approved."

As its first list of approved colleges in the State the board listed "without the formality of application or inspection, the Connecticut degree-granting institutions which are classed by the Office of Education, United States Department of the Interior, as universities and colleges in the *Educational Directory, 1931*." It has since added to its list several institutions which received charters as degree-granting institutions from the State legislature after the law for the incorporation of colleges went into effect. All such institutions were inspected before approval.

Virginia

There is in Virginia but one accrediting agency for both higher institutions and secondary schools—the State Board of Education. The approval of secondary schools dates to 1904, when the State board of education, the supreme educational administrative body for the State, adopted minimum requirements for the course of study, teachers, and the subjects covered in the course of the public high schools. The approval of higher institutions began in 1912, when the State board of education ruled that—

No institution in Virginia shall be registered as a university, college, normal school, junior college, or high school for the issuance of certificates

to graduates of such school until it has been inspected by a representative of the State board of education and the board has acted favorably upon the report of its representative.

The University of Virginia for some years inspected and accredited secondary schools. In 1905 it published for the first time in its annual catalog a list of secondary schools accredited for college entrance. It continued such lists in succeeding catalogs, but following the publication in 1914 by the State board of education of a list of approved high schools, the university abandoned the inspection of public high schools and recognized those schools approved by the board.

The inspection of the private secondary schools and the annual revision of the university's accredited list of schools was continued until 1930, when it adopted as accredited all 4-year public high schools and all private secondary schools fully approved by the State board of education.

Although the university began to announce in its catalog of 1905-6 that students would be admitted with advanced standing from colleges and universities whose requirements for admission equalled those approved by the Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools of the Southern States, it has never drawn up requirements for the accrediting of higher institutions. Formerly in allowing advanced credit the university considered each application separately on its merits. For the past 10 years or more, it has accepted credits of students from the colleges, junior colleges, and teacher-training institutions accredited by the State board of education.

Since 1931, when the State department of education was reorganized, a director of higher education in the department has been charged with the duty of inspecting and making recommendations to the State board of education concerning the accrediting of institutions for both teacher preparation and for general collegiate purposes.

Certification of teachers.—From 1870, when the public-school system was established and placed under the administration of the State board of education, until early in the nineteenth century, there was no uniformity in the examination and certification of teachers. Each county and city superintendent held examinations and issued certificates for his county or district. According to the biennial report of the State superintendent of public instruction for 1907-9, when a central board of examiners took charge of the certification of teachers in 1905, there were 118 different standards for teachers in the State. That the evils of this method were soon apparent is evidenced by the fact that as early as 1883 each superintendent was required, prior to the holding of examinations, to file in the office of the State superintendent copies of his questions for the various examinations and to indicate on each set the percentage to be attained to entitle the applicant to a certificate.

In 1891, at a joint meeting of the State Educational Association and Superintendents' Conference, a resolution was adopted which recommended that all teachers in the State be certificated only upon the passing of an examination prepared by the State superintendent of public instruction. With the acceptance of this recommendation by the State board of education, there began the holding of uniform examinations for teachers throughout the State. At the same time, the regulations of the State board of education were changed by granting to the State superintendent of public instruction the power to issue without the requirement of examination life diplomas, and State certificates valid for 5 years, to graduates of the State Female Normal School; the College of William and Mary; the Peabody Normal College at Nashville, Tenn.; the Virginia Normal and Industrial Institute; and the Hampton Institute. The regulations also authorized the extension of the certificate to 7 years to graduates of the collegiate courses of those institutions. In 1900, the regulation was amended so as to allow a like privilege to graduates of other colleges in the State.

State board of examiners and inspectors.—In 1905, the State board of education created a State board of examiners, only after repeated recommendations for such a unifying agency. The State superintendent of public instruction as early as 1887 recommended the appointment of a board of examiners, and his successor in office continued the recommendation with increasing urgency. The appointment finally of the board was evidently incidental to the adoption in 1902 of a new State constitution, which among other provisions for public education increased the membership of the State board of education by the addition to the three ex officio members of five educational representatives, three from the State-controlled higher institutions, one city, and one county superintendent of schools. At any rate, the act authorizing the State board of education to appoint an examining board was passed in 1904, and the board was created the following year.

The new Board, entitled "State Board of Examiners and Inspectors," consisted of five experienced educators, to each of whom was assigned a division of the State in which to carry on his activities. The board's chief duties consisted in the examination and certification of teachers and the inspection of high and elementary schools. Through the labors of this board, a more progressive and uniform system of granting teachers' certificates was inaugurated.

In the regulations of the State board of education defining the powers and duties of the State board of examiners and inspectors was a provision permitting "graduates of colleges and universities of approved standing and reputation," without further examination to

teach in the public high schools the branches in which they had been graduated.

Registration of institutions by State department of education.—In 1911, the State board of education abolished the State board of examiners and inspectors and transferred to the State department of education the duty of examining and certificating teachers. Thereafter, beginning April 1, 1912, all certificates to teach were issued by the State department of education, and all examinations for teaching positions were prepared and graded by a State board of examiners within the department, one examiner for each subject. Before submission to this board for final rating, the examination papers were graded by the county and city superintendents of schools.

The State department of education put into effect a new and comprehensive scheme of certification. New types of teachers' certificates were provided for, designated according to the nature of the training demanded. Among the certificates offered were those requiring university, college, and academic training, the certificate represented by the latter requiring graduation from institutions ranking between the college and the standard 4-year high school. In order to receive the university, collegiate, and academic certificates, the institution from which applicants graduated were required to be registered by the State board of education.

As the first step toward registration, the board defined the several types of institutions, its definition of a college being that adopted in 1901 by the Board of Regents of the University of the State of New York and later by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

In regulations adopted in 1914, the board provided that—

No institution in Virginia shall be registered as a university, college, normal school, junior college, or high school for the issuance of certificates to graduates of such school until it has been inspected by a representative of the State board of education and the board has acted favorably upon the report of its representative.

Any institution which, after being registered by the State board of education, clearly fails to comply with the regulations of the board, shall be removed from the list of registered institutions.

The regulations provided also for the recognition of universities and colleges in other States, as follows:

(a) A degree from a university located outside of Virginia, which is a member of the Association of American Universities, or of the National Association of State Universities, shall be accepted as a basis upon which a university or collegiate certificate may be issued.

(b) A university or collegiate degree of a college outside of Virginia which is accepted by a member of the Association of American Universities or of the National Association of State Universities as a basis for graduate work to the same extent as the degree of the same name granted by the said member of either of the associations named, shall be accepted as a basis

upon which a university or collegiate certificate may be issued, provided a record of the work completed is furnished the department of public instruction by the president or registrar of the institution from which the applicant is graduated.

Among the certificates which the regulations enumerated were those requiring a degree from the graduate school of a registered university, a degree from a registered college, a certificate from a registered State normal school or city normal school, and graduation from "a registered institution in Virginia which does not comply fully with the definition of a college, but which offers an approved 4-year course, at least 2 years in advance of the standard 4-year high school, with 1 year's work of college grade in English, mathematics, and sciences. * * *"

Undertaken without legal authority, except that implied in the power to certificate teachers, the inspection and registration by the State board of education of the higher institutions in the State was apparently accepted by the institutions as a natural function of the board. The State superintendent of public instruction in his report for 1915-16, says regarding this phase of certification:

During recent years a new and delightful relation has sprung up between the State board of education and the colleges. By the free consent of these higher institutions themselves, visitorial powers have been given the State board of education and all entrance credentials of accredited institutions are now viséed by the department of public instruction. In turn, the graduates of the colleges betake themselves to the department for certificates to teach, and for other credentials, with all of the confidence of members of a great family.

In the superintendent's report for 1916-17, he again refers to the matter of registration:

An honest attempt to standardize colleges, normal schools, and technical schools of the higher rank presents problems of the most delicate and difficult nature. On the one hand there must be a clear and sympathetic recognition of actual conditions, and on the other an inflexible determination to improve those conditions. No system of colleges can ignore the facilities possessed by the schools which support them, and our Virginia colleges have advanced and will advance their standards with the growth of our system of high schools. Furthermore, they have manifested an earnest determination to demand of their students the utmost scholastic attainments that the secondary schools could give them. Thus they have assisted materially and powerfully in applying that upward pressure on high schools which has been exerted so consistently and carefully by this department. I know of no other State in which there has been a demand on the part of the higher institutions of learning that the State department of public instruction publish annually the names, addresses, and credits of all matriculating college freshmen.

The main difficulty in standardizing colleges and universities arises when an attempt is made to determine the integrity of the academic standards in those institutions themselves. These standards can never be decided with mathematical precision either by a committee of the college faculty or by a commission of outside investigators. They depend chiefly on the mental

attitude and conscience of the officers of the schools themselves. It does seem possible and advisable, however, to demand certain evidences of preparation and experience on the part of the members of the faculties, a certain scale of salaries commensurate with high attainments, a certain amount of equipment in classroom facilities, apparatus, and library, certain entrance requirements and certain standards of promotion from class to class. The enforcement of these standards should be carefully supervised and they should be strengthened year by year as conditions may justify.

Standards in normal schools are particularly difficult to settle, but I am glad to report that our State board has begun to give special attention to the duty of fixing and maintaining standards in these institutions also.

In 1918, the State board of education abolished the State board of examiners and transferred to the supervisors in the department of education the duty of passing upon examinations. The supervisors continued this function until 1926, when the passing of an examination as the basis for teacher certification was discontinued.

The State board of education at its meeting May 22, 1918, adopted a definition and requirements for a standard college and a standard junior college, which were in substance and form of the usual type of quantitative standards then in use, and issued lists of colleges, technical colleges, and junior colleges approved temporarily as standard. Appended to the lists was the notation:

The institutions named below have been continued on the list of registered colleges by the State board of education for the session 1918-19. After that time all higher institutions of the State desiring to be registered must meet the standards adopted by the State board of education.

In 1925, the board adopted a new set of standards for colleges and junior colleges, based upon those recommended by the American Council on Education. These standards remained in effect until April 27, 1939, when new ones, including standards for normal schools, were adopted. The board first adopted standards for normal schools in 1930.

The new standards, in consonance with the present trend, emphasize qualitative rather than quantitative requirements. The general policy of the board with respect to accrediting institutions, as expressed in the preface to the standards, is that institutions seeking approval "shall demonstrate, within the limits of the * * * standards, that the pursuit of learning on the collegiate level is the chief concern of the administration, the faculty, and the students."

Illinois

Recognition of higher institutions for teacher certification.—

The present provision in Illinois for a centralized system of teacher-certification through a State examining board has grown up by a series of steps since the creation of the first public-school system of the State in 1825. At first the boards of directors of the schools examined their

own teachers. Later on, the law authorized the township trustees to perform this function. When the present school system was established in 1855, the law placed the duty in the hands of the county commissioners (later county superintendents), and set up a general standard of requirements for teachers. In 1872, the law empowered the State superintendent of public schools also to examine teachers and to issue certificates valid for use in any county of the State. Prior to 1914, however, few State certificates, in comparison with the many county certificates, were issued.

The separate qualifications set up by the 102 county superintendents differed greatly one from another in standard. They acted as barriers to the free circulation of teachers from one part of the State to another. The need for the enactment of legislation to unify certification procedure became apparent. In 1907, therefore, the governor appointed a commission to study the school laws of the State with a view to recommending changes that would bring them into conformity with the needs of the State and the practices current in other States. Among the recommendations which the commission made was that certain classes of certificates to teach be granted without examination to graduates of recognized high schools, normal schools, and colleges and universities, according to the grade of certificate. The commission defined the word "recognized" as applied to schools and colleges and universities, as a school, college, or university maintaining an equipment, course of study, and standards of scholarship approved by the board of education. It submitted a certificating bill which had the support of the State teachers association and the county superintendents. The bill did not receive the endorsement of the general assembly, however, until June 28, 1913. The act incorporating the recommendations of the commission became effective July 1st of the following year.

The act provided for a State examining board to carry out the provisions of the law. The State superintendent of public instruction was made ex officio chairman of the board, the other members to consist of three county superintendents appointed by the State superintendent on nomination of the county superintendents' section of the State teachers association and one other person engaged in educational work, appointed also by the State superintendent. The law required the State superintendent and the State examining board to determine upon a standard of equipment, course of study, and teaching force to be maintained by normal schools, colleges, universities, and special and technical schools recognized for the granting of certificates to teach without examination in the schools of the State.

The State superintendent and the examining board, assisted by a committee representing the Federation of Illinois Colleges, agreed upon definitions and minimum standards for the recognition of all

institutions above secondary grade. They prepared a tentative list of recognized institutions made up on the basis of information furnished by inquiries and investigations along the following lines: (1) The relation of the college to the Federation of Illinois Colleges, (2) the relation of the college to the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, (3) the relation of the college to the graduate schools in universities, (4) recognition given to graduates of the college by departments of education in other States, (5) the catalogs and publications of the college, (6) answers to questions contained in the blank sent out, and (7) a visit made by authorized inspectors. They divided the institutions into four groups: (1) recognized normal schools, (2) recognized colleges and universities, (3) partially recognized colleges and universities, and (4) recognized junior colleges and technical or special schools.

It was recognized at the outset that the work of inspection and recognition required the services of experts in the various fields of higher education, and the superintendent of public instruction therefore appointed advisory committees from the several types of institutions who undertook this task. Such committees continue to perform this service. The law under which the certification of teachers is now conducted was passed in 1929.

Approval for establishment of public junior colleges.—The general assembly at its session in 1937 enacted a law which authorized school districts having a population of not more than 200,000 nor less than 10,000, to establish junior colleges, after seeking the advice of the State superintendent of public instruction. Although the law does not specifically state that the State superintendent shall set up criteria for the recognition of junior colleges, he has regarded that as a necessary preliminary to the giving of advice, and under his direction a set of tentative criteria has been made up, following a study of the regional and State standards. The junior colleges established under the law will probably be extensions of high schools and the two institutions treated as a unit. The superintendent plans therefore for visitation for the purpose of granting recognition to the junior college to coincide with the visitation to the high school.

Accrediting of higher institutions by University of Illinois.—In the catalog of the University of Illinois for 1891-92, there appeared for the first time the announcement that "Credits from other colleges and universities may be accepted by the faculty for advanced standing." Organized graduate work at the university began the same year, and the catalog further announced that "The diploma of any college or university in good standing is accepted for admission, instead of entrance examinations." In succeeding catalogs these statements changed little until 1907-8, when the following announcements were made:

Credits from another college or university or from a fully accredited high school may be accepted for advanced standing.

Admission to the graduate school is conditioned upon the presentation of credentials showing that the applicant holds a first degree either from the University of Illinois or from some other college or university of approved standing.

The university had for a long time inspected and accredited high schools in the State for the purpose of freshman admission. One accredited high school was listed in the catalog of the university as early as 1877. Other State universities had also accredited high schools. But how the university determined whether a college or university was of "approved standing" is not so clear, as no formally approved list of colleges and universities existed at that time. There were, of course, such lists of higher institutions as the membership of the National Association of State Universities and of the regional associations of the North Central States, the New England, the Middle, and the Southern States. There was also the list published in the Annual Report of the Commissioner of Education, by no means a selected list, including as it did all institutions authorized to give degrees. By means of the statistics accompanying the institutions listed in the report, it was possible, of course, to compare their standings in certain particulars. Also the reports, up until 1911, divided women's colleges into classes A and B.

In 1909 the university council appointed two committees, one on Appointment of Graduates, the other on Transfer of Credits, representing the two interests the university had in the standings of colleges and universities. These committees functioned independently of each other. The committee on appointment of graduates made some visitations to some of the colleges in the State to inspect their facilities for offering graduate work, but the work of the committee on transfer of credits was carried on for the most part by the registrar of the university. At approximately this time, the United States Bureau of Education prepared a classification of universities and colleges with reference to the value of their bachelor's degrees in affording their holders admission to the graduate schools of the country; the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching published its list of institutions accepted for Carnegie pensions; and the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools issued its first accredited list. The admissions officers of the university made use of these lists. When an application for acceptance of transfer of credits was received from an institution not on one of these lists or on the membership list of the National Association of State Universities, the applicant was required to present his credits to the different departments concerned to have them checked and approved.

In 1914, the name of the Committee on Transfer of Credits was changed to Committee on Admissions to Higher Institutions. An organized plan for accrediting colleges and universities was begun by the two committees. After a 2 years' study, they completed the preparation of criteria for rating institutions in Illinois and other States. They grouped colleges tentatively into four classes, according to the degree to which they met the criteria; (1) Class A Plus included institutions which met in full all the criteria; Class A, institutions which approximated the standard set for Class A Plus, but fell short of it in certain particulars; Class B, institutions which, "while of collegiate character and standards," fell short in more important particulars of the standard set for Class A Plus; Class C, institutions which while organized and designated as colleges, appeared to be little more than secondary schools. The items covered by the criteria included (1) graduation requirements, (2) entrance requirements, (3) number of departments, (4) faculty preparation, (5) number of students in recitation and laboratory sections, (6) value of buildings, (7) income from endowment, (8) library and laboratories, (9) lighting, heating, etc., and (10) general standards and spirit of administration and faculty.

In a revision of the list made shortly thereafter, the committees dropped Class A Plus colleges. The new grouping included classes A, B, C, and D, and classes A, B, C, and D, with restrictions affecting (1) admission to the graduate school, and (2) restrictions affecting transfers to the undergraduate colleges. The committee also drew up criteria for judging junior colleges, and listed a number of accredited junior colleges with the amount of credit allowed by the university to each.

In 1921, the university senate abolished the former committees and created in their stead the present Joint Committee on Admissions from Higher Institutions. This committee consists of two representatives elected annually by the executive faculty of the graduate school, two representatives of the undergraduate colleges appointed annually by the university senate, the high-school visitor, and the registrar of the university as ex officio secretary. The regulations which govern the work of the committee make it responsible for rating colleges and universities both for the admission of their graduates to the graduate school and for the transfer of credits to the undergraduate colleges. They require also that the committee rate normal schools and junior colleges. The registrar is authorized to make tentative ratings of institutions, to be subject in all cases to revision by the committee.

Under the regulations, the ratings made by the committee are "primarily of *institutions*, not of individual courses offered, nor ordinarily of individual teachers or departments." They are based "in the main" on the criteria set up by the committee. An institution located in another State is rated by the committee after it has ascertained the

rating or practice of the State university of that State, and no higher rating is granted by the University of Illinois than by the other State university. Ratings made by the committee and the data on which they are based are sent to designated representatives of all the departments of the university interested in the fields of work offered by the institutions in question for their criticism, but final decision on all ratings rests with the committee.

The committee, upon invitation, after securing approval of the president of the university, is authorized to make personal inspections of institutions located in Illinois. To avoid annoyance to institutions, it does as much preliminary work as possible. Before sending a questionnaire to an institution, it compiles data from the catalog and from other sources and submits them to the institution to be verified. The committee has visited every institution accredited by the university. Sometimes as many as 15 or 20 members of the faculty, specialists in different departments, visit one institution. The reports and information from the several visitors are assembled and the rating is made in accordance with these reports and data. A possible score for each criterion is set up, and the final rating is based on the relationship between the possible and the actual scores. The criteria formulated by the two earlier committees were revised in 1923, since which time they have not been changed. The lists of ratings are revised annually. Each accredited institution is required to fill out an annual blank.

The Committee on Admissions from Higher Institutions seeks to avoid duplication of work wherever possible. For several years it has recognized the institutions accredited by the Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools and the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, and for a longer period those accredited by the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. Institutions fully accredited by these associations are placed on the Class A list of the university.

Iowa

Approval of higher institutions for certification of teachers.—

The constitution of Iowa adopted in 1857 created a State board of education, vesting it with authority to legislate and make all needful rules and regulations for the public-school system of the State. There were at that time but few institutions for higher education in Iowa. The State university, along with a State system of common schools, was established in 1847, the year after Iowa's admission into the Union; but the university gave no instruction until 1855. All teachers for the public schools of the State were licensed by county superintendents of education after the applicants had passed examinations. As each superintendent prepared his own examinations, the qualifications differed greatly from county to county.

In his report to the board of education in 1861, its secretary called attention to the need for "elevating the standard of qualification in the profession of teaching", and recommended the appointment of a State board to conduct examinations for teachers, in line with the action already taken by other States. He recommended that the examining board be constituted from the faculty of the State university and that the professor of the normal department of the university be made its *ex officio* secretary; also that the course of study in the normal department be recognized as the standard of qualification to teach. The following year, 1862, the board of education, acting upon the authority conferred upon it by the State constitution, carried out these recommendations. It created an "Educational Board of Examiners", with the personnel as recommended, and authorized it to hold examinations for teachers and to grant teaching certificates to be valid in any county of the State. The board also began the practice of certificating graduates of the normal department of the State university.

In order to secure a more uniform standard of qualification for licensing teachers, as well as to set up a line of demarcation between the different classes of certificates, the educational board of examiners prepared and submitted to the county superintendents examination questions to serve as models. At the same time its recommendations called attention to the desirability of legal action to establish the acceptance of the diploma of the normal department of the State university, as evidence that its holders possessed the proper qualifications to teach.

In 1863 the legislature created a department of public instruction and the office of secretary of the State board of education was superseded by that of State superintendent of public instruction. Following the example of his predecessors, the State superintendent urged reforms in the licensing of teachers, especially that of requiring by law the recognition of graduation from the State's higher educational institutions as sufficient qualification to teach. The legislature not only failed to act on the superintendent's recommendations, but in 1873 abolished the educational board of examiners, thereby returning to the county superintendents the sole power to grant teachers' certificates.

After a period of 9 years, the general assembly in 1882 created a new board of examiners, consisting of the State superintendent, *ex officio*, the president of the State University, the principal of the State normal school, and two other persons to be appointed by the executive council. The State superintendent, who was made president of the board, was also a regent of the State university and president of the board of directors of the State normal school. The law of 1882 provided for the holding by the board of two examinations a year, prescribed the subjects in which examinations were to be given, and

empowered the board to issue State certificates and State diplomas to persons found qualified to receive them. State certificates authorized their holders to teach in any public school in the State for a term of 5 years; State diplomas were valid for life.

In 1890 the law regarding the issuance of State certificates and State diplomas was changed so as to permit the State board of examiners to issue State certificates to graduates of any normal school in Iowa who had had 36 weeks' successful experience in teaching, and diplomas to such graduates as had 5 years' experience. At the same time, the board of examiners adopted the policy of accepting diplomas from approved colleges and State normal schools in other States and certificates granted in other States, in place of an examination in academic studies, requiring the candidate, however, to pass an examination in the theory and art of teaching, or in such branch of a group of subjects as the board chose to designate. Acceptance of the candidate's credentials was contingent upon his having had at least 18 months' successful work in Iowa. By the law of 1897 the board was given legal power to grant State certificates and diplomas to persons holding diplomas from State normal schools in other States or holding certificates of as high grade from other States.

In 1900 the general assembly enacted a law which took away from the board of examiners authority to grant licenses without examination to graduates of the State university and the State normal school and to recognize diplomas from other States, and made all licensing to teach dependent upon the passing of an examination. But 2 years later, it reversed this action by constituting the board of examiners "a board for the inspection, recognition, and supervision of the schools designed for the instruction and training of teachers for the common schools." All schools seeking recognition under the law were instructed to apply to the board, which was authorized "to inspect such schools with reference to course of study, equipment, and faculty." Schools that met the requirements for recognition set up by the board were to be known as "accredited schools."

In order to carry out the law, the board of examiners set up minimum standards for the faculties, buildings and grounds, laboratories, and libraries of institutions that trained teachers. Although the law provided for inspection, no appropriation was made for the purpose and the approval of institutions was based on paper reports only, as is evidenced by the minutes of the board for May 8, 1903, which contain a resolution "to receive courses of study and statements from schools for training teachers and to admit such schools as approved, if the standard is sufficiently high."

After repeated recommendations by the board for legislation to abandon the certificating of teachers by county superintendents, the

general assembly, in 1906, passed a law making the licensing of teachers for the public schools of Iowa a responsibility of the State board of examiners alone. The legislature of 1907 restored the power of the board to grant State certificates without examination to graduates of the State University and the State Normal School, and authorized it to grant the same recognition to graduates of the State College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts and to graduates of other colleges and normal schools in the State maintaining courses adjudged by the board to be of equal rank to the regular and collegiate courses offered by the State higher institutions.

The law of 1907 therefore made the courses of the State institutions the standard for the State. As there were few institutions in Iowa maintaining departments of education offering work equivalent to that offered in the departments of the State institutions, the State board of examiners judged it to be the intent of the legislature that the board recognize for teacher certification the institutions in the State known as standard colleges offering 4-year liberal arts courses. It therefore classified temporarily these colleges into three groups, as a basis for which it adopted a definition and a set of 8 standards or "points", with specifications as to faculty—training and class hours—library, laboratory, support, salaries, departments, and ability of the institutions to prepare their graduates for admission into the graduate school of Iowa State University. The first class contained institutions that met in full the standards, the second-class institutions that met 5 of the 8 standards, and the third-class institutions that met not less than 3. The class of certificate was made dependent upon the classification of the institution from which the applicant graduated.

The standards and the classification were intended as a temporary expedient to set in motion the provisions of the law, to be changed in the light of experience. It was soon found necessary to supplement the reports upon which the classification was made by inspection and suggestions from the institutions themselves. New and increased standards were put into effect January 1, 1912, and the grouping of colleges discontinued. Thereafter all colleges were required to meet the standards, and all accredited institutions were contained in a single list. In 1911, new standards were drawn up, to take effect January 1, 1916.

The setting up of standards and the publication of accredited lists of institutions by the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools since 1913, have greatly influenced and modified the work of State accrediting agencies in the Middle West. The standards of the association are given general recognition. Institutions both within and without the State of Iowa accredited by the association are approved by the State board of educational examiners for the certification of teachers, if their provisions for teacher-training

meet the requirements of the board. The board now makes inspections of institutions only for the purpose of checking up on the teacher-training work offered by the institutions. For information on the accrediting of institutions outside of the North Central Association, it depends on the national and other regional accrediting associations and on State departments of education.

Another agency assisting the State board of educational examiners in approving teacher-training institutions is the Intercollegiate Standing Committee, organized in 1919 by the State board of education, which has control of the three State higher institutions. The committee is composed of representatives of the three institutions and its duty is to determine a uniform policy of admission and advanced standing of students transferring to the State institutions from other colleges.

At its first meeting the secretary of the Intercollegiate Standing Committee was requested to notify the secretary of the State board of educational examiners of its organization, and to invite the cooperation of that board in all matters of common interest.

In 1917, the president of the Iowa State College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts was made a member of the State board of educational examiners, so that all of the State higher institutions were represented on the board by their presidents. Cooperation of the board with the Intercollegiate Standing Committee after its formation in 1919 was therefore assured, and the board accepted from the beginning the approval of institutions by the committee as evidence of their standing in the academic field. Accrediting by the committee or by the North Central Association is prerequisite to the making of formal application by an institution for the approval of its professional curricula by the board.

Accrediting of junior colleges.—Since 1927 the State superintendent of public instruction, who is also president of the State board of educational examiners, has cooperated closely with the committee, attending regularly its meetings and taking part in its discussions. This came about by reason of legislation placing the Iowa public junior colleges under the supervision of the State department of public instruction, which was required "to prepare and publish from time to time standards for junior colleges, provide adequate inspection of junior colleges, and recommend for accrediting such courses of study by junior colleges as may meet the standards determined." Agreement was reached at the first meeting of the State superintendent with the committee to cooperate "to the fullest possible extent." The committee has aided the department in carrying out all phases of the junior college law. The standards adopted by the committee for accrediting junior colleges are recognized by the department as the academic standards for these institutions, and separate visitation

and accrediting are made by the department for the approval of professional curricula only.

The board of educational examiners consists at present of the State superintendent of public instruction, the president of one of the three State higher institutions, the president of one of the privately endowed institutions in the State maintaining teacher-training courses, a county superintendent of schools, and a city superintendent of schools.

The former statutes regarding the certification of teachers graduated from the State higher institutions and other colleges in Iowa and from other institutions in States maintaining courses of study of similar high rank, were repealed to take effect July 1, 1935. The present law provides merely that certificates may be issued in the elementary and secondary fields to holders of diplomas from colleges accredited by the board of educational examiners certifying to the completion of 2- or 4-year courses, according to the grade of certificate applied for, together with such specific and professional training as may be prescribed by the board. The law leaves to the discretion of the board the issuance of certificates to applicants from other States who present "evidence of the possession of the required qualifications or the equivalent thereof."

Accrediting of higher institutions for transfer of credits.—

Until almost the end of the nineteenth century there was little need for the State higher institutions of Iowa to consider the acceptance of credits from other institutions in the State. There were besides the three State institutions only a few denominational colleges, most of whose enrollments consisted of local students belonging to the denomination by which the college was controlled. Two of the State institutions offered specialized training and therefore probably transferred few students. Furthermore, the graduate college of the State university was not established until 1900.

The admission of students with advanced standing at the Iowa State University was first noted in its annual catalog for 1890-91, where the following statement appeared:

Students from approved colleges bringing certificates of work and standing will be admitted without examination, except to determine their position in the university.

In the case of colleges where requirements for admission are substantially those of the university, students will ordinarily be admitted to the same rank if they enter not later than the opening of the senior year; but the assignment of studies will be at the discretion of the faculty.

The above or similar statements appeared in the university catalog until 1912. The approval of colleges by the university during this time appears to have been merely a matter of cooperation between the colleges that desired to send their students to the university and the

university itself. There was no definite plan for inspecting and accrediting colleges for the transfer of credits to the State university until the organization of the Intercollegiate Standing Committee in 1919.

Intercollegiate Standing Committee.—The Intercollegiate Standing Committee was organized under the authority of the State board of education, which since 1909 has had control of the three State higher institutions of Iowa. Prior to the establishment of the State board of education each of the institutions was governed by its own board. The creation of the State board was the culmination of several years of effort on the part of a committee appointed by the legislature to find a means of unifying the work of the three institutions.

The problem of admitting students applying for transfer to the Iowa State higher institutions from junior colleges, and also from 4-year colleges not accredited by the North Central Association, led the State board of education to authorize the establishment of the Intercollegiate Standing Committee. The committee is composed of the registrar and a member of the faculty of each of the three State higher institutions, and the offices of chairman and secretary rotate annually from one institution to another, in an order determined by lot. The reports on colleges made by the committee are submitted to each institution, and when approved by any two of them constitute the policy of all three until changed by subsequent reports of the committee.

At its second session, July 28, 1919, the committee approved provisionally a list of eight colleges in the State not accredited by the North Central Association, and took action to inform the colleges, if they desired to establish permanent accredited relations, to make application on a blank prepared by the committee for reporting on their organization, equipment, support, and administration. The committee also appointed a subcommittee to visit each college that requested a visit with a view to becoming accredited. At the following session the committee approved a set of standards for accrediting 4-year colleges and a report blank for securing information from the institutions seeking to be accredited.

On November 2, 1923, the committee appointed a subcommittee to study the junior college situation and to make general recommendations regarding the accrediting of those institutions. The following year, in connection with its report, the subcommittee presented a set of standards for junior colleges and a form for the reports of junior colleges, which received the approval of the committee.

At subsequent meetings, attended by the State superintendent of public instruction and the State inspector of junior colleges, the committee took action with reference to the acceptance of credits from certain public and private junior colleges, and concerning the differentiation of credits to be accepted from junior colleges (1) toward a

degree, and (2) toward meeting the qualifications for teachers' certificates. Under the rules of the committee, public junior colleges are required to send a copy of their annual reports, made on the same form, to both the Intercollegiate Standing Committee and to the State superintendent of public instruction.

The committee has revised its requirements for accrediting both colleges and junior colleges from time to time. It has inspected all institutions applying to it for the accredited privilege and requires of each an annual report. At its meeting on April 29, 1937, the committee voted to inspect each accredited institution once in every 5 years, even though its annual reports appeared satisfactory.

Missouri

Approving institutions for certification of teachers.—The present policy of the Missouri Department of Public Schools with regard to the acceptance of work done in the privately endowed institutions of the State as qualification to teach without examination in the public schools, has grown up over a period of 30 years. The diplomas of the State teachers colleges (formerly State normal schools), as well as those of the University of Missouri and of the State institute for Negroes, have been recognized in the Missouri law since 1887 as authority to teach without examination. At present, under a law passed in 1909, the State institutions are also authorized to grant teachers' certificates to their graduates who have completed the prescribed courses of study.

The practice of recognizing the work of the privately endowed colleges for teacher certification was brought about principally through the efforts of a voluntary organization, the Missouri College Union, the membership of which includes, besides a group of privately controlled colleges, the University of Missouri. As the interests of the two organizations were the same in many respects, the union early sought and received the cooperation of the State teachers association in having the work of the privately controlled colleges approved.

For many years teachers for the public schools of Missouri were licensed by the county teachers' institutes, held for 2 or 4 weeks during vacations, under the direction of boards of education, which differed widely in standards of efficiency. The Missouri College Union was organized in 1893. At its meeting the year following its organization the question was raised as to "Why should not the State grant teachers' certificates to the graduates of colleges who hold the A. B. degree?" Six years later, in 1900, the union adopted the resolution "That the power to license teachers should be taken away from the county institutes, and that training schools for teachers should be set up in the State university, the State normals, in church colleges, and in 50 high schools." The resolution was favored by the State

superintendent of schools, who was an honorary member of the union, and a committee was appointed to report a plan for licensing teachers at a future meeting of the union. There is no record of the report of this committee extant. However, in 1901, the legislature enacted a law which took away the power of licensing by county institutes and provided for the examination and certification of teachers by county boards of education. These boards consisted of the county school commissioner, a member appointed by the county court, and a member appointed by the State board of education. Soon thereafter county superintendents began to replace county boards of education in the supervision of schools, and the duty of examining and certifying teachers became the function of those officers. The law provided for uniform examinations to be held in all counties for the same grade of certificate, the questions to be furnished by the State superintendent of schools, who was also authorized to examine and issue certificates.

The Missouri College Union did not rest in its efforts to secure recognition of the teacher-training work of the endowed colleges and universities. At its meeting in 1902 it resolved:

That it is the sense of the Missouri College Union that hereafter no summer school ought to be approved by the State board of education unless it be maintained in a college or university of this union, or in one of the State normals, or in the Lincoln Institute.

That the colleges of the States, through the medium of the union, had the support of the State superintendent in their efforts to obtain recognition, is evidenced by the following quotation taken from the report of the superintendent for 1910:

The colleges of Missouri, some of them older than the public school system, are rendering splendid service in training those who come under their charge for the duties and responsibilities of citizenship. These institutions were pioneers in the work in Missouri and were for years the only source of higher education. The men and the women whose foresight, courage, and devotion contributed so much to the establishment and development of our present magnificent system of public schools, were inspired and quickened by the education and training afforded by these colleges. The faculties of these institutions and some of their successors, as well as others, have long felt that those of their graduates who desired to teach should have more recognition from the State than had hitherto been accorded them. The State superintendent shared in this opinion and accordingly called a conference of college, university, and normal-school men to meet in his office on February 16, 1909.

The call for the conference referred to by the superintendent had been requested by the Missouri College Union, after a study by a committee of the union of the practice in a number of surrounding States with reference to the certification of college graduates. At the conference were present representatives of the privately controlled colleges offering courses in teacher training and of three of the State

normal schools. The presidents of the State university and of the other two normal schools later approved the action taken.

The conference drew up and adopted recommendations concerning the conditions upon which the State superintendent might grant teachers' certificates to graduates of colleges and universities. The superintendent accepted the recommendations and prepared and published a statement prescribing the rules under which certificates would be granted to graduates of colleges in the Missouri College Union without the requirement of an examination. The rules specified that the entrance requirements to the colleges must be substantially equivalent to those of the University of Missouri, and that the course completed by the graduates applying for certification must be equivalent to the course required for the A. B. degree in the college of arts and science of the university. They prescribed the training and experience to be possessed by teachers of pedagogical subjects in the colleges, provided for adequate library, and for facilities for observation and practice teaching in the institution or in a local public school, and for the minimum amount of pedagogical work to be taken as a part of the requirement for the A. B. degree. The State superintendent agreed, upon the satisfactory completion by graduates of approved colleges and universities of the prescribed courses, to grant them teachers' certificates valid for 3 years, to be made valid for life after a specified period of successful teaching.

The rules contemplated the appointment annually by the State superintendent of three representative Missouri educators "to investigate the organizations, courses of study, equipment, and work" of the colleges and universities desiring to have their graduates certificated without examination, and to furnish to the State superintendent a list of institutions eligible for the privilege. The rules also called for a visit to the institutions by the State superintendent in order to decide whether they fully complied with the professional requirements prescribed.

The plan was accepted by the colleges, and the State superintendent appointed a committee, one of whom was the president of the State university, to assist him in passing upon the qualifications of the institutions desiring recognition under the provisions of the agreement.

Thereafter the conditions for membership in the Missouri College Union contained the provision:

In case the pedagogical work of the institution is to be accepted for certification, the college must maintain at least 8 chairs, one of which shall be devoted exclusively to education or at least to philosophy, including psychology and education.

In 1910 the report of the State superintendent contained for the first time a list of privately endowed colleges whose pedagogical departments were approved by the department of public schools. Some other colleges were said to have "been inspected but not fully approved."

Since 1923 the requirements for membership in the Missouri College Union have been those set up by the North Central Association. The membership of the union is therefore identical with the list of institutions in the State accredited by the association and the institutions whose graduates are certificated to teach are consequently approved by both organizations.

Accrediting institutions for transfer of credits.—The University of Missouri has been an active factor in bringing about cooperation among the higher educational institutions of the State. It was chiefly through its efforts that the Missouri College Union was organized. The object of the union, as stated in its constitution framed in 1893, was—

to raise the standard of higher education in the State, especially by harmonizing the efforts of the institutions represented in it, to bring about a closer union between colleges, and to foster an acquaintance between the faculties.

At its meeting in 1895 the union formulated conditions for membership which prescribed minimum requirements for admission to the course leading to the A. B. degree and for graduation therefrom, the amount of work to be offered in the different subjects, and the faculty, equipment, and resources to be possessed by an institution in order "to be classed as a college." The requirements were adopted at concurrent sessions of the Missouri College Union and the State teachers association and were reported by a committee known as the Committee of Nine, which consisted of representatives of the union, including the president of the State university, and State, city, and high-school education officers. These requirements thus became the standard of the State, and institutions which met the requirements were given recognition by the University of Missouri by having their credits accepted and their graduates admitted to graduate status, and later by the State department of public schools for the certification of teachers.

The original group of institutions admitted into the union consisted of the University of Missouri and six privately controlled institutions. As time progressed several other institutions were admitted.

In 1911 and again in 1923 the conditions for membership in the Missouri College Union were revised. At the 1923 meeting a new constitution was adopted, in which the requirements for membership were stated to be "the requirements as set down from time to time by the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools for accrediting colleges and universities."

At the 1926 meeting of the union it was decided not to require an annual report from its members, inasmuch as such report would but duplicate that required by the North Central Association. At this meeting also a report was made, and accepted, interpreting the section

in the constitution on the use of the standards of the North Central Association for admission to membership. The report was as follows:

1. Any institution seeking admission to the Missouri College Union shall first secure inspection by the North Central Association and be regularly accredited by that association. The Missouri College Union shall then determine whether the applicant has the additional requirements of the Missouri College Union and vote upon the admission of the applicant.

2. Any member of the Missouri College Union dropped from membership in the North Central Association shall also be dropped from the Missouri College Union, unless at the next meeting of the union, it shall show adequate cause why it should not be dropped.

3. Any member of the Missouri College Union, not a member of the North Central Association, shall be dropped from the Missouri College Union, unless it shall secure membership in the North Central Association before the next meeting of the Missouri College Union, or at that meeting show adequate cause why it should not be dropped.

4. Interpretations 2 and 3 shall become operative in 1928.

Accrediting of junior colleges by University of Missouri.—

There were in Missouri in the early part of the century a large number of institutions purporting to be colleges that were not eligible for membership in the Missouri College Union. Most of them were established by church denominations for the higher education of women. They were, in fact, little more than secondary schools. Little attention had been paid to them. Each, for the most part, struggled along in its own way. They were operating largely without reference to the work of the common schools and to that of the colleges considered standard institutions. The presence of so many of these institutions in the State was a source of concern to education authorities. President R. H. Jesse of the University of Missouri probably had some of the institutions in his own State in mind when, in an address at the meeting of the North Central Association in 1896, on "What Constitutes a College and What a Secondary School," said: "It would be a Godsend to our secondary schools if the spurious colleges could be reduced in title, or where that proves impossible, strangled."

The initiative in a movement to bring these institutions into relationship with the university so that their students might receive credit at the University of Missouri, belonged to the colleges themselves. Probably the first institution to request inspection by the university with a view of establishing affiliated relations was Hardin College, in 1901. A committee of the university visited the college and on the basis of its findings recommended that a total of 54 semester hours of credit be allowed graduates of the college with an A. B. degree.

There was no plan for the affiliation of these colleges worked out until 1911. At that time the general movement to require 2 years of college work for admission to professional study had begun, and it in turn was bringing about recognition of a division in college work at

the end of the second year. The small colleges in Missouri seized upon the opportunity offered by these trends, and began to concentrate their efforts on 2 instead of 4 years of college work, and at length asked the University of Missouri how they could obtain credit for this work. The university, eager to be of service in raising the standards of higher education in the State, in 1910 appointed a committee which drew up a plan for the affiliation of the colleges with the university. The following year the Committee on Accrediting Junior Colleges began visitation of the colleges. Its first list of approved junior colleges contained six denominational and one privately controlled school for girls.

The colleges continued relations with the university Committee on Accrediting Junior Colleges (since 1915 the Committee on Accrediting Schools and Colleges) through an organization known at first as the Association of Presidents of Junior Colleges for Women and later the Missouri Junior College Union.

In order that the curricula of the colleges should be standardized, the union requested the university committee to prepare an outline of courses it approved for offering by junior colleges. In issuing the outline, the committee recommended that for the sake of uniformity the junior colleges also adopt the numbering and nomenclature of courses used in the outline.

In 1918 and again in 1926, the Committee on Accredited Schools and Colleges issued a printed Circular of Information to Accredited Junior Colleges, containing the conditions for accrediting, outlines of approved courses, and suggestions regarding records and equipment for the registrar's office and for the equipment of laboratories and libraries. Each year since 1916 the committee has prepared and issued a list of courses approved in each junior college accredited by the university. A maximum of 64 semester hours of transferred credits from the accredited junior colleges is at present accepted by the university.

Some institutions apply for accrediting that are unable to meet in full the requirements for junior colleges. To such of these institutions as give "reasonable promise" of doing so, the university grants approval subject to limitations. The approved courses of these institutions are accepted by the university upon certification and without examination, but the names are not published in the list of accredited junior colleges in the university's annual catalog and the institutions may not advertise that they are accredited.

Both the accredited colleges and those given the certificate privilege are visited regularly by a representative or representatives of the university Committee on Accredited Schools and Colleges.

Formerly institutions desiring to be affiliated with the university made application on a blank form furnished by the secretary on the

Committee on Accrediting Schools and Colleges. If the information given on the form seemed to indicate that the college met the requirements for accrediting, a committee of the faculty visited the institution, and decision on accrediting was made on the basis of the committee's report. Since September 1933, the procedure has been different. Only those private junior colleges incorporated under the laws of Missouri may obtain accredited relations with the university, and before the application of a new institution will be considered, a survey must be made by the university to determine the need for the college, its financial backing and future prospects, and its proposed plan of organization and administration. These requirements affect both new institutions and institutions not on the accredited list.

The University of Missouri has cooperated with the colleges in the State, both junior and senior, to the fullest extent. Its accrediting of the junior colleges has been undertaken in a spirit of sympathy and helpfulness, to which the institutions have cordially responded. The results have been mutually satisfactory.

Summary of Findings

The accrediting of colleges and universities by State universities and State departments of education was brought about by the different needs of the two agencies. The State university needed to ascertain from which colleges in the State students might be admitted with advance credit or as candidates for higher degrees. The State department of education needed to ascertain what colleges in the State were offering satisfactory training for prospective public-school teachers.

From these two needs two systems of accrediting have grown up in some of the States. In other States either the State university or the State department of education, or some agency recognized by both acts as the accrediting agency for the State. There is an increasing tendency for State universities and State departments of education to work in close cooperation with the voluntary accrediting agencies. In the preceding account the development of State accrediting is confined to the movement in six States, selected because of the different ways in which the accrediting of higher education is carried on.

Chapter IV. Accrediting of Professional Schools¹

IN THE following historical résumé, no attempt is made to trace in detail the development of the movement for accrediting in all the branches of professional education where accrediting has taken place. As medical education was the first field of higher learning in which standardization was accomplished, a somewhat detailed account of the movement as it progressed in that field is given, followed by similar accounts regarding dental and legal education.

During the past two decades or more, there has been an increasing tendency for organizations interested in the advancement of education in certain special fields not hitherto having a separate professional status, to seek to raise the requirements of training in those fields to the position where the institutions may be elevated to university schools or colleges. The result has been the drawing up of standards for institutions offering training in these specialized fields and accrediting the institutions which meet the standards. These newer movements in accrediting, as well as the more recent movements affecting the older professional fields, are considered in the following summary largely from the point of view of current history:

• Medicine

During the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries training for the practice of medicine was obtained in this country through the apprenticeship method. Along about the middle of the eighteenth century, however, medical men in some of the large centers began to go abroad for study and research and, upon their return, to give lectures and hold small informal classes. From these classes the first medical schools developed. The first medical training given in an institution of learning was offered at the College of Philadelphia in 1765. The school here conducted, later coming into competition with the newly established department of medicine of the University of Pennsylvania, merged with that department in 1791. By the end of the century three more medical "institutes" of the same type came into existence. Although established as departments of colleges and universities, these schools were largely independent.

¹ The documents consulted in this chapter consisted principally of the reports of proceedings of the several associations and councils. Before printing, the accounts involving somewhat lengthy treatment, were submitted to the secretaries of the associations concerned for approval.

Other documents consulted were:

Bulletins of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, as follows:

Medical Education in the United States and Canada. Bulletin No. 4, 1910.

Training for the Public Profession of the Law. Bulletin No. 15, 1921.

Dental Education in the United States and Canada. Bulletin No. 19, 1926.

In the early part of the nineteenth century, the first proprietary school of medicine was founded in Baltimore. Its success as a source of revenue for its founders led to the creation of other such schools, run strictly as commercial enterprises. These so-called medical schools had practically no equipment, no regular course of study, and no definite term. Their chief concern was the securing of students for the fees they paid. The university schools, whose loose connection with the higher institutions afforded them little support, felt impelled to enter the struggle for student patronage. In this competitive race, the standards of some of them descended to the level of the proprietary schools, and they became divorced from their university connection, a relationship which was reestablished only after many years of effort to restore it.

As there was no government regulation either for incorporating medical schools or for the license to practice, medical schools of all types, unrestrained by legal barriers, continued to multiply until the beginning of the twentieth century, when a concentrated effort to secure better standards for the training and practice of medicine began. In 1904 there were 166 medical schools in this country, an estimated one-half of the total number in the world.

The American Medical Association was founded in 1844, but its hope to establish suitable preliminary education and "a uniform elevated standard of requirements for the M. D. degree * * * by all the medical schools in the United States", did not begin to be realized for more than half a century later. The Association of American Medical Colleges, the successor of the American Medical College Association, was created in 1890, its constitution containing provisions for admission to membership, for minimum preparation for admission to study medicine and for the award of the M. D. degree. In the meantime, individual schools began to establish increased requirements. In the seventies Harvard initiated certain reforms in its medical school, the most important of which was the grading of the course. By 1901, Harvard had reached a stage where it could demand an academic degree for admission. Johns Hopkins University came into existence at this time. Founded in 1893, its medical school was the first of genuine university type, possessing endowment, well-equipped laboratories, a corps of teachers giving full time to instruction and investigation, its own hospital, and requiring for admission the bachelor's degree. The passing of medical practice acts by the States was increasing, and State licensing boards were taking the place of State and county medical societies and of the medical schools in the licensing of physicians.

Standardization of medical education.—In 1902 the American Medical Association appointed a committee of five members, to be known as the Committee on Education. The following year this

committee submitted a report in which it recommended the adoption by all State and county medical societies of a common qualification for membership, including minimum requirements both as to preliminary education and medical education. Because of the amount of labor that would be necessary to see that these requirements were carried out, the committee recommended the appointment of a permanent committee to have charge of the work. This recommendation was accepted in 1904, and the Council on Medical Education was created, its functions being defined as follows:

1. To make an annual report to the House of Delegates on the existing conditions of medical education in the United States.
2. To make suggestions as to the means and methods by which the American Medical Association may best influence medical education.
3. To act as agent of the American Medical Association (under instructions from the House of Delegates) in its effort to elevate medical education.

At its first conference in 1905, the council formulated a so-called "ideal standard," which it recommended for adoption by all medical schools as rapidly as conditions throughout the country would warrant. The standard called for (a) a 4-year high-school education, (b) a year's university training in physics, chemistry, and biology, (c) 4 years of medicine proper, and (d) 1 year as intern in a hospital or dispensary.

In 1906 the council made its first attempt to classify medical schools, dividing them into four classes, according to the percentage of failures of their graduates in State board examinations.

In 1907 it extended the standards to cover a minimum of 30 hours per week in actual work in class, laboratory, dispensary, and hospital, and adopted the following "policies":

Medical schools conducted solely for profit shall not be in good standing with the American Medical Association.

Night schools, meaning those schools giving all or the major portion of their instruction after 4 p. m. and before 10 p. m. shall not be in good standing with the American Medical Association.

The most important work undertaken by the council in 1907 was the personal inspection of all the medical schools in the United States and the preparation of a preliminary classification based on its findings. The classification divided the schools into three groups—acceptable, conditioned, and rejected, the ratings being made on a basis of 10 points, each being given a weight of 10.

The classification was accompanied by a recommendation that State medical boards recognize the colleges in the first group as standard; that they recognize those in the second group after they had made the necessary improvements to bring them up to the passing grade of 70; and that the schools in the third group be not recognized.

The following 10 points are those on which the colleges were rated:

1. Showing of graduates before State boards.
2. Requirement and enforcement of satisfactory preliminary education and the granting of advanced standing.
3. Character of curriculum.
4. Medical school buildings.
5. Laboratory facilities and instruction.
6. Dispensary facilities and instruction.
7. Hospital facilities and instruction.
8. Faculty, number of trained teachers, all-time instructors, especially of the laboratory branches, and extent of research work.
9. Extent to which the school is conducted for properly teaching the science of medicine rather than for the profit of the faculty, directly or indirectly.
10. Libraries, museums, charts, etc.

In 1910, after another and more complete inspection the council prepared another classification of medical schools, the first made public. The colleges, as before, were divided into three classes: Class A, acceptable medical colleges; class B, medical colleges needing certain improvements to make them acceptable; class C, medical colleges which would require a complete reorganization to make them acceptable.

Along with the classification was published an outline of the "Essentials of an Acceptable Medical College," covering 25 points, the majority of which the report stated "represents * * * a line considerably below the average conditions existing in all the colleges of the United States and Canada." The point covering admission stated a requirement of "at least a 4-year high-school education superimposed on 8 years of grammar school work, or the actual equivalent education," and added: "As soon as conditions warrant, the minimum requirement for admission should be enlarged to include at least one year's college work each in physics, chemistry, and biology, and a reading knowledge of at least one modern language, preferably German or French," a requirement which became absolute in 1914. The "ideal standard" of 1905 now became the required standard.

Closing of low-grade medical schools.—Even though these early standards were admittedly conservative, they were effective in closing out many of the low-grade schools. Since the council began to focus its attention on the investigation and classification of medical schools, the number of schools had dropped from 166 in 1904 to 87, in 1913, the most pronounced decline occurring after the first investigation and classification in 1907. The number of schools continued to decline as higher requirements were put into effect. For a decade or more the American Medical Association has listed but 77 medical schools, all of them "acceptable."

Simultaneously with the issuance by the American Medical Association of its classification of medical schools in 1910, the Carnegie

Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching published an extensive report on "Medical Education in the United States and Canada." The report, after a historical résumé and an account of the status of medical education at that time, gave in detail a description of the medical colleges in the two countries, presenting similar data for each school. This presentation, although it made no attempt to rate the schools, revealed facts which indicated how they stood with reference to the points covered. The report, in calling attention to the weaknesses of many of the schools in comparison to the strength of others, and its observations on the general conditions in medical education, was a potent factor in bringing about improvement.

In 1913 the Council on Medical Education adopted a schedule of minimum requirements both for admission to the preliminary college year and for the premedical year. At the same time it began to stress the importance of a year of internship prior to the issuance of a license to practice. It also started an investigation of hospitals and in 1914 published its first list of hospitals approved as properly equipped to furnish satisfactory training for interns.

In 1915 a special committee appointed by the Council on Medical Education began an investigation of graduate medical education and made provision for rating graduate departments of such medical schools as applied for approval. The association published a detailed report concerning graduate work in 1920.

On January 1, 1918, the association put into effect an action taken 2 years previously, advancing the premedical training to include 2 years in a college of arts and sciences approved by the council. It also adopted a new definition of requirements of preliminary education, both for high-school and college courses, as well as a new schedule for grading medical schools, which included the addition of a year of internship.

A year later the council reported a schedule of "essentials for a hospital which intends to train interns," and in 1920 changed its name to Council on Medical Education and Hospitals, as indicative of its new field of service.

In 1921 it revised the undergraduate curriculum, indicating the ways in which the course should be reorganized.

With the standards for medical schools established, the American Medical Association turned its attention to services auxiliary to medicine. In 1927, following the adoption of standards and inspections, it began the publication of a list of "Hospitals Providing Approved Residences in Certain Specialties," for graduates in medicine who already had a general internship or its equivalent in private practice.

In 1928 it adopted "Essentials of a Registered Hospital" and has since published an annual list of registered hospitals, which contains

among other data the "type of service," or the diseases or conditions treated in each.

Standardizing of technical specialties.—In more recent years the Council on Medical Education and Hospitals, with the aid of organizations representing certain technical specialties allied to medicine, has attempted to standardize schools training technicians in these specialties.

In 1933, in cooperation with the Board of Registry of the American Society of Clinical Pathologists, which had already made a questionnaire study of the schools for clinical laboratory technicians, the council made a comprehensive survey of the schools, and in 1936 adopted "Essentials of an Acceptable School for Clinical Laboratory Technicians," and issued a list of approved schools.

In 1934, with the cooperation of the two associations of physical therapy it formulated "Essentials of an Acceptable School for Physical Therapy Technicians," and in 1936 issued a list of approved schools.

In 1933, also, at the request of the American Occupational Therapy Association, it began an investigation of schools of occupational therapy and in 1935 published the "Essentials of an Acceptable School of Occupational Therapy." After revision of the "essentials" in 1938, it published a list of approved schools:

In assuming the responsibility of standardizing technical specialties, the association's service in at least one instance has consisted in the rating of individuals rather than of the institutions at which they were prepared. In order to circumvent the attempts of lay practitioners, technicians, and others to perform radiologic services for which they were not qualified, the House of Delegates in 1928 assigned to the Council of Medical Education and Hospitals the duty of supervising and certifying those who claimed to be radiologists. The council, assisted by a committee, prepared "Essentials for Admission to List of Physicians Specializing in Radiology," and in 1931 published its first list of physicians qualified to practice this specialty.

Group hospitalization.—Another activity of the association resulting from recent events in the practice of the profession of medicine, was the publication in 1937 of a report on Group Hospitalization, in which it "suggested" a list of 10 "principles" on which to base the decision whether or not a group hospitalization plan is essential, which decision it states must rest primarily with the medical profession and the hospital officials of the local community.

Survey of medical schools.—Meanwhile the inspection and rating of the medical schools themselves have not been neglected. In the *Journal of the American Medical Association* for August 23, 1937, the following statement is made:

• The Council on Medical Education and Hospitals has now completed the survey of medical schools that was begun three years ago. * * * Confiden-

tial reports in graphic form have been sent to all the schools for the purpose of assisting them in strengthening their respective programs. In response to this stimulus there are already indications of considerable activity, and such substantial improvements are being made in standards of admission, in number and qualifications of faculty personnel, and in the kind and amount of practical experience comprised in the clinical teaching.

The "Essentials of an Acceptable Medical College" were revised in 1938. An important item in the revision concerns admission requirements. Although the requirement of 2 years of college work as the minimum remains, the "essentials" contain a recommendation of "3 years or more."

In 1907 the Association of American Medical Colleges recommended the appointment of a committee to act in conjunction with committees of the Council on Medical Education and the American Confederation of Reciprocity Examining and Licensing Medical Boards in the formulation of uniform minimum entrance and graduation requirements.

Association of American Medical Colleges.—The American Medical Association and the Association of American Medical Colleges have always worked in cooperation. In 1892 the American Medical Association demanded of all medical colleges that they adopt and observe a standard of requirement for the M. D. degree which should not fall below the minimum of that for membership in the Association of American Medical Colleges. In 1906, in formulating its requirements of preliminary education, medical training, and graduation, the American Medical Association adopted in part the requirements of the college association.

The college association began as early as 1903 to inspect medical colleges applying for membership as well as those already members, and excluded from membership such schools as failed to meet the requirements contained in its constitution.

After the American Medical Association began the inspection and classification of medical colleges, the college association voted to inspect only those membership schools adversely reported upon by the Council on Medical Education.

Following the adoption also in 1913, by a joint committee of representatives of the two associations, of the revised schedule of minimum preliminary requirements, including the addition of a year of college work, the college association adopted a resolution providing that only colleges rated as acceptable by the Council on Medical Education could become or remain members.

In 1917 the association adopted a resolution which made effective January 1, 1918, the same date on which the standard became effective by the American Medical Association, the requirement of 2 years of preliminary college work and a resolution to join with the Council on Medical Education in the inspection of college members of the association.

The preliminary and curriculum requirements of the two associations have been changed from time to time, but they remain substantially parallel. All but a few of the colleges rated as acceptable by the American Medical Association are members of the Association of American Medical Colleges.

Federation of State Medical Boards.—In order to bring about cooperation in the securing of efficient administration of the State medical license laws and satisfactory methods of examining candidates for licenses, there was founded in 1911 the Federation of State Medical Boards. This organization has worked in accord with the American Medical Association and with the Association of American Medical Colleges. In 1929 the federation passed a resolution, "That in each State the medical practice act and its administration conform as far as possible to the educational principles of the Association of American Medical Colleges." A revision of the association's constitution and by-laws in 1930 contained the following proposition:

In all matters of premedical education, courses of study, and educational requirements for the degree of doctor of medicine or its equivalent, the federation recognizes the Association of American Medical Colleges as the standardizing agency for this purpose.

Dentistry

Up until the nineteenth century, dentistry was practiced in this country, in the main, without previous educational preparation, as an adjunct to certain mechanical trades and, occasionally, to medicine. Anyone felt free to engage in it. Later, as in medicine, the apprenticeship method of training prevailed. As recently as 1900 about 40 percent of the dentists practicing in the United States had obtained all of their preliminary training as apprentices. It was not until 1840 that the status of dentistry as a separate specialty for the practice of which a period of formal training was desirable, was recognized by the establishment, in Baltimore, of a College of Dental Surgery of the proprietary type. In a period of almost 30 years thereafter but three other schools or departments of dentistry were established. Two attempts, one in Baltimore and one in New York, to develop dentistry under medical auspices failed. In 1867 Harvard University first elevated dentistry to a real higher educational status by organizing a department of dentistry in affiliation with its medical department. At that time there were still no special prerequisites to the study of dentistry and practically no legal bar to its practice by anyone who cared to do so.

Dental practitioners and others, taking advantage of these conditions and alert to the possibilities of financial gain, opened schools of dentistry, and the number of dental institutions, especially those of proprietary type, increased greatly. Many of the schools were purely commercial in their objectives. Some were simply diploma mills.

They continued to multiply until the end of the century, by which time opposition to their further increase became too strong to withstand, and their number began to decline. Not a small factor in the elimination of the poorer schools was the passage of dental practice acts which, beginning in 1868, by 1900 had been passed by all the States.

National Association of Dental Faculties.—The need for concerted action to bring about improved conditions in dental education and practice was felt long before the close of the century. To afford a means of cooperation among the better schools, representatives of 10 of the schools meeting in 1884, for the purpose of trying to "bring about the adoption of a uniform standard of graduation," established the National Association of Dental Faculties, in which the schools of dentistry constituted the membership. For about 30 years this association, through the exercise of mandatory powers, was the most influential agent for the promotion of dental education in the United States.

Dental Faculties Association of American Universities.—Cumulative dissatisfaction on the part of representatives of some of the dental schools, especially among those of the State universities, with the mandates of the National Association of Dental Faculties, which they considered favored the independent commercial dental schools, led several of the university schools to resign their membership and, in 1908, to found a new organization. Membership in this body, the Dental Faculties Association of American Universities, was limited to dental schools that were integral parts of State universities or of chartered universities of equal standing holding membership in the Association of American Universities, and that required for entrance 4 years of high-school work or the equivalent amount of education. The objects of the association were "to promote dental education; to improve the standard of preliminary educational requirements for admission to dental schools; to establish reciprocal educational relations with its members; and ultimately to establish a national standard which may serve as the basis for reciprocal interchange of dental licenses among the several States."

The original institutions comprising the membership of the association were Harvard University, University of California, State University of Iowa, University of Michigan, University of Minnesota, and the University of Pennsylvania. At the time of its merger in 1923 with other dental organizations to form the American Association of Dental Schools, its membership consisted of 13 institutions. During the period of its existence, the association adopted no compulsory rules, but exercised advisory functions only.

Dental Educational Council of America.—In 1909 the National Association of Dental Faculties and the National Association of Dental Examiners appointed a joint committee of five members from each to

form an independent organization, which would undertake for dental education a service similar to that performed for medical education by the Council on Medical Education of the American Medical Association. The membership of the resultant organization, known as the "Dental Educational Council of America," was increased the following year by five members from the National Dental Association, thus making the council representative of the schools, the examiners, and the practitioners. Little was accomplished by the association during the first 5 years of its existence, but in 1914, it began the inspection of all the dental schools in the United States, on completion of which, in 1916, it adopted "Minimum Requirements for Class A Dental Schools." To the requirements were appended definitions of class A, class B, class C, and "unclassified" dental schools.

The council did not publish at once a list of schools classified in accordance with these definitions, but in 1918, following a revision of the requirements it issued a provisional list in which the schools were divided into class A, acceptable schools; class B, schools needing certain improvements to make them acceptable; and class C, schools needing complete reorganization to make them acceptable.

After another revision of the requirements in 1920, the council made public a classification of schools. Of the 47 dental schools then existing, it rated 19 as class A, 24 as class B, and 4 as class C. It assigned no rating to 4.

At first the council's action in rating the schools consisted chiefly in discussions on reports made by committees of inspections, following which it voted on the particular grade to which the school should be assigned. In 1922, however, it adopted a point system of rating, by which the standing of a school was determined by weighting numerically the 10 main groups of requirements, to each of which was given a value of 10. The 10 groups, each covering very detailed requirements, were as follows:

1. Location and building.
2. Organization and administration.
3. Finances.
4. Faculty and teaching staff.
5. Entrance requirements and advanced standing.
6. Curriculum and course of study.
7. Academic and medicodental subjects.
8. Dental technology.
9. Clinical dentistry.
10. State board record.

In 1923, following an inspection of the dental schools in the United States and Canada made by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, the council reclassified the schools on the basis of the new system of rating.

In 1926 the council again revised the requirements, and beginning the year 1926-27, put into effect the requirement for all class A and class B dental schools of a pre-dental college year. At the same time it adopted the following resolution:

Preprofessional education given either by a dental faculty in a dental school or not mainly under the auspices of the academic college does not meet the minimum requirement in the sense in which the council now expects this standard to be enforced. After the close of the 1927-28 academic year, a school conducting such a first-year curriculum will not be eligible for a class A or class B rating.

In 1928 the council abandoned the list of class C schools, upon the ruling that

A school which in the judgment of the council (1) cannot meet the requirements of class A or class B rating without extensive improvement and complete reorganization; (2) which is conducted for profit to individuals or to a corporation; or (3) which does not meet any other minimum requirements that are regarded as essential for a certified school, is not acceptable and shall be designated "unclassified."

American Association of Dental Schools.—In order to bring about concerted effort in the study and advancement of dental education and practice, the various dental bodies, consisting of the National Association of Dental Faculties (organized in 1883), the Dental Faculties Association of American Universities (organized in 1909), the American Institute of Dental Teachers (organized in 1893) and the Canadian Dental Faculties Association, united in 1923 to form a single organization, the American Association of Dental Schools. "Any dental school in the United States which is classified as of A or B grade by the Dental Educational Council of America, or any dental school that is acceptable to the Dominion Dental Council, or any dental faculty of a recognized university of Canada" was eligible for membership in the new association.

The problem of the dental curriculum was the subject of consideration by the American Association of Dental Schools at its first meeting in 1924. At subsequent meetings suggestions were made by prominent educators that a study should be undertaken to determine what constitutes an adequate curriculum in dentistry. In 1930 the association decided to approach the Carnegie Corporation for assistance in carrying on such a study. The corporation responded with the grant of a subsidy of \$20,000, afterwards increased by \$10,000, and the association appointed a committee to carry on the work. After an investigation covering a period of nearly 5 years, the committee completed a detailed report, which was published by the association in 1935.

The Dental Educational Council of America had made no change in its requirements for class A dental schools since 1926, and in view of the pending investigation of the curriculum, concluded in 1934, to

await the report and recommendations of the Curriculum Survey Committee before proceeding with the preparation of new minimum requirements, which it proposed to adopt in 1935, before it undertook another classification of dental schools.

During the next 3 years, however, the council took no further action on classifying the dental schools, and in 1938 that body was dissolved. In its place and succeeding to its authority the American Dental Association created a Council on Dental Education. At its meeting on May 1, 1938, the new council decided that, since no general inspection of dental schools has been made for some years and many changes in dental education had taken place in the meantime, existing ratings of dental schools do not carry adequate significance. It recommended therefore that the deans and faculties of the dental schools discontinue the use of those ratings.

Following a resurvey which is now being made, the council will reclassify the schools.

Law

The colonists introduced into this country the apprenticeship system of training for admission to the bar. The required period of training differed in the colonies and in the States, and in some cases there was no uniform requirement within the colony or the State. After the Revolution there was a tendency for States to reduce or even abandon the requirement of the period of study, a tendency which increased up to the time of the Civil War, when but 9 of the 39 States had such a requirement, and the formal apprenticeship system had given way to that of a clerkship under an attorney. As a rule, where no period of preparation was prescribed, qualification to practice was established through examinations. But the administration of the examination system was exceedingly lax, and no adequate provisions were made for this purpose until after the Civil War, when a period of reform set in.

Bar associations were beginning to be organized and the problem of bar examinations was considered among their important problems. The American Bar Association was organized in 1878. New Hampshire initiated the central examination board idea the same year; by 1890, three other States had followed the example; and from that time on, under the influence of the American Bar Association the movement grew and became firmly established as the machinery for testing the qualifications of applicants for admission to the bar.

As was the case with schools for medical education, law schools developed out of practitioners' classes. As the number of apprentices increased, the class was designated a "school." Possessing no endowment and with little else of material value, the life of many of these

so-called schools did not extend beyond the life of the proprietor. The first instruction in law in this country given as a professional subject in a higher institution of learning was offered at the College of William and Mary early in the nineteenth century.

The one-man idea of a law school was countenanced even by Harvard University, which in 1816 appointed a professor to deliver a course of lectures and announced a "law school," and by Yale 7 years later. Between these so-called schools and the universities of which they were nominally departments, there was little coordination, but through the relationship, the institutions that sponsored them developed into universities.

The idea of associating law departments with a college or university increased, and from the close of the Revolution until the Civil War, 30 college or university law schools had been started, 21 of which were still in existence in 1860. Up until almost the beginning of the twentieth century it was estimated that at least half of the number of admissions to the bar were of persons deriving their legal education from private study in law offices. Many proprietary law schools, principally night schools, existed at that time.

Prior to the Civil War, 2 years of work was considered the standard for law school training, a standard not always lived up to by those that announced it. Columbia University first offered an optional third year, followed by other schools. In 1878 Harvard made 3 years a requirement.

Until some years after the Civil War no law school in the country required for admission the completion of any college work. The requirement of the better schools was a high-school education. Harvard in 1899 put into effect the first requirement of the completion of a college course.

American Bar Association.—The movement following the Civil War, for reform both in legal practice and in the licensing of practitioners, led to the formation in 1878 of the American Bar Association. At first the growth of the association was slow, but by 1904 every State in the Union was represented in its membership. Nevertheless the full power of the association was not felt for many years, due to the large number of State and local associations acting independently of and in competition with both the national body and each other. The fact that these associations were made up largely of practitioners without law school training and who consequently felt little interest in the schools themselves, made it difficult for the American Bar Association to gain their cooperation in raising standards.

Besides the discussions held at its annual meetings, the association, from its earliest existence, through the medium of resolutions adopted from time to time, made known the principles for legal education and for

admission to the bar which it advocated. The resolutions contained no mandatory provisions, but were merely expressions of opinion or recommendations which the law schools felt free to put into effect or otherwise. But in 1921, after a long series of such resolutions, the association approved a set of standards for law schools and for admission to the bar presented by a distinguished committee, of which Elihu Root was chairman, and directed the association's Council on Legal Education and Admissions to the Bar "to publish from time to time the names of those law schools which comply with the * * * standard, and those which do not, and make such publication available, so far as possible, to intending law students."

The standards were as follows:

1. The American Bar Association is of the opinion that every candidate for admission to the bar should give evidence of graduation from a law school complying with the following standards:

(a) It shall require as a condition for admission at least two years of study in a college.

(b) It shall require its students to pursue a course of three years' duration if they devote substantially all of their working time to their studies, and a longer course, equivalent in the number of working hours, if they devote only a part of their working time to their studies.

(c) It shall provide an adequate library available for the use of the students.

(d) It shall have among its teachers a sufficient number giving their entire time to the school to ensure actual personal acquaintance and influence with the whole student body.

The president of the association and the council were directed to cooperate with State and local bar associations and with the constituted authorities in the several States to secure the adoption of the standards as requirements for admission to the bar.

A resolution was passed providing for the calling of a conference on legal education, to which delegates from State and local authorities should be invited "for the purpose of uniting the bodies represented in an effort to create conditions favorable to the adoption of the principles set forth."

The proposed conference which was called in 1922, and which endorsed the standards, consisted of delegates from bar associations of every State in the Union, as well as a large number of representatives from the leading law schools of the country. The standards have been published annually since that time, together with the council's interpretations and rulings thereon.

In 1929 the standards were the subject of discussion at a meeting of the Section of Legal Education and Admissions to the Bar, and were reaffirmed by the vote of an overwhelming majority of those present. A new standard was added as follows:

(e) It shall not be operated as a commercial enterprise and the compensation of any officer or member of its teaching staff shall not depend on the number of students or on the fees received.

In 1938 still another section was added:

(f) It shall be a school which in the judgment of the Council of Legal Education and Admissions to the Bar possesses reasonably adequate facilities and maintains a sound educational policy; *Provided, however,* That any decision of the council in these respects shall be subject to review by the House of Delegates on the petition of any school adversely affected.

In 1923 the Council on Legal Education and Admissions to the Bar published the standards and also the first list of law schools approved by the American Bar Association. The schools were divided into two classes, A and B. Class A schools were those already complying with the standards; class B, schools expecting to comply with the standards at a future specified date. It was not until 1935 that the council was able to comply with the resolution of the American Bar Association directing it to publish the names of law schools below the standard. In 1926 the council abandoned the listing of class B schools. Since 1935 it has listed all approved law schools in one group with a notation showing those approved provisionally.

Since 1935 the Section of Legal Education and Admissions to the Bar has published an annual review of legal education, which contains the standards of the association, the council's rulings thereon, and a complete list of all the law schools in the country, divided into approved and unapproved schools. The review also contains data showing the length of the school year, whether the course is conducted in the morning or afternoon, the length of the law course, the number of hours of weekly classroom instruction, and the year (for the approved schools) in which the school was added to the approved list. In the compilation of these data the section is assisted by the National Conference of Bar Examiners, established by the Section of Legal Education and Admissions to the Bar in 1931.

Association of American Law Schools.—In 1893 the American Bar Association created a Section of Legal Education, which in 1899 adopted the following resolution:

That a committee of three be appointed to take into consideration what action, if any, shall be taken to bring the reputable law schools of the country into closer relation with each other, and with the Section on Legal Education, and that this committee have the power to invite such law schools to meet in conference with the section next year.

This resolution led to the organization in 1900 of the Association of American Law Schools. Although this association has not acted as a general accrediting agency for schools of law, by the imposition of certain requirements for membership, increased from time to time as conditions warrant, it has been an important factor in the establish-

ment of standards for legal education. The Articles of Association of the association contained the following requirements for a school seeking membership:

Article VI.—Law schools may be elected to membership at any meeting by the vote of the association, but no law school shall be so elected unless it complies with the following requirements:

1. It shall require of candidates for its first degree the completion of a high school course of study, or its equivalent . . . this requirement shall not take effect until September 1901.

2. The course of study leading to its degree shall cover at least two years of 30 weeks per year, with an average of at least 10 hours required classroom work each week for each student: provided that after the year 1905 members of this association shall require a 3-year course.

3. The conferring of its degree shall be conditioned upon the attainment of a grade of scholarship ascertained by examination.

4. It shall own, or have convenient access to, during all regular library hours, a library containing the reports of the State in which the school is located and of the United States Supreme Court.

Some of the more important actions of the association which reveal the trend toward increasing standardization are cited chronologically below:

In 1905, the association declared by resolution its authority "to examine all the books and records of every member of the association, including the records and examinations for admission and the answers of the students to all questions put in the examinations for the degree during the preceding year, and for this purpose may appoint competent and impartial agents."

In 1905 also it amended section 1 of Article VI, to read:

1. It shall require of all candidates for its degree at the time of their admission to the school the completion of a four years' high school course, or such a course of preparation as would be accepted for admission to the State university or to the principal colleges and universities in the State where the law school is located; provided, that this requirement shall not take effect until September 1907;

That a committee be appointed by the Chair to investigate and report upon the feasibility of a uniform curriculum for the schools belonging to this association;

That all law school members of this association which maintain less than a three years' course in law shall be and they are hereby dropped from the association.

In 1908 the association adopted a resolution strongly commending "the action of those schools which have already advanced their requirements so as to require one or more years of work at college as a prerequisite to admission in the law school, and express the earnest hope that this advancement may continue until all the members of the association shall ultimately require at least two years of college work as preliminary to the study of law."

In 1909 by an amendment to the Articles of Association, Article VI, section 2, was changed to read as follows:

It shall require of its candidates for any legal degree study of law during a period of at least three years of 30 weeks each, with an average of at least 10 hours required classroom work each week; provided, however, that candidates attending night classes only shall be required to study law during a period of not less than four years of 30 weeks each, with an average of at least eight hours of required classroom work each week.

Another action of the association in 1909 was the adoption of a report in which was recommended a program of courses preparatory to the study of law.

A resolution adopted in 1912 required of members of the association a library of not less than 5,000 volumes. Another resolution was to the effect that the policy of the association was not to admit to membership any law school maintaining regular courses of instruction in law at night parallel to courses in the day.

In 1913 the association adopted the following resolution:

Resolved, That in the opinion of the Association of American Law Schools the present and future responsibilities of the American legal profession require that the preparation for admission should include at least one or two years of training of college grade prior to beginning the study of law . . .

The association made its first prescription as to faculty in 1916, when a requirement was made of at least four instructors devoting substantially all of their time to the work of the school.

An amendment to the Articles of Association in 1919 increased the period of law study from 2 years to 3 years, to consist of 30 weeks each, and the completion of 60 credit hours in law. After defining the term "credit hour" the amendment stated the conditions upon which night school work would be accepted toward the degree, one of which conditions was the acceptance of credit only when the candidate had passed written examinations in the subjects for which credit was given.

In 1919, also, the association passed a resolution declaring that thereafter no law schools would be admitted to membership except upon the condition that neither they nor the universities with which they were connected would thereafter conduct night classes in law for students preparing for the bar.

Another section of the amendment of 1919 provided for the maintenance of a complete individual record of each student, and enumerated the data to be included in such record.

In 1921 the association adopted the following recommendation of its Committee on the Classification of Law Schools:

That this association do not undertake a classification of law schools, but that it heartily endorse the action of the American Bar Association directing a classification by the Council of Legal Education.

In 1921 also the association adopted the following amendment to section 1 of Article VI:

After September 1, 1923, it shall require of all candidates for its degree at the time of their admission to the school either the completion of one year of college work or such work as would be accepted for admission to the second or sophomore year in the college of liberal arts of the State university or of the principal colleges and universities in the State where the law school is located and, after September 1, 1925, it shall require of all candidates for its degree at the time of their admission to the school either the completion of two years of college work or such work as would be accepted for admission to the third or junior year in the college of liberal arts of the State university or of the principal colleges and universities in the State where the law school is located.

In 1922 the Articles of Association were amended so as to exclude from membership schools operated as commercial enterprises, and schools the compensation of whose officers or teachers depended on the number of students or on student fees. They also specified the amount of time for the law degree to be required by full-time and part-time schools.

The association from time to time has made other changes in or additions to its requirements. Among the more noteworthy in recent years have been the following:

Effective September 1, 1932, it increased the requirement for the law library to be maintained by a member school to 10,000 volumes, and specified that over a period of 5 years the library should expend for "continuations and otherwise," at least \$10,000, of which at least \$1,500 should be expended each year. It specified also the types of material to be possessed by the library by 1939, and provided, commencing in 1940, for a qualified librarian "whose principal activities are to be devoted to the development and maintenance of an effective library."

In 1936 the association adopted the following amendment to its Articles of Association:

No school shall be or remain eligible for membership if it accepts for credit toward the first degree in law, with or without examination in such school, work taken in a nonmember American law school which at the time the credit is offered is not either a member of this association or approved by the Council of the Section on Legal Education and Admissions to the Bar of the American Bar Association.

The membership list of the Association of American Law Schools and the approved list of the American Bar Association include substantially the same institutions.

In 1937 the association amended its requirement of prelegal education to read as follows:

It shall require of all candidates for any degree at the time of the commencement of their law study the completion of one-half of the work acceptable for a bachelor's degree granted on the basis of a 4-year period of study by the State university to the principal colleges or universities in the

State where the law school is located. A student's prelegal work must have been passed with a scholastic average at least equal to the average required for graduation in the institutions attended and such average shall be based upon all of the work undertaken by the student in his prelegal curriculum, exclusive of nontheory courses in military science, hygiene, domestic arts, physical education, vocal or instrumental music or courses without intellectual content of substantial value.

Pharmacy

American Council of Pharmaceutical Education, Inc.—Due to its commercial aspect, pharmacy was slow to gain recognition as a profession. The dispensing of medicines in the early colonial days was undertaken by the physician, as a concomitant to the practice of medicine. The dealer from whom the physician bought his drugs was merely a tradesman, who aspired to no higher calling. It was not until the end of the eighteenth century that the writing of prescriptions became a somewhat general practice. Then the apothecary shop came to be distinct from the grocery or other store, in a corner of which it frequently was located, and the compounding of drugs came to be recognized as a separate function from the practice of medicine. All training for the practice of pharmacy was acquired through the apprenticeship method.

By the early part of the nineteenth century there was developing a sense of the importance of pharmacy and of the need for training in the sciences fundamental to its practice. In 1816 the University of Pennsylvania began a course of lectures on pharmacy, and in 1821 the druggists and apothecaries of Philadelphia founded the Philadelphia College of Pharmacy, the first institution of its kind in the United States. Other schools came into existence very slowly. In 1834 Tulane University established the first university department of pharmacy, in which courses in pharmacy were given by the staff of the medical school; and in 1868 the University of Michigan established the first coordinate school of pharmacy, as a unit of the university organization. Most of the earlier schools, like the Philadelphia College of Pharmacy, however, were founded by druggists' guilds in the large cities, a practice imported from England, and their services were chiefly in supplementing by lectures, given at night, the practical experience gained in the drug store during the day.

The organization of the University of Michigan school was followed by the formation of other State university schools of pharmacy, and pharmacy began to enjoy a new significance. The American Pharmaceutical Association was founded in 1852. The number of State pharmaceutical associations was increasing. Under the stimulus of these groups pharmacy schools increased in number from 3 in 1851, to 56 in the next half century.

There had been several attempts to form a national body to bring about a uniform standard in pharmaceutical education. But at the end of the century the 56 schools in existence were operating each according to its own standards. There was no uniformity in entrance requirements, in the curricula offered, or in the degrees conferred. There had been no effort to bring registration requirements in the several States into conformity with each other or with curricula.

The founding in 1900 of the American Conference of Pharmaceutical Faculties was the first successful attempt to form a national body to deal with standards for pharmacy schools. The object of the conference was stated in its constitution to be "to promote the interests of pharmaceutical education." Four years after the organization of the conference the National Association of Boards of Pharmacy came into existence.

At its annual meeting in 1904 the American Conference of Pharmaceutical Faculties adopted qualifications for colleges seeking membership. The state of pharmaceutical education at the time may be judged by these qualifications—for admission to schools of pharmacy a minimum requirement of the completion of a common-school education; for graduation, "not less than 500 hours given to lectures and recitations, and not less than 600 hours of laboratory work; such work to be given in a period of not less than 40 weeks."

In 1908 the conference raised the requirement for entrance into its member schools (except those in certain specified States) to a minimum of 1 year of high-school work. In 1911-12 it made this requirement the standard for all conference schools.

An act which served to bring about improvement in pharmaceutical education and practice was the formation, by a committee appointed by the National Association of Boards of Pharmacy and the American Conference of Pharmaceutical Faculties, of a course of study for pharmacy schools. The committee devoted several years of study to the preparation of the course and in 1910 issued the first edition of the pharmaceutical syllabus, intended to serve for a period of 5 years, August 1, 1910, to July 31, 1915. By July 1912, 27 examining boards had adopted the syllabus in whole or in part, and 62 of the 83 pharmacy schools then in existence had taken similar action.

Other steps which brought about improvement in pharmaceutical practice were the passage in 1906 of the Federal Food and Drug Act, and the adoption of the United States Pharmacopoeia and the National Formulary as the official United States standards.

Progressive acts in the raising of qualifications for membership in the American Conference of Pharmaceutical Faculties were the increasing, in 1916, of the hours for graduation to 1,200, and specification of the high-school subjects to be required for admission to pharmacy schools; the advancing, in 1921, of entrance requirements

to a minimum of 2 years of high school, and graduation requirements to 50 weeks or 2 full years of pharmaceutical study; the further increase, in 1922, of hours of work for graduation to 1,500; and the prescription, in 1924, of graduate in pharmacy as the degree to be awarded for the 2-year course in pharmacy.

In 1925 the name of the American Conference of Pharmaceutical Faculties was changed to the American Association of Colleges of Pharmacy. The association raised the requirements for admission to the study of pharmacy to 4 years of high-school work or the equivalent, and provided that for the degree graduate in pharmacy a minimum of 3 years' work, consisting of 2,250 hours should be offered; for the degree bachelor of science in pharmacy the completion of not less than a 4-year course; for master of science in pharmacy 1 year of graduate work; and for the degree doctor of pharmacy 3 years of graduate work.

By later amendments to the bylaws, the association made September 1, 1936, the latest date on which member colleges could confer a degree for any course less than 4 years' duration, and provided that, beginning July 1, 1938, the degree of doctor of pharmacy should not be given for work in course.

Bylaws which it adopted in 1934 increased the qualifications of schools by specifying the minimum training of the faculty, the equipment for library and laboratory, and made 3,200 clock hours of instruction the minimum for a bachelor of science in pharmacy degree.

The advisability of establishing standards for accrediting colleges of pharmacy came up for consideration early in the history of the American Conference of Pharmaceutical Faculties, and in 1918 the conference endeavored to enlist the services of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching in making an investigation of the pharmacy colleges with a view to classifying them, a service which the foundation found itself unable to perform. In 1921 the conference went so far as to draft a schedule for grading the colleges, which, however, it never put to use. Following years of agitation of the subject, the American Association of Colleges of Pharmacy in 1932 joined with the American Pharmaceutical Association and the National Association of Boards of Pharmacy in organizing a new body, the American Council on Pharmaceutical Education, Inc., and authorized it to study and advise upon the question of establishing standards and of accrediting pharmacy colleges.

After 5 years of study and preparation, this body, in 1937, adopted a set of criteria for accrediting, which it began at once to apply to the colleges desiring to be considered for accrediting. In the preparation of the criteria the council had the cooperation of the colleges of pharmacy, the State boards of pharmacy, the American Pharmaceutical

Association, the National Association of Boards of Pharmacy, the American Council on Education, the department of education of some of the States, and a number of individuals interested in pharmaceutical education. The council, as now organized, consists of three representatives from the American Association of Colleges of Pharmacy, three from the American Pharmaceutical Association, and three from the National Association of Boards of Pharmacy, with a representative of the American Council on Education acting in an advisory capacity.

The criteria set up by the American Council on Pharmaceutical Education, Inc., contains both quantitative and qualitative provisions. The quantitative criteria concern (1) auspices, organization, and control of the institution; (2) finances, investment, and expenditures; (3) age of the institution and of the 4-year curriculum; (4) basis of requirement for admission of students; (5) number enrolled; (6) curricula and degrees offered; (7) attendance, promotion, and graduation requirements; (8) teaching staff and teaching load; (9) physical facilities; etc. The qualitative criteria include (1) qualifications, experience, or scholarly publications of the members of the faculty, and their contacts with scientific and professional societies; (2) standards and quality of instruction, (a) in the pharmacy departments and (b) in the cooperating departments; (3) scholastic records of students; (4) extracurricular activities—participation in the work of local, State, and National pharmaceutical organizations; (5) attitude and policy of administration toward its college of pharmacy and toward teaching and research.

Out of the 70 colleges of pharmacy in the United States, 62 made application for accrediting, and 54 were accepted. A general reinspection for checking the status of the institutions will probably not be undertaken before 1944. In the meantime, the colleges contained in the list of accredited institutions published by the council on January 1, 1940 (with the exception of 4 designated for reinspection in 1942), are to be considered as accredited for the intervening 4 years.

Library Science

American Library Association.—In 1923 the American Library Association appointed a Temporary Library Training Board "to investigate the field of library training, to formulate standards for all forms of library training agencies, to devise a plan for accrediting such agencies, and to report to the Council." This board, with the aid of a subvention from the Carnegie Corporation, made a study of library school conditions. In its subsequent report to the association it recommended the establishment of a permanent Board of Education for Librarianship, whose functions, among others, would be "to investigate the extent to which existing agencies meet the needs

of the profession; formulate for the approval of the council minimum standards for library schools . . . classify these agencies in accordance with the standards thus adopted; publish annually a list of the accredited agencies."

Such a permanent board was created in 1924 and authorized by its charter to accredit and classify library schools. During the first year of its existence it made a survey of the library schools in the United States, formulated minimum standards for the various types of schools, including junior undergraduate library schools, senior undergraduate library schools, graduate library schools, and advanced graduate library schools. Following adoption of the standards by the association, the Board of Education began the accrediting of the schools and the publication of accredited lists. It has revised its standards from time to time and continued to publish an annual accredited list classifying the schools with reference to type.

Music

National Association of Schools of Music.—The National Association of Schools of Music was founded in 1924 as an accrediting organization. Its bylaws provide for institutional membership representing the various types of music schools, and for the accrediting of music schools following an investigation, recommendation of its Commission on Curricula, and approval of the Executive Board.

The association has adopted minimum curricula for work leading to the degree of bachelor of music or to the diploma course, and departmental requirements with the various majors, each stated in detail. It issues an annual list of accredited schools of music, classified according to the type of institution, as school, department, or conservatory, and indicates whether the school is independent or is a part of or affiliated with a publicly controlled college or university or a privately controlled college or university.

The bylaws of the association require the accredited schools to print in their catalogs the statement, the exact wording of which is prescribed for each type of institution, that the school is accredited by the National Association of Music Schools, and the kind of membership carried in the association.

Supplementing the requirements for accrediting, the association has adopted a code of ethics, provided for in the bylaws, which all of its members are expected to observe.

Optometry

The American Optometric Association, founded in 1897, and several other bodies later formed, sought to place optometry on a professional basis, but none of them attempted to set up educational

standards for rating schools of optometry. The Council of Optometric Education was formed primarily to have some supervision over optometric education, but felt that standards for the schools or for board examinations could not be set up until syllabuses on courses in optometry were adopted. In 1921, however, the American Optometric Association passed a resolution authorizing a conference between representatives of the bodies composed of schools and examiners, including the International Federation of Optometry Schools, the International Association of Boards of Examiners in Optometry, and the Council on Optometric Education of the American Optometric Association, for the purpose of establishing educational standards.

The conference met in 1922, and adopted minimum standards for preliminary and optometric education, approved syllabuses in optometric education, and a plan for classifying optometry schools. These standards remained in effect until 1934, when revision was undertaken by the International Association of Boards of Examiners in Optometry.

International Association of Boards of Examiners in Optometry.—The International Association of Boards of Examiners in Optometry, was formed in 1919. In 1928, it was chartered and adopted a constitution and a set of bylaws, in which its object was stated to be to unite the various boards of examiners in optometry for the purpose of elevating the standard of optometric education, aiding boards, establishing minimum uniform standards of optometric education and uniform legislation as a basis for reciprocity in optometric licensure, establishing a standard qualifying examination acceptable to all boards, and rating schools of optometry.

The International Association of Boards of Examiners in Optometry thereby became the recognized agency for standardizing and rating optometry schools. In 1934 the board revised the standards and syllabuses adopted at the 1922 conference and, after a study of the schools of optometry and a comparison of them with schools of other professions, issued a statement of "Essentials of an Acceptable Optometry School or College," outlines of revised syllabuses, and a classification of optometry schools.

The classification of schools was made under four general heads: (1) faculty, (2) administration and supervision, (3) buildings and equipment, and (4) product, with detailed requirements covering many subjects under each. A system of grading the schools such as used by the American Medical Association and the Dental Educational Council of America was employed. Each of the four general criteria carried a maximum credit of 25 points. Schools qualifying with 70 points and over were rated as class A, schools qualifying with from 50 to 70 points, as class B, and schools with less than 50 points, as class C. All of the schools in the United States and Canada rated were placed in class A, except one, which was rated as class C.

The "essentials" contained a provision carrying increased uniform entrance requirements over a period of years—in 1934 not less than graduation from an accredited high school; in 1935, graduation from an accredited high school with courses in certain specified science subjects; and in 1936, graduation from a recognized high school with courses in certain specified science subjects and at least 1 year in college, in which a science course is pursued.

The board issues an annual list of classified schools.

Forestry

Society of American Foresters.—The society of American Foresters was founded in 1900. It is a professional organization whose senior membership is composed of professional foresters who have demonstrated competence in their field. By provision of its constitution, junior members shall be graduates of schools of forestry approved by the council of the society, or they shall establish proof that they have a foundation for the pursuit of a professional career in forestry substantially equivalent to the training given in a school of forestry approved by the council.

In order to afford a basis for the admission of graduates of schools of forestry to junior membership, the society in 1935 issued a list of institutions offering approved curricula in forestry. The list was made up after a thorough study of the forestry schools, with particular reference to the factors affecting the efficiency of instruction in four basic fields of work—silviculture, forest management, forest utilization, and forest economics and policy. Rating was confined to these fields because the work in the several institutions differed so materially.

Attempt was made "to measure in a broad way the degree of distinction attained by the several schools in these four fields, and then to strike an average for all four fields as a basis for classification." Work in each field was graded as A, B, or C, and the schools grouped in these classes on the basis of their distinction. The method of grading the schools was chiefly by determination of, and grading on a percentage basis, the factors affecting instruction. Eighty-five percent of the grade was given in measurable factors affecting the efficiency of instructions; 15 percent in appraising the results of instruction by (a) estimating the efficiency as teachers of the individual members of the faculties and (b) estimating the efficiency of the graduates as displayed in performance. The standards used were chiefly quantitative. The weights assigned to the various factors to be measured represented the combined judgment of the schools themselves.

The society has added several institutions to the approved list since its publication in 1935.

Engineering

Engineers' Council for Professional Development.—The subject of accrediting engineering colleges was under consideration for 10 years or more before decisive action was taken in the matter. The Society for the Promotion of Engineering Education was the leader in the movement. The setting up of a standard that would be adequate for accrediting all the fields of the profession was a difficult problem to solve. Through the cooperation of the various groups composing the major fields of the profession, however, agreement on a plan of accrediting was finally reached.

In 1932, the American Society of Civil Engineers, the American Institute of Mining and Metallurgical Engineers, the American Society of Mechanical Engineers, the American Institute of Electrical Engineers, and the American Institute of Chemical Engineers (which had been accrediting departments of chemical engineering since 1931), together with the Society for the Promotion of Engineering Education and the National Council of State Boards of Engineering Examiners, formed a body composed of representatives of these groups to be known as the Engineers' Council for Professional Development. In order to carry out the purpose of its organization—the improvement of the status of the engineering profession—the council authorized its Committee on Engineering Schools to formulate criteria for colleges of engineering and to investigate the curricula offered by them, with a view to their accrediting.

The committee first prepared a statement of principles as a basis for accrediting which it submitted to the council and its constituent member organizations. The plan of accrediting involved the approval of individual engineering curricula in each institution, and included both quantitative and qualitative criteria. After securing general approval of the plan, the committee visited the institutions that desired inspection, and following visitations covering a period of 2 years, the Engineers' Council for Professional Development, on October 1, 1937, issued a list of 107 institutions offering accredited curricula in engineering. Altogether curricula in 16 fields of engineering were accredited. The list is revised annually by the Council.

Theology

American Association of Theological Schools.—The American Association of Theological Schools, successor to the Conference of Theological Schools and Colleges in the United States and Canada, was organized out of the older conference in 1936 by the adoption of a new constitution. Article VII of the constitution provides for the setting up of a Commission on Accrediting, and specifies its duties as follows:

It shall be the duty of the Commission on Accrediting to institute and maintain a list of accredited theological schools under standards determined by the association.

Upon appointment, the Commission on Accrediting Theological Seminaries and Theological Colleges was given "full and final authority to institute and maintain a list of accredited theological seminaries and theological colleges."

During the next 2 years it carried on the work of inspecting such seminaries and colleges as desired to be considered for accrediting, and on June 30, 1938, issued its first report, containing a list of accredited theological schools.

The standards used in accrediting the institutions follow for the most part those of organizations accrediting other types of higher educational institutions. They relate to (1) admission, (2) length of courses and graduation, (3) fields of study and balance of curriculum, (4) faculty, (5) library, (6) equipment, (7) finances, (8) general tone, and (9) inspection.

The report listed 46 accredited theological schools, 3 of which are in Canada. Of this number 11 (1 in Canada) were found to meet all of the standards. The rest fall short of them some in one particular, others in several. To the names of the latter institutions certain "notations" are appended, according to the number of items in which they were found to be deficient. In explaining its application of the standards to the schools the report says:

Because of the unique combination of circumstances governing the development of theological schools in the United States and Canada, it was natural and perhaps inevitable that there should be the widest differences between these schools in their organization and manner of work. These schools were not cut to a pattern as they grew, and it is the last thought in any mind now to try to make them uniform.

But the association, by its own act, had adopted a statement of minimum standards, and assigned to a commission the duty of administering a policy of accrediting theological schools with these standards as a basis. And it was discovered, as soon as data from individual schools began to be presented in detail to the commission, that very few theological schools meet the standards completely in every particular. The very first problem that confronted the commission was that of dealing both fairly and honestly with these divergencies.

* * * * *

We have used the term "notation" as a way of referring to footnotes appended to the list of accredited schools; to indicate that while a school is being accredited, it does not yet adequately safeguard standards of admission or of graduation, or has degree practices not in harmony with the standards, or its library is inadequate, and so forth.

Additions and revisions to the accredited list are made annually.

Other Fields of Professional and Technical Training

Architecture.—The collegiate schools of architecture have had a national organization since 1912. Beginning with 10 charter members, the Association of Collegiate Schools of Architecture, in 1914, adopted a set of requirements for an approved school of architecture, and limited future acceptance of members to the schools able to meet the requirements.

As no investigation of the schools had been made since their membership began, to ascertain whether they were maintaining the standard of requirements, the association in 1937 began a check-up on its member schools. This investigation has led to a decision to accredit schools of architecture. A factual survey is in progress, with that end in view. Pending the conclusion of the work of accrediting, the association has voted not to consider any further applications for membership nor to take any action against the weaker schools.

Additional associations of professional schools.—There are several fields of professional and technical training which support national organizations, membership in which is conditioned upon the maintenance by their institutional members of certain prescribed standards. These standards are similar in content to the standards set up by the accrediting associations, so that the membership lists of these organizations are in effect accredited lists.

The following associations have adopted bylaws or regulations in which standards for membership are prescribed. The dates following the names of the associations are those on which they were established.

American Association of Collegiate Schools of Business (1916)

American Association of Schools and Departments of Journalism (1917)

American Association of Schools of Social Work (1919)

Association of Collegiate Schools of Nursing (1935)

The American Osteopathic Association (1902), originally known as the American Association for the Advancement of Osteopathy (1897), requires of its members that they be graduates of approved colleges of osteopathy. Six colleges have been approved by the association.

Summary of Findings

At the end of the nineteenth century the older professions of medicine, law, and dentistry were just emerging from the apprenticeship state. There were numerous institutions for the purported training of persons in those professions. Many of the schools were purely commercial enterprises. Because of the absence of legal authority in the State to control the chartering of institutions and the license to practice the professions, these so-called medical, dental, and law schools flourished. Even after the States established State examining boards for the licensing of practitioners, the requirements were at first so low

as not to offer a serious obstacle to the existence of these low-grade schools.

While these conditions were at their worst, first practitioners and later representatives of the better schools formed organizations for the promotion of the several professions and for the improvement of the opportunities for training. The activities of these organizations led the way to the adoption of higher requirements by the State licensing boards and to the closing out of many of the poorer schools.

In 1905, the American Medical Association set out with the avowed purpose of elevating medical education. It formulated an "ideal standard" for medical schools toward which it recommended the medical schools to advance as soon as conditions would permit. A period of 9 years elapsed before this "ideal standard" was made a requirement for approval by the association. In the meantime several attempts were made to classify the medical schools. The first classification to be published by the association was issued in 1910, and was the first complete classification of any group of higher educational institutions to be made by an accrediting organization.

The example set by the American Medical Association was followed later by organizations representing other professional schools. Dental and law schools were next classified. During the past decade or so schools of library science, music, optometry, forestry, engineering, theology, and pharmacy have been classified or accredited. A survey of nursing education, with the probable object of classification of nursing schools in view is at present under way. Several organizations representing other special fields such as business, social work, journalism, and architecture have adopted requirements for membership which render their membership lists virtually accredited lists.

There is an increasing tendency for associations of various professional or technical schools or departments to accredit the institutions training for their specialties. There is also a tendency where inspections have not been made of the institutions for some time, for accrediting organizations to resurvey and reclassify the schools. Such surveys, for example, are being undertaken by the organizations representing dental and architectural schools.

PART 2

Part II
EXISTING PRACTICES
BY AGENCIES WITHIN STATES

Chapter V. State Accreditation Organizations

IT IS PLANNED in this chapter to analyze the accreditation organizations set up by each of the 30 States comprising the study. Special attention will be given to the appraisal of whether the accreditation organization fits into the State's system of higher education. The information as presented is intended to show:

(1) The type of organization set up by each of the States as indicated by the agency or agencies responsible for accrediting the institutions together with whether they are empowered by law or whether they perform this function voluntarily.

(2) The States in which the accrediting agency is an institution in the State's system of higher education or the governing board of all or of some of the publicly controlled institutions within the State.

(3) The primary interests of the State department of education when designated as the State accrediting agency, that is, whether its main duties are concentrated upon the State's public-school system or whether it has been vested with jurisdiction over certain phases of higher education.

Types of Accrediting Organizations

Diverse types of organizations have been adopted by the 30 States in an effort to solve the particular problems confronting them. The agency or agencies designated to accredit either teacher education or general collegiate institutions vary considerably in the different States. Table 1 outlines the accrediting organization set up by each of these States.

TABLE 1.—Types of accreditation organizations adopted by 30 States, including agency or agencies designated to accredit general collegiate and teacher-education institutions

| Agency or agencies and fields accredited | State |
|--|--|
| State department of education ¹ accredits institutions in both the general collegiate and teacher-education fields. | Connecticut. New Jersey. New York. Pennsylvania. Virginia. West Virginia. |

¹The State department of education is used here to denote either the State board of education or the State's chief school officer, such as the superintendent of public instruction, commissioner or director of education. The laws of some States confer the legal authority over accreditation on the State board of education while in others such authority is vested in the State's chief school officer.

TABLE 1.—Types of accreditation organizations adopted by 30 States, including agency or agencies designated to accredit general collegiate and teacher-education institutions—Continued.

| Agency or agencies and fields accredited | State |
|---|--|
| Intercollegiate standing committee accredits institutions in both the general collegiate and teacher-education fields. | Oklahoma. |
| State college association accredits institutions in both the general collegiate and teacher-education fields. | Michigan. North Carolina. |
| State college association and State university each accredits institutions in both the general collegiate and teacher-education fields. | Kentucky. |
| State university accredits institutions in the general collegiate field while State department of education accredits them in the teacher-education field. | Illinois. Minnesota. Wisconsin. |
| State college association accredits institutions in the general collegiate field while State department of education accredits them in teacher-education field. | Ohio. Texas. |
| State university accredits institutions in the general collegiate field excepting the public junior colleges while State department of education accredits them in teacher-education field and also accredits the public junior colleges. | California. |
| Intercollegiate standing committee accredits institutions in the general collegiate field, excepting the public junior colleges, while State department of education accredits them in teacher-education field and also accredits the public junior colleges. | Iowa. |
| State university accredits institutions in the general collegiate field, including the public junior colleges while State department of education accredits them in the teacher-education field and also accredits the public junior colleges. | Kansas. ¹ Nebraska. |
| State university accredits privately controlled junior colleges while State department of education accredits institutions in teacher-education field. | Washington. |
| State department of education accredits institutions in teacher-education field while no State agency accredits them in general collegiate field. | Colorado. Idaho. Indiana. Louisiana. Montana. North Dakota. Rhode Island. Utah. |
| No State agency or agencies accredit institutions either in general collegiate field or in teacher-education field. | Massachusetts. Wyoming. |

¹ The State Department of Education is also authorized by law to accredit private junior colleges within State.

Unified, bipartite, and tripartite organizations.—Of the 30 States, there are 9, or slightly less than one-third, which have established a unified type of organization to accredit institutions in both the general collegiate and teacher-education fields, according to table 1. Seven States have adopted a bipartite organization. In 6 of these States two agencies have been established, one accrediting institutions in the general collegiate field and the other in the teacher-education field. In the other State one agency is responsible for accrediting privately controlled junior colleges while another accredits institutions in the teacher-education field. A tripartite organization has been set up in 4 States. Under this type, the general collegiate field, the teacher-education field, and the public junior colleges are accredited separately. One agency accredits institutions in the general collegiate field, while another agency accredits them in the teacher-education field and also accredits the public junior colleges as a separate function.¹

In 8 of the remaining States, accreditation is conducted in the teacher-education field alone, no attempt being made to accredit institutions in the general collegiate field. A single agency is responsible for accrediting the institutions in the teacher-education field in these States. There are 2 additional States in which accreditation has not been developed in either the general collegiate or teacher-education field. In consequence, no accreditation organization has been set up. One of the States—Wyoming—has only a single institution, the State university, making State accreditation unnecessary.

The particular agency most commonly designated to accredit institutions is the State department of education headed by the State board of education or the chief State school officer. This department is the accrediting agency in both the general collegiate and the teacher-education field in 6 States and in the teacher-education field alone in 18 States. Thus four-fifths of the States have selected the State department of education to conduct State accreditation either in both of these fields or in one of them.

The State university is responsible for accrediting institutions in both the general collegiate and teacher-education field in 1 State and in the general collegiate field alone in 7 States. An interstate collegiate standing committee has been organized for this purpose in 2 States. In 1, the committee accredits institutions in both the general collegiate and teacher-education field, while in the other the committee's activities are confined to accreditation in the general collegiate field. There are 5 States in which a State college association has been selected as the State accrediting agency. The association in 3

¹ Many of the States have designated separate agencies, such as State examining or licensing boards, to accredit the institutions in the various professional and technical fields, including law, engineering, medicine, dentistry, business, pharmacy, etc. In such cases, a multiple type of State accreditation organization has been established.

States accredits institutions in both the general collegiate and teacher-education fields. In 2 States the association's accreditation includes only the general collegiate field.

Intercollegiate committees and State college associations.—Special attention is called to the States in which the agencies designated to accredit institutions in both fields or in either one of them consist of an intercollegiate standing committee or a State college association. The primary purpose of such organizations is to eliminate as far as possible a conflict of interests and of legal jurisdiction between the accrediting agencies and the institutions to be accredited.

The intercollegiate standing committee accrediting institutions in both the general collegiate and teacher-education fields in Oklahoma is composed of three members. One represents the State department of education, another the State university, and a third the State agricultural and mechanic arts college.² Under this arrangement three of the interests concerned in State accreditation are represented in the organization responsible for conducting this function. It will be noticed, however, that certain of the publicly controlled institutions and all of the privately controlled institutions of the State have no representation on the committee.

In Iowa the intercollegiate standing committee which accredits institutions in the general collegiate field alone includes six members. The State has three State-controlled higher educational institutions—the State university, the State agricultural and mechanic arts college, and the State teachers college. Each of the institutions has two representatives on the committee.³ Hence, an accrediting organization has been set up by Iowa in which all the State-controlled institutions have representation, but no representation has been granted to the privately controlled institutions or the public junior colleges.

A different situation exists in the case of the State college associations. Such associations have been designated to conduct State accreditation in both the general collegiate and teacher-education fields in Kentucky, Michigan, and North Carolina, and in the general collegiate field alone in Ohio and Texas. Each of the associations has been organized along practically the same lines as the regional accrediting associations except that they are State-wide rather than region-wide in scope. Both the publicly and privately controlled institutions as well as those of different types within the groups are members of the association. The State department of education in most instances is also represented in the association's membership. In consequence, all the various interests of the State concerned with State accreditation

² The State department of education is represented by the director of its division of curriculum, the State university by its dean of administration, and the State agricultural and mechanic arts college by its dean of education.

³ The two representatives of each institution on the committee include the registrar and a faculty member.

are not only represented but actually participate in the performance of this function.

Legally empowered and voluntary accrediting agencies.—A significant point in connection with the designation of the agencies in the different States is whether they are empowered by law to conduct accreditation or whether they are performing this function voluntarily. Regional and national associations now engaged in accrediting institutions are voluntary organizations without legal sanction. The extent to which the States have arranged for voluntary agencies to assume the responsibility of accrediting institutions within the State rather than vesting them with the authority of law is of special importance. Frequently, the effectiveness of the State accrediting agency may be conditioned upon whether the function is being performed as a result of a law enacted by the State legislature or on a voluntary basis.

The States have adopted three policies with respect to establishing legally empowered or voluntary agencies to accredit institutions in one or another of the fields. These policies are as follows: (1) The agency is empowered by law to conduct accreditation; (2) the agency is empowered by law but delegates its authority to another agency through a cooperative arrangement; and (3) the agency performs the function of accreditation on a voluntary basis. Table 2 shows the particular policies adopted by each of 28 States in designating agencies to accredit institutions in the general collegiate field and teacher-education field.

As indicated by table 2, 6 States in designating agencies to accredit institutions in the general collegiate field have adopted the policy of empowering them by law to perform this function. In 2 other States the agencies are empowered by law to conduct accreditation in this field but delegate the authority to another agency through a cooperative arrangement. The agencies responsible for accrediting institutions in the general collegiate field in 11 additional States do so on a voluntary basis without legal authorization. Of the 28 States, therefore, there are 8, or slightly less than one-third, in which agencies responsible for accreditation in the general collegiate field are vested with legal power.

TABLE 2.—Policies adopted by 28 States in establishing legally empowered or voluntary agencies to accredit institutions in different fields

[Policy adopted by State indicated by "X"]

| State | Agencies responsible for conducting accreditation in— | | | | |
|---------------------|---|--|-----------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|
| | General collegiate field | | | Teacher-education field ¹ | |
| | Empowered by law | Empowered by law but delegates authority | Accredit on voluntary basis | Empowered by law | Empowered by law but delegates authority |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| California..... | | | X | X | |
| Colorado..... | X | | | X | |
| Connecticut..... | | | | X | |
| Idaho..... | | | | X | |
| Illinois..... | | | X | X | |
| Indiana..... | | | | X | |
| Iowa..... | | | | X | |
| Kansas..... | | | X | X | |
| Kentucky..... | X | | X | X | |
| Louisiana..... | | | | X | |
| Michigan..... | | | X | | X |
| Minnesota..... | | | X | X | |
| Montana..... | | | | X | |
| Nebraska..... | | | X | X | |
| New Jersey..... | X | | | X | |
| New York..... | X | | | X | |
| North Carolina..... | | X | | | X |
| North Dakota..... | | | | X | |
| Ohio..... | | | X | X | |
| Oklahoma..... | | X | | | X |
| Pennsylvania..... | X | | | X | |
| Rhode Island..... | | | | X | |
| Texas..... | | | X | X | |
| Utah..... | | | | X | |
| Virginia..... | | | X | X | |
| Washington..... | | | | X | |
| West Virginia..... | X | | | X | |
| Wisconsin..... | | | X | X | |

¹ None of the States has agencies which conduct accreditation on a voluntary basis in the teacher-education field.² Another State agency is empowered by law to accredit public junior colleges.

On the other hand, there are 25 States in which the policy has been adopted of conferring power by law on the agencies designated to conduct accreditation in the teacher-education field. The agencies in 3 other States are empowered by law to accredit institutions in the teacher-education field but delegate the authority to another agency through a cooperative arrangement. This means that in all the 28 States in which accreditation in the teacher-education field is undertaken legal power has been vested in the agencies although delegated in 3 instances.

Legally empowered agencies which delegate authority.—The 3 States in which the authority of legally empowered agencies to conduct accreditation has been delegated to another agency through a cooperative arrangement are of special interest. Such a measure represents another step on the part of the States to avoid conflict of interests between the accrediting agencies and the institutions. The cooperative arrangements involving the delegation of legal powers vary somewhat in the States.

The North Carolina State department of education through the State board of education is empowered by law to accredit institutions in both the general collegiate and teacher-education fields. The department has delegated its authority to a State college association, known as the North Carolina College Conference. This association functions in much the same way as a regional accrediting association. It has a committee on standards which is responsible for visiting institutions to ascertain whether they are complying with the prescribed standards and for recommending the institutions for final accreditation to the association. Action on the recommendations is taken by the association at its annual meetings. The committee on standards consists of eight members, two of whom are representatives of the State department of education.⁴ Members of the committee maintain the closest cooperation with the State department of education. The secretary-treasurer of the association is also an official of the State department.

In Oklahoma the State department of education through the State board of education is similarly empowered by law to accredit institutions in both the general collegiate and teacher-education fields. By a cooperative agreement these powers have been delegated to an inter-collegiate standing committee, which has been previously described. This committee has assumed all the responsibilities of accreditation, which would otherwise be performed by the State department of education. The institutions accredited by the committee make up the official list issued by the State department of education.

The State department of education in Michigan is legally empowered to accredit institutions in the teacher-education field alone. This authority has been delegated to a State college association, the Michigan Association of North Central Colleges, which performs the function in an advisory capacity. Whenever an institution within the State applies to the State department for accreditation in the teacher-education field, the department refers the request to the college association. Through its accrediting committee, the association visits the institution and makes a report to the department recommending the approval or disapproval of its accreditation. The State department of education then accepts or rejects the recommendation of the association. Up to the present time all the reports of the association approving or disapproving any particular institution for accreditation have been accepted by the department.

Agencies accrediting on voluntary basis.—The particular agencies conducting State accreditation in the general collegiate field on a voluntary basis without legal sanction vary among the 11 States which have adopted this policy.

⁴ One of the representatives of the State department of education on the committee on standards is the State superintendent of public instruction. The other is the director of the department's division of professional service.

The agency assuming the responsibility is the State university in California, Illinois, Kansas, Minnesota, Nebraska, and Wisconsin. The State department of education is the agency in Virginia accrediting institutions voluntarily in the general collegiate field, although this same agency is empowered by law to accredit them in the teacher-education field. The voluntary accrediting agency in Iowa is the intercollegiate standing committee. A State college association is the agency responsible for voluntary accreditation in the three other States—Michigan, Ohio, and Texas.

It will be observed that the State university is the agency in the majority of these States undertaking accreditation on a voluntary basis. In the States in which the State college associations voluntarily accredit institutions, the State university has frequently been responsible for their initial organization or maintains a close contact with their accrediting activities. For instance, the State college association in Ohio was organized largely through the efforts of the State university. For many years the State university accredited institutions in the general collegiate field in Ohio through the dean of its liberal arts college.

The Ohio State college association was organized to assume responsibility for such accreditation in place of the university. In the organization of the association, the dean of the liberal arts college of the State university was made the chairman of its committee on membership and inspection and has continuously held that position. This committee inspects institutions upon application within the State to discover whether they are maintaining required standards and are thus eligible for membership in the association. Only institutions holding membership in the association are recognized as having an accredited standing.

Similarly, the State college association in Texas came into existence as a result of the efforts of the State university. Prior to its establishment the State university conducted accreditation in the general collegiate field on a voluntary basis. The purpose of the State university in promoting the State college association was to relieve itself of the responsibility of accrediting institutions within the State. The association has a committee on standards and classification which inspects institutions and performs other duties relating to accreditation. The registrar of the State university is a member of the committee.

Accrediting Agency as Institution or Governing Board in States' System of Higher Education

The extent to which the States have followed the practice of designating an institution or governing board to serve as State accrediting agency is of special significance. As previously indicated, there

is a likelihood that lack of cooperation or opposition may develop to such an arrangement among the institutions subject to accreditation.

State university as accrediting agency.—Of the 28 States, it is found that 8, or slightly more than one-fourth, have an institution in the State's higher education system conducting State accreditation. Information has already been presented as to the identity of the institution. It is in each instance the State university. In one of the States, Kentucky, this institution is responsible for accrediting the other institutions in the State's system in both the general collegiate and teacher-education fields. In the remaining States—California, Illinois, Kansas, Minnesota, Nebraska, Washington, and Wisconsin—the State university accredits the other institutions in the general collegiate field alone.

Governing board as accrediting agency.—The practice of designating a governing board within the State's higher educational system as the State accrediting agency is more widespread. This situation is applicable in those States where the State board of education as head of the State department of education has been made responsible for State accreditation and is also the governing board of all or some of the State-controlled higher educational institutions.

Table 3 gives the States which have followed this practice. The table is so arranged as to show whether the board governs all of the State-controlled institutions; all of the State-controlled institutions, except the State university; all of the State-controlled teachers colleges; or all of the State-controlled junior colleges.

TABLE 3.—States in which the governing board of State-controlled institutions has been designated as State accrediting agency

| State board of education is State accrediting agency and also governing board of— | State |
|---|---|
| All State-controlled institutions..... | Idaho. Montana. New York. |
| All State-controlled institutions, except State university... | Louisiana. West Virginia. |
| All State-controlled teachers colleges..... | California. Connecticut. New Jersey. Pennsylvania. Virginia. ¹ |
| All State-controlled junior colleges..... | Utah. |

¹ State board of education is also governing board of State-controlled Negro college in addition to teachers college.

A governing board of State-controlled institutions, namely, the State board of education as head of the State department of education, has been designated as State accrediting agency in 11 States, table 3 discloses. In other words, this practice has been followed in approximately two-fifths of the 28 States.

The board governs all the State-controlled institutions in 3 States. In 1 of them the board accredits the other institutions within the State in both the general collegiate and teacher-education fields, while in the other 2 States it accredits them in the teacher-education field alone. There are 2 States in which the board governs all State-controlled institutions except the State university. This board in 1 of the States accredits institutions in both the general collegiate and teacher-education fields and in the other State in the teacher-education field alone.

In 5 additional States the board is the governing board of all State-controlled teachers colleges. The board in 3 of these States is the State accrediting agency in both the general collegiate and teacher-education fields. In the other 2 States the board accredits institutions in the teacher-education field alone. There is 1 State in which the board governs all State-controlled junior colleges. This board conducts State accreditation in the teacher-education field alone.

Primary Duties of State Departments of Education Serving as Accrediting Agencies

In contrast with designating an institution or governing board within the State's higher education system as State accrediting agency is the practice of selecting an agency outside the system, the primary duties of which are concerned with State educational interests other than higher education.

This situation occurs when the State department of education has been made State accrediting agency in those States where its main functions and activities consist of the supervision of the State's public school system, including the certification of public school teachers. To present complete information on this point, it becomes necessary to show the extent to which the State departments of education in the 24 States where they conduct State accreditation possess or do not possess legal powers over higher education in addition to supervising the public schools.

Legal powers over higher education of various descriptions have been conferred on the departments in the different States. As has just been shown, complete governing authority over all or some of the State-controlled institutions has been vested in the State board of education as head of the State department of education in certain States. It is evident that the main duties of the State departments

of education in such States are as much concerned with higher education as with the State's public-school system.

Among the other more important legal powers for the regulation of higher education adopted by some States are the approval of the charters of new institutions and the approval of the right of institutions to grant degrees and diplomas. These powers apply chiefly to privately controlled institutions, although a few States have made the latter applicable also to those under public control. Where the State departments of education possess these powers, their principal responsibilities and duties are concerned with higher education in addition to the public schools of the State.

In table 4 are listed the 24 States in which the State department of education has been designated as the State accrediting agency together with information as to whether the department possesses one or another of these power or neither of them.

TABLE 4.—*Extent to which State departments of education in 24 States possess certain legal powers over higher education*

[Practice in State indicated by "X"]

| State | State department of education is State accrediting agency and also possesses— | | |
|--------------------|---|---|-----------------------------|
| | Legal power to approve charters of new institutions before they are issued | Legal power to approve right of institutions to grant academic degrees and diplomas | Neither of the legal powers |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| California..... | | | X |
| Colorado..... | | | X |
| Connecticut..... | | X | |
| Idaho..... | | | X |
| Illinois..... | | | X |
| Indiana..... | | | X |
| Iowa..... | | | X |
| Kansas..... | | | X |
| Louisiana..... | | | X |
| Minnesota..... | | | X |
| Montana..... | | | X |
| Nebraska..... | | | X |
| New Jersey..... | X | X | |
| New York..... | X | X | |
| North Dakota..... | | | X |
| Ohio..... | X | X | |
| Pennsylvania..... | X | X | |
| Rhode Island..... | X | X | |
| Texas..... | | | X |
| Utah..... | | | X |
| Virginia..... | | | X |
| Washington..... | | | X |
| West Virginia..... | X | X | |
| Wisconsin..... | | | X |

Departments possessing legal powers over higher education.—There are 6 of the 24 States in which the State department of education possesses both the legal powers to approve charters of

new institutions before they are issued and to approve the right of institutions to grant academic degrees and diplomas, table 4 reveals. In another State the department possesses only 1 of the powers, the approval of the right of institutions to grant degrees and diplomas. Attention is called to the fact that in 5 of these States—Connecticut, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, and West Virginia, the State board of education as head of the department is also the governing board of all or some of the State-controlled institutions. Thus, the primary duties of the department in each of the 7 States concern higher education to a considerable extent and are not confined to the public schools of the State.

Departments without legal powers over higher education.—

In the remaining 17 of the 28 States, neither of the legal powers is possessed by the State department of education. However, in 6 of them, the State board of education heading the department serves as governing board of all or some of the State-controlled institutions. Accordingly, there remain 11 States in which the State department of education is the State accrediting agency but does not possess either of these legal powers over higher education nor does it have any governing authority over State-controlled institutions.⁵ In these particular States, therefore, the primary duties and functions of the department appear to be concentrated in the supervision of the State's public-school system.

Summary of Findings

The major findings of this chapter may be summarized as follows:

1. Diverse types of organizations have been set up by the 30 States comprising this study for the conduct of State accreditation in the general collegiate and teacher-education fields.

2. In 9 of the 30 States a single agency to accredit institutions jointly in both of these fields has been established. In 7 additional States two separate agencies exist, accrediting institutions in one or the other of the fields. In 4 States accreditation of general collegiate institutions, of teacher-education institutions, and of public junior colleges is conducted by three separate agencies. In 8 of the remaining States one agency accredits institutions in the teacher-education field alone. In 2 States no accreditation is conducted by State agencies.

3. Among the various agencies responsible for State accreditation are State boards or departments of education in 24 States, the State university in 8 States, an intercollegiate standing committee in 2

⁵In 1 of the States, Texas, the State board of education as head of the State department of education has legal powers to make studies and recommendations for the elimination of duplication of courses of study among the State-controlled institutions. The board is also empowered to examine into the financial needs of the institutions and to recommend to the State budgetary agency the amount of biennial appropriations that they should receive.

States, and a State college association in 5 States. These different agencies accredit institutions in either one or the other fields dependent on the accreditation situation in the particular State. Where bipartite and tripartite types of organization have been set up, the State department of education conducts accreditation of teacher-education institutions or of public junior colleges while the State university, the intercollegiate standing committee or the State college association generally performs this function for general collegiate institutions. Other variations are found.

4. The States follow different practices with respect to conferring authority by law on the accrediting agencies or allowing them to conduct accreditation on a voluntary basis. Of the State agencies accrediting institutions in the general collegiate field, 6 are empowered by law, 2 are empowered by law but delegate this authority to another agency, and 11 conduct the work on a voluntary basis. The agencies are empowered by law to accredit institutions in the teacher-education field in all the 28 States, but there are 3 that delegate this authority to another agency. The most common agencies conducting accreditation on a voluntary basis are the State university and the State college association.

5. In many of the States, accreditation is carried on by an agency which legally controls one or more of the institutions which it accredits. In 8 States the agency is the State university. In 11 States it is the State department of education which controls all State-controlled institutions in 3 States, all except the State university in 2 States, all the State teachers colleges in 5 States, and all the State junior colleges in 1 State.

6. In 11 States the principal functions of the State department of education, although responsible for conducting accreditation, are concentrated on the supervision of the State's public-school system with little or no responsibilities with respect to higher education.

Chapter VI. State Accreditation of Teacher-Education Institutions

General nature of accreditation.—Each State has the responsibility and authority for assuring an adequate supply of teachers for its public schools, and for prescribing such qualifications for its teaching staff as public policy may demand. With the exception of a decreasing number of teachers prepared in teacher-training high schools and county normal schools, or certificated upon the basis of examinations that do not require college preparation as a prerequisite, all public-school teachers are required by the several States to secure at least some college preparation. The States therefore have a special interest and concern in the amount, nature, and quality of the offerings and facilities of higher education institutions that prepare teachers, in addition to their general interest in the constructive development of effective State systems of higher education.

The States have adopted several means to assure an adequate supply of teachers with satisfactory qualifications. Among such means are first, the establishment, maintenance, and direction of State-controlled teachers colleges and normal schools, and of professional offerings and facilities in State colleges and universities; second, State prescription of minimum academic, technical, and professional subject-matter requirements which must be met before graduates and students of publicly and privately controlled higher education institutions can be certificated to teach; third, State supervision or advisory activities in respect to instruction in one or more subjects or fields in the colleges and universities, often undertaken incidentally in connection with the supervision of public-school instruction by State department staff members; and, fourth, State accreditation or approval of teacher-education institutions and curricula. The primary concern of this chapter is with the last-mentioned topic.

Strictly defined, State accreditation is the official recognition accorded to an educational institution or to one or more of its curricula by means of inclusion in a list issued by some State agency which sets up standards or requirements that must be complied with in order to secure approval. The exercise of the accreditation function is a comparatively recent development among the States, however, and in many of them the plan of accreditation has not yet evolved to a stage that can be accurately described in the strict terms of this definition. The means provided, sponsored, or accepted by the States for the approval of teacher-education institutions are variously termed in State laws and other documents as approval, recognition, appraisal,

standardization, or accreditation.¹ Such means vary greatly in nature and effectiveness among the several States, in accordance with the nature of the organization, administration, and personnel of the State accrediting agency, with the number of institutions subject to approval, with the degree of coordination of effort by the institutions, with the rigidity of certification requirements, with the type of control of the teacher-education institutions, with the educational traditions of the State, and with other factors. As a single example of such conditioning factors, may be mentioned the varying number of institutions in the several States. In Wyoming, the State university is the only higher education institution in the State. Graduates and students of this institution are certificated if they meet the State certification requirements, and no formal system of approval or accreditation is necessary for this one institution. At the other extreme, more than 70 institutions are accredited for teacher-education purposes in Illinois, Pennsylvania, and Texas.

The present chapter is concerned primarily with the detailed means whereby the 30 States included in this study accredit or approve institutions of higher education and their curricula for teacher-education and certification purposes. Involved in this presentation, are discussions of the detailed administration of accreditation, the formulation and use of standards and lists of approved institutions, institutional visitation and reporting practices, and related topics. Certain problems and considerations relating to the nature and needs of accreditation for the specialized professional purpose of teacher education, as contrasted with problems and considerations relating to accreditation in general, will be given treatment. Problems relating to teacher certification, and State administration and supervision of teacher-education institutions will be treated only when vitally related to the problems of accreditation.

Growth of the movement.—Informal evaluation by State and local public-school officers of the standing and work of normal schools and colleges has been involved since the certification and employment of college-prepared public-school teachers began. The necessity for more careful evaluation of institutions that educate teachers increased steadily during the nineteenth century, as larger numbers of teachers secured post-secondary preparation, and as their certification upon the basis of institutional credentials instead of examinations began from time to time in the several States. During comparatively recent years, increasingly systematic methods of institutional approval and accreditation have developed.

¹ For convenience in expression the term "accreditation" will sometimes be used in this chapter when the means and processes of appraisal do not meet the strict definition of the term. Likewise, such terms as "State superintendent of public instruction," "State department of education," "State director of teacher education and certification," and the like are occasionally used as generalized titles. "Teacher-education institutions" include institutions of all types that are approved by the State for teacher education.

There are several reasons for the rapid development in recent years of State interest in the accreditation of teacher-education institutions. The amount of public funds expended annually for normal schools and teachers colleges increased approximately tenfold between 1900 and 1936, and proportionate increases occurred in public expenditures for other institutions that prepare teachers. During the nineteenth century, most of the elementary teachers received their preparation in elementary schools, high schools, and academies. At the present time, more than 95 percent of the elementary and secondary school teachers have received some normal school or college education, and the character of their collegiate work has become a matter of much importance. During the nineteenth century, certification of teachers was predominantly upon the basis of examinations, in which institutional appraisal was a matter of small concern; now every State in the Union issues one or more types of certificates upon the basis of institutional credentials. The greatest growth of education as a professional field of instruction has occurred during the present century, and the establishment of requirements governing the hundreds of courses now offered in this field constitutes a professional problem of the first magnitude. The increased centralization of control over the education and certification of teachers by the State boards or departments of education, and the rapid growth in the staffs and services of the State departments, have been outstanding trends in recent years. Consequently, conditions have become much more favorable for closer State supervision of the teacher-education institutions and their activities. The need increased greatly during the early part of the present century for more systematic appraisal of the institutions, and formal systems of accreditation of institutions—regional, National, and State—developed both for general collegiate purposes, and for technical and professional purposes. Included among the accrediting activities for professional purposes, is accreditation for teacher education.

Although various definitions and classifications of institutions of higher education were attempted from time to time before 1909, it was in that year that the North Central Association adopted the first standards for accrediting colleges for general collegiate purposes. This action was followed by the final publishing of an accredited list in 1913. In 1917, a separate set of standards for junior colleges was adopted, and in 1918 a set of standards primarily but not exclusively for normal schools with 2-year curricula. In 1927 teachers colleges were made eligible for inclusion in the regular list of colleges, but the special teacher-training list was dropped in 1934.

After considerable preliminary work, including the adoption of a set of standards in 1923 which were not immediately enforced, the American Association of Teachers Colleges in 1927 tentatively adopted

a revised set of standards and made up a list of accredited institutions. Constant efforts have since been made to revise and strengthen these standards, and the work of the association today constitutes the outstanding effort made on a national scale to accredit teachers colleges, normal schools, and schools of education solely on a professional basis.

Inasmuch as the terms "accreditation" and "approval" are often used interchangeably, and there are different degrees of completeness in initial plans of accreditation, only about half the State accreditation officers visited ventured the setting of a definite date for the beginning of accreditation in their respective States. Most of the dates suggested antedate the actual publishing of standards or lists of institutions and therefore are of highly uncertain value. However, all the significant dates mentioned are within the past 27 years; and half of them are in the period 1918-38. With the exception of one large gap between 1920 and 1927, the dates are fairly equally distributed over the entire period. Further details concerning the development of State accrediting of general collegiate and of teacher-education institutions are given in chapters II and III.

Purposes of accreditation.—The chief purposes of accreditation of teacher-education institutions by agencies within the States were reported by the officers of such agencies as follows, in descending order of frequency: (1) To assist the State department of education in evaluating institutional credits offered for teacher-certification purposes; (2) to provide a list of institutions approved specifically for the education of teachers; and (3) to assist institutions in evaluating college credits offered by students for transfer or admission. The prominence of the first-mentioned purpose is easily understood, inasmuch as all of the 30 States included in the present study evaluate college credentials as a basis for the issuance of one or more types of teachers' certificates. This involves, of course, consideration of the standing of the institution from which the credentials are submitted, and an evaluation of its curricula, majors or minors, and courses offered. Not all of the 30 States, however, accredit teacher-education institutions according to a strict definition of accreditation.

The first and second purposes mentioned are so closely related and are so often considered together by State department officers that they will be discussed as one purpose, namely, to provide a list of institutions approved for teacher-education and teacher-certification purposes. This purpose also is related in some ways to the third purpose, that is, to assist institutions to evaluate the credits of students transferring to them from other institutions.

No purpose in addition to the foregoing was mentioned by accreditation officers in more than 3 of the 30 States. Most of the purposes

listed below therefore appear in actual practice to be incidental, when recognized at all.

- (1) To guide prospective students, their parents, and guidance officers in the choice of an institution.
- (2) To improve the work of the institutions.
- (3) To assist school employment officers in selecting teachers.
- (4) To assist the institutions to realize their objectives.
- (5) To promote better interinstitutional relationships, including the coordination of the work of the institutions.
- (6) To assist out-of-State institutions and agencies in evaluating institutions within the State.
- (7) To safeguard the public in the degree-granting privilege.
- (8) To describe the characteristics of institutions worthy of public recognition.
- (9) To coordinate secondary and higher education.

The absence of recognition of the foregoing purposes by accreditation officers deserves some comment. Accreditation specifically for teacher-education and certification purposes cannot be expected to serve fully the purposes of accreditation in general; but even so it would appear that some very desirable outcomes of accreditation will be lost if there is no conscious effort to attain them.

Several accreditation officers and faculty members stated the belief that the commonly observed purposes of State accreditation are too narrow. At least three officers expressed the thought that properly-devised accreditation lists could be made of much service to prospective students and their parents, and to guidance officers. The belief was also expressed that accreditation should serve the purpose of improving the work of the institutions, as well as of providing approved lists primarily for the use of certification officers. That this idea is fairly wide-spread among educators is further indicated by the statements of purposes and standards of some of the regional accrediting associations, notably the North Central Association. The purposes of accrediting higher education institutions as stated by this association, emphasize several of the foregoing purposes² that are neglected or minimized by the majority of State accrediting agencies. It is to be said, however, that only as certain limitations later described in the actual operation of accreditation by State agencies are removed, can the realization of much wider purposes be achieved.

Special Problems in Organization of State Accrediting Agencies

The organization of State agencies for accrediting purposes in general has been described in chapter V. Certain special problems in the organization of State agencies that approve or accredit teacher-education institutions will be discussed in this chapter because of their imme-

² Works, George A. Proceedings of the commission on institutions of higher education. In North Central association quarterly, 13:68, July 1938.

ciate bearing upon the nature and effectiveness of accreditation specifically for teacher-education and certification purposes.

Legal provisions for approval or accreditation.—The laws of nearly all States giving the powers and duties of the State boards or commissioners of education or of other State officials or agencies responsible for teacher education and certification, include more or less detailed provisions for the approval or accreditation of teacher-education institutions, of their schools or departments, or of their courses of study. Certification laws also designate specific subjects or individual courses that must be offered if graduates of the institutions are to be certificated, but such laws are here distinguished from the specific legal provisions for approval or accreditation of institutions and of entire courses of study.

Constitutional provisions are made for State boards of education in 9 of the 30 States included in this study; and for a chief State school officer, usually the State superintendent of public instruction, in 22 of them. Although constitutional provisions concerning or mention of the powers and duties of the State board or superintendent of education with respect specifically to the government, supervision, or approval of State higher education institutions are made in a few of the 30 States; specific provisions relative to such powers and duties are usually left to legislation.

In answer to the question concerning the agencies that were primarily responsible for establishing the accrediting or approving organization (State board or department of education), the answer given by 13 of the 15 States replying to the question was the State legislature. Two States ascribed responsibility to the State department of education, and one to the State board of regents. Responsibility for initiating the accreditation or approval of institutions by these agencies was ascribed by 11 States replying, as follows: Legislation, 7 States; State board of education or of regents, 2 States; and State department of education, 2 States.

The statutory provisions made relative to the approval or accreditation of the institutions or their schools, departments, or courses of study are the same in no 2 States. The provisions vary from direct statements made in considerable detail, to brief and indirect references. An example of the more detailed statements made is found in the laws of Indiana which read in part as follows:

The Board or Department of Education is authorized and directed to * * * accredit such schools and professional departments of schools for the training of teachers as comply with the rules and regulations of the board and to inspect the same; to recommend and approve courses of study for the training of particular kinds of teachers in such accredited schools and accredited departments of schools. * * * Schools and departments of schools so accredited shall have the right to use the word "accredited" in

advertising. * * * This right shall be revoked by the State Board or Department of Education at any time upon refusal of any such school or department of school to abide by the rules and regulations of the board.

Iowa laws simply provide that the State board of examiners shall have authority to issue certificates to holders of diplomas or official statements "from an Iowa college accredited by the board of educational examiners." The word "accredit" or "approve" is used by about half of the States mentioning this power; in the remainder, the terms variously used include "recognize," "classify," "standardize," and the like. In a few States, one or more standards are set forth in the statutes.

It appears that in general the State boards and departments of education and cooperating agencies that accredit or approve institutions for teacher-education and certification purposes have requisite legal authority for such functions. Even in States in which the statutes are completely silent on the matter, it is safe to assume that a State system of accreditation could be established if desired, to meet the recognized responsibility of the State for safeguarding the inflow of competent teachers into the public schools. Although it cannot be said that the States in which the statutes are most direct and specific always have the most effective accreditation systems, the stimulus afforded by State legislation is admittedly powerful, and in almost every State that has an effective accreditation program for teacher education and certification, the statutes are not silent on the matter. The absence in some States either of specific statutory provisions that formally delegate authority to accredit or approve institutions to some State agency, or of lack of provision of funds with which a staff adequate to enforce the spirit and letter of the law can be employed, was not infrequently a subject of comment by certification officers. The absence of specific legal determination of their authority for performing the accreditation function is probably one of several reasons elsewhere discussed why a number of State accreditation officers have no standards for approval of institutions other than certification requirements, have no published lists of approved institutions, and exercise no effective supervision over the institutions that prepare teachers.

Although specific statutes that plainly designate the responsible State accreditation agency and its general powers and duties appear desirable, no detailed statements of standards, accreditation procedures, or designation of individual accredited institutions appear to be necessary or desirable in the statutes. Such detailed regulatory provisions should be entrusted to the responsible State accreditation agency.

State boards and departments of education responsible for accreditation.—Insofar as the State boards and departments of

education are involved in accreditation, two general types of agencies or officers officially responsible under the Legislature for approving or accrediting institutions specifically for teacher-education and certification purposes may be distinguished.

The first general type, found in 20 of the 30 States studied, is that in which the final approving or accrediting State agency is the State board of education (18 States), State board of regents (1 State), or State council of education (1 State). In most of these States, the State superintendent of public instruction as executive officer of the board is responsible for recommending institutions to it for approval for certification purposes. The second general type, found in 10 States, is that in which the State superintendent of public instruction, director of education, department of public instruction, or board of examiners more or less responsible to the superintendent, are severally responsible. The existence of this second type of State approving agency is partially explained by the fact that 6 of these 10 States do not have State boards of education vested with administrative and supervisory control over the general school system of the State.

A few States are included in both of the foregoing groups, in which a cooperative State accrediting agency accredits both teacher-education and general collegiate institutions. Such States are included for present purposes in the two foregoing groups, inasmuch as the final approval of teacher-education institutions is the right of the State agency or official indicated. Chapter V presents information on the plans by which the accreditation of institutions has been delegated to some cooperative agency.

The officers of the State department of education immediately responsible under the State board or superintendent of education for the direction of State approving or accrediting activities relating primarily to teacher-education institutions are designated by a variety of titles. These include: The director or head of the teacher-education or teacher-certification division (19 States); secretary or chairman of the State examining board (5 States); deputy or assistant superintendent or commissioner of education (3 States); certification clerk (1 State); secretary, State board of education (1 State); and chairman, teacher-certification committee of State department (1 State.) These officers are usually but not always administratively responsible to the State superintendent of public instruction, who makes his recommendations to the State board of education when such exists.

In States having certification boards of examiners, the State superintendent usually has directive powers over the administrative activities of the board. He may be the chairman, secretary, or a member of the board, and often has a considerable degree of responsibility in the appointment of its members.

About half the 30 State boards or departments of education have permanent or temporary committees on teacher-education, teacher-certification, and closely related activities. There is little uniformity in the titles of the committees. They function variously as committees on recognition or accreditation of institutions, examinations for teacher certification, teacher education, visitation of institutions applying for accreditation, standards for accreditation, planning and advisory services, determination of procedures and policies, and the like.

In some States there is considerable confusion in lines of State authority in respect to accreditation. Special situations exist which more or less limit the powers of the State director of teacher education or equivalent officer. For example, in 5 of the 30 States, the single approving agency is not definitely included in a division of the State department of education; and in 8 States, the counties, cities, or towns, or certain State teacher-education institutions, are empowered to evaluate college credentials and to issue or make recommendations for the issuance of certificates upon the basis of such evaluations.

The situation is further complicated by the existence of different State agencies in control of the State teacher-education institutions. There are numerous exceptions, therefore, to the typical situation in which the State board of education is the final approving authority; the State superintendent of public instruction is the final recommending authority; and the State director of teacher education and certification, or equivalent officer, the official immediately responsible for the supervision and approval of teacher-education institutions, subject to the approval of the superintendent. In general, the most serious difficulties in the approval or accreditation of teacher-education institutions by State boards or departments of education appear to exist in States where administrative responsibility and authority is not clearly and definitely placed in the hands of qualified and appropriate State education officers, where staffs are inadequate in numbers, and where they are not adequately protected from minority pressures inconsistent with the teacher-education and certification needs of the State as a whole.

No State board or department of education functioning as an accrediting agency reported that any educational or lay organizations, or groups other than the accredited institutions and cooperative accrediting agencies participate officially in accrediting activities. However, in the majority of the States, the State boards of education are composed of laymen and of State officers with or without professional connections in education who are ex-officio members of the board. The State superintendent of public instruction is elected by the people in 21 of the 30 States. It is therefore evident that the approving or accrediting State agencies do in fact include many

individual officers through whom many social, educational, and political forces of the State may directly affect the policies and procedures of accreditation. When these forces are mobilized by effective leadership, they may afford potent means for advancing teacher education as well as the interests of higher education in general. On the other hand, when accreditation officers are directly responsible to the institutions and people they serve a situation exists that is peculiarly favorable to the exercise of minority pressures that are extremely difficult to withstand. A small group of weak institutions, for example, can exert pressure that may result in the weakening of standards and of their enforcement. Similarly, a group of large or of well-financed institutions can exert influence that may result in raising standards to a point not attainable by perhaps an undue number of the weaker institutions of the State. The former difficulty, however, is more apparent among the States than the latter.

Representation of State board or department in cooperative accreditation organization.—In nearly all States having a plan of accreditation for teacher education only, or a single plan of accreditation for both teacher-education and general collegiate purposes, the State board or department of education is either the accrediting agency, or is officially represented in the membership of the accrediting organization. When the State board or department of education is not represented in the State plan of collegiate accreditation, it usually formulates its own criteria for institutions approved specifically for teacher education, and its own special list of accredited institutions. Similarly, if the State accrediting plan is set up primarily for teacher-certification purposes, and the general collegiate institutions find the accreditation standards and lists unsuitable for their purposes, they may set up their own standards and lists of institutions. These conditions may result in a dual system of institutional approval in the same State, as shown in chapter V.

It is apparent that a single system of State accreditation may have certain advantages over a dual system in economy and efficiency of administration. The fact that practically no national or regional accrediting agency appears to have been able to establish standards or lists of accredited institutions that satisfactorily meet the needs of all the professional, technical, and special-type institutions in its area of service should not discourage the States unduly in their efforts to accredit their institutions in different fields and for different purposes through a single unified accrediting agency. Fair and proportionate representation of the different types of institutions in the membership and administration of such an agency will do much to assure its success.

It is very important in any unified system of State accreditation that the objectives of the institutions and the specific means they

employ to realize these objectives not be distorted or limited. The standards and activities of the agency, however, must advance State as well as institutional interests and programs.

The final approval of the amount and nature of the preparation of teachers employed in the public schools is a responsibility that the State board or department of education can never wholly surrender or delegate. To the extent that accreditation affects the amount and quality of the preparation of teachers, to that extent, at least, the State board or department of education must exercise or share responsibility for approving the institutions that give such preparation. The fact that a situation often exists in which the State department of education is not well developed, or is subject to political or other influences that render its efforts to accredit institutions more or less ineffective, is not sufficient reason to remove all authority from it with respect to the accreditation of teacher-education institutions. The logical step to take in such a situation is to strive unceasingly to remove the unfavorable working conditions that exist, and to strive to develop the State board or department of education to a point where it may function effectively. It will gain strength by overcoming difficulties, but not by avoiding them.

Financing accrediting activities.—In States where accrediting is administered directly by the State board or department of education, the salaries of the officers engaged in the work are paid by the State. In the case of cooperative accrediting organizations, the secretary or chief executive officer is usually a State or institutional employee, and his regular State or institutional salary generally covers his part-time accrediting duties. These duties in many States are not very time-consuming in any case. Clerical, printing, mimeographing, and other office expenses are similarly met by the State or by the institutions whose representatives engage in accrediting activities.

In the case of travelling expenses necessitated by visitation of the institutions, practices vary somewhat. Such expenses when incurred by State employees engaged in accrediting activities by the State boards or departments of education are usually paid by the State for visitations made either before or after accreditation. In cooperative accrediting plans in which some college organization does the accrediting, the institutions often pay the expenses of visitors. Accreditation in such cases is usually for both teacher-education and for general collegiate purposes.

Teachers' certification fees are used specifically for institutional accreditation or approval purposes in at least two States. Annual dues are not required of institutions accredited or approved by the State departments alone and the same is also true with a few exceptions when the institutions are accredited by cooperative State organizations. North Carolina has a fee of \$20 for 4-year colleges, and \$10

for junior colleges. Texas institutions pay \$25 for an initial inspection for accreditation, and sometimes travelling expenses thereafter when visits are requested by the institutions. On the whole, the total expenses to approved institutions for accreditation by agencies within the States are extremely light, and in marked contrast to the total amounts paid by the same institutions to various national and regional accreditation agencies that accredit in general, professional, or technical fields other than teacher education. Limitations in the amounts of State department funds available for approval or accreditation purposes, however, obviously may result in proportionate limitations in the scope and effectiveness of State accreditation activities.

Personnel of State Boards and Departments of Education Engaged in Accreditation

Composition, selection, tenure, and salaries of officers.—

Twenty-four of the 30 States have State boards of education of general jurisdiction. In 17 of these, all or a majority of the State board members are appointed by the governor; in 3, all or a majority of the members are ex-officio; in 3, all or a majority of the members are elected by popular vote; and in 1, the members are selected by the State legislature. Although most of the board members are laymen, in half the States the chief school officer is an ex-officio member of the State board; and in at least 7 States, some of the board members have administrative or other professional connections with educational work other than that of the boards. The length of term in office of board members ranges from 2 to 12 years, with an average of 5 years. Educational authorities agree that short terms in office, and majority ex-officio membership of board members are undesirable.

The State superintendent of public instruction is selected by popular vote in 21 of the 30 States, is appointed by the governor in 6, and is selected by the State board of education in 3. The term of office of the superintendent when not indefinite in length (3 States) ranges from 2 to 6 years, with an average of 4 years. All these officers whose length of tenure is indefinite or permanent are appointed by the State board of education. The salary range for all States having this officer in 1938 was from \$2,400 to \$15,000, with an average of \$5,631. In general, the States which choose their State school officers by popular election pay them lower salaries, offer a shorter term of office and change officials more frequently than the States in which the State board of education appoints such officers.³

In all but a few of the 30 States, the State superintendent of public instruction appoints or nominates for appointment, the professional employees of the department, including those who administer accredi-

³ National education association. Research division. Studies in State educational administration. Washington, D. C., The Association, March 1931. 61 p. mimeographed. (Study no. 9.)

ation. In about half of the States, he appoints them, and in nearly all of the remaining States the appointment is made by the State board of education.

In 27 of the 30 States, the typical State director of teacher education and certification has had his present position about 6 years, although the range in length of service is from 1 to 30 years. His staff averages about 5 in number, and the range is from 2 to 28.⁴ Other members of the State department staff also are sometimes assigned to visitorial, research, statistical, and other necessary work in the approval or accreditation of institutions or institutional courses and curricula.

Growth in size and effectiveness of the State department staffs.—Growth in the size and effectiveness of the State departments of education, including the office of the State director of teacher-education and certification, has been an outstanding trend in American education during the past half century. Between 1890 and 1930, the median number of staff members of State departments of education increased from 2 to 28, and the largest State department staff increased in numbers from 13 to 594. Salaries and qualifications of staff members, including the State superintendent and the State director of teacher certification, have improved greatly. The methods of selection of staff members tend to become such as to ensure longer tenure. For example, in 1890 there were 3 States in which the chief State school official was appointed by the State board of education as compared with 10 in 1930. The average length of the term of office of the State superintendents has been lengthened; and the number of terms less than 4 years in length has decreased by more than half during this period.⁵

The strengthening of the State departments of education, however, has not proceeded at equal rates in any 2 States. The range in the amounts spent for State department staffs in 1930 for each \$1,000 spent for education in the States, was from 62 cents to \$28.88.⁶ Much progress therefore remains to be made in many States in the provision of State funds that will make possible the upbuilding of a strong professional staff.

Relationships to State Administrative Control of Institutions and to Teacher Certification

Relationship to overhead administrative control of institutions.—In States where the State teacher-education institutions are controlled and administered by a State board or department of education which is responsible also for the administration of teacher certifi-

⁴ Emens, John R. A study of State administration of teacher personnel. Doctor's thesis. Ann Arbor, Mich., University of Michigan, 1933. p. 94.

⁵ National Education Association. Research division. Studies in State educational administration. Washington, D. C., The Association, March 1931. 61 p. mimeographed. (Study no. 9.)

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 13.

cation and the public schools, these boards or departments can integrate and develop a State teacher-education program with relatively small hindrance, insofar as the State institutions are concerned. Such centralized control of State institutions exists, however, in only a minority of States. Furthermore, privately controlled teacher-education institutions are to be found in all except 3 of the 48 States, and these prepare a large number of teachers.

The total number of institutions in all States, classified by major types of control as shown by the Office of Education Directory for 1938-39, is given in table 5. Approximately two-thirds of them prepare teachers. Less than one-third of the 1,709 institutions of higher education are under State, city, or district control, and only about one-fifth are directly under the control of the State. Many problems, some of which are indicated in chapter II, arise in coordinating and accrediting the work of State institutions not directly under the control of a single board, as well as the work of privately controlled institutions.

TABLE 5.—Control of higher education institutions in 48 States and the District of Columbia, 1939

| Type of institution | State control | District or city control | Private control | Denominational control | | Total |
|----------------------------|---------------|--------------------------|-----------------|------------------------|-------------------|-------|
| | | | | Protes- tant | Roman Catholic | |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| College or university..... | 107 | 15 | 175 | 208 | 135 | 730 |
| Professional school..... | 19 | 1 | 153 | 72 | 19 | 264 |
| Teachers college..... | 156 | 7 | 12 | 1 | 4 | 180 |
| Normal school..... | 30 | 6 | 18 | 8 | 5 | 67 |
| Junior college..... | 35 | 170 | 99 | 125 | 39 | 468 |
| Total..... | 347 | 199 | 457 | 504 | 202 | 1,709 |

¹ Includes 3 under Federal control.

Some special problems arise in coordinating and accrediting the work of State teachers colleges and normal schools that are under the control of State boards other than the State board or department of education. Without attempting to indicate certain coordinating functions of the State board or department of education, and disregarding exceptional situations, 5 types of control of State teachers colleges and normal schools may be distinguished. The first type of control, found in 3 of the 30 States studied, is that in which each of the teachers colleges or normal schools is governed by its own separate board of trustees. The second type, found in 7 States, is that in which such institutions are governed by a single State teachers college or normal school board, which does not have jurisdiction over the public schools or other State higher educational institutions. The third type, found in 3 States, is that in which the teachers college or normal schools along with the

other institutions are governed by a single board of higher education. The fourth type, found in 11 States, is that in which these institutions are governed by the State board or department of education which has jurisdiction over the public schools, but such board or department does not govern the other State higher educational institutions. The fifth type, found in 3 of the States studied, is that in which the institutions are governed by the State board of education which has jurisdiction over the public-school system and also controls all other State higher education institutions.

In addition to the foregoing institutions, there are various other kinds of State institutions that prepare teachers, including State universities, State technical and special colleges, including among others the land-grant institutions which may or may not be integrated with the respective State universities, State colleges for women or for women and men, and colleges for Negroes. The methods of control of these vary even more than in the case of the teachers colleges and normal schools. The privately controlled teacher-education institutions, which considerably outnumber the State institutions, typically operate, of course, with a high degree of freedom from State control.

In the most effective State teacher-education programs, the overhead administrative control of State teacher-education institutions involves a number of activities. These may include the recruitment and selection of prospective teachers, the establishment of quotas of prospective teachers for the State and for each institution, the prescription or approval of courses of study and of individual courses, in-service teacher education, supervision of instruction, selection of the institutional staffs, and other activities. Inasmuch as the State performs the foregoing functions only to a very limited extent, if at all, in privately controlled institutions, the necessity of its having some effective means for controlling the quantity and quality of the output of such institutions is obvious. Aside from the activities of the institutions themselves, the effectiveness of the State teacher-education program in privately controlled institutions in a very large part depends upon the effectiveness of certification requirements and of the requirements for institutional accrediting.

The organization of State teachers colleges and normal schools under two or more different boards is an unduly complex arrangement at best. The State department must rely very largely upon the initiative and voluntary cooperation of the institutions, and of their independent governing boards, to secure improvements and changes desired by the departments in the qualifications of public-school teachers. Because of the close and vital relationships of State teachers colleges with the public schools, educational authorities usually advocate the centralization of control of all such institutions under the State board of education in charge of the public schools. This is especially

desired when the State department of education is organized and staffed in accordance with sound educational principles. When the department is not in a position to exercise effective leadership, coordination may be sought by other means.

A State plan of accreditation of institutions and of their curricula, when properly devised, is one means whereby a certain measure of coordination may be secured. However, the problems of accreditation are also complicated by the existence of different agencies of institutional control in the same State. For example, the procedures followed by accreditation officers when an accredited institution is definitely known to be violating one or more standards of accreditation, are determined somewhat by the extent to which the accrediting agency has administrative control over the institution. In the States where the State board of education has administrative control over 1 or more State institutions and is also the accrediting agency, direct administrative action, involving, if necessary, adjustments in institutional budget items, is possible with respect to these institutions. It has been shown, however, that such control over all State institutions is exercised by the accrediting agency in only a minority of States, and that practically no State accrediting agency has the advantage in respect to the privately controlled institutions, except somewhat indirectly through chartering or licensing them, through control of the degree-granting privilege, or through certification requirements.

The primary purpose of colleges of arts and sciences is to provide a liberal, cultural education for their students. They are not primarily professional schools, although they provide preprofessional work, and in the case of prospective teachers, the instruction in subjects later to be taught by them. Such colleges also offer the strictly professional subjects demanded of teachers. However, marked emphasis upon professionalization of teaching is a comparatively recent development. Effective work in teacher education now demands that the institutions engaged in it provide laboratory school facilities, introduce a number of courses in professional education, appoint staff members who are experienced in public-school work, build up library collections primarily for teachers, and, to at least some extent, select and adapt their arts and science courses and curricula to meet the needs of prospective teachers. Many of the colleges of arts and sciences are unable or unwilling to vocationalize their offerings to an extent that would appear inconsistent with their primary objectives. Consequently, the application and enforcement of rigid standards set up specifically for teacher education is often difficult in such institutions. Many of them are small and have limited incomes. An important problem of accreditation is to ensure facilities in such institutions that meet the increasing demands for the professionalization of teaching, and at the same time not to set up requirements that

seriously interfere with realization of the primary liberal and cultural objectives of the institutions.

Relationship to teacher certification.—Nearly every aspect of a State teacher-personnel program is conditioned by the effectiveness of the work of the higher education institutions that prepare teachers. The standards maintained by the institutions in respect to admission, curricula, instructional equipment, and facilities, including the training school, preparation of faculty, and the like, are directly reflected in the extent and quality of the teacher supply provided by these institutions.

In order to assure a satisfactory supply of qualified teachers, every State in the Union issues one or more types of teachers' certificates. For the most part, these are issued by the State board, superintendent, or department of education upon the basis of institutional credentials. The evaluation of transcripts of credits offered by applicants for certificates necessitates, of course, appraisals by the State board or department of the nature of the work taken by the applicants, including majors and minors, or curricula leading to degrees or diplomas. Approval of specific professional and other courses is also undertaken to varying extents among the several States.

The division of teacher education and certification, or equivalent unit in the department of education, alone evaluates credentials and recommends applicants for certification to the State board, superintendent, or department of education in 16 of the 30 States. This same division likewise functions in 9 other States, but in addition to it, county, city, or district boards or superintendents of education, and boards of trustees of State teachers colleges or of the State university or land-grant college, may also function in 1 or more of these 9 States. In the remaining 5 States, a certification clerk, committee, or examining board recommends applicants to the State board of education; or the State superintendent or an examining board alone has direct control over certification. There has been a tendency for a number of years to centralize the issuance of certificates in the hands of the State board or department of education, and divided responsibility among different agencies within the State for certification is being steadily reduced.

In 12 of the 30 States, one or more types of certificates are issued upon the basis of State or local examinations, and usually little question is raised in the issuance of these types of certificates concerning the institutions in which the applicants secured their collegiate preparation. For that matter, it is possible in 6 of these States for applicants to secure certificates upon examination with no collegiate work whatsoever. However, in typical States the number of certificates issued upon examination tends to decrease, as the prerequisite scholastic requirements for certificates are raised, and as the examinations

themselves are discontinued. There have been marked trends for a number of years toward the raising of scholastic prerequisites for examination, toward the discontinuance of certification by examination, and toward the issuance of certificates upon the basis of institutional credentials alone. The necessity for the evaluation and approval of institutions the credentials of which are so used constantly tends to increase.⁷

Low minimum certification requirements account in part for the inclusion in lists of State-approved teacher-education institutions of hundreds of non-degree-granting junior colleges, special and technical schools, and normal schools. Of 48 States, only 5 in September 1937, required 4 years of college work as a minimum for certification of elementary school teachers. There were 9 States that required 3 years, 11 States that required 2 years, 8 States that required 1 year, and 2 that required a few months only of college work. There were 13 that required high-school graduation or less as a minimum. Figures for the 30 States included in the present study vary similarly. Fortunately, however, an upward trend in certification requirements is under way. In 1926, there were only 4 States that had reached the 2-year college level as a minimum. If the prevailing trend of elevation of requirements continues, it appears that within a relatively few years it will be impossible for a graduate of a 1- or 2-year institution in most States to secure a certificate to teach, without transfer to, and additional work in, a 3- or 4-year institution—a situation that already exists in about one-fourth of all the States. Eventually, the great majority of the States will doubtless attain a 4-year or higher level for elementary teachers, at which time many troublesome problems relative to the approval of non-degree-granting institutions will have been somewhat simplified.

It is still possible in a number of States for college graduates and others to receive general or "blanket" teaching certificates that do not specify the subjects, grade levels, or fields of educational service to be taught, supervised, or administered. Consequently, it is legally possible in some States for certificated teachers to undertake educational work in subjects in which they have had little if any specific college preparation. There is incomplete coordination between accreditation and certification in all States that have unspecialized certificates and that accredit institutions by curricula, and also in all States that have specialized certificates and do not accredit by curricula. Administrative consolidation or coordination of the work of local or State boards of trustees engaged in administering institutional teacher-education programs with that of the State department

⁷ Frasier, Benjamin W. Development of State programs for the certification of teachers. Washington, U. S. Government Printing Office. 1938. p. 46-47. (U. S. Department of the Interior, Office of Education. Bulletin 1938, No. 12.)

of education which administers certification, would assist considerably in attaining coordination of certification, teacher-employment, and accreditation requirements. In respect to certification, such coordination would be forwarded by the further extension of certification by subjects, grade levels, or fields of work. There is a very strong tendency in this direction. For example, the number of States issuing special certificates to administrative and supervisory officers increased from 1 in 1906, to 31 in 1937. The approval of institutional curricula for these and many other specialized workers in education has not proceeded with the rapidity with which certification requirements have been specialized, but promising beginnings elsewhere described have been made.

To meet certification needs the plan of accreditation must in some way take into account the curricula or fields of work for which specialized certificates are issued by the several States. By generalizing titles somewhat, it may be said that specialized certificates are issued for the following major subjects or fields of work in two-thirds or more of the States: Agriculture, vocational and general; art education, public-school art, and drawing; commercial and business education; home economics and homemaking; industrial arts education and manual training (nonvocational); music education, vocal and instrumental; and physical education, health, and hygiene. Similarly, specialized certificates are issued in from one-third to two-thirds of the States in the following fields: Administration and general supervision; school librarianship; and trade and industrial education (vocational). Furthermore, specialized certificates are issued in a wide variety of additional subjects or fields of work demanding prolonged and special preparation on the part of the teacher in less than one-third of the States, the most frequent among such subjects or fields of work being the teaching of exceptional children, evening school work, school nursing, and speech or speech arts.

In respect to general or academic subjects, elementary teacher-education curricula and curricula including the usual subjects taught in high schools are so commonly recognized in certification requirements, that it may safely be said that accreditation or approval of curricula for elementary and for high-school teachers should be provided for in every State. The rapid introduction of specialized certificates for junior high school teachers suggests that consideration should also be given to the establishment of criteria by which to judge curricula for such teachers.

There are no important distinctions made between publicly controlled and privately controlled institutions in respect to State accreditation by curricula. Although the State normal schools are more often accredited for the preparation of elementary teachers than the

4-year privately controlled colleges of arts and sciences, this is to be attributed more to the nature of the curricula traditionally offered and to other causes, than to control through accreditation.

A few States, among which are New York, Pennsylvania, and Washington, have, through State law or regulatory action of the State agencies in control, allocated specific curricula or fields of instruction to individual State institutions. Such action tends more or less indirectly to strengthen the administration of certification and accreditation in such States. Allocation of curricula by administrative action, however, is limited to only a minority of States. Consequently there is considerable duplication of offerings among institutions. Universities, colleges of arts and sciences, and junior colleges, both public and private, often prepare elementary teachers, even though the States in which these institutions are located have established a number of normal schools for the purpose. Likewise, as normal schools become teachers colleges, they prepare increasing numbers of secondary school teachers; and as the teachers colleges introduce graduate work, they prepare increasing numbers of school superintendents, principals, and supervisors as well as elementary and secondary school teachers. Similarly, many schools originally offering highly specialized vocational or technical work have expanded their offerings to include academic subjects, and now contribute materially to the current oversupply of high-school teachers of such subjects. It is conceivable that a well-devised accreditation plan could contribute materially to the better placement of specialized instruction in institutions specifically equipped to undertake it.

Problems relating to the approval of 1-, 2-, and 3-year normal schools, whose curricula are generally recognized as too short and meager, appear to be well on the way to solution as these institutions become 4-year teachers colleges or are discontinued. In the country as a whole, the number of normal schools decreased from 231 in 1919-20 to 67 in 1938-39. A large number of private and city normal schools, but practically no State normal schools, were closed during the period. During the same period, the number of 4-year teachers colleges increased from 46 to 180. The problem of approving short-curriculum normal schools is therefore becoming increasingly a problem of approving degree-granting teachers colleges.

County normal schools and teacher-training high schools still constitute factors to be reckoned with in nearly one-fourth of the 30 States. Two States now maintain county normal schools which offer 1 or 2 years of post-secondary work. Michigan maintains 23 of these schools offering 1 year of work above high school. Wisconsin maintains 28, which at present offer 2 years of work. In addition to these two States, 5 of the 30 maintain a total of several hundred teacher-training high schools, few of which offer post-secondary work. Inas-

much as the staff and facilities of these small schools rarely equal in number and quality those in institutions of collegiate grade, the maintenance of teacher-training high schools and county normal schools places the States having them in a somewhat illogical and difficult position in their endeavor to achieve higher standards in approved collegiate institutions. This is especially true when the graduates of the State-approved collegiate institutions are forced to compete for teaching positions with graduates of the State-approved teacher-training high schools and county normal schools. Fortunately, the number of these small teacher-training units is rapidly declining. Of the 1,743 reported for the country as a whole in 1922-23, at least 1,200, or approximately two-thirds, have been discontinued since that time.

Procedures in Accreditation

Initial accrediting procedure.—The procedures followed by accreditation officers when an institution applies for accreditation vary somewhat among States. The initiative in the series of activities leading to accreditation is taken in practically all States by representatives of the institution that is proposed for accreditation. Often there are preliminary conferences or correspondence between such representatives and the State accrediting officers before formal application for accreditation or approval is made. Formal applications may be made either by letter or upon forms provided by the State accrediting agency. Usually the next step after the application is submitted is visitation of the institution by a representative or representatives of the accrediting agency. In the case of the State board or department of education, this officer most commonly is the director of teacher education and certification, or equivalent officer. In a few States, a committee makes the visitation.

Reports of visitors are made to the final approving authority or, less frequently, to its accrediting committee. Final action is taken in most States by the State board or department of education, or by the cooperating accrediting agency as a whole. There are numerous variations from the foregoing typical procedures, necessitated by different types of organization of the chief State education office, or of cooperative accrediting agencies. Several States reported that no definite procedure has been established, because applications for accreditation were infrequent.

Of 18 agencies reporting the length of time for which institutions are accredited or approved, 10 accredit for an indefinite period and 8 for a specific period ranging from 1 to 3 years in length. It states that accredit institutions for a specific period, certain old, well-established institutions had in effect permanent accreditation status. Two States reported the accreditation status of part of their institutions to

be on a permanent basis, and part to be on a 1-year or probationary basis. State laws directly or by implication were reported in a few States to protect the accreditation status of certain State institutions.

Of 16 States reporting in respect to probational accrediting, 9 place institutions on the accredited list on a probationary basis, allowing a specific period of time, e. g., 1 year, in which to comply with standards in which they are deficient. Seven of the 16 States do not accredit on a probationary basis.

Visitation of institutions.—Almost without exception, State accreditation officers report that representatives of the accrediting agency visit for appraisal purposes, such institutions as apply for accreditation. In several States, few if any applications have been received in recent years. The officers who make visits prior to, and after accreditation, are usually those who are directly in charge of State accrediting activities. The State directors of teacher education and certification, or their assistants, are usually the visitors for the State departments of education. However, in some States, including among others California, Illinois, Kansas, Louisiana, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, and West Virginia, State department supervisors or specialists in various instructional fields, the secretary or a committee of the State board of education, institutional staff members, and others may regularly or occasionally visit institutions that apply for accreditation, or that are already accredited. Nearly all of the visitations are made by officers who have other duties in the State department or in the institutions with which they are regularly affiliated, and visitorial work is often performed in connection with other field duties. In several States, very little visitation is reported, except for initial accreditation or for general purposes. Fewer than 3 States reported that visitations were made by any individuals not regularly affiliated with the accrediting agency, i. e., especially selected visitors from without the State, institutional staff members, and others.

Although the satisfactory appraisal of the many different curricula and facilities for instruction of institutions located in States with large State department staffs appears entirely feasible, it is difficult to understand how such work can be effectively performed or how any great assistance to the institution can be rendered in many States where only 1 or 2 staff members are available for a few days each year for visitation of institutions before or after accreditation. The most promising visitation programs appear to exist in States such as Pennsylvania where more than 80 visits were made during the past biennium to higher education institutions offering approved teacher-education programs. The fact that highly competent faculty members and heads of various instructional departments are available in the larger institutions of higher education in practically all States,

suggests that these specialists might be more widely utilized for visitation, especially in States where the number of State department specialists is limited.

Visits by representatives of the accrediting agencies to the institutions, although made in most States, are made at widely varying intervals. Irregular visitations upon need, at the convenience of the visitor, or upon the invitation of the institutions, are the predominant practices.

There is an average of nearly 30 accredited institutions per State. Frequent visitations therefore require a considerable amount of time, which often is not easily available to State department staff members regularly engaged in a variety of office or other departmental duties. Hence, there is considerable reliance upon the traditional standing of the larger and stronger institutions as evidence that standards are being met. Visits to privately controlled institutions are not made so frequently as visits to State controlled institutions. Not infrequently, such comments as the following were made in the reports concerning visitations: "Made only if questions arise"; "Hope to visit more but have little time"; "Make visit for initial inspection, but not thereafter"; and "Meet institutional officers informally (at the State department), and visit them sometimes."

The usual purpose of the visits is to check the observance by the institutions of the minimum standards prescribed. There is abundant evidence that visits are not frequent or prolonged enough to enable the visitors to make well-considered suggestions for institutional improvement. A number of institutional staff members reporting in the present study made commendatory remarks concerning the ability, tact, and other qualifications of visitors, but reported very few intensive studies by the accrediting officers.

The time spent for purposes of appraisal by visitors from the accrediting agency to institutions that apply for accreditation is most commonly 1 day. Relatively few States report a longer or shorter visit. The perfunctory "luncheon conference" type of visitation was confessed to occur in a few instances, chiefly when several visits were made during the course of appraisal. Many visitors believed that longer visits would be welcomed by the institutions, but none reported complaints because of brevity of visitations. The practical difficulty of "building up a case" against institutions not deserving accreditation, in a short visit of a day or less, was pointed out by one visitor.

The fact that an institution that is once accredited can be dropped from the accredited list only with considerable difficulty may be pointed out as an additional reason for extended and intensive initial appraisals. Not infrequently, accreditation officers make repeated visitations the length of which varies with need, to institutions representing special problems. Although it would appear that the thorough

examination and appraisal of large institutions would require many days, there are few institutions that receive such service.

The problems of initial State accreditation are chiefly confined to small, newly established institutions. Important as the problems presented by them are, even greater problems exist in most States, in the improvement of the facilities and offerings of institutions that are already accredited.

Institutional reports to accrediting agencies.—Only 13 State accrediting agencies in the 30 States require accredited institutions to submit regular reports which are used as a basis for determining the adherence of the institutions to standards of accreditation. With unimportant exceptions, the reports are made annually. A number of the remaining States requiring no regular reports also have no formal standards. Special reports are occasionally requested upon need, but the number of such reports is small. Special research studies and surveys, while valuable, are so few in number and so infrequent that they do not provide much assistance in the continuing task of institutional appraisal.

It is difficult to ascertain in many States how information is secured that is sufficiently broad in scope and extended in detail to serve as a basis for helpful suggestions to the institutions that are appraised. It is a rather surprising fact that the majority of the States do not regularly require the institutions of higher education to submit statistical reports to be printed or made generally available in the biennial or similar State reports on education. State boards or departments that have administrative control over State institutions obtain reports from them, but the number of such institutions is only a fraction of all the institutions that are accredited and the reports secured are often of small use in accreditation in any case. Institutional catalogs are of course available, but they provide supplementary information only. Apparently a heavy burden rests upon visitors to the institutions to secure detailed information about the practices and requirements of the institutions. That a satisfactory amount of detailed documentary material is secured in the brief and infrequent visitations made in many States is open to question.

Copies of the blank forms for annual reports provided by the accrediting agencies were secured when available. For the most part, these are in mimeographed form. Some are quite old, and a few suffer from undue brevity. A detailed form worthy of emulation in several respects was secured from the Department of Public Instruction of Indiana. The form contains 17 printed pages. Standards for colleges and universities, and for normal schools and special-subject institutions that prepare teachers are included separately. Both the standards and the data blanks requested to check their observance, are

prepared in the light of teacher-education needs. Many detailed items of information are requested under main topics which include: General information, total student registration, registration in teachers' curricula, teacher-training curricula completed, summary of degrees granted, summary of work in extension classes, faculty, library, miscellaneous information, expenditures, income, financial statement (balance sheet), admission and graduation requirements, and schools for observation and student teaching. The last-mentioned topic is especially to be noted.

Less than half of the report forms that were secured contain items relative to student teaching. The omission of this item in so many forms is rather surprising. Facts concerning the extent and the quality of laboratory school work are commonly agreed to be among the most essential items of information that can be secured in appraising teacher-education facilities. Provisions for student teaching are known to be very meager in many institutions. It would appear that detailed information relative to such facilities should be secured from all institutions accredited for teacher education.

Some accreditation officers encounter difficulties in securing necessary information from all the institutions subject to accreditation. Such difficulties not only exist in collecting the extensive body of information demanded in special studies, but also in securing annual reports. A high degree of satisfaction, if not of actual relief, is confessed by some accreditation officers when they receive 100-percent returns of the annual reports requested of the accredited institutions. Difficulties in securing the large amount of information necessary in occasional basic studies appear to be due chiefly to the failure of the institutions to make provisions for continuing records and reports that would be of considerable value to the institutions themselves in self-improvement programs. In view of the extensive amount of data collected for accreditation purposes by such agencies as the North Central Association, for example, the requests made for essential information by typical State accrediting agencies appear exceedingly modest.

Supplementary or incidental means of appraising institutions.—Of the sources of information used in determining whether or not accredited institutions are adhering to standards for accreditation, personal visitation or inspection was ranked first in usefulness by accreditation officers. Regular reports made by the institutions were ranked second. Use of regional and national lists was also frequently reported. Although a number of other means of securing information concerning institutional observance of standards was reported, none was mentioned by more than 1 or 2 accreditation officers each. The less frequently mentioned sources or methods of securing information include: Informal reports from alumni, students, patrons, and

others; individual and group conferences held with institutional representatives away from the institutions; general or traditional reputation of the institutions; correspondence; transcripts of credits submitted for certification purposes; study of curricula and courses; use of catalogs; committee work of institutions; occasional reports, studies, and surveys; tests and comprehensive examinations of prospective students from other institutions; and checks on the performance of graduates who are employed or who are continuing their graduate work.

Of the foregoing supplementary or occasional means of securing information, several were recommended by some of the officers visited as worthy of much wider use. Among such means are the careful study of specific curricula, and the use of cooperating institutional committees. Such means are constantly used in the New York State program, in which specific curricula are carefully appraised before approval.

Less than half the States report that special studies, surveys, or similar intensive programs of investigation have been conducted by the accrediting agency for the purpose of improving the curricula or work of the approved institutions. Activities in a few typical States illustrate the types of work that are being done. California is now making a study with the improvement of teacher-education curricula as an important purpose. Connecticut, on the basis of excellent State teacher personnel records, has made some helpful studies of teacher supply, turnover, placement, and related activities. Iowa completed, several years ago, an extensive State teacher personnel study; and like other States, it has assisted in supplying data to graduate students on problems of interest in accreditation. An elementary teacher education curriculum study has also been made in Kansas.

New York reviews the curricula of all institutions that are approved, and has made many suggestions to such institutions. Pennsylvania has collected a large amount of data on problems basic in accreditation. West Virginia has had the benefit of considerable institutional research in recent years. Additional States that have been doing good work have been mentioned elsewhere in this report; but on the whole, extended research and study on accreditation problems cannot be said to be a characteristic feature of State accreditation programs in typical States. That such research and study is necessary on a wide scale if institutional growth is to be markedly advanced by State efforts appears obvious.

Only 6 of 25 State directors of teacher education and certification or similar officers from whom information was secured on the subject report that they have available any research bureau or comparable facilities for intensive or prolonged study or appraisal of the work of the institutions. Nevertheless, most State departments have re-

search or statistical bureaus or services, and nearly all of the States have within their borders, higher education institutions that are regularly engaged in graduate research work. Lack of utilization of such facilities in the study of higher education institutions results from several causes. First, the limited research staffs of many State departments are already overburdened with work; second, some responsible officers of the State departments have not yet seen fit to undertake seriously a systematic program for the improvement of the institutional teacher-education programs; and, third, organizational difficulties hinder the free use of such research facilities as are available.

It is to be said that most accreditation officers are keenly aware of the need for study and research pertaining to the institutions they appraise. Not infrequently these officers, despite the heavy demands on their time occasioned by their regular administrative duties, somehow find opportunities to make helpful studies of such subjects as teacher supply and demand, criteria for judging institutional equipment and instruction, and the like. A few States have collected a sizable amount of material about institutions at the time of their establishment, chartering, or licensing, or at the time of some significant change of status in institutions after their establishment.

Several means other than accreditation for determining the quality and effectiveness of the work of institutions from which students transfer to other institutions are in current use. The most common means is to admit the student upon condition, and if his record thereafter is good, to allow partial or full credit for his prior work in the institution from which he transfers. Comprehensive or special examinations are sometimes given; but these are rarely uniform in difficulty among institutions. A few institutions have shown an interest in checking upon the professional record of graduates of given institutions after such graduates enter teaching; but the difficulties are formidable in attempting to secure reliable measures for evaluating teaching success, and of securing systematic reports from public-school officials of such evaluations.

Despite the difficulties, further experimentation along the foregoing lines appears highly desirable for several reasons. One reason is that brilliant and promising students may be denied admission to accredited institutions, or be unduly penalized, if the institutions from which they come are not accredited. Arbitrary and unfair denial of opportunities for such students by the institutions in which they would profit most would result in an intolerable social waste which is totally inconsistent with the purposes for which the institutions exist. Probationary admission in which prior work in an unaccredited institution may be given credit if the student does acceptable advanced work, admission of special students with the idea of allowing them to make up work in which they are deficient, and similar practices

appear desirable, even though they complicate the problem of accreditation.

Special problems in accrediting procedures.—The handicaps in accrediting teacher-education institutions reported by State accrediting agencies include among others: Failure of some of the institutions to comprehend or appreciate the problems or needs of teacher education; lack of standards for accreditation; existence of old, incomplete, or weak standards; lack of information concerning what constitutes best practice; lack of curriculum revision work in institutions; difficulty in securing reports from privately controlled institutions; difficulty of junior colleges in meeting teacher-education standards; lack of enforcement of standards through reports and visitation; and lack of funds and staff by the accrediting agency.

Not many important changes in curricula were reported by accreditation officers as a result of specific action on their part. The changes that were reported, however, indicate that considerable advancement in State programs of teacher education can be made provided an adequately staffed accreditation agency is in operation. Iowa reported that constant changes were under way, as new or revised standards were formulated, or as a result of visitations. New York, which reviews in detail curricula that are submitted for approval, is able with the cooperation of the institutions or of institutional committees, to assist in making many desired changes in institutional offerings for prospective teachers. Ohio has formulated a tentative pattern for a 4-year curriculum for the preparation of elementary teachers and outlines for the preparation of teachers of speech, art, etc., after much work by teachers' committees, members of the State department, and others.

A few States reported accreditation an influencing factor in extension and summer session work; in the changing of weak 4-year colleges to junior colleges; and in the introduction of stronger teacher-education curricula in junior colleges. It was felt by a number of accreditation officers that the possibilities open to them for developing cooperative institutional action were very broad, but had not yet been sufficiently explored in their States.

Judging from reports of accrediting officers, the extent to which accredited institutions fail to meet standards over long periods does not appear to be a very serious problem. It is shown elsewhere that relatively few institutions are dropped from the accredited lists, and that no large number are suspended. These facts, however, appear to justify several questions concerning a situation that on the surface appears so happy. The first question concerns the absence of definite minimum standards in a substantial number of States. The second concerns the limited scope of the standards that are in operation. The third pertains to the care with which accreditation officers check

the observance of standards, especially when detailed annual reports are not required, and visitations are short and infrequent. Lack of strict administration of State accreditation doubtless accounts for many situations in which few problems in accreditation are reported.

The procedures actually followed by State accrediting agencies when accredited institutions are temporarily violating a standard rarely appear to be either hasty or arbitrary. The usual procedure is for the accrediting officers to call the attention of the institutional officers to the deficiency, either by correspondence or in conference. Usually this appears to suffice. New Jersey asks the institutions to submit a plan for improvement. This appears to be a commendable approach to a problem that should be as much the concern of the institution as it is of the accrediting agency. The danger of withdrawal of the certification privilege by State departments of education from graduates of institutions not meeting State requirements for certification doubtless induces some institutions to observe accrediting standards more carefully than would otherwise be the case.

A problem in accreditation arises in the transfer of students from teachers colleges, normal schools, and other professional or special-type institutions, to universities and colleges of arts and sciences. In recent years the rapid elimination of normal schools extremely weak in academic subject-matter offerings and in staff, and the broadening and strengthening of the academic work in teachers colleges, has resulted in much less concern than in earlier years about the quality of work offered in these institutions. The problem remains, however, of finding means for the arts and science colleges and the universities to recognize credits in professional courses in education. If the student has been graduated from an accredited teachers college and wishes to begin graduate work in education elsewhere, he is usually admitted to such work with full credit. If he transfers in the course of his undergraduate work to a school of education, similar handling of his case is possible. If, however, he wishes to earn a degree in arts and sciences only, he may receive varying amounts of credit for some of his professional work, and take the additional courses in arts and sciences necessary to meet degree requirements. The problem is simplified if the student has taken only arts and science courses in his undergraduate work, perhaps in a lower division of a teachers college. Half of the elementary teachers in America, however, begin public-school service with only 1, 2, or 3 years of college education. To secure their necessary professional preparation in such limited periods, they must limit somewhat their work in general and cultural subjects.

The problem of transfer is not confined to strictly professional courses, however. The teachers colleges and normal schools very often select and adapt their arts and science courses from the first

year, to meet the needs of elementary teachers. For example, in comparison with typical institutions of arts and sciences, progressive teachers colleges and normal schools often require for prospective elementary teachers, fewer courses in ancient and modern languages and in advanced mathematics, and more courses in music, art, and physical education and health. There is likely to be less emphasis in the teachers colleges upon the formal aspects of ancient history, English, science, and the like, and more upon modern history and civics, children's literature, speech, geography, nature study, and general science. Large numbers of teachers are prepared also for teaching such subjects as agriculture, commerce, homemaking, trades and industries, music, and art, and usually they must begin early in their collegiate work to secure the specialized undergraduate credits in such fields demanded by public-school employers.

In the course of time, when graduate work is required of more teachers, less specialization in their early undergraduate years will be necessary. Although the problem of recognition of specialized professional curricula and courses will still exist on higher levels, it can probably be more satisfactorily met by the graduate schools.

The definite recognition of liberal-cultural, professional, technical, and special curricula and courses is necessary in an effective plan of accreditation that includes all of the institutions in a State. It is furthermore necessary to recognize the need for staffs that are appropriately prepared for instruction in such fields, and for plant, laboratory, library, and other instructional facilities necessary to meet the specific purposes and objectives of the institution. With such recognition, greater effectiveness in accreditation is possible, and conflicts of institutional and vocational group interests may be more easily resolved.

The success of an integrated program of accreditation, in contrast to that of multiple accreditation programs, appears to depend to a very large extent upon the success with which the single program forwards the essential purposes of the different types of institutions. If it does not recognize such purposes to the satisfaction of the institutions, and to workers in the professions and vocations served, the present condition of separatism in accreditation that has grown up in the past and that is now manifested in more than a score of national and regional accrediting agencies as well as in multiple State accrediting agencies, in all probability will continue to prevail.

Standards for Accrediting

Extent to which detailed standards have been adopted.—Less than half the States studied have criteria in printed, mimeographed, or typewritten form that can be definitely identified as standards

designed exclusively or largely for the specific purpose of evaluating institutions for teacher-education purposes. However, the application of most of the State standards designed primarily for the evaluation of general collegiate institutions affects institutions that prepare teachers (ch. VII). State accreditation agencies that have only one set of standards for both general collegiate and for teacher-education institutions may or may not include in such standards mention of specific teacher-education facilities and offerings such as laboratory schools, professional curricula, and the like. However, States having a separate set of standards for junior colleges usually formulate such standards for general collegiate purposes only.

Certification requirements, made in practically all States, are not here considered accreditation standards; but in actual practice such requirements operate very much like accreditation standards, insofar as they impel institutions to professionalize their courses and curricula, establish training schools, employ staff members with professional preparation, and otherwise adapt their facilities and offerings so that the institutions may attain places on the State department lists of institutions approved for teacher-education and certification purposes.

Some States, including among others Idaho, Louisiana, North Dakota, and Utah, rely more or less upon regional association standards in approving teacher-education institutions within the State, although such standards are designed primarily for general collegiate institutions. Similarly, most States regularly use the regional accrediting association lists as supplementary sources of information concerning the general collegiate standing of out-of-State institutions from which applicants for certificates present credentials. The general collegiate standards both of the State and of the regional accrediting agencies are therefore of considerable assistance to the State departments of education. The chief difficulty in their use is that they do not provide much of the information needed by the State departments concerning the professional preparation of the applicants.

Nature and contents of standards.—Although most of the fully-developed sets of standards of national, regional, and State accrediting agencies follow a similar pattern, there are many differences in details. Inasmuch as these standards are reproduced in full in another publication of the Office of Education,⁸ they are not given extended treatment in this place.

The chief differences between the regional standards of a few years ago and the State standards consist of the relative height or rigidity of the minimum quantitative or objective standards set forth. In general, State standards are less difficult to meet than regional standards. The chief points of similarity are in the items concerning

⁸ Ratcliffe, Ella B., *Accredited higher institutions, 1938*. Washington, United States Government Printing Office, 1938. 218 p. (United States Department of the Interior, Office of Education. Bulletin 1938, No. 16.)

which standards are prescribed. The major items in the State standards for 4-year institutions, which are mentioned by three or more States each, include: Definition of a college or other institutions; admission or entrance requirements; graduation requirements; curricula; number of departments; preparatory departments or schools; faculty size; faculty training or qualifications; faculty salaries; faculty load, including number of classes taught per week; efficiency or quality of instruction; size of classes; number of students, including enrollment and registration; material equipment, including lands, buildings, classrooms, libraries, laboratories, shops and equipment; financial resources and support, including endowment and income; inspection; number of degrees, including honorary degrees; student teaching; and departments of education. A number of additional items are infrequently mentioned.

The items mentioned most frequently among the foregoing include those pertaining to faculty qualifications and size, curriculum content, admission and graduation requirements, and material equipment and facilities. There is a distinct tendency to stress items concerning which quantitative or objective data can be secured.

Although the older standards of the regional accrediting associations are similar in many respects to the State standards, the newer standards of the North Central and of the Middle States Associations of Colleges and Secondary Schools contain some very significant innovations. For example, the North Central Association includes a statement of policy defining a number of general principles to be followed in accreditation, supplemented by a manual and other materials which contain elaborations of the statements of policy, and detailed directions for the execution of the policies set forth. Much study and research was necessary in deciding upon a new approach to accreditation and in the preparation of the new instruments. A comprehensive study of an institution is necessary before it is accredited. While the use of the North Central materials and procedures to any large extent by typical State accrediting agencies would appear to demand much more extensive staffs and facilities than such agencies possess, careful study of the new developments in regional accrediting, and some use of the techniques developed in it, would appear to be highly worth while for many of the State agencies.

Constant study of changing emphases in teacher education is necessary if standards are to be kept up to date. As illustrations, there is growing emphasis upon selective admission to the institutions, and to schools of education in universities; and upon the requirement of student teaching for all prospective teachers. Accreditation standards with respect to the admission of students to teacher-education institutions usually include little more than the requirement of graduation from an approved 4-year high school. Lack of satisfactory selective

measures and a belief in some places that every high-school graduate regardless of his natural fitness should have a chance to prepare for teaching at State expense if he so desires, appear to hinder somewhat the extension of selective admission programs. Nevertheless, considerable progress has been made in a number of States such as Connecticut, New Jersey, Massachusetts, and New York, in developing programs of selective admission. Further progress may be expected in this direction as time goes on. It would appear to be in order in the establishment or revision of standards in every State to give serious consideration to the possibility of inserting a definite standard designed to regulate the inflow of students into curricula offered exclusively for prospective teachers.

Student-teaching and training-school facilities are given very brief mention in typical standards, and their mention is omitted altogether in a few. In contrast, the standards of the American Association of Teachers Colleges with respect to student teaching and the training school are presented in detail. Student teaching or observation is required for one or more types of teachers' certificates in all of the 30 States. Student teaching facilities are almost universally recognized as one of the important assets of any teacher-education institution. Hence, the inclusion of definite and fairly detailed standards with respect to training school or student teaching facilities would appear to be essential in any complete set of standards formulated specifically for teacher-education institutions,

The provision of laboratory and practice school buildings and staffs is relatively expensive, and many small colleges of arts and sciences and junior colleges with limited financial resources constitute a serious problem in determining and enforcing minimum standards in respect to student teaching. In contrast, the universities and teachers colleges for the most part have provided reasonably satisfactory facilities for demonstration, experimentation, and student teaching, and the adequacy of their provisions constitutes no unusual problem in accreditation.

Among other weaknesses in laboratory school work against which those who develop standards should be on guard, is the utilization of poorly qualified and overworked supervisors, unsatisfactory supervision of student teachers in off-campus training schools, and lack of pupils for practice purposes. The standards of the American Association of Teachers Colleges are suggestive to State officers interested in upbuilding standards for student teaching.

Fields or types of work for which institutions are accredited.—Somewhat more than half of the 30 States indicate on their accredited lists of institutions, or in some less formal way, two or more of the general fields of instruction, curricula, or courses of study that are approved for teacher education. Some of these States, however,

differentiate their lists of institutions no more than to indicate those that are approved for the education of elementary school teachers or of secondary school teachers. The general fields of instruction and curricula that are differentiated follow, in descending order of frequency: Elementary teacher education, secondary teacher education, music, art, physical education and health, industrial arts, commerce, kindergarten education, trades and industries, school administration and supervision, school librarianship, and the education of exceptional children. A few other fields or curricula, including agriculture, junior high school education, and adult education are differentiated by one State each. The best illustrations of States that differentiate fields or curricula are afforded by New York, Pennsylvania, California, Illinois, Ohio, and Indiana. New York, for example, annually evaluates hundreds of curricula of different types that are submitted for approval by institutions within and without the State.

Less than a half-dozen States each specifically approve as many as 5 distinct types of curricula. Nearly half of the State agencies that approve institutions for teacher education, approve them on a more or less "blanket" institutional basis; that is, the institutions are merely classified in the approved lists as public or private institutions; as colleges, professional, or technical schools; and as junior colleges, or the like.

Methods of formulating and revising standards.—Approximately two-thirds of the State officers reporting on the question believed that their standards are not entirely satisfactory for the purpose for which they were set up. At least 4 of the 30 States were revising their standards in 1938. The improvements in standards that were suggested by the accrediting officers are numerous and varied. Among them are: Standards should be brought up to date; standards should be included on student teaching; standards are limited to statutory provisions and need expansion; standards are entirely lacking and should be formulated; attention should be given to desirable goals instead of to minimum standards; more attention should be given to the human product of the institutions; the regional standards used are too rigid and should be adapted to State needs; junior college standards should be raised; adverse political situations that affect the work and morale of the accrediting officers should be improved; teacher-education associations should function so as to help both State and regional associations; and more attention should be given to liberal-cultural requirements. In general, the suggestions made indicate that a continuing program of revision of standards is desirable in most States.

Of 14 State accrediting agencies reporting on detailed State standards for accreditation, 4 report that a complete revision of standards has been made at some time during the past 11 years. Of these 4

States, 2—Virginia and California—were thoroughly revising old standards, or constructing new ones in 1938. Of the remaining 10 States, 4 reported that they had partially revised their standards at some time during the past 7 years. A few additional States may have made some unimportant changes in their standards during the period that were not deemed worthy of report.

During depression years it was not possible, or at least not expedient, to raise standards in many States. In fact, it was very difficult for many institutions to maintain the standards that were already in force. Nevertheless, the fact that nearly half the States have never revised their standards and that most of them have made no great changes in them since accreditation began, contrasts unfavorably with the practices of most of the regional associations, which have completed or have in progress extensive and fundamental revisions of standards. Such revisions are given formal consideration each year by the American Association of Teachers Colleges, which conceives its standards to be moving, and not fixed goals.

In States where accreditation standards primarily for teacher-education institutions have been formulated, revisions of such standards are usually made under the general direction or with the final approval of the State board or department of education. Recommendations for revisions are made in such States by standing or special committees of the State board or department, by the director of teacher education and certification, or by both. In a few States having cooperative plans of accreditation in which the institutions participate, a college conference, council, or association may approve revisions to be made, with or without the assistance of committees. An illustration of the organization and activities of a standards committee in a cooperative accrediting organization may be found in North Carolina. In 1936, the North Carolina College Conference had, in addition to an executive committee, eight other committees, one of which was a Committee on College Standards. Of the eight members of this committee, two were representatives of the State department staff.

The committee had four different types of standards to consider: For higher institutions, for the operation of branch summer schools, for extension work, and for 2-year normal schools. Detailed recommendations were made for the revision in the annual meeting of the conference, of several standards relative to extension work, and to higher education. Reports had been received from all but four of the institutions, and deficiencies in the observance of standards had been duly noted. Inspection of the recommendations made by the Committee indicates an appreciation of local needs and of conditions under which the institutions operated which is ordinarily not displayed by out-of-State accrediting agencies.

The use of the standards and lists of the national and regional accrediting associations in varying degrees by the several State accrediting agencies constitutes the most significant point of relationship between the State and the national and regional accrediting agencies insofar as teacher education is concerned. However, only one national accrediting association, the American Association of Teachers Colleges, has standards for teacher-education institutions as such. None of the regional accrediting associations has separate and distinct standards exclusively for teacher-education institutions or curricula, inasmuch as the accreditation of institutions or curricula for professional purposes, including the professional education of teachers, is not the primary purpose of such associations.

Of the many sets of standards available, those of the regional accrediting associations, and of the American Association of Teachers Colleges were found most helpful by State accrediting organizations in their formulation of standards for teacher-education purposes. One or two States reported that they find the standards or criteria of each of the following agencies helpful: State university, Association of American Universities, American Association of Junior Colleges, National associations representing professional or technical groups, and accrediting agencies of other States. Not infrequently, the practice in constructing or revising standards is for the standards committee to collect the standards or criteria of various national or regional groups, to select various individual standards that appear suitable, and to adapt them to the State situations. There is good reason to believe that the results of educational research have not been as extensively utilized in the construction and revisions of standards as would appear possible and advisable.

Of special interest is the fact that relatively few States appear to find helpful the standards of the many national associations of professional and technical groups other than the American Association of Teachers Colleges. Many State accrediting officers are scarcely aware of the existence of the standards set up by some of the national groups that have recently undertaken to accredit institutions in specific fields or subjects. Opposition was expressed by some institutional officers to the activities of certain of these groups, on the grounds that there are too many national accrediting agencies; that the total costs to the institutions for accreditation are too great; that duplication of accrediting activities exists; and that the freedom of the institutions to develop along self-determined lines is threatened.

National leaders and authorities in specialized fields have not infrequently contributed to the formulation of standards used by their associations, and a number of the groups appear to have the same objectives held by State teacher-education authorities; namely, the upbuilding of institutional offerings and instructional facilities and prac-

tices in the several fields in which prospective teachers will render service. The recency of the establishment of standards by such special groups and the absence in many States of accreditation or approval of specific curricula in which the national groups are interested, account only in part for the lack of cooperative endeavor. The fact that the cooperation of the State accreditation agencies and of the institutions often has not been sought in the construction and administration of the national association standards, and that as a consequence such standards are often not well adapted to State needs, may be an additional reason for this situation.

The efforts made in recent years by the North Central and other regional accrediting associations to establish criteria for institutions with differing objectives and of varying degrees of excellence, rather than rigid minimum standards of chief import to weak institutions only, were found to be of considerable interest to State accreditation officers. State accrediting officers in general agree that minimum standards that bring about regimentation and mere uniformity in curricula and courses, or that interfere with the freedom of growth of established institutions, are undesirable. Dangers undoubtedly exist in these respects. One set of minimum standards is too often assumed to be adequate to cover the offerings, facilities, and practices of large and of small institutions, of professional, technical, and academic institutions, of facilities of urban and State colleges and universities, and of other types of institutions. Furthermore, there is considerable truth in the frequent charges that minimum standards are arbitrary, inflexible, and quantitative rather than qualitative.

However, in those stages of evolution of institutional accreditation in which the needs of many weak institutions must be considered, definite written standards appear to provide a practical and useful device for such appraisal of institutions as is needed. Lacking definite criteria, accreditation officers must rely upon their own personal opinions rather than upon the reasoned judgments that are usually expressed in standards. Without written standards, accreditation officers have few common grounds of understanding with institutional officers. The cooperation of such officers is not easily secured if they are subjected to a different set of personal opinions each time a new visitor comes to the institution. Institutional officers often find helpful some tangible goals toward which to direct their efforts toward institutional improvement. Furthermore, there is need of assurance that there will be reasonable consistency in the evaluation of institutions included in a given plan of accreditation. In general, the constant improvement of standards and of other commonly accepted criteria for the appraisal of institutions of each distinctive type is a much more promising procedure than to attempt to proceed without

objective and commonly understood guides toward improvement, imperfect though they may be.

Lists of Accredited Institutions

Number and classification of accredited institutions.—There is nowhere available an entirely complete list of all post-secondary institutions in the United States as a whole, nor is there a similar list of teacher-education institutions that are approved and accredited by all recognized agencies. The Annual Directory of the Office of Education contains the most complete single list of higher education institutions, but it does not indicate State accreditation and does not list certain post-secondary institutions offering less than 2 years' work, or enrolling very few students. Some States have no published lists of approved or accredited institutions; and the lists that are available are sometimes old, and occasionally include institutions that have been closed. Classifications of institutions by accrediting agencies differ among States, especially in respect to junior colleges and technological institutions. Lists prepared by denominational organizations sometimes contain the names of institutions of post secondary standing not found in State lists.

It was with some difficulty, therefore, that the list compiled in table 6 was prepared. The figures given were secured during 1938 from the sources indicated in the table. For the sake of uniformity, the classification of institutions used follows that of the Office of Education Directory, which is based upon reports made by the institutions. Changes in basic lists are frequent, and although every effort was made to secure accurate data, a few inaccuracies may exist in the classification or number of institutions, for which the State departments are not responsible.

COLLEGIATE ACCREDITATION WITHIN STATES

TABLE 6.—Total number of higher-education institutions in 30 States, and number approved or accredited by State agencies for teacher-education or certification purposes, classified by types of institutions, 1938¹

| State | NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS, CLASSIFIED BY TYPE | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|--|-----------------------|---|----------|--|----------|------------------|----------|--|----------|--|----------|----------------------|----------|---------------------------------|----------|---------------------------------|----------|---|----------|---|----------|-------------------------------------|----------|---|----------|
| | All types | | State teachers college or normal school | | City teachers college or normal school | | State university | | State land-grant college if separate from university | | State 4-year college other than teachers college | | State junior college | | City or district junior college | | Municipal university or college | | Privately controlled college or normal school | | Privately controlled 4-year college or university | | Privately controlled junior college | | Independent professional or technical schools | |
| | Approved and not approved ¹ | Approved ¹ | Total | Approved | Total | Approved | Total | Approved | Total | Approved | Total | Approved | Total | Approved | Total | Approved | Total | Approved | Total | Approved | Total | Approved | Total | Approved | Total | Approved |
| 1 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 | 26 | 27 |
| California | 119 | 25 | 7 | 7 | | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Colorado | 19 | 15 | 3 | 3 | | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Connecticut | 30 | 12 | 4 | 4 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Idaho | 8 | 7 | 2 | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Illinois | 105 | 76 | 5 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Indiana | 43 | 31 | 2 | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Iowa | 70 | 46 | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Kansas | 44 | 21 | 2 | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Kentucky | 38 | 31 | 4 | 4 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Louisiana | 24 | 23 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Massachusetts ² | 70 | 46 | 10 | 10 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Michigan ⁴ | 41 | 22 | 4 | 4 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Minnesota | 37 | 23 | 6 | 6 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Montana | 11 | 8 | 2 | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nebraska | 25 | 19 | 4 | 4 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| New Jersey | 36 | 15 | 6 | 6 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| New York ⁴ | 115 | 89 | 11 | 11 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| North Carolina | 57 | 54 | 7 | 7 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| North Dakota | 12 | 8 | 5 | 5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Ohio | 68 | 47 | 5 | 5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------|-------|-----|-----|-----|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|-----|----|----|----|----|----|-----|----|-----|----|
| Okahoma..... | 46 | 17 | 6 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 7 | 19 | 1 | 6 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 2 | 1 | | | |
| Pennsylvania..... | 100 | 71 | 14 | 14 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 51 | 9 | 25 | 4 | 4 | 6 | | | |
| Rhode Island..... | 8 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 2 | | | |
| Texas..... | 91 | 86 | 8 | 8 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 20 | 2 | 24 | 20 | 19 | 10 | 6 | 6 | | | |
| Utah..... | 10 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Virginia..... | 43 | 27 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 15 | 14 | 13 | 3 | 5 | 5 | | | |
| Washington..... | 25 | 14 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 8 | 7 | 11 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | |
| West Virginia..... | 21 | 18 | 6 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 2 | | | |
| Wisconsin..... | 43 | 24 | 10 | 10 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 14 | 13 | 9 | 6 | 6 | 6 | | | |
| Wyoming..... | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | |
| Total..... | 1,360 | 857 | 139 | 139 | 7 | 6 | 29 | 29 | 25 | 25 | 7 | 152 | 44 | 13 | 12 | 43 | 32 | 219 | 84 | 233 | 46 |

¹ Total is a composite secured from Office of Education, Educational Directory, 1939; from latest official State lists and directories; and from Report to the American Association of Collegiate Registrars, 1938.

² Based upon latest official State lists available, and upon reports secured by correspondence and visitation of State departments of education.

³ Massachusetts issues State certificates to a limited number of educational workers only. The list of approved institutions is not quite complete, as it includes only colleges

which are given the degree-granting privilege by Legislature, and certain other institutions, including teachers colleges and normal schools, whose graduates are often employed in public schools.

⁴ Does not include county normal schools.

⁵ New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and other States approve specific curricula. The figures given for such States represent the approximate number of institutions in which one or more curricula are approved for certification purposes.

Of a total of 1,360 institutions in the 30 States listed in table 6, 857, or 63 percent, are approved or accredited for teacher education or certification purposes by State boards or departments of education. All State teachers colleges and normal schools, State universities and landgrant colleges, and State 4-year colleges in the 30 States are accredited or approved for teacher-education or certification purposes. Nearly all the municipal 4-year teachers colleges, normal schools, and colleges and universities, are similarly approved. Nine-tenths of the privately controlled 4-year colleges are accredited or approved, and about two-thirds of the privately controlled teachers colleges and normal schools. Most of the privately controlled institutions are denominationally controlled, and some of these prepare teachers primarily for parochial schools.

About one-third of all publicly and privately controlled junior colleges are approved or accredited for teacher-certification or teacher-education purposes. The proportions of approved privately controlled and approved publicly controlled junior colleges do not differ greatly. In about half the States, minimum certification requirements include 2 years or more of college work. Only a negligible number of junior colleges are approved in States that require 3 or 4 years of college preparation as a minimum for teacher certification. Inasmuch as the tendency in certification is steadily in the direction of prescribing higher minimum scholastic requirements for teachers, the number of junior colleges approved for teacher-education and certification purposes may be expected to decrease proportionately in the future. One-fifth of the independent professional and technical schools are approved for teacher-education and certification purposes.

The total number of approved institutions in the 18 remaining States and the District of Columbia is estimated, upon the basis of such lists as are available, to be 339. If State approval of higher education institutions for teacher-education and certification purposes is accepted as a criterion of a teacher-education institution, the best estimate available to date of the total number of teacher-education institutions of collegiate grade in the 48 States and the District of Columbia in round numbers is 1,200. To these may be added more than 500 teacher-training high schools and county normal schools. According to rough estimates made in the National Survey of the Education of Teachers, of the total elementary and secondary school teachers prepared in 1930-31, universities, colleges, and junior colleges in 1930-31 prepared 40 percent; teachers colleges, 50 percent; and county normal schools, teacher-training high schools, and similar institutions, 10 percent. The number of beginning public-school teachers employed annually averages less than 80 from each approved institution of collegiate grade. Even after allowance is made for the much larger number of teachers who continue their college education while in

service, it appears that State approval of teacher-education institutions is far from selective in the country as a whole.

Accreditation officers report that, with few exceptions, no distinctions are made in the accreditation of publicly controlled and of privately controlled institutions. Certain conditions exist, however, that deserve explanation. In many States, State-controlled institutions are almost automatically approved. Privately controlled institutions, on the other hand, must make a request for accreditation before action is taken, and some do not care to make such requests. If a State accrediting agency automatically accredits State institutions, but follows regional accrediting association action in the accreditation of privately controlled institutions, the higher standards of the regional agency may result in the State accreditation of a smaller percentage of privately controlled than of publicly controlled institutions. Furthermore, many of the privately controlled institutions not accredited for teacher education and certification are denominationally controlled institutions which prepare teachers primarily for parochial school service. More than two-thirds of the 30 States do not require teachers in parochial elementary or secondary schools to hold teachers' certificates. As a consequence, accrediting officers in these States are particularly concerned with the accreditation of denominational institutions that prepare parochial school teachers, only when the graduates of such institutions apply for State certificates for public-school service.

The problem of State approval of junior colleges and other non-degree-granting institutions for teacher-education and certification purposes remains a difficult one. Of a total of 392 junior colleges found in the 30 States, 135, or slightly more than one-third, are approved by the State for teacher-certification purposes (table 6). Ried and Rosenlof, in a study made in 1937 of 451 junior colleges in 45 States, found that 223, or about half, offered courses in professional education. However, only about half of the 223 that had courses in professional education, also offered student teaching, and only a few stated their primary purpose to be teacher education. Nevertheless, most of the 223 junior colleges contribute directly to the supply of teachers.⁹

Despite the steady advancement of minimum requirements for elementary school teachers to the 4-year level, the approval of junior colleges and non-degree-granting special and technical schools continues to be of concern to teacher-education officers in high-standard States, because graduates and students of these institutions will doubtless continue indefinitely to constitute a source of supply of entrants in approved 4-year teacher-education institutions. Furthermore, as in the case of the high schools and of degree-granting institu-

⁹ Ried, Harold O. and Rosenlof, George W. Teacher-training in junior colleges. *Junior college journal*, 8: 347-51, April 1938.

tions, the State has a direct responsibility for safeguarding the general educational interests of the students who attend them.

Determination of the standing of out-of-State institutions.—

The sources of information used by State teacher-education and certification officers in determining the standing of out-of-State institutions from which credentials are submitted for evaluation are numerous and varied. No single list or source of information is depended upon entirely in any State. Lists of the following agencies were mentioned by 12 States as regular or occasional sources of information: American Association of Teachers Colleges, regional accrediting associations, and State departments of education in other States, including cooperating accrediting agencies of those States. The annual directory of the Federal Office of Education, and its bulletin on accredited higher institutions, which shows the accreditation status of institutions accorded by various recognized accrediting associations, were singly or together mentioned by 8 States as sources of information. The Office, of course, is not itself an accrediting agency. The following were mentioned less than 6 times each: Association of American Universities, State university in another State, American Association of Junior Colleges, reports of State department visitors to out-of-State institutions, books by Hurt, Marsh, and McCracken, and directories of Catholic colleges and schools. Not all the foregoing are accrediting agencies, of course, hence the lists or materials taken from some of these sources merely provide general information upon which the State departments may judge the standing of a given institution. Much correspondence with out-of-State officers is necessary in order to reach conclusions concerning the standing of institutions that are not included in accredited lists. Not infrequently, such information is given on a confidential basis only.

An indication of the extent to which State officers may determine the general standing of State and municipal teachers colleges and normal schools from accredited lists of national and regional accrediting associations is given in table 7. The American Association of Teachers Colleges is the only national accrediting association that accredits exclusively for teacher education. Of the 30 States, all but 1 of those having teachers colleges are represented on the list of this association.

The regional associations accredit primarily for collegiate purposes, although the Northwest Association of Secondary and Higher Schools and the Middle States Association of Colleges and Professional Schools have separate lists containing a few teachers colleges and normal schools that are accredited for the most part on the basis of general collegiate standards.

Because of the professional nature of their work, numerous teachers colleges and normal schools do not apply for accreditation by regional associations. In New England, no regional agency accredits teachers

colleges or normal schools. Some institutions with good general standing also have never applied for accreditation by the American Association of Teachers Colleges. Hence, lack of accreditation of a given institution by regional and national associations does not necessarily imply lack of satisfactory standing.

TABLE 7.—Number of publicly controlled teachers colleges and normal schools accredited by regional accrediting associations, and by the American Association of Teachers Colleges, classified by States, 1938-39¹

[NOTE.—Italicized States are included in present study]

| State ² | Number of institutions | | |
|---------------------------|--|--|--|
| | Total accredited and non-accredited ³ | Accredited ⁴ | |
| | | Regional accrediting associations ⁵ | American Association of Teachers Colleges ⁶ |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Alabama..... | 6 | 4 | 4 |
| Arizona..... | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Arkansas..... | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| California..... | 7 | 2 | 4 |
| Colorado..... | 3 | 2 | 2 |
| Connecticut..... | 5 | | 2 |
| District of Columbia..... | 2 | | 2 |
| Georgia..... | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Idaho..... | 2 | 2 | |
| Illinois..... | 7 | 5 | 6 |
| Indiana..... | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Iowa..... | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Kansas..... | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Kentucky..... | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| Louisiana..... | 3 | 1 | 1 |

¹ Middle States Association of Colleges and Professional Schools. Accredited lists of Institutions, November 1937. Revised to June 1938. 2 p. (George W. McClelland, Sec'y, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.)

North Central Association Quarterly. List of accredited institutions of higher education. Accredited institutions of higher education. Accredited institutions outside of NCA territory. North Central Association Quarterly, 13:77-95, July 1938.

Northwest Association of Secondary and Higher Schools. List of accredited schools, 1937-38. Revised to April 1938. 8 p. (Paul S. Filer, Sec'y, Spokane, Wash.)

American Association of Teachers Colleges. List of accredited institutions, 1938-39. In Seventeenth yearbook, 1938. p. 157-162. (Charles W. Hunt, sec'y-treas., State Normal School, Oneonta, N. Y.)

² Office of education. Educational Directory, 1939. Part III; and State lists.

³ North Central: Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, New Mexico, West Virginia, and Wisconsin.

Southern: Alabama, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia.

Middle States: New Jersey.

Northwest: California, Idaho, Montana, Oregon, and Washington.

⁴ State-controlled unless otherwise indicated in footnotes. No privately controlled independent teachers colleges or normal schools are accredited except as follows: By regional associations, Oregon 2, Tennessee 1, and Washington 1. (See also footnote 5.)

⁵ Fourteen additional university schools or colleges of education and State colleges not here included are also accredited by the American Association of Teachers Colleges as follows: Georgia, 1 State college; Indiana 1 privately controlled college of education; Kansas, 1 State college and 1 municipal college of education; Louisiana, 1 college of education in a State college; Michigan, 1 college of education in municipal university; New York, 1 municipal college of education; Ohio, 1 school of education in a State university, 2 State universities, 1 school of education in a privately controlled university, 1 privately controlled college; Utah, 1 school of education in State university; West Virginia, 1 school of education in State university.

⁶ One is municipally controlled.

⁷ Two are municipally controlled.

⁸ Three are municipally controlled.

TABLE 7.—Number of publicly controlled teachers colleges and normal schools accredited by regional accrediting associations, and by the American Association of Teachers Colleges, classified by States, 1938-39—Continued

[NOTE.—Italicized States are included in present study]

| State | Number of Institutions | | |
|----------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---|
| | Total accredited and non-accredited | Accredited | |
| | | Regional accrediting associations | American Association of Teachers Colleges |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Maine..... | 6 | | |
| Maryland..... | 5 | | 1 |
| <i>Massachusetts</i> | 12 | | |
| Michigan..... | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| Minnesota..... | 6 | | 6 |
| Mississippi..... | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Missouri..... | 8 | 7 | 8 |
| Montana..... | 2 | 3 | 1 |
| <i>Nebraska</i> | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| New Hampshire..... | 2 | | 2 |
| <i>New Jersey</i> | 6 | 2 | 5 |
| New Mexico..... | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| <i>New York</i> | 12 | | 8 |
| North Carolina..... | 7 | 1 | 3 |
| <i>North Dakota</i> | 5 | | 5 |
| Ohio..... | | | |
| Oklahoma..... | 6 | | 6 |
| Oregon..... | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| Pennsylvania..... | 14 | | 13 |
| Rhode Island..... | 1 | | 1 |
| South Carolina..... | | | |
| South Dakota..... | 4 | | 3 |
| Tennessee..... | 5 | 3 | 4 |
| Texas..... | 8 | 7 | 7 |
| Vermont..... | 3 | | |
| Virginia..... | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| Washington..... | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| West Virginia..... | 6 | 1 | 5 |
| Wisconsin..... | 10 | 7 | 9 |
| United States..... | 199 | 82 | 144 |
| 30 States..... | 148 | 57 | 108 |

See footnotes on preceding page.

Although regional and national accredited lists are made generally available, most of the State accrediting agencies do not regularly distribute their approved lists of teacher-education institutions to other States. They can be secured only by correspondence in some cases. Furthermore, many regional, national, and State lists show only the general collegiate accreditation status of institutions. Most of them do not give essential information concerning institutional curricula, and courses in professional subjects. A college may be on an accredited list of institutions, but that fact alone does not indicate whether or not its graduates have been prepared to teach in the elementary schools, or in some special field such as agriculture.

The need for better sources of information concerning the standing and work of out-of-State institutions was mentioned by a number of the officers visited. The comments "Do not tell enough" and "Need something better" were frequently made by such officers in reference to the sources of information available. That the national and re-

gional association lists contain too few institutions and the State lists too many institutions was the belief of some of these officers. The provision of better means for evaluating out-of-State teacher-education institutions would materially advance the effectiveness of the work of State accreditation and certification agencies, and of admission officers of teacher-education institutions.

Extent of changes in State accredited lists.—In most States, complete records are not kept over extended periods of the number of institutions that are considered for, but denied accreditation. Sponsors for the accreditation of institutions usually do not bring their applications to the point of formal consideration when they find in preliminary informal conferences with accreditation officers that the institutions are not likely to qualify. Usable records are not often kept of such informal tentative applications.

Data partially based upon estimates were secured from 7 States concerning the number of institutions that were formally considered for accreditation since January 1, 1933. Of the total of 23 institutions of all types considered, all were accredited except 3. These were being considered for accreditation when the reports were secured. In the remaining States, either no institutions were considered for accreditation, or data were not available concerning applications.

Five of the 12 States from which usable information was secured reported a total of 11 institutions that were dropped from the accredited lists during the period. An additional State reported that "several" were dropped. Incomplete reports render these figures indicative only, but there is good reason to believe that the total number dropped is relatively small in any case. Institutions are rarely suspended from accredited lists, but not infrequently they are warned to improve in respect to the observance of standards in which they are deficient. Usually they appear able to do so.

The increase in the number of entirely new 4-year colleges is relatively small in recent years. Inspection of the Office of Education directories for the years 1934-38, inclusive, shows that an average of 7 new 4-year colleges per year were listed during the period. The number of entirely new institutions that were actually established was probably somewhat smaller. However, some of the most important problems of accreditation pertain to institutions other than 4-year colleges. Among such problems are the provision and enforcement of satisfactory requirements for the establishment of new junior colleges and of technical and other special-type schools of collegiate or semi-collegiate grade, and the authorization of the degree-granting privilege for normal schools and junior colleges that wish to attain a 4-year college status.

Another problem that has arisen in a number of States is the establishment of approved lists of State teachers colleges that offer work

leading to the master's degree. The number of teachers colleges that confer this degree is increasing rapidly, and the construction or revision of appropriate accreditation standards is now being seriously undertaken by the American Association of Teachers Colleges. Other national agencies are also interested in the construction of criteria for the evaluation of graduate work for teachers, and it is to be expected that many of the States will soon be involved in a similar undertaking.

Two characteristics of existing lists of accredited teacher-education institutions that should be given first attention in the construction of improved lists include, first, their lack of selectivity, shown by the very high percentage of 4-year institutions, and the relatively high percentage of nondegree-granting institutions that are accredited; and, second, the failure of the lists to indicate the major fields of instruction for which the institutions are accredited. If accredited lists include almost every institution in the State, and if the institutions are not distinguished in the lists in respect to the types of offerings for which they are approved, the lists have very limited usefulness.

The inclusion of almost every institution in the accredited lists of some States, although an obvious weakness in some respects, nevertheless suggests that the States have better opportunities in their accreditation plans to assist the weak institutions than is afforded to the regional and national associations, with their more restricted lists. The State agencies undoubtedly have, and will continue to have, a more difficult problem than the regional associations in working with such institutions. There are doubtless too many weak institutions in existence, but inasmuch as the States have chosen to authorize their establishment they should be kept within the purview of State accreditation, and the quality and extent of their work should be safeguarded as much as possible through it.

The classification of institutions on a basis of approved offerings in special fields or curricula is a useful and entirely practicable procedure, as demonstrated by a number of State accreditation agencies. This procedure is closely allied to accreditation in the light of institutional objectives, which is increasingly practiced by regional accrediting associations. By accrediting the weaker institutions only for strictly limited fields of work in teacher education, it may be possible to afford at least some assistance in their constructive development, and at the same time safeguard to an appreciable extent the inflow of competent teachers into the public schools of the State.

Summary of Findings

The major findings of this chapter are as follows:

1. In accordance with its responsibility for assuring an adequate supply of properly qualified public-school teachers, each State has the

responsibility for the provision and constructive development of such teacher-education institutions as it may require. A number of activities are involved in the discharge of this responsibility, including the establishment, chartering, and licensing of institutions that prepare teachers; their organization, administration, and supervision; and their approval or accreditation. These functions are closely related, and the effectiveness of performance of each vitally affects the performance of the others. Nevertheless, there are wide differences among States in the extent and quality of their performance; and in few if any States are all of the major State activities involved in teacher education integrated in a State program of maximum effectiveness.

2. Accreditation by State agencies of institutions that educate teachers is of comparatively recent development. In many States, it consists only of the informal approval of institutions for teacher-certification purposes. In others, fairly well-developed accreditation systems have been established in which official recognition of institutions by a definitely organized State accreditation agency is accorded through the use of approved standards and accredited lists of institutions.

3. The chief purposes of accreditation of teacher-education institutions are to assist the State departments of education in evaluating institutional credentials offered for teacher-certification purposes; to provide a list of institutions approved for the education of teachers; and to assist institutions in evaluating college credits offered by students for transfer or admission. Compared with the expressed purposes of certain regional accrediting associations, the stated purposes of State accrediting agencies are quite limited in scope. A number of potential outcomes of accreditation have not yet been realized.

4. The laws of nearly all the States either through broad grants of power or through detailed statutory provisions accord to specified State agencies the responsibility for the approval or accreditation of institutions for the education of teachers. In some States, however, the statutes authorize the function in such general terms that it may or may not be assumed as a duty by such agencies. On the other hand, a few States embody detailed accreditation standards and provisions for accreditation in the statutes, a situation which renders the changes of such standards and provisions difficult.

5. The State agency that has been legally accorded or has assumed responsibility for accrediting teacher-education institutions is most commonly the State board or department of education. In some States, however, the function is exercised by a cooperative agency which also accredits institutions for general collegiate purposes. Most State boards or departments of education in the evaluation of teacher-education institutions rely to an appreciable extent upon a number of

auxiliary sources of information, such as regional accreditation standards and lists of institutions, and college transcripts of credits offered by applicants for certification.

6. The officer of the State department of education who is immediately responsible under the State board of education or superintendent of public instruction for the administration of accreditation is usually the State director of teacher education and certification, or similar officer. The responsibility for accrediting teacher-education institutions is sometimes accorded cooperative accrediting agencies in which the institutions of the State and the State department are represented. No two States have exactly the same pattern of accreditation, however, and in many of them there is considerable confusion in the placement of responsibility and authority.

7. The State superintendent of public instruction usually nominates or selects the State department officers who are directly responsible for accrediting teacher-education institutions. Officers of State cooperative accrediting organizations other than State department officers are nearly always staff members of educational institutions. Accreditation officers for the most part are therefore subject to direct electoral or institutional influences and pressures that may or may not contribute to the constructive development of an integrated and effective State program of teacher education for the State as a whole. Nevertheless, such officers have an excellent opportunity to exercise public and institutional leadership. The effective functioning of the State accreditation agencies therefore depends to a very important extent upon the amount and quality of leadership provided.

8. In varying degrees among the several States, the effectiveness of accrediting is conditioned by undue limitations in numbers of staff members available for accrediting purposes, limited tenure provisions for the staff, lack of funds, and lack of assignment of authority to staff members commensurate with their responsibilities. Although marked advances have been made during the present century in the development of State department staffs, there are still great variations among States in respect to financial support, size, effectiveness of organization, and extent and quality of services.

9. Lack of provisions in State accrediting plans specifically for institutions specializing wholly or partially in technical, special, or professional work, including teacher-education institutions, is in part responsible for the existence of incomplete or of dual accrediting systems in a number of States.

10. The costs to the institutions for State accrediting, as compared to the costs to them of regional or national accrediting, are relatively small. State department funds are used to cover major expenses in nearly all cases where the department does the accrediting.

11. The effectiveness of accreditation and of a wide range of additional activities involved in administering a State teacher-education program is conditioned to a considerable extent by the nature and scope of the general State overhead administrative control and supervision of institutions. Teacher-education institutions are controlled in the several States by a wide variety of governing boards, ranging in number from a single State board in control of all State higher education institutions and also of the public schools, to a very large number of independent boards, each of which is in control of a single institution. Slightly less than one-fifth of all higher education institutions are under State control, and slightly less than one-eighth are under city or district control. The remainder are under private or denominational control. In a number of States there is little coordination of the offerings and activities of the several institutions through State control, supervision, or accreditation.

12. Coordination of certification requirements and of institutional offerings for teachers is essential in a State program of teacher education. Coordination may be more easily and directly attained if accreditation is administered by a single State accrediting agency, rather than by dual or multiple accrediting agencies. It may also be more effectively attained if certification is administered by a single State agency. However, certification activities are not centralized in one State agency in all States, and even when they are centralized, they are often not functionally related to the work of State accreditation officers. Furthermore, in many States applicants are certified from teacher-training high and county normal schools, and upon the basis of examinations, with no prerequisite college preparation in approved institutions. Certain teacher-education institutions, as well as city and county educational officers, can certificate teachers in some States. Furthermore, "blanket" certification exists in which the teacher's preparation in important major fields is not assured; likewise "blanket" accreditation exists in which the institution as a whole is accredited, regardless of the extent and quality of work it offers in different teaching fields. These difficulties account in large part for the employment of thousands of teachers who have had little if any preparation in subjects that they are teaching. However, marked trends exist in the centralization of certification in the hands of the State board or department of education, in raising requirements so that approved college preparation is required of all teachers, and in the abolition of "blanket" certificates.

13. Slightly more than half the States reporting accredit institutions for an indefinite period; most of the remainder accredit for periods ranging from 1 to 3 years in length. In effect, certain institutions have a permanent accredited status. Slightly more than half the agencies accredit on a probational basis.

14. Representatives of practically all State accrediting agencies visit institutions prior to and after accreditation. The visitors most commonly are State directors of teacher education and certification, State department specialists in various instructional fields, and institutional staff members located within the State. Practically all visitors have regular State department or institutional duties in addition to visitation and other accrediting activities. In typical States, visitations are made irregularly, and are not usually more than one day in length; hence the visits usually are not frequent or prolonged enough to permit intensive study of the institutions. Undue limitations exist in the number of visitors, especially those who are specialists in the several instructional fields, and in the amount of time they can devote to visitation. Difficult problems are found not only in the accreditation of small, newly established institutions, but also in the improvement of institutions that are already accredited.

15. In less than half the States studied, institutions submit regular reports in respect to their observance of standards of accreditation. Special surveys, studies, and reports are infrequently made. Difficulty in securing reports is sometimes encountered. In many States, periodic statistical reports from all institutions are not required. Report forms showing observance of standards are often quite brief. Less than half of them include items relative to student teaching.

16. Study of institutional offerings and practices by accrediting agencies in cooperation with local institutional committees is one among other promising means infrequently used by accrediting agencies for securing information about institutional adherence to standards.

17. Use of institutional or State department research bureaus in appraisals of institutions for accreditation purposes is relatively infrequent.

18. Institutional admission officers find it necessary to make numerous special provisions for the admission of students by transfer from both accredited and non-accredited institutions. Such provisions include probational admission, admission by examination, admission with partial credit for prior work, and the like.

19. Few institutions are dropped or suspended from State accredited lists.

20. Changes in institutional curricula as a result of accrediting activities are relatively limited in number.

21. Less than half the State agencies that accredit for teacher-education purposes have published standards. The standards of the American Association of Teachers Colleges and of the regional accrediting associations appear to be of considerable assistance, and the standards of national subject-matter groups of little assistance in the formulation of State standards.

22. The items most frequently mentioned in the State standards pertain to the faculty, curricula, and material equipment of the institutions. Institutional appraisal through use of the standards for the most part demands the collection of objective data.

23. Sufficient recognition of specific curricula, practices, and facilities such as the training school that are characteristics of teacher-education institutions is often lacking in the standards used.

24. Needed improvements in the construction and content of standards suggested by State accrediting officers are numerous and varied. They include, among others: More frequent revision of standards, extension of cooperative activities in formulating standards, and provision of standards by which to appraise specific teacher-education offerings and facilities.

25. A number of State agencies attempt to appraise institutions informally without the use of written standards. Although weaknesses in the application of a set of minimum standards to institutions of widely varying types are commonly acknowledged, more serious weaknesses exist in an accreditation plan that does not include definite criteria that are commonly understood and agreed to by the institutions subject to accreditation.

26. Available State lists of institutions accredited for teacher education are subject to such serious weaknesses that their value is questioned and their use unduly limited. No reliable and up-to-date list is available for the country as a whole. Some States have no lists. Few States regularly distribute such lists as they may have, to other States. There is little uniformity among lists in the classification of institutions, and satisfactory information is infrequently given in them concerning the curricula of the institutions that are approved.

27. Of a total of 1,360 institutions of higher education in the 30 States, 857, or 63 percent, are accredited or approved for teacher education. Practically all publicly controlled 4-year institutions, approximately nine-tenths of the privately controlled 4-year colleges, and about one-third of the publicly and of the privately controlled junior colleges are accredited or approved. The number of institutions so approved in the entire country is approximately 1,200. More than 500 teacher-training high and county normal schools in 8 States, although not included in college accredited lists, also prepare teachers. State approval of teacher-education institutions is therefore far from selective.

28. Typical State lists of accredited teachers colleges and normal schools considered as a group, and of 4-year colleges and universities that prepare teachers, are not changed greatly from year to year. Junior colleges approved specifically for teacher education are decreas-

ing in number as minimum certification requirements are raised to 3 or 4 years of college work.

29. No single list or source of information is depended upon in any State in the evaluation of out-of-State institutions. Several sources of information, none of which is entirely complete or satisfactory, are variously used. Consequently, appraisals of out-of-State institutions are unduly difficult, and are very likely to be inaccurate and inconsistent, to the disadvantage of the institutions, their graduates, and the public schools that employ out-of-State teachers.

Chapter VII. State Accreditation of General Collegiate Institutions

THE OBLIGATION of the State to accredit institutions conducting higher education in the general collegiate field is of paramount concern.

With few exceptions the services of all the institutions within each of the States are devoted wholly or partially to the general collegiate field. By far the larger majority of college students are enrolled in this field. A prerequisite of admission to many of the professional and technical fields is the completion of a stipulated amount of study in the general collegiate field. Furthermore, a large porportion of the instruction in the teacher-education field where public-school teachers are trained comprises general collegiate courses.¹

The primary purpose of State accreditation in the general collegiate as well as the other fields is the protection of the public. Through the appraisal of the resources, staff and facilities of each institution providing higher education in this field, it is determined whether the services given the students are of a satisfactory quality and worthy of being accredited. Thus, the interests of the students as well as the general public are safeguarded.

In the case of some States, certain agencies have a different purpose in performing such function. This purpose is to evaluate the academic credits of students transferring from one institution to another. Moreover, these agencies in some instances disavow that they are conducting State accreditation or that they are accrediting agencies. It is claimed by them that the function which they are performing consists of the "approval," "listing," "rating," or "recognition" of acceptable institutions for student-transfer purpose only.

The question, therefore, arose, when the facts were being examined, as to whether States having such agencies should be regarded as conducting State accreditation. These particular agencies were either State universities or State college associations, performing their accrediting function on a voluntary basis without authority of law. The procedures followed by them, however, were largely the same as the legally empowered agencies. It was their practice to conduct some sort of appraisal of resources, staff, and facilities of institutions through visitation with the object of preparing a list of accredited or approved institutions. In the end, therefore, these agencies were accomplishing the same results from the accreditation viewpoint as the

¹ In the liberal arts colleges it is estimated that 83 percent of the work in the teacher-education field consists of general collegiate courses. The estimate for teachers colleges is 75 to 80 percent.

legally constituted agencies. For this reason and in order to present a complete picture, they have been classified as conducting accreditation.

It is planned in this chapter to analyze the extent to which the State agencies accredit general collegiate institutions and to show the practices or procedures of the agencies in conducting such accreditation. The information will be presented under the following general topics: (1) States having accrediting agencies in the general collegiate field; (2) Internal organization set up by agencies for performing accreditation function; (3) Standards used by agencies in accrediting institutions; (4) Methods employed by agencies in appraising institutions; and (5) Issuance by agencies of accredited lists of institutions. An effort will be made to present the material in such a manner as to reflect as far as possible the effectiveness of the accreditation being conducted by the agencies.

States Having Accrediting Agencies in General Collegiate Field

The various types of organizations set up by the States to accredit both general collegiate and teacher-education institutions have been shown in Chapter V from the standpoint of higher educational problems confronting the States. The particular agencies designated to conduct State accreditation in each of the fields were also indicated together with whether they were empowered by law or performed the function voluntarily.

Since the present chapter deals with State accreditation in the general collegiate field only, it is necessary to show separately the States having such accrediting agencies. In some of them two accrediting agencies have been established rather than a single agency; one of which accredits institutions in the general collegiate field and the other public junior colleges. In table 8 are given the States together with the agencies conducting both types of State accreditation.

TABLE 8.—Agencies conducting State accreditation of general collegiate institutions and of public junior colleges in 20 States

[Agency indicated by "X"]

| State | Agency within State accrediting | | | | | |
|----------------|---------------------------------|------------------|---------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------|
| | General collegiate institutions | | | | Public junior colleges | |
| | State department of education | State university | State college association | Intercollegiate standing committee | State department of education | State university |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| California | | X | | | | |
| Connecticut | X | | | | | |
| Illinois | | X | | | | |
| Iowa | | | | X | X | |
| Kansas | | | X | | X | |
| Kentucky | | | X | X | | |
| Michigan | | | | X | | |
| Minnesota | | | X | | | |
| Nebraska | | | X | | | X |
| New Jersey | X | | | | | |
| New York | X | | | | | |
| North Carolina | | | | X | | |
| Ohio | | | | X | | |
| Oklahoma | | | | | X | |
| Pennsylvania | X | | | | | |
| Texas | | | | X | | |
| Virginia | X | | | | | |
| Washington | | | | | | X |
| West Virginia | X | | | | | |
| Wisconsin | | | X | | | |

¹ State department is authorized by law to accredit private as well as public junior colleges within the State.

² State university accredits privately controlled junior colleges within the State but several of them are semipublic in character, being conducted in public-school buildings and being governed by boards composed in part of public-school representatives.

Agencies accrediting general collegiate institutions.—According to table 8, 20 out of the 30 States comprising this study have agencies conducting State accreditation in the general collegiate field. This means that in the other 10 States institutions conduct this type of higher education without being subject to accreditation by any agency within the State. These States either rely upon outside agencies, such as regional and national accrediting associations, to perform this function for them or are without accrediting facilities in this field.

The State department of education accredits institutions in 6 States, the State university in 7 States, a State college association in 5 States, and an intercollegiate standing committee in 2 States.³ In 3 of the States where the State university conducts the accreditation and in 1 where an intercollegiate standing committee performs the function

³ The State department of education in New York and the State university in Illinois accredit institutions outside of the State in addition to those within the State.

the State department of education has been made responsible for accrediting public junior colleges. In an additional State, the State university accredits privately controlled junior colleges within the State, no agency having been established for accrediting institutions in the general collegiate field.

It will be observed from table 1 that two agencies, the State university and the State college association, conduct State accreditation in the general collegiate field in Kentucky. These agencies are also responsible for such accreditation in the teacher-education field. This situation is due to a State statute which authorizes both agencies to accredit institutions within the State. The statute also provides that the institutions within the State approved by the Southern Association of Secondary Schools and Colleges shall be recognized as standard accredited colleges. Kentucky, therefore, has three legally empowered accrediting agencies, two within and one outside the State.

Agencies accrediting public junior colleges.—The practice in 4 States of having the State department of education accredit public junior colleges while at the same time another agency accredits institutions in the general collegiate field is due to the fact that specific legal power has been vested in the department over public junior colleges. For example, the State department of education in California is legally responsible for the distribution of State funds for the support of public junior colleges and also has supervisory authority over them. As a result, the department serves as the official accrediting agency over such colleges. The State university is required to recognize the public junior colleges accredited by the department.

In the other 3 States—Iowa, Kansas, and Nebraska—the State department of education is empowered to exercise certain legal jurisdiction over public junior colleges including their accreditation. These powers, however, are limited compared with those of the department in California. For the purpose of avoiding duplication, the department in Iowa in its accreditation of public junior colleges works in close cooperation with the intercollegiate standing committee responsible for accrediting institutions in the general collegiate field. Correspondingly, the State department in performing this function for the public junior colleges in Kansas has a cooperative arrangement with the State university, which conducts State accreditation in the general collegiate field. In the case of Nebraska, however, the State department of education and the State university accredit public junior colleges separately, the function being duplicated by these two agencies within the State.

Internal Organizations of Agencies for Performing Accreditation Function

Different internal organizations have been set up for performing the function of accreditation in the general collegiate field by the State departments of education, State universities, State college associations, and intercollegiate standing committees in the several States.

Accrediting organizations of State departments of education.—A bureau or division within the State department of education headed by a director has been made responsible for performing the function in the 6 States in which this department accredits institutions in the general collegiate field. The responsibility has been vested in the department's bureau or division of teacher preparation or certification in 4 of the States—Connecticut,³ New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and West Virginia—the State director of teacher preparation or certification being its head.⁴ In the other two States—New York and Virginia—the department's bureau or division of higher education headed by the State director of higher education has been assigned the task of performing the function.

The State departments of education in each of these 6 States conduct State accreditation in the teacher education as well as the general collegiate field. In setting up the internal organizations, the two types of accreditation have been consolidated in a single bureau or division under the same officer within the department.

Accrediting organizations of State universities.—The internal organization of State universities responsible for performing accreditation is a faculty committee in the 8 States in which the State university serves as accrediting agency. In several of the universities the regular committee on admissions conducts the accreditation while in others a special committee on relations with other higher institutions has been organized. The members of the committee range from 6 to 15 in number.

It is of interest to note the personnel of these faculty committees. The committee of the State university in Illinois is composed of two representatives of the graduate school, two of the undergraduate colleges, the high-school inspector, and the registrar. In the case of the State university in Kansas, the committee consists of the dean of the graduate school serving as chairman with various faculty members from the other colleges or schools. The committee of the State university in Kentucky includes the president serving ex officio and the deans of the different colleges or schools with the dean of the liberal arts college as chairman. Similarly, the State university's committee in

³ A reorganization is planned by the State department of education in Connecticut for accrediting institutions in that State. In the future special committees of five members headed by the State commissioner of education are to be responsible for performing this function. The State commissioner, therefore, will be the administrative head of the accrediting organization.

⁴ The State director of teacher training in West Virginia is also secretary of the State board of education.

Wisconsin is composed of the deans of the several colleges, schools, or divisions, the dean of the school of education being its chairman. The committee of the State university in California has a director with an office staff to perform the detailed work of accreditation.

Accrediting organizations of State college associations.— State college associations in the 5 States in which such an association conducts State accreditation have followed the plan adopted by regional and national accrediting associations and established a permanent committee or commission to perform this function. The committee or commission bears such titles as committee on standards, membership and inspection, standards and classification, or commission on institutions of higher education. The number of members varies from 6 to 12.

The personnel comprising the committee or commission consists of selected presidents, deans, and faculty members of the institutions belonging to the association. Commonly, the members of the committees are distributed among the publicly controlled institutions, privately controlled institutions, teachers colleges, or junior colleges.⁵ By this arrangement each of the different types of institutions within the State holding membership in the association are represented on the committee or commission and participate in the accreditation work.

The administrative head of the accrediting committee or commission is a chairman elected by its members in the case of all the State college associations excepting the association in Michigan. The president of the association assisted by the secretary in that State serves as the administrative head of its accreditation work appointing special committees to conduct the accreditation.

Through the chairman of the accrediting commission or committee, a relationship is maintained between the State college association and the State university in several of the States. For example, the chairman of the association's committee in Ohio is the dean of the liberal arts college of the State university. In the case of the association in Michigan, the president of the association is director of the State university's bureau of cooperation with other institutions.

Likewise, the secretary of the association in Kentucky is the dean of the liberal arts college of the State university, who is also chairman of the university's accrediting committee. This committee also conducts State accreditation in Kentucky, as already indicated. A similar relationship is found between the State college association and the State department of education in North Carolina. The secretary-treasurer of the association in North Carolina is the director of the division of professional service of the State department.

⁵As an illustration, the Texas State college association's accrediting committee consists of one representative of the State university, one of the State teachers colleges, two of the 4-year State colleges, two of the 4-year privately controlled institutions, two of the privately controlled junior colleges, and one of the public junior colleges.

It is apparent, therefore, that in four of the States, the State university or the State department of education exercises an influence over the accrediting operations of the State college associations.

Accrediting organizations of intercollegiate standing committees.—The intercollegiate standing committees responsible for State accreditation in the general collegiate field in two States are separate agencies established for that specific purpose. The result is that their organizations differ somewhat from those of the other agencies.

In Iowa, the committee is composed of six members, two representing the State university, two the State agricultural and mechanic arts college, and two the State teachers college. The representatives of each of the institutions are the registrar and one faculty member. In the administration of the committee's accrediting work, one of the registrars serves as secretary. This position rotates among the registrars of the three institutions so that the secretarial officer changes at periodical intervals.

The committee in Oklahoma consists of three members. One represents the State department of education, another the State university, and the third the State agricultural and mechanic arts college. The State department of education is represented by the director of its division of curriculum, the State university by its dean of administration, and the State agricultural and mechanic arts college by the dean of its school of education. As chairman of the committee, the representative of State department of education is its administrative head.

Relationships of accrediting agencies with other agencies or organizations.—In a number of States the several accrediting agencies have established administrative, functional, or cooperative relationships with other higher educational agencies or organizations either within or outside of the State.

The State university's accrediting committee in Kansas maintains an administrative and functional arrangement with the officer in the State department of education conducting State accreditation in the teacher-education field. An analogous arrangement exists in Nebraska between the State university's committee and the board of educational examiners in the State department of education.⁶ Similarly, the intercollegiate standing committee in Iowa also has a cooperative relationship with the board of examiners in the State department of education. Each of these boards of examiners is responsible for accrediting institutions in the teacher-education field.

⁶ The State university examiner is a member of the board of educational examiners in the State department of education being appointed to that position by the State superintendent of public instruction.

Both the State university's accrediting committee and the State college association's accrediting committee, which conduct State accreditation separately in Kentucky, have a functional relationship with a third higher educational agency within the State, the State council on higher education. This council is empowered by law to coordinate the educational programs and curricular offerings of the State university and the four State teachers colleges. The State university is represented on the council by its president and three members of its governing board. The State college association while having no direct membership on the board is authorized to send three representatives to attend certain of its meetings in an advisory capacity. Similarly, the State university in California has a relationship with the State council of educational planning and coordination which conducts studies for the purpose of integrating the academic programs of the public junior colleges and the public schools with the university.

Of particular significance are the cooperative relationships maintained by several of the State agencies with accrediting organizations outside the State. The State college association in Michigan is directly affiliated with the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, its membership being confined to institutions in Michigan belonging to that organization.⁷ In Nebraska and Wisconsin the State universities responsible for State accreditation have a cooperative arrangement with the State committee of the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools which also accredits institutions within these States. The State college association in Ohio and the intercollegiate standing committee in Iowa have close functional relationship with this same association. The State university in Kentucky has a similar relationship with the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools.

The nature of these administrative, functional, and cooperative relationships between the State accrediting agencies and other higher educational organizations or agencies will be presented later in describing the accrediting practices of the agencies.

Method of defraying costs of accrediting operations.—An important question connected with the administrative organization of the agencies is the methods by which the costs of the accrediting operations are defrayed.

In the States in which the State department of education serves as the accrediting agency, these costs are paid by the State out of the department's regular funds. The costs of the accrediting operations of the State universities in most instances are defrayed either by the university, itself, or partially by the university and partially by the institutions being appraised for accreditation.

⁷ The name of this State college association is the Michigan Association of North Central Colleges.

Several plans are followed in the case of State college associations. Under one the institutions are required to pay the entire costs. The college association under a second plan pays a part of the costs while the other part is paid by the institutions being appraised.⁸ Under a third plan found in North Carolina the State department of education assumes the costs of the accreditation work of the association. In that State the State department, as already shown, is legally empowered to conduct State accreditation in both the general collegiate and teacher-education field; but has delegated its authority to the State college association.⁹

The methods of paying the costs of the accrediting operations of intercollegiate standing committees differ. In Iowa the costs are divided among the three State-controlled institutions represented on the committee. The accrediting costs of the intercollegiate standing committee in Oklahoma are paid jointly by the State department of education and the institutions being appraised for accreditation.

Standards Used by Agencies in Accrediting Institutions

The practices of State agencies in the adoption, formulation, and revision of standards used in accrediting general collegiate institutions have a bearing on the efficacy of their accreditation programs.

Practices of agencies in adopting standards.—The practices of the agencies with respect to the adoption of standards fall under two general plans. Under one plan the agency has adopted no standards, while under the second, standards have been adopted. Where the agency has adopted standards, one or another of the following practices is found: (1) Agency has adopted the standards of a regional accrediting association; (2) agency has adopted its own standards for both 4-year colleges and junior colleges; and (3) agency has adopted standards for junior colleges only.

Table 9 shows the particular one of these practices followed by the agencies in each of the 20 States. In the case of the States which have established two agencies, one accrediting institutions in the general collegiate field and the other public junior colleges, the practice of each is shown separately.

⁸ The plan followed in Ohio is for the institutions to pay the cost of the initial appraisal while the State college association defrays the costs of reappraisals made from time to time.

⁹ In Michigan where the State college association assists the State department of education in accrediting in the teacher-education field in addition to its own accreditation in the general collegiate field, the operating costs are distributed among the State department of education, the institutions being appraised, and the State university.

TABLE 9.—Practices of State agencies in adopting standards for the conduct of accreditation in general collegiate field in 20 States

[Practice is indicated by "X"]

| State | Accrediting agency has adopted— | | | |
|------------------------------------|---------------------------------|--|--|--|
| | No standards | Standards of regional accrediting associations | Its own standards for both 4-year colleges and junior colleges | Its own standards for junior colleges only |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| California: | | | | |
| State university | X | | | |
| State department of education | | | | X |
| Connecticut | | | | X |
| Illinois | | | X | |
| Iowa: | | | | |
| Intercollegiate standing committee | | | | X |
| State department of education | | | | X |
| Kansas: | | | | |
| State university | | ¹ X | | |
| State department of education | | | | X |
| Kentucky: | | | | |
| State university | | X | | |
| State college association | | | X | |
| Michigan | | X | | |
| Minnesota | | | | X |
| Nebraska: | | | | |
| State university | X | | | |
| State department of education | | | | X |
| New Jersey | | | | |
| New York | | | X | |
| North Carolina | | | X | |
| Ohio | | | X | |
| Oklahoma | | | | X |
| Pennsylvania | | | X | |
| Texas | | | X | |
| Virginia | | | X | |
| Washington | | ¹ X | | |
| West Virginia | | | X | |
| Wisconsin | X | | | |

¹ Standards are closely in accord with those of the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools.

² Standards adopted are largely those of American Council on Education.

As shown by table 9 all the agencies in the 20 States with 3 exceptions have adopted standards for conducting accreditation. Of these agencies, there are 4 which have adopted the standards of a regional accrediting association, 10 their own standards for both 4-year colleges and junior colleges, and 8 their own standards for junior colleges only.

The 3 agencies which have adopted no standards are the State universities in California, Nebraska, and Wisconsin. In place of using standards, the State university in California bases its accreditation on the scholastic records made by students in the university after transferring from the other institutions in the State. For this purpose a continuous appraisal of the grade point ratio ¹⁰ of such students is being conducted over a period of years by a staff maintained by the university's accrediting committee. Institutions, the students of which have satisfactory scholastic records in the university as shown

¹⁰ The grade point ratio used by the State university in California is more frequently known as the grade point index or grade point average.

by their grade point ratios, are placed on the university's accredited list.

The State university in Nebraska, in addition to visitations of the institutions being appraised for accreditation, requires them to submit the written examination papers of their freshman and sophomore students. The examination papers are regraded by faculty members of the university as a criteria of the quality of academic work performed by the institutions. There are also other measurements used by the State university in Nebraska instead of standards.¹¹ The State university in Wisconsin accredits institutions on a basis of the personal judgment of its visitors.

Of special interest are the practices of some of the agencies which have adopted standards. The State university in Kentucky, which has adopted the standards of the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, specifically excludes the application of the association's standard requiring a minimum endowment for privately controlled colleges. Although conducting accreditation of 4-year institutions in the State, the State department of education in Connecticut and the State university in Minnesota have adopted standards for junior colleges only. Similarly, the intercollegiate standing committees in Iowa and Oklahoma have adopted standards for junior colleges only and at the same time are responsible for accrediting 4-year institutions. Both of these agencies, however, depend on the regional accrediting associations for performing this function, recognizing those institutions in the State accredited by them.

Procedures and practices in formulating standards.—The several types of agencies which have adopted their own standards follow different procedures and practices in formulating them.

The officers in the State departments of education responsible for conducting accreditation in most instances formulate the standards used by the department. Frequently, a committee composed of representatives of institutions within the State is organized to assist in the task.¹² After the standards are formulated the State board of education is required to take favorable action before they are actually in force. In two States, New York and Pennsylvania, certain of the standards are prescribed by law. It is the general practice for the faculty committee performing the accreditation function for State universities to formulate the standards.

For the most part, the standards of State college associations are formulated by the same permanent committee or commission which

¹¹ In conducting State accreditation in the general collegiate field, the State university in Nebraska recognizes all institutions within the State already accredited by the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. Its accrediting activities, therefore, are confined to institutions not accredited by that association.

¹² A committee representing the institutions belonging to the State college association, a nonaccrediting organization, participated in the formulation of the standards adopted by the State department of education in Virginia in 1939.

is responsible for conducting its accreditation.¹³ Before becoming effective the standards including any amendments must be approved by a vote of the association. In the case of the State college association in Ohio, a different plan is found. Its standards are contained in the association's constitution and consist of the requirements which must be met by institutions in order to become members of the association. Hence, an amendment to the association's constitution is necessary to change the standards.

The intercollegiate standing committees formulate their own standards. The same practice is followed by State departments of education responsible for accrediting public junior colleges with one exception. In Iowa, the intercollegiate standing committee formulates the standards for such colleges used by the State department. The standards for public junior colleges in California are partially prescribed by law, the result being that the State department of education formulates only a part of them. A considerable proportion of the different agencies reported that they found the criteria and standards of the regional accrediting associations helpful in formulating their standards.

Practices of agencies in revising standards.—Of the six State departments of education conducting accreditation in the general collegiate field, four have revised their standards within the past 5 years. These are the State departments in New Jersey, New York, Virginia, and West Virginia. In the case of the State departments in Connecticut and Pennsylvania, the last revision of their standards was made in 1931 and 1930, respectively.

With one exception, the State universities using standards have revised them recently. As already shown, two of the universities have adopted the standards of regional accrediting associations. Since these associations have revised their standards within the past 6 years, the standards of the State universities have been revised accordingly.¹⁴ This situation also applies to the State college association which has adopted the standards of a regional accrediting association. The State university in Minnesota having standards for junior colleges only has not revised them since 1925.

It is in general the practice of State college associations having their own standards to revise them at frequent intervals. This is accomplished by amendments to the existing standards at the regular annual meetings of the associations. The State college association in Kentucky revised its standards in 1939,¹⁵ the State college associ-

¹³ The State college association in Kentucky has a special committee on college standards responsible for formulating them, separate and distinct from its commission on institutions of higher education, which conducts its accreditation.

¹⁴ The North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools revised its standards in 1934, the Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools in 1937, and the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools in 1938.

¹⁵ Prior to 1939 the State college association in Kentucky used the standards of the regional accrediting association.

ation in North Carolina in 1937, the State college association in Ohio in 1933, and the State college association in Texas in 1938. Standards for junior colleges only used by the intercollegiate standing committee and the State department of education in Iowa are revised annually. Such standards of the State department in Kansas were last revised in 1927 and those of the State department in Nebraska in 1931.

Methods Employed by Agencies in Appraising Institutions

Light is thrown on the effectiveness of the accrediting operations of State agencies in the general collegiate field by a review of the methods employed by them in appraising the institutions for accreditation.

The methods ordinarily employed for conducting such appraisal may be outlined as follows: (1) After applying for accreditation the institution is required to file an initial report containing data as to its fulfillment of the various standards used by the agency; (2) Visitation to the institution is then made by staff members or representatives of the agency for the purpose of appraisal; (3) After accreditation the agency visits the institution periodically for the purpose of reappraisal and to ascertain whether it is continuing to maintain standards; and (4) The institution must submit annual reports which are examined by the agency as a further check on its adherence to the standards.

Initial reports filed by institutions with agencies.—It is found that 9 of the accrediting agencies in the 20 States follow the procedure of requiring the institutions to file initial reports containing data as to the fulfillment of standards after applying for accreditation.

Among these agencies are the State department of education in Connecticut, New York, and Virginia; the State universities in Illinois, Kansas, and Minnesota; and the State college associations in Michigan, Ohio, and Texas. Hence, there are 3 out of the 6 State departments of education conducting State accreditation which do not require such reports, 4 out of the 7 State universities, and 2 out of the 5 State college associations. Institutions applying for accreditation to the intercollegiate standing committees in Iowa and Oklahoma are not required to submit initial reports. A similar situation exists with respect to the State departments of education accrediting public junior colleges only.¹⁶

Visitations by agencies in appraising institutions.—All the State agencies make visitations to the institutions for the purpose of appraisal prior to accreditation and of reappraisal after accreditation, excepting the State university in California. As previously indicated,

¹⁶ The public junior colleges in California before being given State funds annually for their support must submit certain initial reports to the State department of education.

this agency accredits institutions in the State on a basis of the scholastic records of their students after transferring to the university.

Several questions regarding the practices of the agencies in making visitations are of significance. One involves the amount of time spent by the visitors in appraising the institutions prior to accreditation. The other concerns the frequency of the visitations in reappraising the institutions after accreditation. In table 10 are presented data on these questions. The table is so arranged as to show whether the visitors of each agency spend 1 or 2 days in appraising the institutions prior to accreditation. In the case of appraisals after accreditation information is given as to whether the visitations of each agency are made annually, biennially, or irregularly. Attention is called to the fact that the State university in Kentucky and the State department of education in California are not included in the table, since data from these two agencies were not obtained.

TABLE 10.—Practices of State agencies conducting accreditation in general collegiate field in making visitations to institutions for purpose of appraisal prior to accreditation and of reappraisal after accreditation in 19 States

[Practice is indicated by "X"]

| State | Prior to accreditation | | After accreditation | | |
|------------------------------------|---|--------|---|------------------|-------------|
| | Amount of time spent by visitors in appraising institutions | | Frequency of visitations in reappraising institutions | | |
| | 1 day | 2 days | Annually | Biennially | Irregularly |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Connecticut | X | | | | X |
| Illinois | X | | | | X |
| Iowa: | | | | | |
| Intercollegiate standing committee | X | | | | X |
| State department of education | X | | | | X |
| Kansas: | | | | | |
| State university | X | | X | | X |
| State department of education | X | | | | |
| Kentucky: | | | | | |
| State college association | | X | | | X |
| Michigan | X | | | | |
| Minnesota | (¹) | | | | X |
| Nebraska: | | | | | |
| State university | X | | | | X |
| State department of education | X | | X | | |
| New Jersey | X | | X | | |
| New York | | X | | (²) | |
| North Carolina | (³) | | | | X |
| Ohio | X | X | X | | X |
| Oklahoma | X | | | X | |
| Pennsylvania | X | | | | X |
| Texas | X | X | | | X |
| Virginia | X | | | | X |
| Washington | X | | | | X |
| West Virginia | X | | | X | |
| Wisconsin | X | X | | | X |

¹ Visitations for reappraisal purposes made only when it is reported that standards are not being maintained by institutions.

² Only junior colleges are visited annually for reappraisal purposes.

³ Length of time of visitations dependent on need for thorough appraisal.

⁴ Visitation made to each institution for reappraisal purposes every 5 years.

⁵ In some instances, less than 1 day.

⁶ Visitations made annually only to denominational colleges which depend on contributions from church.

Visitors of 15 of the State agencies, or approximately four-fifths, spend 1 day in appraising the institutions prior to accreditation, table 10 shows. In the case of two additional agencies, the visitors spend less than 1 day in some instances. There are five other agencies, the visitors of which spend from 1 to 2 days. Similarly, it is found that 15 of the agencies make visitations to the institutions irregularly after accreditation for the purpose of reappraising them. The remaining agencies make such visitations either annually or biennially. One agency follows the practice of making visitations to the institutions every 5 years for the purpose of reappraisal.

Of importance in this connection is the number of staff members or representatives of the State agencies responsible for conducting visitations to the institutions. Of the different agencies there are 4 with 1 staff member making visitations, 6 with 2 staff members, 2 with 3 staff members, and 10 with 5 or more staff members. In general, the agencies with a small number of staff members performing this function are the State departments of education.

The arrangement, however, has been adopted by several of the larger State departments of education to utilize their specialists in various fields in making the visitations to the institutions. In the same manner, a number of the State universities use faculty members of their several subject-matter departments. The State college associations in most instances select faculty members from individual institutions belonging to the association to assist in the visitations.¹⁷

Requirement by agencies of annual reports from institutions.—Submission of annual reports after accreditation by the institutions for examination as a further check on their adherence to standards is required by all except seven of the State accrediting agencies.¹⁸ Among those not requiring the reports are the State department of education in Connecticut, the State college association in Michigan, and the State universities in California, Kentucky, Minnesota, Washington, and Wisconsin.

Some of the agencies requiring the reports are more or less lenient in enforcing the provision. For example, the State university in Illinois requires junior colleges to furnish the reports regularly every year, but the 4-year colleges submit them irregularly. Similarly, the State university in Kansas applies the requirement to junior colleges and only to those 4-year colleges, the accreditation status of which is doubtful. The State department of education in West Virginia and the intercollegiate standing committee in Oklahoma follow the practice of requiring the junior colleges to submit annual reports, other types of institutions being exempt.

¹⁷ Visitations for the State college association in Kentucky are made by the Bureau of School Service of the State university. This bureau is an educational research division of the university's college of education.

¹⁸ The State college association in Ohio required institutions to submit reports triennially unless specifically called for in the intervening years.

On the other hand, several of the agencies enforce rather strictly the requirement. This is especially true of the State departments of education in New York and Pennsylvania.

Issuance of Accredited Lists of Institutions

The final step taken by State agencies in conducting accreditation in the general collegiate field is the issuance of a list of accredited institutions. All of the agencies in the 20 States, excepting the State university in California, issue such lists. In the case of the latter agency, the list is prepared but not formally issued.

Accredited lists of institutions.—The accredited lists issued by the agencies differ as to form. This is due to the fact that some of the agencies accredit the institutions from the viewpoint of evaluating the academic credits of their students for transfer purposes. Their accredited lists classify or rate the various institutions on a basis of whether they are fully or partially accredited and in accordance with the academic credits allowed students transferring from them. In most instances, these agencies as previously indicated conduct State accreditation voluntarily without authority of law. Several other agencies accredit the curricula of each institution rather than the institution as a whole.

Among the agencies having accredited lists which classify or rate the institutions are the State universities in California, Illinois, Kansas, and Wisconsin. The accredited lists of the State universities in California¹⁹ and Illinois segregate the institutions into two classes, A and B. The institutions comprising Class A are fully accredited, their students being permitted to transfer to the university with full credit. The Class B institutions are partially accredited, the academic credits of their students being given from three-quarter to one-half valuation. Some of the junior colleges on the accredited list of the State university in Illinois are accredited for 1 instead of 2 years' work.

The accredited list of the State university in Kansas includes institutions partially accredited. In the case of the list of the State university in Minnesota, some institutions are accredited provisionally, that is, the academic credits allowed their students are determined according to the scholastic records made by them after transferring to the university. Certain institutions on the list of the intercollegiate standing committee in Iowa are similarly accredited. The State college association in Texas in placing junior colleges on its accredited list specifies the particular basic sciences, such as biology, chemistry,

¹⁹ The accredited list of the State university in California also has a third segregation, Class C. Institutions so classified have no accredited standing although partial credit may be given their students transferring to the university at the discretion of the director of admissions in individual cases.

or physics, taught in the colleges that are accredited for either 1 or 2 years' work.

Extent of revision of accredited lists.—In order to discover the extent to which the agencies revised their accredited list, an attempt was made to obtain the number of institutions added to and dropped from the lists during the 5-year period, 1933 to 1938, inclusive. Some of the agencies were unable to furnish the required information. Others supplied more or less indefinite information. On this account it is impossible to present complete and accurate data for all the agencies.

Five of the State departments of education conducting accreditation in the general collegiate field added from 1 to 3 institutions to their accredited lists during the 5-year period. Four dropped from 1 to 5 institutions.²⁰ The other department reported that no institutions had been dropped. Three of the State universities added from 6 to 12 institutions to their accredited list,²¹ some of which were 2-year colleges raised to a 4-year accreditation status. One university reported that it had dropped one institution while no institutions were dropped by the others. Another university indicated that no change had been made in its accredited list over the 5-year period.

Of the five college associations, two reported revisions of their accredited lists. One association added one institution and another two institutions. None of the associations dropped institutions from their lists. The State college association in Ohio, however, refused accreditation to five institutions after visitation. In the case of the two intercollegiate standing committees, the committee in Oklahoma added eight junior colleges to its accredited list while none was added by the committee in Iowa. The only institutions dropped by the committees were junior colleges which discontinued operation. Two of the State departments of education accrediting junior colleges only, added from four to five institutions to their lists. At the same time the departments dropped from two to three such colleges, most of which went out of existence.

Number of institutions on accredited lists of State agencies.—In examining the accredited lists issued by the State agencies it is found that many of them contain practically all the institutions offering general collegiate work in the State. This would tend to indicate that these agencies make little or no discrimination in accrediting the various institutions within the State. As already explained, however, the agencies in some States include institutions on their lists

²⁰ The State department of education in New York, accrediting institutions by curricula, added to and dropped from its accredited list many different curricula conducted by the various institutions within the State during this period.

²¹ The State university in Illinois reported that 199 institutions had been added to and 20 dropped from its accredited list, which included those located both within and outside the State. The university did not furnish information as to exact number within the State added to or dropped from the list.

which are partially accredited or are accredited on a probationary basis.

The agencies accrediting the curricula of institutions instead of the institutions as a whole are the State departments of education in New York and Pennsylvania. In consequence, their accredited lists show the specific curricula leading to a degree conducted by each institution which has been accredited.

Institutions included in accredited lists on a probationary basis.—Of the agencies in the 20 States, there are 7 that include institutions on their accredited lists on a probationary basis. A period of time is permitted such institutions to comply with the particular standards in which they are deficient. In the event that they fail to meet the standards within this period, the agencies remove them from the accredited list.

Agencies following this practice are the State departments of education in New York, Pennsylvania, and West Virginia; the State universities in Illinois and Minnesota; the State college association in Kentucky; and the intercollegiate standing committee in Iowa. The time allowed the institutions for compliance with the standards generally varies from 1 to 2 years. Several of the agencies, however, fix the time limit according to the circumstances in each individual case.

The State university in Minnesota has adopted a special method of placing institutions on its accredited list on a probationary basis. Institutions are given a probationary status on the list when at least five of their departments have been accredited by the corresponding departments in the State university. As soon as the remaining deficient departments are similarly accredited, the institutions are accorded full accreditation.

In compiling the number of institutions on the accredited list of the State agency in each State, similar information was compiled for the particular regional accrediting association conducting accreditation within the same State. By comparing the figures it is possible to discover the extent to which the State agencies accredit larger numbers of institutions than the regional accrediting associations. These data are presented in table 11. The institutions are classified into three types, universities and 4-year colleges, teachers colleges and normal schools, and junior colleges. The number of each type included on the accrediting list of the State agency and the regional accrediting association is given.

Among the regional accrediting associations represented in the table and conducting accreditation in one or another of the States dependent on the particular region covered by them are: New England Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools,²¹ Middle States Association

²¹ The New England Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools is not an accrediting association. It enforces standards for membership, however, so that its list of members in reality represents an accredited list.

of Colleges and Secondary Schools, Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, and Northwest Association of Secondary and Higher Schools. Attention is called to the fact that in the States where two agencies accredit institutions, the figures for only one of them are given in the table. The reason is that the accredited lists of the two agencies approximately duplicate each other.

TABLE 11.—Number of institutions classified by type on accredited lists of State agencies conducting accreditation in general collegiate field and number on lists of regional accrediting associations in 20 States

| State and agency | Number of— | | | | | | | |
|--|--|----------------------|--|----------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------|
| | Universities and 4-year colleges accredited by | | Teachers colleges and normal schools accredited by | | Junior colleges accredited by | | Total institutions accredited by | |
| | State agency | Regional association | State agency | Regional association | State agency | Regional association | State agency | Regional association |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
| California (State university)..... | 22 | 15 | 7 | 3 | 50 | 1 | 79 | 19 |
| Connecticut (State department of education)..... | 8 | 6 | 8 | 5 | 9 | 12 | 25 | 6 |
| Illinois (State university)..... | 33 | 29 | 8 | 5 | 19 | 12 | 60 | 46 |
| Iowa (Intercollegiate standing committee)..... | 23 | 14 | 1 | 1 | 36 | 3 | 60 | 18 |
| Kansas (State university)..... | 19 | 16 | 2 | 2 | 19 | 7 | 40 | 18 |
| Kentucky (State college association)..... | 12 | 8 | 5 | 4 | 15 | 7 | 32 | 19 |
| Michigan (State college association)..... | 12 | 12 | 4 | 4 | 7 | 7 | 23 | 23 |
| Minnesota (State university)..... | 14 | 13 | 6 | 4 | 10 | 4 | 30 | 17 |
| Nebraska (State university)..... | 12 | 6 | 4 | 4 | 6 | 1 | 22 | 11 |
| New Jersey (State department of education)..... | 16 | 11 | 7 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 25 | 14 |
| New York (State department of education)..... | 53 | 46 | 12 | 7 | 7 | 2 | 72 | 48 |
| North Carolina (State college association)..... | 25 | 20 | 8 | 1 | 23 | 4 | 56 | 25 |
| Ohio (State college association)..... | 39 | 37 | | | | | 39 | 37 |
| Oklahoma (Intercollegiate standing committee)..... | 11 | 5 | 6 | | 28 | | 45 | 5 |
| Pennsylvania (State department of education)..... | 57 | 46 | 14 | | | 4 | 71 | 50 |
| Texas (State college association)..... | 25 | 22 | 7 | 7 | 34 | 13 | 66 | 42 |
| Virginia (State department of education)..... | 19 | 19 | 5 | 4 | 12 | 3 | 36 | 26 |
| Washington (State university)..... | | | | | 10 | 3 | 10 | 3 |
| West Virginia (State department of education)..... | 11 | 4 | 6 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 21 | 6 |
| Wisconsin (State university)..... | 15 | 9 | 17 | 6 | 6 | | 28 | 15 |
| Total | 426 | 338 | 127 | 44 | 297 | 66 | 850 | 448 |

According to table 11, the accrediting lists of all the State agencies excepting one contain more institutions than those of the regional accrediting associations. The State college association in Michigan has the same number of institutions on its list as the regional association. It has already been pointed out that this State college association has a functional and cooperative arrangement with the regional association in conducting accreditation in that State.

Considering the institutions by type, the number of universities and 4-year colleges on the accredited lists of the State agencies exceed that of the regional associations by approximately one-fourth. The State department of education in Virginia is the only State agency other than Michigan, accrediting the same number of universities and 4-year colleges as the regional association. There are approximately three-times as many teachers colleges and normal schools accredited by State agencies as by regional associations and more than four times as many junior colleges. This may be partially explained by the fact that many teachers colleges and normal schools as well as junior colleges do not apply for accreditation to the regional accrediting associations.

Of the total institutions in the 20 States, almost twice as many are found on the accredited lists of the State agencies as on those of regional associations.

Out-of-State use of accredited lists of State agencies.—Of special interest is the extent to which the general collegiate accredited lists of the State agencies are used outside of the State.

Out-of-State use of such lists of State departments of education and State universities is rather widespread. They are utilized principally for the purpose of ascertaining the general collegiate standing of institutions and of evaluating academic credits of transfer students. For example, the United States Civil Service Commission in appraising the collegiate work of applicants for classified civil-service positions gives recognition to all institutions approved as of full collegiate grade by State departments of education and State universities, as shown by their accredited lists. Similar use is made of the lists by other Federal Governmental agencies, such as the Army, Navy, and Coast Guard, in admitting students with advanced standing to their training academies.

Accredited lists of State universities are also used somewhat extensively by admission officers of institutions in other States for evaluating credits of transfer students. A loose-leaf publication issued by the American Association of Collegiate Registrars to its membership uses the accredited lists of State universities in most of the States. The lists are so arranged as to show the academic credits allowed students transferring to the State university from each institution within the State. In using the lists, admissions officers of out-of-State institutions allow the same credits to transfer students as does the State university.

This loose-leaf publication containing ratings of institutions in each State is revised annually. It is being used especially by members of the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and has been found more valuable in many instances than the accredited lists of national and regional accrediting associations.

Summary of Findings

The major findings of this chapter may be summarized as follows:

1. Of the 30 States making up the study 20 have agencies conducting State accreditation of general collegiate institutions. No State agency has been established for this purpose in the other 10 States.

2. The State department of education is responsible for such accreditation in 6 States, the State university in 7 States, a State college association in 5 States, and an intercollegiate standing committee in 2 States. Four of these States have dual agencies for accrediting junior colleges. Both the State university and a State college association conduct general collegiate accrediting in 1 State.

3. Different internal organizations for performing the accreditation function have been set up by the several agencies. A bureau or division headed by a director within the State departments of education has been assigned this task where this department serves as the State accrediting agency. A faculty committee of the State university is responsible for performing accreditation while State college associations have followed the plan of designating a permanent standing committee or commission to perform the work. The intercollegiate standing committees have been established specifically to conduct accreditation so that the entire committee participates in the function.

4. The method of defraying the cost of the accrediting operations among the agencies varies from State to State. Where the State department of education is the agency conducting general collegiate accreditation the costs are paid by the State out of the department's regular funds. In the States where the State university, State college association, and intercollegiate standing committee are responsible for accreditation, the costs are defrayed either by the agency itself, by the institution being appraised for accreditation, or partially by the agency and partially by the institution. In some instances where the State department of education has delegated its legal authority to one or another of these agencies, the State pays the entire cost or its proportionate share of it.

5. With respect to the use of standards for conducting accreditation in the general collegiate field, the facts are: 3 of the State agencies have adopted no standards, 4 agencies have adopted the standards of regional accrediting associations, 10 their own standards for both 4-year colleges and junior colleges, and 8 their own standards for junior colleges only. Although conducting accreditation of 4-year colleges, 4 agencies had standards for junior colleges only.

6. In most cases the agencies conducting accreditation in the general collegiate field have made it a practice to revise their standards at frequent intervals. There are, however, 5 agencies, 4 of which are State departments of education and 1 a State university, which have

not revised their standards during periods varying from 14 to 8 years. Two of the agencies accrediting junior colleges only follow the procedure of revising their standards annually.

7. In making visitations to the institutions, the representatives of 2 of the State agencies accrediting in the general collegiate field spend less than 1 day in such visit prior to accreditation. The visitors of 15 other agencies spend 1 day and of 5 agencies from 1 to 2 days. After accreditation visitations for the purpose of reappraising the institutions are made annually by 4 agencies, biennially by 2 agencies, every 5 years by 1 agency, and at irregular intervals by 15 agencies.

8. Submission of annual reports after accreditation by the institutions as a further check on their adherence to standards was a requirement of all except 7 of the State agencies accrediting in the general collegiate field. Several of the agencies required the annual reports from junior colleges only, the 4-year colleges submitting them irregularly or on demand.

9. The accredited lists issued by the agencies differed as to form due to the fact that some of them accredited the institutions from the viewpoint of evaluating academic credits of students for transfer purposes. Eight of the agencies included institutions on their lists which were classified according to a certain rating scale or were accredited either partially or provisionally. There were also 7 agencies that placed institutions on the lists on a probationary basis contingent upon their compliance at some time in the future with particular standards in which they were deficient.

10. During the last 5 years, 13 of the State agencies conducting accreditation in the general collegiate field have each added from 1 to 12 institutions to their accredited lists and 6 agencies have each dropped from 1 to 5 institutions from the lists, some of which were colleges that had gone out of existence. On the other hand, no institutions were dropped by 11 of the agencies during this period.

11. A comparison between the accredited lists of State accrediting agencies and of regional accrediting associations in the 20 States showed that almost twice as many institutions were included on the lists of the State agencies as on those of the regional associations.

PART 3

Part III
ISSUES, PROBLEMS
AND A CONCLUDING PROPOSAL

185

Chapter VIII. Issues and Problems Involved in the Accrediting Movement

IN COUNTRIES where the central government maintains an authoritative control over education, accreditation as carried on in the United States is unknown. Such is the case in most European countries. Where education is left largely to local units of control, however, some device like accreditation is necessary if the people are to know what the standing of the various colleges and universities is. Furthermore, if students are to be allowed to pass freely from one school or college to another, and if a State is to accept for purposes of professional licensure the work done in colleges either within the State or in other States, some such device as accreditation is necessary.

It is but natural, therefore, that in the United States accreditation should have become a strong movement, serving to raise the standards of many weaker institutions, and probably to improve higher education as a whole. It is equally natural that in the development of the accrediting movement certain problems should arise. These must be kept in mind by the State departments of education when they are considering their own policies of accrediting colleges and universities.

These issues and problems will be discussed under four heads:

Difficulties Arising From the Extent of the Accrediting Movement

Three decades ago there were no lists of accredited colleges. Today there are more than 40 such lists. The more widely recognized of the accrediting agencies and the number of colleges and universities on their lists are given below.¹

The number of universities and colleges, junior colleges, and teacher-training institutions accredited by national and regional accrediting associations in 1938 is shown in the table following.

¹ Ratcliffe, Ella B. Accredited higher institutions, 1938. Washington, U. S. Government printing office, 1939. 212 p. (U. S. Department of the Interior, Office of Education, bull., 1938, No. 16.)

| Accrediting organization | Universities and colleges | Junior colleges | Teacher-training institutions |
|--|---------------------------|-----------------|-------------------------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Association of American Universities..... | ¹ 285 | | |
| Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools..... | 121 | 12 | 2 |
| New England Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools..... | 41 | 7 | |
| North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools..... | 235 | 47 | (?) |
| Northwest Association of Secondary and Higher Schools..... | 55 | 14 | 9 |
| Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools..... | ² 141 | ⁴ 48 | (¹) |
| Negro colleges: | | | |
| Class A..... | 20 | 4 | |
| Class B..... | 18 | 4 | |
| American Association of Teachers Colleges..... | | | 157 |

¹ Includes 2 institutions in Canada.

² The association includes teacher-training institutions in the list with universities and colleges.

³ Of this number, 17 fail to meet one or more standards but are continued on the approved list pending removal of deficiencies; 11 are on probation.

⁴ Of this number, 3 are on probation.

The following tabulation shows the number of professional and technical schools and departments accredited, approved, or classified by their national professional organizations:

| Accrediting organization | Number of schools or departments accredited |
|--|---|
| American Association of Colleges of Pharmacy..... | 59 |
| American Association of Collegiate Schools of Business..... | 50 |
| American Association of Schools and Departments of Journalism..... | 32 |
| American Association of Schools of Social Work..... | 35 |
| American Association of Theological Schools..... | 43 |
| American Bar Association..... | ¹ 98 |
| American Library Association..... | 27 |
| American Medical Association..... | ² 77 |
| American Osteopathic Association..... | 6 |
| Association of Collegiate Schools of Architecture..... | 32 |
| Engineers' Council for Professional Development..... | ³ 107 |
| International Association of Boards of Examiners in Optometry..... | 8 |
| National Association of Schools of Music..... | ⁴ 91 |
| Society of American Foresters..... | 18 |

¹ 91 colleges fully accredited, 7 colleges on probation.

² 2 are on probation, 2 with approval withdrawn Oct. 11, 1936, on June 6, 1937, protection was extended to students enrolled in first year class in 1937-38, at these institutions.

³ Accredited for 1 or more curricula in engineering.

⁴ 75 schools fully accredited, 14 provisionally accredited, 2 accredited for 2 years.

Naturally these several associations accredit colleges on the bases of differing criteria: The Association of American Universities accredits colleges and universities primarily on the basis of their qualifications to prepare students to do graduate study. The American Association of University Women (one of several accrediting agencies not listed above) accepting a college's membership on this A. A. U. accredited list as evidence of a satisfactory general collegiate standard, accredits a selected number of those same colleges on the basis essentially of the breadth of their cultural curricula, and the

satisfactoriness of their treatment of women students and women faculty members. One of the regional associations accredits its portion of these same colleges on the basis of each college's effectiveness in attaining its own stated objectives. Each of the professional schools of these same colleges or universities such as law, medicine, music, and social work is accredited by its own national professional organization such as the American Bar Association or the American Medical Association, or by the appropriate national organization of professional schools.

This pyramiding effect while relatively unimportant to the independent arts college, becomes serious to institutions which comprise many schools. While it is true that no institution is examined for purposes of accreditation except upon its own request, it is equally true that as long as the system of accreditation is the method used to publicize the standing of an institution, few colleges can afford to remain independent of these accrediting agencies. Occasionally an institution declines on principle to cooperate with accrediting agencies, on the ground that the State is the only agency with authority to determine its educational standing, but these cases are rare. Practically all the colleges and universities in the United States seek accreditation by the several accrediting agencies.

A few jurisdictional difficulties are arising as the movement grows. For example, since the North Central Association accredits an institution as a whole, shall it accredit a university otherwise satisfactory but in which the law school is refused accreditation by the American Bar Association? Or does it alter the situation if the law school is or is not eligible to membership in the Association of American Law Schools? Or shall the Association of Teachers Colleges accredit (or admit to membership in the Association) colleges of arts and sciences which educate teachers? Or shall the Association of Collegiate Schools of Business refuse accreditation to curricula of business administration organized within colleges of arts and sciences, while the Association of Schools and Departments of Journalism accredits departments in colleges of arts and sciences as well as separately organized schools? At present the American Chemical Society is embarking on a career of accrediting departments of chemistry. This will introduce (especially if the example of chemistry is followed by other departments such as English, history, botany, etc.) new complications. Shall the Association of American Universities accredit a liberal arts college in which the chemistry department is denied accreditation by the American Chemical Society?

The factor of cost is becoming troublesome as the movement grows. The necessary steps involved in accreditation by any of these accrediting agencies requires a fee to be paid by the college. This varies greatly but ranges up to \$400 charged by the Engineers' Council for

Professional Development for the examination and inspection of the whole series of engineering departments. Furthermore, such examination is not carried on once for all. It is a periodic matter in the case of most of the accrediting agencies although in some cases subsequent inspections cost less than first inspections. In any case, the money cost is far less than the labor cost. The time of college officers and teachers which is devoted to supplying required information and conferring with the inspectors is a much heavier charge than the accreditation fee which the college pays. When it is remembered that commonly a single university has relations with as many as 12 or more of these widely recognized agencies in addition to numerous other agencies with legitimate claims to information, one must realize that the cost in money and time of this system of voluntary accreditation is far from negligible.

One other situation growing out of the extent of the movement deserves mention. Practically all the agencies use a questionnaire more or less voluminous with which to assemble the required information. These questionnaires are trying enough at best. But when they originate in a score of different agencies which do not coordinate their forms, the case is much worse. All agencies may ask for the same items such as the student enrollment, for example, but one may call for the number of different students enrolled for the full year, another the number enrolled for the 9 months' academic year, another the number enrolled October 15, another the average attendance during the year. The same variety of definition characterizes the requests for information about income, expenditures, faculty training, faculty salaries, and all the other items on the questionnaires. The labor of filling out one questionnaire is largely lost when the officers come to fill out the next questionnaire covering similar items. This is a problem which would appear possible of solution by cooperation among the agencies in the collection of information. In fact, some hopeful steps have already been taken in that direction, but nevertheless up to the present time this excessive labor and annoyance involved in filling out accrediting agency questionnaires is a real problem.

The above cases of difficulties arising out of the extent of the accrediting movement relate mostly to regional and national agencies. But State agencies also carry on extensive accrediting activities. In many States, the State university rates the many colleges and universities in the State in order to determine what values to give to college credentials of students applying to transfer from one of these colleges to the university. This type of rating is much more detailed than that of the regional or national accrediting agencies. It involves oftentimes the discrimination between departments in a given college, credits from one being accepted while credits from the other are not. Or the freshman and sophomore courses in a given department may be accepted

while the junior and senior courses are not. Many other detailed evaluations are sometimes made. The effect of all this evaluation by the university is to fit the courses of the colleges into one or more of the curricula of the university. The work of the college is judged more or less by the multiplicity of standards maintained by the many departments of the university. The college is constrained to conform to these standards, department by department, because it is essential to its life that its students be able to transfer to the university without significant loss of credits.

In the same spirit but to a lesser extent, universities other than State universities exercise the same influences upon the colleges from which they receive numbers of transfer students. A system of colleges and universities related to a given church denomination is a good illustration of this form of accreditation.

The State agency which accredits colleges and universities most widely is the State department of education. In every State the law places upon the State department of education (sometimes the State board of education, and sometimes the chief State school officer) responsibility for certificating some or all of the teachers. As a part of the requirements for such certification, college credentials are coming to be more and more widely accepted. This means that the State department of education must determine from which colleges it will accept these credentials. The colleges thus accepted constitute a list especially approved for teacher-education purposes. The matter would be relatively simple if teacher education were confined to specially organized normal schools and teachers colleges. But practically all liberal arts colleges prepare teachers. Many technical schools, such as agriculture, engineering, and home economics, prepare teachers. And, more troublesome still from the standpoint of certification, special schools such as art, music, physical education, and business, seek recognition from the State department of education in order that their graduates may be certificated to teach.

Probably no other accrediting agency has as complicated and perplexing a task as has the agency which accredits institutions for teacher-education purposes. Its requirements may well be pitched on a different level from those of an agency interested in only the broad cultural outcomes of a college. Indeed, this distinction is being made in some States at the present time and is making a most serious problem for the colleges, which must have teaching as the occupational outlet for their graduates.

State departments of education in a number of States have one other responsibility in the sphere of accreditation. They are charged by law with general supervision of the collegiate institutions in the State the same as over the elementary schools and high schools. This imposes upon the State department the necessity of determining

the standards of work done at each institution, the same as any other accrediting agency must do. In a few States, the function of administering the requirements for licensure in the many professions rests with the State department of education. This makes the State department an accrediting agency for all the professional schools the same as for the colleges which educate teachers.

The above brief description of accrediting activities, Nation-wide, regional, and State, will suffice to indicate that the extent and complexity of the accrediting movement have transformed in the short space of 30 years this innocent and helpful effort of the colleges to raise their own standards, into a cumbersome sort of machinery which appears greatly in need of simplification and coordination.

The problems arising out of the multiplicity of demands made by accrediting agencies have resulted in quite open expressions of discontent by many leading universities because of the fact that they have many colleges and schools, each accredited by a different agency. This difficulty has been felt more keenly, or at least expressed more openly, by State universities than by others. This is probably due to many factors, but chief among them is no doubt the possibility of conflict between the activities of accrediting agencies and the direct responsibility of the university to the State.

As manifestations of the discontent among State universities and land-grant colleges two actions taken by their national associations will be cited.

In 1924 the National Association of State Universities at its regular annual meeting adopted a resolution the first paragraph of which is as follows:

The National Association of State Universities has viewed with increasing concern the rapid increase in the number and variety of organizations which have undertaken to standardize procedures and policies in one or another branch of higher education. Not only does it feel that actions in matters vitally affecting the policies of State institutions have too often been taken by such organizations without sufficient provision for consultation with the institutions concerned, but it is further of the opinion that the movement toward standardization in higher education in America, while it has accomplished great good, is assuming such a character as seriously to limit both local initiative and that freedom of experimentation which is necessary for educational advance.¹

The remainder of the resolution provided for the appointment of a committee to study the problem of standardization and included among the duties of the committee, "to confer with such organizations and agencies both as to the larger participation by State universities themselves in the formulation and administration of educational policies affecting their work, and as to the confinement of the work of

¹ Transactions and Proceedings of the National Association of State Universities in the United States of America. Vol. 24, 1926, pt. II, p. 1.

such organizations within limits that shall leave ample scope for local initiative and experimentation."

Among the conclusions which that study seemed to justify, one was stated as follows in the report:

4. In a university having many schools and colleges, those units whose curricula are standardized by an outside agency, and whose rating is fixed by an outside agency, are in position to exert a disproportionate pressure upon the general university administration for funds. Therefore, all other units of the institution not already so standardized are feeling the impulse to standardize through national organization. On this account, the movement is likely to grow so as to include practically all phases of higher education.³

The growth of the movement as there predicted has taken place as was shown above.

In 1937 a considerable number of State universities and land-grant colleges became aroused by the increasing activities of standardizing agencies. The two associations, one the Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities, the other the National Association of State Universities, appointed a joint committee known as the Joint Committee on Accrediting. This Committee gave hearings to representatives of several standardizing agencies, and reported in 1938 to the two associations. The recommendations of the Committee as made to and adopted by the Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities were as follows:

(1) That the Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities establish a Joint Committee on Accrediting, cooperating with the National Association of State Universities, and authorize this committee to prepare for members of this Association a list of the approved agencies with which the members are encouraged to cooperate. It is understood that the new agencies seeking to institute accrediting procedures must first secure the approval of this Joint Committee.

(2) As a long-time policy, the work of the Committee should direct itself, among other things, toward an elimination of some of the existing accrediting agencies if possible, simplification of procedures, reduction of duplication, removal of dictation from groups outside the educational field, and restoration of responsibility to states and institutions.

(3) Authorize the Committee at its discretion, to cooperate with comparable committees or agencies of other associations having a similar interest and to participate in any general conferences dealing with problems of accrediting.⁴

It is clear from these recommendations that the land-grant colleges (and the same may be said of the State universities which adopted almost identical recommendations) are considerably aroused and propose to check the indiscriminate development of accrediting agencies. It is reasonably clear also that it will be difficult for the accrediting

³ *Ibid.*, p. 10.

⁴ Proceedings of the Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities. Fifty-Second Annual Convention, November 14-16, 1938. p. 333.

movement to proceed smoothly along its accustomed course without the support and cooperation of the State universities and the land-grant colleges.

Transition From Quantitative to Qualitative Standards

As accreditation has been carried on over the years by the numerous accrediting agencies more and more protests have been heard concerning the unsuitability of the standards being used. Some colleges which could not meet one or more of the standards set up and hence were denied accreditation were superior in their general educational effectiveness to numerous others which could meet all of the standards. Furthermore, the psychology of individual differences among children was working its way over into the field of institutional life and there was coming to be a better recognition among accrediting agencies of the need for individual differences among the institutions. It was becoming increasingly clear that an institution designed primarily to serve a selected group of highly intellectual students, for example, should have a very different program from that of an institution that was set up primarily to serve either the rank and file of college students or students of a distinctly different sort of ability from the ones being served by the first institution. Therefore, in 1929 the North Central Association, which had had the richest experience of any of the associations in carrying on the work of accreditation, sought and secured funds with which to make a critical study of its standards. The work was carried on under the supervision of a committee known as the Committee on Revision of Standards of the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education of the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools.

The study by this committee extended over a period of 5 years and resulted in a series of seven volumes which make very interesting reading to anyone concerned with the accrediting movement. The committee recommended a new program for accrediting and this program was adopted by the North Central Association at its annual meeting in 1934. In its statement of policy relative to accrediting, the paragraph dealing with bases of accrediting reads as follows:

An institution will be judged for accreditation upon the basis of the total pattern it presents as an institution of higher education. While institutions will be judged in terms of each of the characteristics noted in this statement of policy, it is recognized that wide variations will appear in the degree of excellence attained. It is accepted as a principle of procedure that superiority in some characteristic may be regarded as compensating, to some extent, for deficiencies in other respects. The facilities and activities of an institution will be judged in terms of the purposes it seeks to serve.⁶

⁶ Zook, George F., and Haggerty, M. E. *The Evaluation of Higher Institutions. I. Principles of Accrediting Higher Institutions.* p. 140. Chicago, Ill. The University of Chicago Press, 1936.

From this it will be observed that institutions are to be rated not by their compliance with a certain specified list of standards but on the basis of the total pattern which the institution presents. If, for example, the institution is deficient in endowment but yet employs good teachers, the deficiency in one respect may be assumed to be compensated for by the superiority in the other respect. Thus in the final analysis the North Central Association sets up certain general definitions of the effective college and leaves to the wisdom of its inspectors whether or not in the light of these definitions a given college is worthy of accreditation. This policy naturally leads to what has become the dominant practice of the North Central Association, namely, to differentiate among colleges on the basis of their different objectives. The question now is, how well does each institution accomplish its own purpose, not how rigidly does the institution conform to some widely accepted pattern.

This is such a radical change in the procedure of accrediting that it is hard to apply the same term to it that has been applied to the form of accrediting which has generally prevailed for the last 25 years. As an indication of the soundness of this new point of view, it is noted that within the past 2 years both the Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, and to a lesser extent many other associations, have accepted in principle the findings of the North Central Association and are modifying their practices accordingly.

When this new point of view has worked its way thoroughly into all the colleges, standardization based on the uniformity of institutions will yield to differentiation particularly among those colleges devoted in whole or in part to general education. Not all liberal arts colleges will try to be alike. Not all junior colleges will try to be alike. Teachers colleges will differentiate their curricula, more than at present, each limiting itself to training certain types of teachers.

As this movement develops there will be need for some basis of determining what particular objectives each college shall select. Not all liberal arts colleges can properly specialize on the program best adapted to the intellectually elite, and thus provide no college program for the "mine run" of youth in need of college training. Not all teachers colleges can specialize in educating high-school teachers of the so-called academic subjects and neglect the education of elementary teachers. Some educational pattern will have to be designed into which each college will fit. For most purposes the area for which that pattern can best be made is the State. Accordingly, accreditation on the basis of the effectiveness of each institution in achieving its own particular objectives will tend to be carried on most advantageously in the future by State agencies, rather than by regional or national agencies. Of course institutions such as medical schools and in some cases

denominational schools which fit into a regional or a national pattern rather than a State pattern will need to determine their particular functions or objectives on regional or national bases, and be accredited accordingly.

This means planning and cooperation among the colleges and universities whether within a State, a regional, or a national pattern. Accrediting agencies will naturally adjust their programs to facilitate this cooperation and will not seek to apply the same standards to all colleges. In this adjustment it seems likely that State agencies will find their functions materially expanded because these adjustments will involve generally the relations of colleges to their near neighbors, those within the same State.

Implied Responsibility of the State to Assure the Satisfactory Standards of the Colleges the State Establishes or Charters

Institutions of higher education from early days have been established or have been able to obtain charters in most of the States without meeting requirements set up by any State educational agency. In consequence, many States now find themselves with some institutions of low standards which are of doubtful service to the State. It is largely these weaker institutions that have made necessary the adoption of measures for accrediting institutions by out-of-State agencies. Furthermore, almost every State department of education faces the difficulty of deciding whether to place certain institutions of this type on the approved list for teacher education.

This situation of authorizing institutions to secure charters without first meeting certain educational standards and without being approved by an appropriate State educational agency continues to exist. There are at present 37 States which have never adopted any legal provisions placing supervisory control over the chartering of newly organized institutions in any State educational agency. It is possible in many of these States for three or more persons to charter an institution and open its doors by the simple process of filing articles of incorporation with the secretary of State or some other State officer. No guarantee is required that the proposed new institution possess the necessary financial resources, staff, and facilities to assure the conduct of academic work of full collegiate grade, to say nothing of the possible expensive duplication which the establishment of the institution may bring about.

Moreover, it is legally possible in almost all of the States for any type of school or institution to use the name "college" or "university." There are only three States which have enacted statutes prohibiting the use of the name "college" or "university," until specific approval of an appropriate State educational agency has first been obtained.

This applies alike to chartered or unchartered institutions. A single individual may start an institution, rent the second floor of a building, and adopt the name "college" or "university" without restriction.

Another problem found in many States is the absence of any effective regulation of the degree- and diploma-granting privilege. The value of a degree in this country is thus jeopardized. In fact, this absence of regulation has frequently resulted in the establishment of "diploma mills" which sell degrees at a fixed price or confer degrees and diplomas on scanty academic work. In some instances, persons conducting these questionable enterprises secure charters in States where they may be obtained without restriction, and then operate in other States and in foreign countries. Some progress has already been made in restraining the activities of "diploma mills" but their complete destruction depends upon legislation by all those States which have vested no authority at present in any educational agency to stop the abuse.

There are at present only 14 States that have legal provisions in force regulating in one way or another the degree- and diploma-granting privilege. Thirty-four have no such provisions.

There are two principal reasons why the State has been slow about guaranteeing a high quality of work in the colleges, both publicly controlled and privately controlled. First, many of our present colleges date back to the period before it was customary for the State to assume responsibility for any phase of education. They represent the tradition, therefore, of institutional independence. They have provided a much-needed educational service, some of them without public aid aside from the tax exemption of their educational property. Many of them have had the sponsorship and less often the support of some church, the handmaiden if not indeed the mother of education. For all these reasons it is natural that the State should hesitate to adopt regulatory measures in the field of college education.

Secondly, the college is the institution to which many of the State leaders owe affectionate allegiance as alumni. The faculty members are well known and highly respected citizens. On this account, then, it is natural that the State should be in no haste to assume its implied responsibility in respect to standards of college work.

Two situations are arising which are hastening the demand that the State assume more responsibility for standards than it has customarily done in the past. One of these is the rapid development of the junior college, and the other the grossly misleading advertising by the proprietary school of many types. A word about each.

Local communities in many States are seeking to establish junior colleges in conjunction with local public-school systems. They virtually duplicate the work of the first 2 years of the arts college. Pres-

sure of local community interests is frequently responsible for the establishment of such colleges rather than the educational needs of the communities and of the State as a whole. As in the case of the chartering of new institutions, the final approval as to whether a public junior college shall be established is commonly not vested by law in a State educational agency. A resolution adopted by the local district school board is all that is required to open a college in some instances.

The consequence is that public junior colleges are often established in communities unable to provide adequate financial support for them and unable to furnish sufficient students to justify their operation. They are often supported at the expense of the public high school. In the circumstances no plan is possible for distributing the junior colleges throughout the State on a proper geographical basis. At present, there are eight States having no public junior college law whatever, in which the colleges are established by local district school boards without specific legal sanction. Six other States, while having such a law, allow the colleges to be established by local district school boards without prior approval by the State department of education. In other words, local school boards in 14 States may establish junior colleges at their own discretion. Of the 22 States having one or more junior colleges operated in conjunction with local public-school systems, there are only 8 in which the State department of education is legally empowered to supervise or accredit them after establishment. This type of development is bound to be harmful to the junior-college movement.

Private proprietary schools are being established and operated in many of the States without regulation or accreditation by any State educational agency. Included among them are business, commercial, trade, and correspondence schools. Most of these schools conduct programs on the secondary school level. There are some, however, which have extended their programs to include collegiate work. A few have gone so far as to grant academic degrees. In some instances, the schools have adopted the name "college," in the absence of any State law forbidding its use by them.

These private proprietary schools are numerous throughout the country. Since they are profit-making enterprises, advertising and high-pressure soliciting for students is the common practice. Contracts are made with prospective students requiring full or partial payments of tuition fees in advance. Through financial reverses or for other reasons some of the schools fail or go out of business before completing the full courses of instruction provided for in the contracts. Many times these schools cannot make good on their promises. The students or their parents, unable to collect their advance tuition payments, suffer financial losses, or recognize too late that the school is not worthy of the students' efforts.

In addition, private schools of this character are not required to meet any educational standards under the prevailing conditions. Often they are conducted in unhygienic quarters without adequately trained staffs and necessary instructional equipment. Some correspondence schools with headquarters in one State make it a practice to solicit prospective students in other States.

The existing schools conducted on a legitimate basis and on sound business principles favor in general some form of State supervision. At the present time only eight States provide for the regulation or accreditation of either business, commercial, trade, or correspondence schools by requiring them to obtain a State license. One State prohibits business colleges from granting a degree of any kind except upon approval of the State board of education. In at least one State, accreditation is carried out on a voluntary extra legal basis in cooperation with the State department of education.

But States are becoming increasingly conscious of the above-described unsatisfactory conditions. Changes are taking place in the States' attitude, and recent developments foreshadow further changes. These will be discussed briefly.

In most of the States the people have built up publicly controlled colleges and universities. These constitute indirect but definite competition with the privately controlled colleges in their quest for funds. Foundations and philanthropists are becoming much more discriminating than formerly in their choice of institutions to aid. Income from endowments, always meager in the case of many of the colleges, is diminishing painfully in these same colleges under the lowering interest rates available on investments. The student-recruiting practices indulged in by many of the institutions are proving a boomerang in many cases and the college enrollments are declining in those institutions which are in the most dire need of tuition fees to maintain their educational programs.

As a result of all these changed conditions, enrollments in publicly controlled institutions are increasing more rapidly than in privately controlled institutions. Many privately controlled colleges are compelled to pay very low salaries, and are able to provide only inadequate equipment for the programs they maintain. In their financial extremity they are raising in an increasing number of States the question as to whether the State should not subsidize them. In some cases they quite frankly acknowledge that they are unable to compete for students with the publicly controlled low-tuition institutions. They maintain that they are unwilling to continue if continuing means to offer an inferior education. In some cases they see but two alternatives, (1) to get help from the States, or (2) to close up. If the latter, then they point out that the State will have to bear even a larger share

of the cost of the education of the students who would then transfer to the publicly controlled institutions.

One other trend has a definite bearing upon the attitude of the State toward higher education. While a few States like South Dakota and Montana have had for decades a single board of regents for the control of all the State's colleges and universities, most of the States have had separate boards for the several types of State-controlled institutions. During the past three decades, State after State has abolished separate boards, and substituted single boards for the control of some if not all of its colleges and universities. Later still, some of the States have provided for a single executive officer, usually called the chancellor, whose jurisdiction extends over all the institutions governed by a single board. Thus Georgia, Montana, New York, North Dakota, and Oregon now have such a unified system of publicly controlled higher education with an executive officer or chancellor.

As these single boards and chancellors study the needs of higher education in their respective States, it is inevitable that the place of the privately controlled institution should come in for consideration. What the privately controlled institutions are doing in a given State is bound to condition somewhat the programs of publicly controlled institutions in that State. Therefore, the single board in charge of publicly controlled institutions must of necessity be concerned with both the type and quality of work done by the privately controlled institutions. This is leading to efforts to coordinate the programs of all the institutions, public and private, so as to eliminate overlapping and yet provide adequately for all the higher education needs in the State. This is tending to build up a State consciousness and to break down the traditional institutional consciousness. It is significant that at least seven States have recently enacted laws providing for studies of their plans of managing higher education.

From the above it seems clear that the traditional hands-off policy maintained by States toward colleges and universities is being replaced slowly by a recognition of the State's ultimate responsibility. Higher education must be of an acceptable standard. Since the State charters the institutions and is the agency with ultimate legal jurisdiction over them, it is logical that the State should guarantee their quality.

What are some of the more important difficulties which States must overcome if and when they assume more largely their implied responsibility for insuring a satisfactory standard of college work? Mention will be made of three.

Inadequacy of present State accrediting agencies.—The responsibility for State accreditation of colleges is divided among a number of agencies in many States, while in others the legal authority possessed by one agency is delegated in practice to another. The State department of education and the State university are the most

common agencies doing accrediting. The State department of education in many States is interested in colleges and universities mainly because they educate teachers, but for that purpose the department must establish and maintain a list of colleges of all sorts from which the department accepts academic credentials for a teacher's certificate. But too frequently the State department works under two handicaps which the departments freely acknowledge: (a) Its personnel is not well suited to the task of college accreditation, and (b) its tie-up with partisan politics in many States makes it very sensitive to pressure which may be exerted by minority groups, such as the friends and alumni of a given college about to be refused accreditation.

On these accounts the accrediting done by State departments of education even for teacher-education purposes amounts to little more in many States than listing all the institutions in the State which apply for the recognition of their credentials.

While somewhat more removed from direct partisan politics, the State university suffers in a degree from the same handicaps. Its personnel may be unfamiliar with and sometimes unsympathetic with the work the colleges are doing. Its principal interest is the transfer of credits from these colleges to the university. Consequently the courses or curricula carried on by the college which are unlike any courses or curricula in the university are likely to be discounted by the university.

Furthermore, the university is often only one step removed from partisan or minority-group pressure. Since it gets its funds through legislative appropriations, it courts the friendship of the colleges because of their influence upon the legislature.

Complications growing out of the dual responsibility for educating teachers and certifying them.—School teaching is unique among the professions in that a large proportion of school teachers are employed by the public. The same public controls and supports a good many of the institutions which train these teachers but by no means all. The public in every State has provided for a department of public education to look after the State's interest in public education. It is natural, therefore, that this State department of education should have responsibility for certifying or licensing the teachers for the public schools.

But the institutions which educate the teachers are not in the majority of cases under the control of the State department of education. Publicly controlled institutions often have their boards of control separate from the State departments of education, and privately controlled institutions always do. The board governing the State university, for example, or more particularly the board governing the State normal schools or teachers colleges, assumes that one of its functions if not its chief function is to educate teachers. It employs specialists whose

time is devoted specifically to teacher education, and whose job involves keeping informed about the best developments in teacher education. The boards in control of these institutions regard themselves as representative of the State's interests just as truly as are the State departments of education. In short, they believe that their judgment—or that of the institution they control—with respect to what constitutes the best education of teachers should be accepted by the certifying agency. In confirmation of this belief, some States give to institutions authority by law to certificate their graduates as teachers, or to require the State department of education to certificate them.

Still another issue arises when privately controlled institutions are involved. These have been established over the years mainly for purposes to which preparing teachers is quite incidental. Yet their graduates constitute more than half the high-school teachers in the country. As teacher education has become more and more professionalized, these privately controlled colleges have experienced increasing difficulty. The new requirements for teacher education are hard for some of the colleges to meet, and yet they cannot persist as colleges for general education purposes unless their graduates can be certificated to teach. With new certification requirements, the colleges must make, at least in their own opinions, a sort of fish or fowl choice: either arts colleges or teacher-education institutions, not both.

To find a solution of this difficulty is one of the severest tests before State agencies charged with the responsibility of developing a State system of higher education.

Relation of the State to national professional organizations.—The State assumes responsibility for admitting to the practice of medicine, law, pharmacy, and many other professions only those persons who meet requirements set up by the State. The State provides for a board of examiners or of licensure in each of these professions. These boards are authorized by law to license successful applicants and refuse to license others. More and more commonly these boards are requiring that successful applicants for licensure must be graduates of "accredited" professional schools. This imposes upon them at once the necessity of maintaining a list of accredited professional schools.

But the examining boards do not have the facilities with which to pass first-hand upon the standards of colleges. It would be quite absurd for them to build up such facilities in each of the States. Hence they must depend upon other agencies for accreditation.

Some of the professions maintain national organizations of their practitioners, such as the American Medical Association, or the American Bar Association. Each of these associations, with more or less

cooperation of the appropriate association of professional schools, sets up machinery for accrediting the institutions in its field.

More commonly, the professional schools through their organizations such as the American Association of Collegiate Schools of Business accredit professional schools. This plan seems to prevail generally for those professions in which there is no State license required for practice. In those professions where State licensure is required, the national associations of practitioners assume in general more responsibility for accrediting professional schools from which State boards of examiners accept credentials.

The issue arising out of this situation is a subtle one. It is related to general social policy quite as much as to education. By controlling standards of professional education, it is obvious that the organization of practitioners may control the number of persons to be admitted to the profession. It is possible to use this power for the advantage of the practitioners rather than for the advantage of the public or the State.

The educational question involved is also a subtle one, particularly as it affects the State university. These professional schools are almost always parts of universities. The State appropriates funds for the support of the State university as a part of the total higher education program of the State. But requirements for these professional schools are largely fixed by these associations outside the State. The maintenance of a balance among the schools making up the university is very difficult under these circumstances.

The State establishes, let us say, a State board of medical examiners. It also establishes a medical school as a part of the State university. It would be anomalous for the State board of medical examiners to refuse to accept for their examinations the graduates of the State medical school. But that is a possibility under the present plan of relying upon an outside agency for the list of accredited medical schools.

While the problem of the relation of the State to national professional organizations has not become serious, it is fraught with possible seriousness in the future. The State which undertakes to solve its problems of college accrediting may not neglect it.

Transfer of Credits for Student Work From One Institution to Another, Both Within a State and Between States

Probably the greatest urge to establish accrediting agencies, whether State, regional, or national, has had its origin in the problem of the transfer of college students. As long as graduation depends mainly on accumulated credits, a student who transfers from one institution to another desires assurance before such transfer that the work done

in the first institution will count toward graduation in the second. This calls for some system of accrediting which will furnish each college with information as to the quality of work done in each other college from which it receives transfer students. Largely for this reason the Association of American Universities accredits liberal arts colleges, and the regional accrediting associations such as the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools accredit all types of colleges and universities in their respective territories.

In the light of this purpose of accreditation the general assumption has been that unless a college is accredited, students may not transfer from it to an accredited college or university. Or at least if such transfer is permitted, certain definite strings are tied to such transfer. But an examination of the actual operation of accrediting reveals a different situation. Admission of transfer students is not limited to those who come from accredited institutions. A recent case will illustrate. A graduate of a college not accredited by the Association of American Universities was denied admission on that score to the Sorbonne in Paris. The president of the college in question professed great surprise because his graduates have been and still are admitted to the leading graduate schools both public and private in this country on equal footing with those from accredited colleges.

The reason for this failure of the accrediting service to function as it was designed to, is not hard to find. If all that an institution knows is that the college in question is or is not on some accredited list, it must either admit or reject the transfer student on that basis. There are usually so many extenuating circumstances that the decision to reject the applicant is painful and often unjust. Therefore, unless there can be some detailed evaluation of an unaccredited college on the basis of which greater justice can be given to applicants for transfer, it is quite likely that students having a satisfactory record in such unaccredited college will be accepted as transfers by all but a surprisingly few colleges and universities.

But colleges have found a more satisfactory way of taking care of transfer students. The American Association of Collegiate Registrars makes an annual report on credit given by educational institutions to transfer students. This plan involves asking one institution in each State, usually the State university, to report on the amount of credit it accords to a student transferring to it from each other college in the State. The admissions officers in most of the other institutions whose registrars are members of the Association of Collegiate Registrars grant the same credit to transfer students.

A college in a given State does not use in the main the presence of a college on, or its absence from, the regional association lists when a student desires to transfer to it from a college in another State. The admissions officer, usually the registrar, in each college or uni-

versity depends upon the admissions officer of the reporting university of the State in which the college is located for an evaluation of the transfer record. Each college or university is willing to give to a student just such transfer credit as the reporting university in the State from which he is transferring would give him. Thus the colleges and universities whose registrars belong to the Association of Collegiate Registrars by a sort of gentlemen's agreement, actually operate largely independently of the regional and national associations, in facilitating the transfer of students from institution to institution and from State to State. In other words, each reporting university has quietly become in effect an accrediting agency for the colleges within its State insofar as the transfer of their students to other colleges and universities is concerned. The loose-leaf rating book revised each year by the American Association of Collegiate Registrars is the really effective system of facilitating student transfers.

And bear in mind that this accrediting by the reporting university is very detailed. Work of a given college may be given hour for hour transfer value in English, half value in economics, and no value in physics. Or the freshman and sophomore courses may be given full credit while the junior and senior courses may be docked half, or be given no credit at all. That is the sort of evaluation an institution desires concerning a college from which a transfer student comes.

It would seem, then, that the main aspects of the problem of transfer of students may be solved by proper organization within the State. The regional and national accrediting associations are not functioning very effectively in that field at present.

In summary it may be said that the issues and problems involved in the accreditation movement, fall into four categories, namely, (1) the extent to which the movement has gone, and promises to go; (2) the transition from quantitative to qualitative standards; (3) the implied responsibility of the State to guarantee a satisfactory quality of work in the colleges which it charters; and (4) the evaluation of college credits for students transferring from one college to another. To aid in the solution of the problems in each of these categories some procedure which uses a State pattern of organization for accreditation is utilized in some States and seems clearly indicated for all States.

It is possible that a further strengthening of the State machinery for accreditation holds out the clearest hope of solving the most urgent accreditation problems.

Suggestions as to how the State machinery for accreditation may be strengthened are made in the next chapter.

Chapter IX. A Concluding Proposal

HOPE FOR improvement in accrediting practices is widespread.—The studies reported in the earlier chapters of this bulletin reveal on the whole a rather unsatisfactory status of the function of accrediting institutions of higher education. But the accrediting movement is of such recent origin, and has grown so rapidly, that there has been little occasion until recently to raise questions about it.

However, in the past decade adverse criticism of accrediting practices has mounted. The regional associations have studied their programs more critically and have made changes of far-reaching importance in the bases of their appraisals of colleges and universities. The bearing of these changes upon their procedures of accrediting is yet uncertain but without doubt the use of quantitative standards will be much reduced. Individualized college programs will be encouraged. This will tend to lessen the emphasis upon accreditation as a means of helping colleges to attain minimum standards. It will also tend to nullify the present doubtful claim that regional accreditation helps colleges with their problems of transfer students. It seems fair to predict, therefore, that the regional associations will welcome any proposal that will enable them to minimize their use of accredited lists.

The national accrediting associations, centering mainly in organizations of specialists such as lawyers, doctors, and chemists, are becoming so numerous that strong resistance to their present line of development is already taking shape.

States are finding it necessary to increase their accreditation activities in order that their colleges and universities may function cordially as neighbors and that the States may carry out their legal responsibilities. Up to date, however, only a few States have developed machinery adequate to deal with the problem. The accreditation activities of State agencies in many of the States must be characterized as little more than a farce. It is recognized in practically all the States, however, that the present situation is a passing phase, and that something basic must be done to put the States in position to accomplish more satisfactorily the purposes of accreditation.

Placing larger responsibility upon some State agency appears to be indicated.—In the light of all these factors in the present situation, it seems inevitable that some fundamental change in the machinery of accrediting must take place. After months of study of the problem, the authors of this bulletin are convinced that such change should be in the direction of placing greater responsibilities upon appropriate agencies in the several States. While the

building up of machinery in the States adequate to overcome the great obstacles now present in many of them will be difficult and slow of accomplishment, it is believed that only as the movement veers in that direction will some of the present serious and growing troubles afflicting accreditation tend to disappear.

What is the most effective plan for the States to adopt if they wish to strengthen their accrediting activities? To attempt to answer that question is hazardous. Nevertheless, as the most useful way of bringing together the elements believed to be most essential for such a plan, a proposal is set forth on the following pages, embodying the opinions of the authors as to the best State organization for accrediting colleges and universities. In thus recording their views, their sole purpose is to stimulate the most serious study of the problem by those directly affected by it.

A Proposal for Strengthening the Accrediting Activities of Agencies Within Each State'

Arguments in its support will be offered following the proposal itself.—However, at the outset one thing should be made clear: The proposal to strengthen the accrediting activities of agencies within each State is not made with a view to reducing the effectiveness of the regional or national associations which now accredit institutions. These associations which have been and still are of great value to higher education were established and are now maintained for the purposes primarily of improving the quality of work of the colleges and universities, and secondarily, of facilitating the transfer of students from one institution to another. The belief is growing among these associations that if accrediting were done satisfactorily by some other agency they would be left free to carry out even more effectively their primary function of improving the quality of the work of the institutions. As for their secondary purpose—facilitating the transfer of students—experience has already shown that in general other agencies can serve that purpose better. The proposal here made is for the State to maintain an accrediting agency to cooperate with these regional and national agencies and not to compete with them. The imperative need for the accrediting services of these agencies during the transition period is recognized and it is hoped that until any given State does set up satisfactory accrediting machinery, the regional and national associations will continue to function as accrediting agencies in that State.

While no single type of accrediting agency is likely to prove the most satisfactory to all the States, the following proposal is believed to provide for necessary variations and to embody the most essential features of such an agency. This proposal envisages three plans of organiza-

tion of State accrediting agencies. Each of the several States will wish to utilize or develop the particular one of these plans which its own situation suggests.

Whatever plan is adopted, the State should make sure that no new machinery is set up where that already existing may be utilized to carry on the work of accreditation. But if new machinery is set up, the State should make quite sure that it is so devised as not to retard the development of a unified, well-integrated system of education in the State from the nursery school through the university. To this end, whatever accrediting agency is set up in any State in which the agency is not a part of the State board or department of education, should be so related to the State board or department as to facilitate the steps which such board or department must take to bring about the desired unification in the State's education program.

On the other hand, colleges and universities, both public and private, should be accredited by an agency as free as possible from the influence of pressure groups, representing political or other special interest. Wherever the State board or department of education is not thus free, or where it lacks the kind of personnel needed for this function, the State should build up an accrediting agency such as will assure colleges and universities a high-grade accrediting service.

It is understood that in many States, legislation will be required to make operative whatever plan of accrediting the given State may adopt.

Below are brief descriptions of the three plans suggested:

Plan A. Accrediting by the State Board or Department of Education

In a few States, the State board or department of education has at its center a governing board with the State superintendent or commissioner of education serving as executive officer of the board, has a staff adequate in number and qualifications properly to appraise institutions of higher education, and has widely recognized and comprehensive official relationships with institutions of higher education in the State. In such States the State department of education should have large and perhaps complete responsibility for the program of accreditation.

This plan of organization recognizes the essential unity of the entire program of education from the nursery school through the university and thus avoids the division of responsibility for the successive levels of education. The State board or department of education which in all States looks after the State's interest in elementary schools and high schools is also given responsibility for the State's interest in higher education in States operating under this plan. Such an organization avoids the conflicts which arise in some other States between the insti-

tutions which educate for the professions, notably teaching, and the State boards or agencies charged with certification or licensure. Such an organization also avoids the evils of competition for State support which arise when the State department of education seeks State support for elementary and secondary schools while other State boards such as regents of State universities or of State teachers colleges seek State support for institutions of higher education.

Most important of all, such a plan of organization facilitates the building of a well-integrated educational program for all levels of the system. The colleges cannot be charged with dominating the high schools by the device of college-entrance requirements. Transfer from one institution to another is made easy. In short, States which have developed such a State board or department of education are no doubt prepared to carry on effective accreditation of institutions of higher education by merely assigning that function to such authority.

Plan B. Accrediting by the State Board or Department of Education Through a Special Arm Created With the Cooperation of the Institutions of Higher Education

Certain other States, while placing the control of part or all of their institutions of higher education in boards other than the State board or department of education either have at present or may readily develop a State department with such official and unofficial relationships with institutions of higher education in the State, that those institutions will readily cooperate in creating an accrediting agency as an arm of the State board or department of education. When such an arm has been created, the full responsibility for accrediting institutions of higher education should be placed upon the State board or department of education, the activity to be carried on by the accrediting agency within the department, upon the terms agreed upon at the time of its creation.

Such a type of organization looks to the strengthening of the State board or department in its relation to higher education. It has the distinct merit of not creating new educational machinery, but utilizing the machinery already existing. It tends in fact toward the same unity of educational program on all levels as that which characterize plan A, heretofore described.

Plan C. Accrediting by a Special Commission or Board Set Up by the Cooperative Action of the Institutions and Agencies Concerned

A considerable number of States have State boards or departments of education with responsibilities limited largely to elementary and secondary schools. In these States other boards have been created

to govern the institutions of higher education. Many of these States have strong State colleges, universities, and teachers colleges in addition to privately controlled colleges and universities. While the problems of incoordination arising from this divided responsibility are growing more and more serious, it would probably not be desirable at present, even if feasible, to place responsibility for accrediting institutions of higher education in these States upon the State board or department of education.

In such States it is recommended that a plan for accreditation be formulated and adopted through the cooperative action of the State board or department of education, of publicly controlled institutions of higher education, and of privately controlled institutions of higher education in the State. Preliminary conferences or other action for this purpose may be initiated by any of the cooperating units. Such plan may involve the creation of a new board or commission, but consideration should also be given to the possibility of adding the function of accrediting colleges to the duties of some existing board such as the State board of higher education.

The accrediting agency here suggested should include representatives of at least the State board or department of education, of the State university or land-grant college, of the State teachers colleges as a group, and of privately controlled institutions of higher education as a group.

It is understood that this agency should in no wise interfere with the function of the State board or department of education in prescribing within legal limits the requirements for the certification of teachers nor with the functions of other State licensing boards in prescribing within legal limits the requirements for entrance into the other professions. In accrediting teacher-education institutions and other professional schools such agency should determine which institutions meet satisfactory standards in whatever departments of instruction the institutions maintain. The State department of education and the other State licensing boards would prescribe the particular courses and curriculums which the students must have pursued in the approved institutions in order to receive the various types of teacher certificates and professional licenses upon the submission of credentials from these institutions.

Those States which utilize plan C have, no doubt, the most difficult problem of accreditation to solve. Usually there has been little State-wide planning in the field of higher education in them. Many of the institutions have inadequate funds to maintain a high-grade program. Local community pressure has been responsible in large part for the establishment of many of the institutions and will continue to be felt if any institution is left off an accredited list. This pressure makes it difficult for the chief State school officer to deny accreditation even

for teacher-education purposes to such colleges, particularly in those States where the chief State school officer is elected by popular vote. Furthermore, accreditation in these States is frequently carried on by more than one agency thus bringing about confusion and inefficiency.

On these and many other accounts it is believed that for the job of accrediting colleges in such States the cooperative action of all the principal educational agencies in the State will be most effective, will withstand the pressure from minority and local groups, and will be particularly welcomed by the State officer who has legal responsibility for certificating teachers and must therefore have a list of approved teacher-education institutions.

Duties of the State accrediting agency.—In all States, whether utilizing Plan A, B, or C, the agency charged with accrediting institutions of higher education should have the following duties:

1. It should have immediate responsibility for the accrediting of all types of general collegiate institutions, including all those engaged in the education of teachers, and should ultimately have responsibility for all other accreditation, including professional schools.

2. It should establish proper relations with national and regional standardizing or accrediting associations. It is quite possible that the standards fixed by these agencies should be adopted at least in part as the standards of the State accrediting agency. It is possible, too, that the State accrediting agency will wish to invite representatives of these regional or national agencies to cooperate in the inspection of some or all of the institutions in the State, particularly where the State agency is embarrassed by local pressures.

3. Because certain other functions intimately related to accrediting call, in each State, for the services of such an agency, the following duties related to accreditation should be assigned by law to the above-described accrediting agency:

(a) Approve the granting of charters to new educational institutions in order to make sure that the prospective college is needed and will be able to finance its program adequately; inspect the work of the colleges from time to time, and suspend or revoke or recommend the suspension or revocation of the charter of any institution which fails to meet the stipulations of its charter.

(b) Prohibit the use of the name "college" or "university" by any institution, or person, except as defined by the accrediting agency. Exceptions must be made where this privilege is guaranteed to the institution by an irrevocable charter.

(c) Approve or deny the right of institutions or schools to grant any degrees, diplomas, and certificates, and rescind the right in case of the failure of institutions to maintain work of a recognized collegiate grade. This power should be applicable to existing institutions as far

as is consistent with the degree-granting privilege already irrevocably vested in the institutions by charter.

(d) Cooperate with other States to prevent disreputable interstate practices such as the awarding of worthless degrees and diplomas in States other than the State in which the bogus institution is chartered.

(e) With the concurrence of the State board or department of education in those States in which the agency is separate from such board or department, formulate suitable legislation to recommend to the legislature relative to the establishment of junior colleges whether separate from or in connection with public high schools.

(f) Where requested to do so by the State board or department of education in those States in which the agency is separate from such board or department, license private proprietary business, commercial, trade, and correspondence schools operating within the State.

Summary of the Principal Reasons for the Proposal

The responsibility for accrediting institutions of higher education should be placed in a State agency for the following reasons:

1. **The multiplicity of accrediting agencies.**—The present tendency to multiply agencies for accreditation cannot go on. The number of agencies calling upon the institutions for both facts and fees is bound to grow to such a point that the resistance, as yet only mildly expressed, will become insuperable.

2. **The State's obligation in fields related to accreditation.**—Certain functions related to accrediting institutions emphasize the legal responsibility of each State. These functions include teacher certification, professional licensure, and stamping out "diploma mills" and disreputable proprietary schools. Therefore, certain machinery for evaluating institutions of higher education is necessary in each State.

3. **Institutions concerned with improving colleges need not accredit them.**—The program of accreditation tends to be confused with the program of improving the quality of the institutions subject to accreditation. Associations of colleges, desirous of improving the work of their members, utilize accredited lists as a means to that end. It is now appearing that programs of accreditation have tended to produce undue standardization. With the growing emphasis on differentiation of functions among colleges, a program of improvement of the quality of institutions can probably be carried on best when not accompanied by accreditation. Accreditation by a State agency should be carried on with the cooperation of the associations and other agencies both within and outside the State devoted to the improvement of the institutions.

4. ***Student transfer from one college to another is best facilitated by accreditation by State agencies.***—Accreditation by regional or national agencies is not adequate to enable students to transfer readily from one institution to another. Much more detailed information concerning the work of a college than can properly be available to these agencies is needed for that purpose. Such information can be assembled most easily by those close at hand. Furthermore, the bulk of student transfers takes place between institutions in the same State. The institutions which receive most students by transfer have the greatest need of this detailed information about other colleges in order to work out their own plans of admission to advanced standing.

5. ***The unification of the several accrediting agencies in a State.***—The present practice in many States of carrying on accreditation by two or more State agencies is wasteful and otherwise unsatisfactory. A single State agency should be in charge of all accrediting within a State.

6. ***Such an agency will need only a small staff.***—It is not assumed that the agency here proposed would require the services of any considerable staff. After deciding upon policies, the agency would carry on its work by committees or individuals appointed to render particular services such as formulating standards and visiting institutions. For such services, members of faculties and of State department staffs, both within the State and outside, including representatives of regional and national associations, would be utilized. The best services available anywhere would be sought.

7. ***Accrediting colleges is fundamentally a State function.***—The most basic argument of all is that the State should not and probably will not indefinitely shirk its legal responsibility. The State is obliged to assure a high quality of higher education as certainly as of elementary education. Due to traditional differences in origin and development between higher education and elementary education, the State has exerted its authority over elementary education much more than over higher education. However, unsatisfactory conditions in higher education, which present methods of control and accreditation seem unable to correct, suggest that the State will tend in the future to assume more fully its responsibility in higher education. To this end it is important that the State shall set up such an agency, if it does not already have one, as will view that responsibility broadly and utilize the best available services both within and without the State in carrying it out.

SELECTED REFERENCES

Selected References

ALLEN, TRACY T. Desirable standards for accrediting institutions for the training of teachers. In Myers, Alonzo F., ed. Problems in teacher training. Proceedings of the 1924 spring conference of the Eastern States association of professional schools for teachers. Vol. 9, pp. 62-73. New York, N. Y., Prentice-Hall, inc., 1935.

Contains material taken from a thesis written by the author at New York University in 1934. Submits 23 proposed standards for teacher-education institutions validated by 255 jurymen, some of whom are outstanding educators. Applies particularly to Pennsylvania, but the standards are for the most part applicable to other States.

CAPEN, S. P. The principles which should govern standards and accrediting practices. The North central association quarterly. Vol. 6, no. 4, pp. 337-343. March, 1932.

Refers to standards of accrediting agencies as laws which are used to coerce higher educational institutions to a pattern pleasing to the lawgiver. Claims that through accredited list power of accrediting association is comparable to that of the government in countries which have governmental systems of higher education. Advocates that all accrediting practices in the United States be discontinued.

— Privileges and immunities. Bulletin of the American association of university professors. Vol. 23, No. 3, pp. 190-201. March, 1937.

Points out that the results of classifying enterprises of national and regional associations, State departments of education, and other bodies in higher education has resulted in retardation of the development and the lowering of the morale of institutions which have been given unfavorable rating.

Coordination of accrediting practices. American council on education studies, Washington, D. C., series I, vol. III, no. 9. 1939. 49 p.

A summary of the proceedings of a conference on accrediting attended by representatives of national and regional accrediting associations and of different higher educational organizations. Contains discussions of the purposes of accrediting and the objectional practices of accrediting agencies. Critical problems inherent in existing accrediting procedures are also analyzed.

Evaluation of higher education. Committee on revision of standards of commission on institutions of higher education. North central association of colleges and secondary schools. Vols. 1-7. Chicago, Ill. University of Chicago Press, 1936-37, 7v.

A comprehensive investigation into the entire program of accreditation of the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. This investigation resulted in a complete revision of the standards, policies and procedures of the association in evaluating and accrediting institutions. The volumes comprising the investigation are: 1. Principles of accrediting higher institutions, by George F. Zook and M. E. Haggerty; 2. Faculty, by M. E. Haggerty; 3. The educational program, by M. E. Haggerty; 4. The library, by Douglas Waples and others; 5. Student personnel service, by D. H. Gardner; 6. Administration, by J. D. Russell and F. W. Reeves; 7. Finance, by J. D. Russell and F. W. Reeves.

FRAZIER, BENJAMIN W. Development of State programs for the certification of teachers. United States Government printing office. Washington, D. C. (U. S. Department of the Interior, Office of Education, Bulletin 1938, No. 12.) 166 p.

An extensive analysis of State administration of certification, interstate exchange of certificates and interstate recognition of institutional credits, issuance of certificates upon credentials and by examinations, certification requirements and patterns, relation of teacher-education institutions to certification, and suspension or revocation of certificates. A summary of findings and recommendations is also included.

KELLY, FRED J. Report on standardizing agencies. Transactions and proceedings of National association of State universities in the United States of America, Vol. 24, part 2, 1926, 116 p.

This report made as a result of a resolution adopted by the association in 1924 outlines the standard and activities of the various organizations undertaking to standardize procedures and policies in one or another branch of higher education. It indicates that in the case of universities having many schools and colleges the units standardized by an outside agency exert a disproportionate pressure upon the general university administration for funds. The report further raises the question as to whether the standardizing agencies should not limit their activities to making sets of definitions and marshaling data leaving to the legally constituted agencies in each State the task of enforcing requirements.

— The State and standardization. Observations on a visit to European universities. *School Life*, 23: 33-35, October 1937.

A comparison between the policies adopted by England and those by the United States with respect to standardization of higher education by the State. Differences are shown in the practices of the two countries in controlling the chartering of higher educational institutions and in restricting their right to confer degrees.

— and **CAPEN, SAMUEL P.** The influence of standardizing agencies in education. Proceedings of the fourteenth annual meeting of the Association of urban universities, pp. 89-109. 1927.

Cites and discusses three dangers of standardization movement as follows: (1) Nation-wide standardization endangers public confidence on ground that the professions limit thereby the numbers who can enter the profession; (2) standardization of requirements gives to the schools whose curricula are thus standardized a disproportionate influence in their demands for support from university funds; and (3) for any agency to demand uniformity in educational practice all over the country tends to stifle experimentation and impede progress.

KLONOWER, HENRY, and others. Institutions of higher learning in relation to a State program of teacher education. Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Harrisburg, Department of public instruction bulletin 156. 1939. 29 p.

A description of the plan of accrediting institutions for teacher-education purposes in Pennsylvania together with a digest of legal provisions and procedures. Progress made in coordinating institutions of higher learning and in promoting inter-institutional relationships is also described. A brief historical sketch of the growth and development of State teachers colleges in Pennsylvania is likewise given.

MCNEELY, JOHN H. Supervision exercised by States over privately controlled institutions of higher education. United States Government printing office, Washington, D. C. (U. S. Department of the Interior, Office of education, Bulletin 1934, No. 8.) 64 p.

Outlines legal provisions of several States for incorporating privately controlled institutions of higher education, including procedures, limitations, and requirements with which they must comply at time charters are granted and after charters have been granted. Also presents legal provisions of States restricting the right of such institutions to confer degrees and supervisory powers of States over teacher-training work in institutions whose graduates are to receive State teachers' certificates without examination.

NORLIN, GEORGE. Standardizing agencies and their interference with normal university development. Transactions and proceedings of National association of State universities in the United States of America. Vol. 36, pp. 11-20. November, 1938.

Points out that existing standardizing and accrediting agencies in rating, approving, or disapproving schools and departments within universities virtually assumes control of educational policy in the particular line of its interest, thereby superseding authority of the governing board.

Organization and administration of teacher education. Commonwealth of Kentucky. Frankfort, Department of education Bulletin, no. 11. January 1938. 50 p.

Presents State's program of teacher education, including statutory provisions for accrediting institutions, training and certification of teachers, curricula upon which certificates are issued and cognate standardization procedures. The bulletin also contains the regulations of the State department of education respecting teacher certification.

RATCLIFFE, ELLA B. Accredited higher institutions. United States Government printing office, Washington, D. C. (U. S. Department of the Interior, Office of education, Bulletin 1938, No. 16.) 212 p.

Contains standards and accredited lists for general collegiate and teacher-education institutions of regional and national accrediting associations, of State departments of education, and of State universities. Also gives professional and technical schools accredited, approved, or classified by national organizations.

Statutory status of six professions. Research bulletin of the National education association. Vol. 46, no. 4. Washington, D. C. September 1938. 150 p.

Presents legal regulations, provisions of expulsion, and revocation of licenses for professions of accountancy, architecture, law, medicine, nursing, and teaching in the several States. Special attention is given to comparing the statutes applicable to these different professions with those applicable to teachers.

TIGERT, JOHN J. Report of the joint committee on accrediting agencies of the National association of State universities and the Land-grant college association. Transactions and proceedings of the National association of State universities, Vol. 36, pp. 21-38. November 1938.

Presents and discusses following findings of the committee in its inquiry into activities of accrediting agencies: (1) There are too many accrediting agencies; (2) accrediting agencies are invading the rights of the institutions, are destroying institutional freedom, and assuming powers vested in boards of control; (3) costs to the universities in membership and visitations of the accrediting agencies are becoming excessive; (4) too much duplication exists among the national and regional accrediting organizations; (5) standards used by most of the accrediting agencies are unmoderated; and (6) tendency is developing for these outside accrediting groups to dominate the institutions and to refuse to them the freedom that they ought to have in participating in this movement.

ZOOK, GEORGE W. Who should control our higher education? Proceedings of fifty-second annual convention of the Association of land-grant colleges and universities, November 1938, pp. 90-99.

Reviews control of higher education in its relationship to the development of voluntary accrediting agencies pointing out the gathering storm of criticism against their activities. Proposes that accrediting process of these agencies be modified by abandoning quantitative standards, developing programs for stimulating institutions toward self-improvement, permitting institutions to select their own objectives, and encouraging experimentation in new educational processes.