

MONOGRAPH 9

Supervision of
Secondary Education as a Function
of State Departments
of Education

By

CARL A. JESSEN

Senior Specialist in Secondary Education

and

W. T. SPANTON

Chief, Agricultural Education Service

BULLETIN 1940, No. 6

MONOGRAPH No. 9

Studies of
STATE DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

PAUL V. McNUTT, Administrator

U. S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION

JOHN W. STUDEBAKER, Commissioner

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON : 1941

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, Washington, D. C. - - Price 10 cents

ii

Contents

| | Page |
|-------------------------------------|------|
| FOREWORD..... | v |
| I. DEVELOPMENT..... | 1 |
| II. ORGANIZATION AND PERSONNEL..... | 4 |
| III. FUNCTIONS..... | 10 |
| IV. ACTIVITIES..... | 21 |
| V. COÖPERATIVE RELATIONSHIPS..... | 35 |
| VI. SOME RECURRING PRACTICES..... | 43 |

Foreword

WHEN, by the tenth amendment of the Federal Constitution, there were left to each State of the Union the right and the responsibility to organize its educational system as it saw fit, the way was opened for establishing the beginnings of State policy with reference to public education. Moreover, the grants of land made for educational purposes and the creation of school funds, in the use of which local districts shared, brought early into the educational picture some form of State regulation. The receipt of aid from the State was accompanied by the necessity of making reports to the State, and this in turn evolved into compliance with other State demands as well. As a result, State officials were appointed to receive reports from the school corporations and to deal with them in matters relating to the apportionment of funds and other items of State policy.

The early duties of the officers thus appointed were largely clerical, statistical, and advisory with reference to the application of the State school law. But out of them grew the comprehensive structure of the modern State education department, with its chief State school officer acting in many cases as executive officer of the State board of education. Today myriad responsibilities of administrative, supervisory, and advisory services replace the original simple functions of tabulation of records and management of funds. State educational administration has become a challenging opportunity for exercising constructive leadership in the State's educational affairs.

Because of the individual authority of each State for its own educational program, practices and policies differ widely among them in many respects. Yet in the midst of differences there are also common elements of development. The United States Office of Education, in presenting this series of monographs, has attempted to point out those common elements, to analyze the differences, and to present significant factors in State educational structure. In so doing, it accedes to the requests of a large number of correspondents who are students of State school administration and who have experienced the need for the type of material offered in this series.

The sources of information have taken the form of both documentary evidence and personal interviews. During the year 1939, more than 20 representatives of the Office of Education were engaged in visiting State education departments throughout the country, conferring in each case with the chief State school officer and his assistants. Working in "teams" of from 2 to 7 persons, they spent several days in the State offices of the respective States, seeking accurate and comprehensive data, gathering all available printed or mimeographed

documents, and securing from each member of the department who was available an oral statement of his duties, activities, and problems. Preceding this program of visitation and again preceding the compilation of reports, committees of chief State school officers met in Washington with members of the Office of Education staff, to assist in the drafting of plans, and later in the formulation of conclusions. No effort was spared, either at the time of the visits or in studying and checking data subsequent thereto, to make of the final report for each State a reliable document.

The topics considered in the series include problems of administrative organization and relationships, financial control and assistance, legislative and regulatory standards, and various types of supervisory services. Each has been studied from the point of view of past developments and of organization existing at the time of the visit to the State. For some fields of activity a State-by-State description is given of policies, problems, and practices. For some, selected States are used as examples, with a summary of significant developments and trends in all States. The total series, it is hoped, will prove to be a helpful group of publications relating to the organization and functions of State education departments and of the boards of education to which they are related.

The present publication is one of the series of monographs dealing with supervision. Essentially it includes discussion of the history and development of secondary school supervision, the supervisory personnel, the functions performed, the activities engaged in, and the working relationships which facilitate supervision at this level. Services rendered by personnel assigned to both high-school supervision and supervision of vocational education are included.

To the chief State school officers, to members of their respective staffs, and to other State officials who have assisted in furnishing data for this series of monographs, the United States Office of Education expresses its deepest appreciation. Without their wholehearted cooperation the publication of the series could not have been realized. The entire project is an example of coordinated action, both on the part of Office of Education staff members who have participated in it and on the part of State officials who gave so generously of their time and effort to supply the needed information and materials.

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

2

Supervision of Secondary Education as a Function of State Departments of Education

I. Development

THE IMPORTANCE of State supervision of high schools has long been recognized. Just when and where the idea was first put into practice is difficult to say. One may, for instance, defend with considerable success the thesis that State supervision in Massachusetts began with Horace Mann in 1837 or that supervision in New York State had its rise with the appointment of Gideon Hawley as superintendent of common schools in 1813. Even earlier isolated inspections of secondary (and higher) schools by State agencies can be cited. If, however, we understand by supervision an enduring and continuous service to secondary schools in the State and the appointment of personnel on a somewhat permanent basis specifically for supervision of secondary schools, these early services must be ruled out. They were too often sporadic in their application to secondary education and were performed by persons who had many educational irons in the fire, one of which was secondary education. Frequently their major concerns were in other areas.

Supervision of secondary schools was, however, among the earlier supervisory services established in State departments of education. Some of the State representatives interviewed in the present investigation did not know when the first supervisory officers were appointed in their States; nor were they able to supply references which would establish dates for early supervision by the State. Leaving out of consideration 10 States in which the first supervisory service has not been ascertained, the evidence indicates that the first specific supervisory service in 17 State departments of education was assigned to secondary schools, in 8 States to rural schools, in 3 States to elementary schools, in 1 State to junior high schools and agricultural education, and in 9 States concomitantly to elementary (or rural) and secondary schools, the work being sometimes performed by one person.

In a number of States earlier supervisory or inspectional services than those mentioned above issued from the State university or from other higher institutions in the State, for State supervisory programs in secondary education took their rise from the need of adequately preparing students for college. From Colonial times the colleges had

drawn their students principally from their own preparatory departments and a few closely affiliated preparatory schools. As the number of academies and high schools grew, the problems surrounding college entrance also grew. Examinations for college entrance were used extensively, but had their defects. Considerable skepticism existed about the effectiveness of academies and high schools as preparatory institutions. Moreover, some State universities, especially in the Middle West, had to rely to considerable extent upon the high schools as feeder institutions. The doubts regarding the adequacy of their graduates as college material coupled with the need for having those same graduates in the universities as students made it imperative that closer relations should be established between the high schools and the State universities.

The University of Michigan was one of the institutions which encountered this problem. Since the university in that State did not have a preparatory school of its own, dependence upon high schools for university students was especially significant. The problem was dealt with at length by President Frieze in his annual report of 1870 and the following year the University of Michigan put into operation a plan for a committee of the faculty to visit high schools requesting such visits. If the members of the committee were satisfied with what they saw and could learn about a given school, it was placed in a preferred position under which its graduates would be admitted to the university on the recommendation of the high-school principal or the superintendent, but with no entrance examination of the individual student being required.

In 1873 Indiana put into operation a system of "commissioning" high schools whose graduates might then be admitted to the university on probation, but without examination. The Indiana plan differed from the Michigan plan in that the State board of education passed upon the "commissioning" of schools. At first the approval was granted mainly on the basis of reports submitted by the schools, no visit being required, but in 1888 it was ordered that some member of the State board of education should visit a school and submit a report in writing before that school might be "commissioned." Still no provision was made for the employment of a special officer for general visiting of secondary schools.

In the years following the beginnings in Michigan and Indiana other States developed plans for inspection of high schools and entrance of their graduates to the university without examination. One of these was Wisconsin, where efforts by the university to strengthen the high schools had through the 1870's gradually evolved into a system of inspection of schools by university authorities for college entrance purposes. It was not, however, until 1889 that the Wisconsin State Department of Education became active in the work of accredit-

ing schools. In that year the legislature authorized the State superintendent of public instruction to appoint a high-school inspector who was "to assist him in visiting, inspecting, and supervising the free high schools of the State." This appointment in 1889, according to data supplied to the United States Office of Education, is the first provision made for a supervisory officer specifically assigned to the secondary area and attached to a State department of education.

A few other States appointed high-school inspectors or supervisors before the turn of the century, but the important expansion in State services to secondary education did not occur until the period 1906 to 1920. It was during this time that the general education board began to assist States in the South to employ State supervisory officers; moreover, the rapid rise in high-school enrollments, the passage of the Smith-Hughes Act in 1917, and the emphasis on youth and services to youth during and following the war period all contributed to an expansion in State departments of public instruction. At least 27 States established for the first time supervisory positions in secondary education during the period 1906 to 1920; 12 States appointed their first supervisors in secondary education within 5 years, 1916 to 1920. More than three-fourths of the States established supervisory services to secondary schools before 1920.

The earlier State officers were principally concerned with accrediting programs and inspectorial functions. This emphasis developed naturally from the genesis of State supervision of high schools for purposes of providing satisfactory entrants to higher institutions of learning. Both by extraction and by statute supervision by State departments of public instruction was closely affiliated with accrediting, standardization, and classification of schools. This motive is still important in State supervision of high schools. However, as more and more pupils have entered the schools, increasing majorities of whom are not destined for college, State supervision has tended in the direction of emphasizing an adequate educational program for all youth, including the noncollege group no less than those who will continue their school attendance beyond high-school graduation. Accompanying this movement has been a gradual retirement of the college from participation in the accrediting of high schools and a growing emphasis upon revision of the high-school curriculum and methods of teaching. Even the accrediting function in recent years has taken on the character of stressing the progressive improvement of schools fully as much as the reaching of an established minimum which would give the school accredited rating.

A special State supervisory service to secondary education was initiated by the passage of the Smith-Hughes Act for vocational education in 1917. The act, it is true, made no specific provision for

the use of Federal funds for the State supervision of federally aided programs of vocational education. The act, however, did make separate allotments to the States for the maintenance of teacher training and specified that not less than 20 percent of the total teacher-training fund shall be expended for the training of teachers in any one of the three fields of vocational education as a condition for the use of the allotment of Federal funds for salaries of teachers in any one of these fields of service.

Since the purpose of supervision is the improvement of teaching and since the improvement of teachers in service is a necessary part of an effective teacher-training program, the Federal Board for Vocational Education as early as July 1918 (just a little more than a year after the Smith-Hughes Act was passed) ruled that teacher-training funds may also be used for the maintenance of State supervision. In 1925 this ruling was broadened so as to include local supervision as a reimbursable item from Federal teacher-training funds.

Because some States found it unnecessary to use their entire allotment of Federal teacher-training funds for institutionalized pre-employment teacher-training programs, they welcomed the opportunity of being permitted to use these funds for the maintenance of itinerant teacher training and State supervision. Needless to say this ruling served as an effective stimulus for the strengthening and expansion of supervisory activities within the several States. Today each of the 48 States, the Territory of Hawaii, and the Island of Puerto Rico have provided for one or more full-time or part-time supervisors in each field of vocational education with the exception of vocational education in distributive occupations which was not inaugurated until the passage of the George-Deen Act in June 1936.¹

II. Organization and Personnel

In every State the administration of vocational education is by law a function of the State board for vocational education. In all of the States a State director of vocational education has been appointed in order to provide adequately for the proper integration of all fields of vocational education for which Federal funds are being used. In 13 States the chief State school officer serves as executive officer of the State board for vocational education and also as State director of vocational education. In 35 States a separate director of vocational education is employed. In 26 of these States the State director serves in this capacity on a part-time basis, giving the other part of his time to supervision in one of the fields of vocational education. In all but a very few States where a separate director of vocational

¹ Federal funds for the maintenance of supervision of vocational education in distributive occupations were specifically authorized in the basic Act of June 1936.

education is employed, he is responsible to the State board through the State executive officer, who in turn is almost universally the chief State school officer. In a few States, of which Washington and Wisconsin are examples, vocational education is set up as a separate enterprise having little or no connection with the State department of public instruction.

Supervisors in each of the several fields of vocational education always are employed to assist the director in the administration of the programs in their specific fields and to help local school administrators and teachers improve their vocational instruction and further develop their respective local programs. Twenty-three State supervisors of vocational education are located at some convenient center other than the offices of the State board for vocational education. Regardless of their location, supervisors always work under the immediate control and direction of the State board for vocational education during that portion of their time which is devoted to State supervisory functions.

The controlling purpose of all federally reimbursed programs of vocational education is to train for useful employment. Such programs must be of less than college grade and designed to meet the needs of persons over 14 years of age. These restrictions are contained in the basic act and apply to all fields of vocational education except teacher training. All vocational instruction conducted under the provisions of the National Vocational Education Acts must be given in schools or classes under public supervision or control and is ordinarily organized into three major groups or kinds of classes as follows: (1) All-day occupational preparatory schools or classes for persons who are regularly enrolled students in day schools, including cooperative classes in which students secure practical experience in employment outside the school; (2) part-time schools or classes for persons who ordinarily would be in or above the secondary-school age group, but who for various reasons are no longer enrolled in school; and (3) evening schools or classes for adults who already are employed in an occupation and who return to school at reasonably frequent intervals to secure additional instruction to supplement their daily employment.

The supervision of all of the above-mentioned types of instruction in each of the fields of vocational education is under the general supervision of the State supervisor for that particular service and could be classified as falling in the field of secondary education. In the case of trade and industrial education greater specialization in supervisory functions frequently obtains. Special supervisors of part-time instruction, evening instruction, police training, fire training, and other public service occupations frequently are employed, all working, however, under the general supervision of the State supervisor of trade and industrial education.

The number of persons employed as full-time or part-time supervisors in each of the fields of vocational education varies, of course, from State to State depending largely upon each State's particular needs and financial ability. For example, in some States there may be one head State supervisor with one or more assistant supervisors together with several district or area supervisors in one of the fields, while in other fields one full-time or a half-time supervisor may be adequate to supervise all of the vocational activities in that field in the State.

Since federally reimbursed programs of vocational education in distributive occupations are comparatively new, there are still a few States that have not yet employed supervisors nor inaugurated training programs in these subjects. In certain other States where the program has not yet reached large proportions the supervision of vocational education in distributive occupations is being conducted by the State supervisor of trade and industrial education who also qualifies as a supervisor of vocational education in distributive occupations.

In some of the smaller or more sparsely populated States it has been found more economical to have the supervisor in one or more fields of vocational education serving as a part-time supervisor and part-time teacher trainer for his special field.

The supervisory organization for vocational education is rather well developed in that a number of persons are employed in supervisory positions in each State; its scope is well defined in that the supervisory responsibilities both extend and are limited to agriculture, home economics, trades and industry, and distributive occupations; and it is compact in that with a few exceptions each supervisor has one and only one specific area to supervise. Moreover, the law and experience have determined that vocational supervision shall be at the high-school level with only a few excursions into the elementary school and, except in teacher education, none into college.

Supervision of secondary education, other than in the vocational field, is marked by variety in both organization and personnel. No uniform pattern could meet the differing and changing demands in the several States. As will appear presently, however, the variety is not so great as to make classification altogether impossible.

One feature which should not be ignored is that there are employed in every State department some staff members whose work cuts across secondary education. Among such individuals and services found most frequently are those concerned with libraries, special education, school buildings, Negro education, and various subject fields, especially music and physical education and health. They are dealt with in detail in other bulletins of this series and are therefore not described in the present study.

The more immediate concern of this section is with the personnel assigned to secondary education as a level of instruction. There are in all States, except Colorado (which relies upon the State university to work with the secondary schools) employees who are specifically assigned responsibility for supervision of secondary schools. Four of the States are rather unusual in their organization. These are: Arizona, where the work of the State department of public instruction with secondary schools is done mainly by two persons, one who works with tests and measurements, the other with certification; Florida, which has a division of instruction in which no one is specifically assigned to secondary education, but where rather extensive activities involving secondary schools are performed by the director of the division of instruction, the curriculum adviser, and the supervisor of school accreditation; Rhode Island, where the service to secondary schools is given by the chief of the division of promotion and supervision; and Wyoming, where the commissioner of education as a member of the staff of the State superintendent of public instruction carries responsibility for both elementary and secondary schools.

In the remaining 43 States assignment of responsibility for high schools is made to officials with titles such as high-school supervisor, director of secondary education, assistant superintendent in charge of secondary schools, director of division of instruction, and the like. That there is no uniformity in the titles of these officers may be judged from the fact that in the 43 States there are 30 different titles of the persons in charge of secondary schools. In 10 States they are associate, assistant, or deputy superintendents or commissioners; in 15 States they are called directors of secondary education, of secondary schools, of supervision or of instruction; and in the remaining 18 States they have titles such as supervisor, inspector, or agent.

More important than the titles are the number employed professionally on secondary-school work. Again omitting the 5 States first mentioned, there are 13 States that have one official assigned to secondary schools for full time or for part time. There are 16 States that have two such officials with varying extent of full-time and part-time assignment. The remaining 14 States have more than 2 professional persons supervising schools at the secondary level; however, with the frequent part-time assignments this cannot always be interpreted as meaning that more than the equivalent of two persons for full time give attention to secondary schools. The staffs which appear to be largest are those of Illinois and Texas with respectively 9 and 25 State officers who divide their time between elementary and secondary supervision; Oklahoma and Missouri which have, respectively, 4 and 6 full-time supervisors or inspectors of secondary schools; and Pennsylvania and New York which have 3 full-time and several part-time officers each at the secondary level. New York with its

11 persons employed in the Division of Secondary Education, all of whom give the major part of their time to secondary schools, and the additional assistance secured from divisions of vocational education, research, examinations and testing, elementary education, health and physical education, and school buildings and grounds, not to mention several bureaus, undoubtedly has a larger staff giving attention to secondary education than any other State.

All told, there are 145 staff members of State departments that are employed full time or part time on supervision of secondary schools. Of these, 58 are full-time supervisors of secondary education in 34 States. Some of these 34 States have in addition supervisors that give part of their time to secondary education. Of the States having only part-time supervision at the secondary-school level, 9 have from 2 to 25 such supervisors.

There are three dominant types of organization for State supervision of secondary schools in these 43 States. Most readily defined is the type under which the State is divided into districts and one or more supervisors assigned to each area. Seven States are organized on this basis. In Illinois, Iowa, and Maryland there are 3 supervisory districts; in Missouri, 5; in Nevada, 6; in Georgia, 7; and in Texas, 24. In Georgia, Maryland, Nevada, and Texas the supervisory officers reside in the districts which they supervise; in the other 3 States their headquarters are at the State office. In Maryland and Missouri separate supervisory organization is maintained for elementary education; in the other 5 States supervision of both elementary and secondary schools is performed by each staff officer. Nevada and Texas give these officers the title of deputy State superintendent; in Illinois they are assistants to the superintendent; and in the other 4 States they are supervisors or inspectors.

Another type of organization followed in 11 States is through a division of supervision (or instruction) within which various supervisory services, including secondary education, are brought together.¹ Included here are the States of Alabama, Connecticut, Kentucky, Massachusetts,⁴ Michigan, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Virginia, and Wisconsin.⁵ In New York and Pennsylvania the service to secondary education is large enough to have a subdivision of its own with a chief in charge. In Connecticut the division of instruction includes a section on supervision in which are supervisors

¹ Wisconsin also has a plan for districting for high-school supervision, but because of certain other characteristics of supervision Wisconsin has been placed in another classification.

² As mentioned earlier in this section, Florida also has a division of instruction, but with no staff officer assigned especially to secondary education.

³ In Massachusetts the name, *Division of elementary and secondary education and teacher training* is given to this service. The division has responsibilities somewhat similar to those of divisions of instruction in other States.

⁴ Wisconsin brings a number of supervisory services, including secondary education, together under a senior assistant superintendent who in addition has responsibility for some nonsupervisory services.

of rural, secondary, adult, and other areas. All of the 11 States have in their divisions of instruction services to both secondary and elementary (or rural) education, although 2 of the States indicate no specific title in elementary education. Oddly enough only 3 of the 11 States (Connecticut, Ohio, and Pennsylvania) indicate that vocational education is included in the division of supervision. Health and physical education services are included in 7 States, the curriculum in 5, teacher training in 3, special education in 3, library in 2, school buildings in 2, research in 2, and Negro education in 2. Massachusetts, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Virginia have music supervisors in their divisions of instruction; New York and Pennsylvania also have supervisors in a number of the other large subject areas. Individual States have services in various other supervisory areas, but all those appearing in at least 2 States are mentioned above.

The third type of organization is found most frequently. Under this plan 1 or 2 (sometimes 3 or more) high-school supervisors are employed to work on a State-wide basis directly under the chief State school officer. The remaining 25 States follow this pattern. Usually these supervisors are assigned specifically and only to secondary education. An exception is Indiana, where they are responsible for supervision of both elementary and secondary schools. Minnesota also has a plan by which those who supervise secondary schools do the supervising of State graded schools, generally located in cities or villages; the rural elementary schools of Minnesota, however, are assigned to other supervisory officers.

In New Hampshire and Vermont the direction of vocational education is the responsibility of the officer in charge of secondary education generally. In Rhode Island the assistant director of education is also director of vocational education. Adding the 3 States mentioned in an earlier paragraph and Florida, which also includes vocational education in the division of instruction, one arrives at 7 as the total number of States in which the organization indicates a rather close integration between secondary and vocational education. In addition, in New York the assistant commissioner for instructional supervision and the assistant commissioner for vocational and extension education report to the same associate commissioner. In most of the other States direction of secondary education and of vocational education are delegated, but to different officers; in 13 of the States supervision of secondary education is delegated by the chief State school officer, but direction of vocational education is not.

By way of summary—it will be seen that more than half of the 48 States follow the plan of employing an officer or officers for the supervision of secondary education working on a State-wide basis directly under the chief State school officer; in the large majority of cases these officers are responsible only for secondary schools. One-fourth

of the States have brought their supervisory officers together into a division of supervision (or instruction); usually one or more of the supervisors is assigned to secondary education. The remaining one-fourth of the States have various types of organizations, although districting the State for supervisory purposes occurs frequently enough to warrant special comment; in this one-fourth of the States, supervision of secondary education is likely to be merged with other supervisory duties, most frequently with supervision of elementary education.

It is apparent that in the two plans of organization last mentioned, attempt is made to bring about integration through organization, in the one case principally through employment of supervisors who will do the actual supervising of both elementary and secondary education, and in the other through employing special supervisors for different areas, but effecting integration through having them all do their work under the direction of the same officer. In the plan of organization mentioned as followed by 25 States, integration is often aimed at through having all supervisory activities clear through an assistant or deputy State superintendent (or commissioner), but without organization of a division of supervision.

All types have their champions and certainly all types have their advantages as well as their disadvantages. Moreover, good State supervisory organizations exist under each of the types. This would suggest that effective integration of supervisory services is not primarily a result of organization but is brought about through reasonableness and a give-and-take relationship among the various supervisors.

III. Functions

Accrediting

The functions of State supervision of high schools vary in scope and emphasis from State to State. The one which is discharged most frequently is accrediting of schools. While accrediting may not have been clearly defined at all times as a significant supervisory function it is true that it is being used more and more for bringing about improvements in the services of the high schools. Progressive upgrading through the meeting of higher standards from time to time is an element found rather commonly in accrediting programs.

The State departments of education in all States except California, Colorado, Michigan, Nevada, and Wisconsin now issue lists of accredited high schools. In the 3 States first mentioned the State universities issue such lists; in Nevada the University accredits for college entrance. In Wisconsin neither the State department nor the university issues a list of accredited schools; the State Department, however, passes upon schools before they can participate in State

aid, and in practice this official list of State-aided schools is accepted as equivalent to an accredited list. Until recently the University of Nebraska was the accrediting agency in that State, but this function has now been taken over by the State Department of Public Instruction. In Georgia and Illinois the State University and the State Department issue joint lists of accredited schools.

All accrediting programs whether operated by higher institutions or by State departments provide for rating of schools which issue a high-school diploma at the end of their courses. This means that in all cases provision is made for recognition of 4-year high schools. In many cases 3-year senior high schools are also accredited on the basis of their 3 years of work; however, in a number of States senior high schools are not recognized by themselves, accrediting being based upon the work of the last 4 years in high school. The trend is definitely toward accrediting on the basis of either 3 or 4 years of work, depending upon whether the school is a 3-year or a 4-year institution.

Two decades ago the tendency was not to accredit any work below the last 4 years. With the increase in reorganized schools, has come some form of recognition or approval of junior high schools or 6-year schools in approximately half of the States.

Classification of schools, where it appears, is usually a concomitant of accrediting. Six States (Florida, Louisiana, Minnesota, New York, Ohio, and Pennsylvania) make the classification fundamentally on the basis of types, such as 4-year, senior, junior, 6-year, and variants within these patterns. Ten States (Georgia, Illinois, Maine, Maryland, Mississippi, Missouri, South Carolina, South Dakota, Texas, and West Virginia) base their classifications on whether the schools offer complete or partial high-school courses; accrediting of 2-year schools offering the first 2 years of a 4-year course, for instance, is common in these States.

An increasing number of States give qualitative ratings to schools in their accredited lists. The accrediting programs in at least 13 States (Arizona, Arkansas, Delaware, Indiana, Kansas, Kentucky, Massachusetts, North Carolina, North Dakota, Tennessee, Vermont, Virginia, and Wyoming) have this characteristic. In these States there are separate sets of standards or at least differentiated standards to be met by different classes of schools. A feature of such a plan is that an incentive is offered for schools to improve their practices in order to qualify for the higher ratings. A somewhat similar purpose is achieved in many other States, however, through a probationary rating of schools which need to improve their services in certain regards, without indicating in the accredited list which are the probationary schools. If a probationary school does not improve its

services in the areas on which the warning is issued it may be dropped from future accredited lists.

The remaining States in which State departments operate as the accrediting agents issue one list of high schools from which diplomas are recognized as being of standard grade, although some of these States also provide for recognition of junior high schools and schools whose courses stop short of high-school graduation.

In 38 of the States where State departments do the accrediting, private schools may be admitted to the accredited lists, usually on the same basis as public high schools. Four State departments (Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, and Wyoming) make no provision for the accrediting of private secondary schools; in Minnesota and Missouri the State universities accredit private schools while the State department confines its activities to public high schools. In Iowa private schools are accredited by the Iowa Board on Secondary School Relations. Regularly the private school exercises an option as to whether or not it wishes to be considered for accrediting.

Many representatives of State departments feel that there is need for accrediting of business colleges, private trade schools, and other special schools, but with rare exceptions no provisions have been made for any sort of official approval of such schools. The State which seems to have had the longest period of experience with approval of such schools is Michigan, where the first law on the subject was passed in 1925; Michigan has licensing requirements and regulations governing the operation of private business schools, private correspondence schools, and private trade and industrial schools. Another of the exceptions is New York State where licensing of private trade schools since March 1937 is a function of the board of regents and where special standards have been set up by the commissioner of education for the licensing of beauty schools and the registration of business schools. Pennsylvania also has developed standards for approval of beauty-culture schools and the licensing of operators under a law approved in May 1933. Some progress has also been made toward accrediting of business colleges in Pennsylvania through cooperation of the State department of public instruction and the Pennsylvania Department of Secondary School Principals. Oregon has a plan for licensing but not for approval of private trade schools. Rhode Island has a system of chartering business colleges and beauty-culture and barbering schools; such chartering is the responsibility of the secretary of state. New Mexico and West Virginia have systems for control of beauty-culture schools; in New Mexico a separate board has been set up for this purpose; and in West Virginia the State department of health exercises the supervision. Apparently, with the exception of Michigan, New York, and Pennsylvania, State departments of public

instruction have not assumed supervisory responsibility for such special types of schools.

In this connection it should be mentioned that provisions are made in a number of States for approval of special courses or auxiliary services related to public education. Evening schools are approved in New York and Pennsylvania; special standards apply to high schools with normal training departments in Iowa and Nebraska; approval of summer-school work is especially provided for in Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Mississippi, Missouri, New York, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, and West Virginia; in Montana, Oklahoma, Washington, and West Virginia, State departments have issued regulations concerning approval of correspondence study given in the high schools, while in some other States, notably Nebraska and North Dakota, validation of correspondence courses has been handled by higher institutions; in addition Michigan, New York, Oregon, and Wisconsin have provisions for passing upon correspondence schools located within the State boundaries; in a considerable number of States the standards make mention of conditions under which courses in Bible, music, and tutoring subjects may be validated for high-school credit.

A feature regularly accompanying an accrediting program is a set of standards for accrediting. Usually these standards are adopted by the State board of education or some similar body. The standards deal largely with such subjects as time requirements (school year, school day, school period), qualifications of teachers, teaching load, buildings and equipment, programs of study, admission and graduation, records and reports, and efficiency and tone of the school. Subjects dealt with less frequently in the standards are minimum number of teachers and pupils for operating a high school, qualifications of principals, teachers' salaries, elementary school efficiency, guidance, credit for special work (summer school, correspondence study, etc.), and employment of teachers upon recommendation by the superintendent.

Many of the requirements written into the standards for accrediting in different States are similar in intent and expression. It is noticeable, for instance, how frequently 36 weeks or an equivalent number of days are mentioned as a school year; how similarly a unit of credit is defined by various States; how maximum teaching load is safeguarded in much the same way from State to State; and how alike in purport and reading are the standards dealing with efficiency and moral tone of the school. States apparently have learned much from one another regarding accrediting; besides, the experiences of numerous States have tended to be somewhat similar and parallel; moreover, the existence of large regional accrediting agencies have had the effect of

bringing a certain amount of uniformity into accrediting standards and procedures.

It would be erroneous, however, to conclude that accrediting is the same throughout all the States. Similarities of the kind enumerated are marked; there are also some marked differences both in the standards and in their application.

For instance, some States have a library requirement which runs to a line or two in the standards, while some States, such as Kansas and North Carolina, stipulate in considerable detail what constitutes a satisfactory library service for a secondary school. The very exact and brief standards found in many of the States differ from the accrediting policy of States such as Minnesota, Ohio, and Virginia, where numerous suggestions and recommendations are given for guidance in meeting the standards. Contrasting with the great importance attached to the act of accrediting in many of the Western and Southern States is Massachusetts, where accrediting supplies nothing except the prestige of recognition by the State department of public instruction, and Maryland, where accrediting follows more or less automatically upon permission to operate a high school supervised by the State. Accomplishment in school subjects is almost taken for granted in some States if satisfactory conditions for learning are present; in New Hampshire, by contrast, an extensive "work report" is required as a part of accrediting procedure; and in Oklahoma and Texas, schools are accredited for certain subjects which are enumerated with the name of each school in the accredited list. While accrediting in most of the States is an act of the State board of education or of the State department of public instruction, some Southern States (Georgia and Texas are cases in point) have accrediting commissions on which the secondary schools and the colleges as well as the State department are represented. Accrediting is far from being a uniform, undeviating process throughout the United States. In order to serve its purpose of evaluation and rating of schools, it has of necessity developed features of standardization. In order to serve the purposes of education in 48 States it has developed variety and flexibility.

Growing out of problems relative to accrediting has come in recent years a plan for evaluation of schools developed by the *Cooperative Study of Secondary School Standards*. The *Cooperative Study* was begun some years ago by the six regional associations of the United States for the purpose of making a scientific investigation of standards for accrediting and of accrediting procedures. The criteria and procedures developed through years of study and try-out, of elimination and addition and revision, appeared during the summer of 1938 in a series of publications which, after undergoing still further revision, were printed in a 1940 edition.

The techniques evolved by the *Cooperative Study* are significant for accrediting but in no less measure for stimulation to improvement in schools. A total of 29 State departments reported that evaluations of from 1 to 53 schools by *Cooperative Study* procedures were made within the areas of their States during the school year 1938-39. In succeeding years the movement has spread to more States and to more schools. During the school year 1939-40 approximately 1,000 such *Cooperative Study* evaluations were made, generally with the cooperation of State departments of education. With at least 2 days given to each school (a longer time for larger schools) it will be seen that 1,000 evaluations constitute a significant effort.

A similar systematic program for evaluating local departments of vocational education in agriculture is being undertaken cooperatively by the agricultural education service of the U. S. Office of Education and the several State boards for vocational education. The American Vocational Association is also cooperating in a financial way by paying a part of the cost of this study. When this study is completed, it will be used as a basis for setting up more objective standards to be achieved and also should be of assistance to local teachers and school administrators in helping them to evaluate their own programs from time to time for the purpose of making certain improvements and refinements.

Improving the Curriculum.

Another function aimed at rather generally by State departments of public instruction is improvement of the curriculum. Over a period of years this function has been discharged with varying success through the preparation and distribution of State courses of study. Within the last 10 years, however, several States have given special attention to the improvement of the curriculum and have developed numerous techniques for the attainment of this purpose.

In a number of States the programs are comprehensive in nature, having for their purpose the betterment of the curriculum at all levels. In other States limited funds and the short time of operation have narrowed the program to selected areas of the curriculum or to a certain level. The emphasis in California, New Mexico, and Oklahoma, for instance, has been largely upon elementary education; in Illinois rural education has received the greatest amount of attention; and in Florida and Michigan secondary education has been most prominent in the curriculum work. In Iowa, Nevada, North Carolina, and Washington reading problems have received special consideration; in New York the social studies, and in Rhode Island speech education and safety have been emphasized.

Fundamental viewpoints have colored the curriculum work in many States. In Virginia and a number of other Southern States the tend-

ency has been toward a core curriculum, Michigan has emphasized self-evaluation of practices by cooperating schools, Oklahoma has stressed in-service training of teachers. Missouri and Pennsylvania have tried to provide as good State courses as possible which can then be adapted to local conditions; on the other hand, Alabama and Georgia have not attempted to construct State courses of study, but instead have centered their energies upon assisting local supervisors and teachers to build their own courses.

A number of States have given prominence and unity to their efforts by assigning a descriptive name to their curriculum undertakings and bringing all their facilities for curriculum revision together in the organization thus set up. Florida, Georgia, Mississippi, Tennessee, and Virginia have programs for the improvement of instruction; Illinois has a program of curriculum study and improvement of instruction; Alabama has a curriculum development program; Louisiana and New Mexico have programs of curriculum development; Arkansas has a cooperative program to improve instruction; Michigan has a study of the secondary school curriculum; Texas has a curriculum revision movement. It should not be concluded that all States having significant curriculum improvement programs have given them official names; as may be judged from the enumeration given above, many States have felt that it was desirable to give a name to the movement.

Another way in which unity has been brought into the curriculum programs of many States is through the appointment of someone in the State department office to direct the undertaking. Most frequently the person so designated is an assistant superintendent, a director of instruction, or a supervisor, persons who obviously have responsibilities for other functions as well as for the improvement of the curriculum. At the time State departments were visited in 1939 only six States (Arizona, Florida, New York, Oklahoma, Tennessee, and Texas) had on their staffs specialists who apparently gave full time to curriculum problems. Many States brought into the programs curriculum consultants for longer or shorter periods.

The number and sequence of problems to be met vary with the purposes aimed at and the conditions in the State. There are, however, three essential questions which confront every State setting out on a curriculum-improvement program. They concern: (1) How to get the program started; (2) how to get materials prepared; and (3) how to get the materials used. Many other problems, whether closely or remotely related to these, may command the attention of the State administration, but these three are fundamental.

On the first of these subjects there are available the experiences of States which have launched curriculum programs. The initiation most frequently comes from the State department or from the State

education association or from the higher institutions; in some cases two and even all three of these agencies cooperate in getting the program started. In Florida, Kansas, Mississippi, Texas, and Virginia the first demand appears to have come from educational associations in the State; in Alabama, Arkansas, and Michigan the State departments of public instruction seem to have been the first movers; in Missouri the university and some of the teachers colleges took the initiative; in Louisiana the State department and the State university acted jointly to get the program going; and in Georgia the State department, the university system, and the State educational association acted as the nucleus for an initiating group which included numerous State organizations having an interest in education.

Whether the State department was the originator or not it regularly was represented early in the curriculum deliberations in these States and others. Similarly the universities and other institutions engaged in training teachers generally were called upon to take an important part in the program, especially through their summer-session courses for teachers. About half of the States found it desirable to have some sort of steering committee, while the others relied upon the State department to supply direction without the assistance of an executive or advisory committee.

Many of the more extensive programs have had financial assistance from educational foundations; in fact, the program has so frequently been retarded when subventions of this kind have been withdrawn that it may be suspected that financial aid from outside the State plays an important part in the success of many programs. Some effective and far-reaching undertakings, however, have been carried on with little or no out-of-State financial aid. Among these may be mentioned the present programs in Florida, Georgia, Kansas, Louisiana, Missouri, Nebraska, Texas, and West Virginia. In these programs much time is donated by teachers, administrators, professors, and State department representatives; the State department usually provides clerical help and pays for the printing bills; and the State educational association appropriates for emergency expenses. Missouri and Nebraska are somewhat unusual in having legislative appropriations and Texas in having available a continuous State fund for curriculum study.

Especially in the Southern States where so many of these curriculum movements have been developed, a year of initial study to get the setting and to arouse interest often has preceded the production phase. Summer courses, summer curriculum laboratories, and summer workshops have played an important part in this connection as have also the development and guidance of local study groups which would carry on during the school year.

These last-named features are important also in the second stage when curriculum materials are produced and tried out. The results of this production stage are far from uniform. In some States the objective is State courses of study; in other States (Alabama, Georgia, Maryland, Michigan, and Mississippi) development of local curriculum materials is aimed at with State courses taking a subsidiary position if, indeed, they are contemplated at all. Much of the work is done by committees of teachers and by individual teachers who prepare materials during the summers at the universities and colleges and try them out in their classes during the school year. In the process large numbers of experimental units, some good, some poor, are prepared, much revision and trading of experiences takes place, and extensive library collections of curriculum materials are built up at the teacher-training institutions and sometimes in the State department offices; Michigan and Oklahoma report sizeable libraries of curriculum literature available in the offices of their State departments.

If the orientation and production stages have been well handled the use of the curriculum materials in the schools follow naturally, since those who are to use the materials have been active in developing them. Because of the large turn-over in teaching personnel in the schools, however, and because even under the most extensive programs not all teachers in a State are enlisted equally in the preparation of curriculum materials, forward-looking programs usually provide for some follow-up to get the available materials used more widely and to stimulate development of new materials. Printing or duplicating of curriculum bulletins together with wide distribution of them is one of the important methods of follow-up. Florida, Georgia, Michigan, New Mexico, and Texas, to mention a few States, designate some of their secondary schools as laboratory or cooperating or demonstration centers. Florida and Michigan also have plans for assembling data regarding practices from the schools and giving currency to those that appear significant. Moreover, State department representatives in their visits to schools can supply stimulation and spread information regarding successful curriculum practices.

Curriculum programs usually are conceived as projects which will cover a considerable period of time. Production of a course of study in some subject or of an individual curriculum bulletin can be completed in a year or less, but a curriculum-betterment program intended to include many areas and to secure the participation of large numbers of teachers must occupy more time. A number of the programs mentioned were planned as undertakings to last from 3 to 5 years; the Michigan study of the secondary school curriculum is announced as a 12-year program; a number of the States think of their curriculum programs as being continuous, although the results indicate that they are undulating rather than continuous in most

cases. The point is well made that curriculum programs are best conceived of as of long duration; whether they should be recurrent or at least shifting in their emphases rather than continuous appears in the light of experience to be an open question.

Other Functions

Accrediting and improvement of the curriculum are two supervisory functions for secondary education which are carried on in greater or lesser degree by nearly all State departments. In many of the States where few staff members are employed no time is left for the performance of other functions; and since accrediting usually is required by law and improvement of the curriculum often is not specifically mentioned, accrediting in some of these cases gets the major block of time. Again, in some States with larger staffs but also with large numbers of schools to be supervised (sometimes 1,000 or more schools per State supervisor) it is apparent that not much time can be reserved for other functions.

Training of teachers and improvement of teaching are functions which obviously are closely-bound up with both accrediting and improvement of the curriculum. In some States, however, special efforts are made by State departments to supervise and improve the teaching service.

In Massachusetts the teacher-training programs in the State teachers colleges are operated not only under the supervision but under the administration and control of the State department. This function is so important in Massachusetts that, in contrast with most other States, there is no system of certification of teachers. The peculiarly close relationship of the State department to pre-service training of teachers makes certification superfluous. In Connecticut, also, the State department maintains close connection with pre-service training of teachers, especially, however, at the elementary level.

Among States which emphasize in-service training of teachers (aside from those already commented on as having special programs for the improvement of instruction) may be mentioned North Carolina, where efforts for a number of years have been centered on improvement of faculty meetings; Rhode Island, where selected teachers from each of the school districts in the State are brought together for special instruction when new emphases are to be introduced as, for instance, safety or speech education; Delaware, where State supervision is so thorough that the problems of large numbers of individual teachers are known and assistance given by the State office; Maryland, where the high-school supervisors make a number of visits each year to many of the schools in their areas and are in close contact at all times with the county superintendents; and a number of States, such as

Connecticut, Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York, and Rhode Island, where local supervisory service is subsidized from State funds.

Another function in which many State high-school supervisory programs have a part is the distribution of various types of State aids. Often the statistical and distributional features of this function are performed by other divisions in the State office, but the supervisory service usually is called upon to render many decisions concerning such matters as high-school tuition for nonresident pupils and State aids for general support of high schools and for special courses. For instance, in a number of States in the Middle West (Iowa, Kansas, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, and Wisconsin) teacher-training departments in high schools call for distribution of State funds for their support as well as supervision of their educational features. And directors and supervisors of vocational education, of course, have large responsibilities for the administration of Federal and State funds as a part of their general supervision of vocational education.

In Minnesota, North Dakota, and New York are found rather extensive programs of subject-matter examinations; in Minnesota and North Dakota the tendency in recent years has been toward limitation to seventh and eighth-grade examinations; the well-known regents examinations in New York State are given for seventh and eighth grades and also in a wide variety of high-school subjects. Nebraska also has a system of eighth grade State examinations, given under direction of the rural and elementary division in the State department of public instruction. In Ohio the *every pupil testing program* is administered by the State department but not by those in charge of secondary education. New Hampshire has a scholarship day and Alabama has a cooperative testing arrangement between the Alabama College Association and the Association of Secondary School Principals, of which the State high-school supervisor is *ex officio* secretary-treasurer. Oklahoma has a State-wide program of achievement testing administered by the State department. Varying responsibilities exist with regard to preparation, scoring, keeping records, and reporting results of these tests in the various States, but inevitably the State high-school supervisory staff is required to spend a good deal of time with them. While no State testing program is in operation in Delaware, the State department maintains a record of the progress of every pupil enrolled in the schools from the first grade until 1 year after graduation from high school. In Tennessee the State department checks the records of all high-school seniors before they can be graduated.⁶

⁶ The reader who is interested in securing further information regarding State testing programs is referred to monograph No. 5 in this series, *Pupil Personnel Services as a Function of State Departments of Education*, by Maris M. Proffitt and David Segel.

Among other supervisory functions mentioned by one or more States are assistance in the selection of textbooks and various kinds of promotional work designed to build up libraries, new courses, improvement in existing courses, consolidation of districts, development of junior colleges, and extension of correspondence study. Further conception of some of these functions and of ways in which they are carried out may be secured from the section of this bulletin that deals with activities.

In the light of the frequent mention by State department representatives of inadequacy of staff for doing all the things that ought to be done, the observation is justified that State departments of public instruction must and do make choices among the various functions that they might appropriately perform. Some functions, of course, are specifically mentioned in the law and are therefore a part of the supervisory program. Frequently, however, there is in the law some blanket provision for supervision of schools which may be interpreted by the educational authorities in accordance with the changing needs. In fulfilling such legal requirements State departments not infrequently put into operation a sequential or tandem arrangement of objectives, especially in the promotional work. Consequently no enumeration of functions of State departments can be regarded as applicable year after year.

IV. Activities

Visits to schools.

Among the activities of State supervisory officers at the secondary-school level none receives more attention or absorbs more time than visiting of schools. A considerable number of the State officers interviewed stated that they spent more than half of their total time during the school year in the field observing schools. Others indicated very clearly by their mention of the number of schools visited that a major portion of their time was given to this activity. The number of schools visited by each supervisor ran through a broad range from 15 to more than 700 annually. In three-fourths of the States reporting, the number of visits made by each staff member is under 150 per year. The median is between 100 and 125. In 4 States each supervisor is expected to visit more than 200 schools each year.

Even with this large number of total visits State officers in most cases do not find time to go to every school every year. The mode among those reporting on this subject is a visit once in 3 years. The next in point of frequency is once a year. The median falls at a visit every 2 years.

¹ For a discussion of legal provisions see monograph No. 1 in this series, *State Boards of Education and Chief State School Officers: Their Status and Legal Powers*, by Walter S. Deffenbaugh and Ward W. Keesicker.

It is apparent from the facts reported above that visiting by State departments, while it is the most time-consuming among all the activities, nevertheless must fall far short of being a direct supervisory service to teachers. Where visits are made less often than once a year, as happens in most of the States, and when, as appears in the statements of a number of State supervisors, visits to a school typically last for half a day or less, it is, of course, impossible to expect any close acquaintance with the instructional problems met by individual teachers. For such close direct supervision of teachers throughout the United States reliance must be, and generally is, placed principally upon local rather than State officers.

It must not be concluded that there is no direct supervision of teachers by State departments. In Delaware and Maryland, where schools are visited several times each year, individual teacher supervision through visits is a definite part of the plan of the State department. In a few States, Michigan and Wisconsin, for example, visits are largely made upon invitation from the local school authorities and in these cases intensive studies of the teaching situation are possible. In a number of States, too, conscious effort is made to visit fewer schools and thus to spend longer periods of time in each school; New Jersey and Pennsylvania follow this policy. It is entirely possible to exercise rather extensive supervision of teaching from the State department; the exigency of time available for supervision usually makes it impracticable; even where practiced the work of the State supervisor is usually supplemented by considerable local supervision.

Visiting of schools by State department representatives, however, serve a number of other purposes. The function of accrediting, so commonly performed by State departments, is facilitated and made more satisfactory by observation of the school in action. Visits make possible consultation with local school officers regarding numerous types of educational problems, including curriculum, State aid, promotion of special programs, and so forth. The general and specific stimulation to more adequate and progressive school practices is an observable result of visiting of schools by State department representatives.

Because of the larger number of vocational supervisors visits to the classroom play a much more significant role in vocational education than in other types of high-school supervision by State agencies. All supervisors of vocational education are agreed that one of the most effective methods of giving technical and professional assistance is through the giving of such instruction on the job as will improve the methods and techniques of teachers.

A coordinate responsibility consists of visiting vocational schools or classes for the purpose of inspecting the work being done, determin-

ing whether the standards for such schools as outlined in the State plan are being met, and whether the school or class is entitled to receive reimbursement from State or Federal vocational education funds. It is in connection with this phase of the supervisor's job that he is enabled to help secure more satisfactory working conditions, such as more adequate class, laboratory, or shop rooms, equipment, and supplies. All good supervisors know that their most effective, most difficult, but most appreciated services are rendered while they are on their field trips visiting vocational schools or classes where the highest type of supervisory service cannot be performed in any other manner.

While one of the major responsibilities of a supervisor of vocational education therefore may be that of a field inspector of vocational schools or classes, since a thorough knowledge of the local situation is necessary before worth-while suggestions for improvements can be made, this function needs to be performed as unostentatiously as possible if the greatest service is to be rendered. Teachers, principals, local superintendents of schools, and members of school boards resent supervision which has the earmarks of police or detective work. Such supervision, no matter how well intended, is often more harmful than beneficial. Even rare instances of the exercise of undue authority or issuing of mandatory orders may lead to serious consequences not only for the local program of vocational education but for the supervisor as well.

Through his own powers of persuasion, stimulation, encouragement, and leadership, a supervisor should be able to secure reasonable conformity to the minimum standards set up in the State plan for any particular program of vocational education. The effectiveness of any State supervisory program in the field of vocational education is therefore in direct proportion to the all around abilities of the supervisory or field staff. Experience has proved that supervisors who possess adequate technical and professional competence backed by thorough training and proved experience in their special field, together with that all-important capacity for dealing understandingly and sympathetically with teachers and local administrators, usually succeed in securing such performance.

The frequency and length of supervisory visits to vocational schools or classes varies considerably among the several States and the different services within the same State. In States maintaining large supervisory staffs, the head State supervisor does not attempt to visit each school or class so often since this is the responsibility of the assistant, district, area, or local supervisor who is directly in charge. Frequency of visits to each school or class is further predicated upon local needs. Those schools or classes that need most assistance usually are given first consideration while those that are

known to be progressing satisfactorily sometimes are passed over for a year without being visited.

The length of time spent in visiting each vocational school or class also varies among the several States and among supervisors in the different fields of vocational education within the same State. In fact this variation is so wide that even an average for the country as a whole would not be of any real value. In this connection it is of significance to note that almost universally local teachers and administrators have come to appreciate the value of supervisory visits to the point where they are requesting both more frequent and more extended visits from members of the supervisory staff.

Conferences and Meetings

The group conference method is used rather extensively by those who supervise secondary education in the States. Many of the conferences are general in character; that is, they deal with the improvement of education at a number of levels and have certain sections or certain parts of their programs which deal specifically with secondary education. Of this kind are State-wide conferences of members of local boards of education, city superintendents, county superintendents, and members of State educational associations. Usually the State department personnel works in close cooperation with the organizations calling such conferences; the administrators' meetings are in a number of States called by the State department or by the State department working jointly with some other agency such as the State university. At all events, State department representatives, including those assigned to secondary education, give considerable time to planning, to committee work, and to appearing on programs of group conferences of this sort.

In most States there are also organizations of high-school principals; with these agencies the supervisory force at the secondary level usually has very close affiliation. The National Association of Secondary-School Principals, for instance, has State units in 43 States; supervisors of high schools are active in these organizations, as regards both the State meetings and the local discussion groups which have been so generally organized during the last few years; in Alabama, Maine, Oregon, and Utah the high-school supervisor serves as secretary of the State association. A number of universities call summer conferences of high-school principals and with these the State representatives usually cooperate closely. In a few States one or more conferences of high-school principals is called by the State department itself.

Practically all State supervisors of vocational education in agriculture and home economics conduct at least one annual State-wide professional improvement conference for the benefit of their teachers

in service. In the case of trade and industrial subjects, annual State-wide conferences of teachers are not so common, since large numbers of teachers are usually located in each of the larger cities or towns where it is more convenient for the State supervisor to meet with them locally. Furthermore, because of the great diversification of training content in the various trades, any large number of trade teachers will have fewer problems in common than teachers of agriculture or home economics. For instance, the problems of a teacher of "carpentry" are likely to be quite different from those of a teacher of "mining." Furthermore, about two-thirds of all teachers of trade and industrial subjects are teachers of part-time or evening classes in these subjects and for that reason they are not so homogeneous a group as teachers in all-day schools.

In addition, it is often customary for State supervisors of agriculture and home economics to conduct a series of district conferences at convenient centers throughout the State where a smaller number of teachers may come together for 1, 2, or 3 days to discuss local problems that are common to them in that particular area or district of the State.

In the case of all professional improvement conferences conducted for the benefit of teachers in service by State supervisors of vocational education, it may be stated that the general purposes and objectives are similar. They are all very definitely and specifically working conferences. Except for State-wide conferences with large attendances, where the program consists of addresses and inspirational speeches together with committee work and reports, the bulk of the time of most conferences for vocational teachers is given to round-table discussion of specific problems. Here the teachers have the opportunity to discuss their problems informally, exchange ideas, methods, and techniques, and plan a more effective coordinated program of vocational education in their specific field of service for the entire State.

In fact, the conference is considered by State supervisors of vocational education as one of the most effective devices for upgrading teachers in service, and attendance by all teachers of vocational subjects is obligatory in some States. Credit for extension or renewal of certificates to teach vocational subjects is sometimes allowed for attendance at professional improvement conferences, called by the State board for vocational education or by the State supervisor on behalf of the State board. Massachusetts and California are examples of States where such credit is allowed.

Conferences of teachers of nonvocational subjects are usually local or regional rather than State-wide in scope. The holding of a conference with all the teachers and administrative staff of a school at the

time the school is visited is reported by several State high-school supervisors. District or area conferences are mentioned especially by supervisors in States which have extensive curriculum or instructional improvement programs. In these cases the conferences may include teachers and administrators from all levels and usually, insofar as possible, are held early in the school year. In some States, notably Iowa and Wisconsin, work with this type of conference requires almost solid booking of the time of supervisors for a number of weeks in the fall of the year. In other States the area or district conferences are spread over a longer period, but nevertheless demand much time from the supervisory staff. Arkansas reports about 30 a year; Montana has 6; New Jersey has 12 to 14; Oklahoma has 8; Oregon has 12; Pennsylvania has 8 to 10 (county institutes); South Carolina has 6; Utah has 16; and West Virginia has almost as many as the State has counties. In Florida, Maryland, and New York one or more conferences with local groups are held almost daily.

In addition to participation in these local, district, and State conferences and meetings of various kinds, the State high school and vocational supervisors are notably active in certain national and larger-than-State organizations, especially the American Vocational Association, the National Association of Secondary School Principals, the several regional associations of colleges and secondary schools, and the National Association of State High-School Supervisors and Directors. All in all, a great deal of time and energy is given to improving secondary education through the conference method.

Consultation and Correspondence

Consultation orally and by letter is an activity which inevitably is a part of every supervisor's job, vocational and nonvocational alike. Much of it involves consultation with principals, teachers, superintendents, and school board members at the time a school is visited. Another considerable block of it takes place in the supervisor's office; and here the consultations are likely to be of more variety, involving commercial representatives as well as educators. Then, again, much of the consultation is conducted through correspondence. For instance, in many States a visit to a school is regularly followed by a letter reporting on that visit to the principal, superintendent, and school board members.

The amount of time given to consultative service is appreciable. One State supervisory office which kept a record reported 570 consultations with county and city superintendents and school principals in one year. Another high-school supervisor estimated that correspondence of one kind and another took up about 30 percent of his time. Some supervisors follow the plan of spending at least 1 day, sometimes 2 or 3 days, of every week during the school year in the

State office in order that they may take care of their correspondence and be available for consultation

A good deal of the consultative work, of course, is on subjects rather remote from supervision. Much of it, however, is likely to center around instructional problems—textbooks, shop and laboratory layouts and equipment, programs of study and curriculum problems in general, teachers and teaching, and similar subjects. State supervisors at the secondary level regularly use correspondence and individual and small-group consultation, partly to supplement and make more effective their school visitation programs and conference activities, partly as techniques which in their own right may be employed for the improvement of instruction.

Research and Publications

Many research undertakings and publications appear in connection with two major functions of State high-school supervision, namely, accrediting and improving the curriculum. As such they have been mentioned in an earlier section of this study.

State courses of study are the most numerous and most elaborate publications for which high-school supervisors are responsible. In at least 19 States these courses are fairly complete in their coverage and are published sometimes in one bound volume, but more frequently as a series of bulletins for individual subjects or subject fields. In 13 or more other States individual courses of study are prepared from time to time as occasion warrants, but apparently with no plan for having courses in all principal subject fields. In a number of States courses are rarely published by State authority, but the high-school supervisors and curriculum workers center their activity upon assisting local schools to develop their own curriculum materials.

This latter plan is regularly followed by State vocational supervisors, partly because of the extremely large number of occupations for which instruction is offered, and partly because of wide variations in the types of communities that may exist in any State. Instead of being given a State course of study, teachers are trained through methods of evaluation and curriculum-building to analyze local needs and to develop specific teaching materials which are needed in building the curriculum for their local situations. The activity of the supervisor in connection with curriculum problems, therefore, becomes that of a consultant or teacher trainer who through conferences and committee work assists teachers on the job to build their own curriculum.

Another type of publication closely related to courses of study is the high-school manual circulated by many State departments. It frequently serves an administrative as well as a supervisory purpose.

A total of 18 States have published rather elaborate manuals of advice to schools within the last few years. Numerous other States circulate suggestions through letters, memoranda, or shorter bulletins from time to time instead of bringing these materials together in a high-school manual. Both methods are utilized in some States. Whatever plans are followed, State supervisors generally have some system by which suggestions are given to the schools regarding such matters as recommended programs of studies; standards for accrediting and their interpretation; records and reports; library and laboratory equipment; new materials; new methods; the extracurriculum; and various other subjects.

Somewhat similar to the high-school manuals in purpose are the State plans for vocational education which under the vocational acts are submitted by every State as a condition of participation in disbursement of Federal funds for vocational education. These plans are submitted to the Federal authority by the State boards for vocational education, but obviously the State vocational supervisors and teacher trainers are usually asked to do much work in getting them ready.

State supervisors at the secondary level conduct a considerable number of research studies on the educational conditions within their States. In the relatively few States that have research departments which interest themselves in instructional studies, the high-school supervisor may be called in as a consultant rather than actually be responsible for the studies; but in the large majority of the States he will have to make the studies himself if they are to be made at all. Most often these studies are of statistical nature and involve tabulations and interpretations on such subjects as number of schools, their enrollments, teaching personnel, curriculum offerings, pupil registrations, and so forth. In at least eight States (Alabama, California, Delaware, Georgia, Maine, Massachusetts, Minnesota, and New Hampshire) annual follow-up studies are made of the graduates, especially of the success of graduates attending higher institutions. In States having larger staffs at the secondary level, such as New York and Pennsylvania, the amount of research thus conducted is impressive.

In the field of vocational education research has long been recognized as one of the responsibilities of State supervisory staffs. However, in practice, supervisors tend to assign to other individuals on their staff, or to the staff of the teacher-training institution, most of the research work. Some supervisors make independent studies of their own and many make excellent use of research studies which have been made by others. In fact, most of the technical content of vocational courses in agriculture and home economics was originally developed through research studies of State experiment stations and

the United States Department of Agriculture. Similar studies of a professional nature in the field of education, whether made by themselves or others, are being used by some supervisors of vocational education in summer conferences and at the time of their supervisory visits, in connection with their efforts to improve or upgrade teachers in service.

State supervisors of vocational education also render valuable assistance to teachers under their supervision in the field of research by suggesting to them subjects in which there is need for special study and investigation and assisting them to organize such studies. In June 1932, Bulletin No. 166, *Suggestions for Studies and Research in Home Economics Education* was made available to State supervisors, teacher-training institutions, and graduate students. This bulletin outlines projects needing investigation and sets up some basic considerations for carrying on worthwhile research in educational problems concerned with home economics. Annual lists of titles of studies and subject index⁸ of these studies have been made available from the home economics education service, U. S. Office of Education. From 1932 to 1938 abstracts of studies in home economics education⁹ have been made available to State workers and now are published annually in *Notes on Graduate Studies and Research in Home Economics and Home Economics Education*. These notes are compiled alternately by the home economics education service of the United States Office of Education, and by the Office of Experiment Stations and Bureau of Home Economics of the United States Department of Agriculture, at the request of the home economics section of the land-grant colleges and the research department of the American Home Economics Association (Misc. 2086, 1938, is U. S. Office of Education compilation). In June 1935, the United States Office of Education published Bulletin No. 180, *Summaries of Studies in Agricultural Education* which gives the titles and brief synopses of 373 research studies that had been carried on throughout the country before that time.

The preparation, distribution, collection, tabulation, and analysis of report forms used by teachers in making their various reports to the State office is a regular and accepted phase of the work of the vocational supervisor. From a critical analysis of these data the supervisor receives important information concerning the possible future development of his program. He in turn is responsible to the executive officer of the State board for vocational education for the preparation of an

⁸ *Studies and Research in Home Economics Education reported by Colleges and Universities*. Misc. 1163.

⁹ *Subject Index of the Theses Studies in Home Economics Education listed in Misc. 1163*. Misc. 1173-Rev.

¹⁰ *Suggestions for Studies and Research in Home Economics Education*. Bulletin No. 166.

¹¹ *Abstracts of Theses in Home Economics Education reported by Colleges and Universities in 1931-1934*. Misc. 1690.

¹² *Abstracts of Studies in Home Economics Education 1934-1938*. Misc. 2114.

annual descriptive report to the United States Office of Education which gives in considerable detail the extent and nature of the work done in his particular field of vocational education each year. In addition the vocational supervisors either prepare or cooperate in preparing, the annual financial and statistical reports to the Federal office covering their specific field of vocational education. All supervisors of vocational education also cooperate with the State director of vocational education or the executive officer of the State board for vocational education in the preparation of their portion of the annual or biennial report of the State board for vocational education to the State legislature.

Every State department of public instruction prepares an annual or biennial report of education within the State. In these publications it is customary to have chapters or sections dealing with secondary education and vocational education, and in the preparation of these the State high-school and vocational supervisors usually have a hand. Some of the material included in these reports is descriptive and much of it is statistical. At all events, supervisors of secondary education assemble information for these reports and usually prepare manuscript for them. In some States, notably Alabama, Georgia, North Dakota, and Ohio, separate reports for the high schools are prepared and published annually. In a number of other States lists of high schools with or without statistical data are printed or mimeographed each year.

Work with research and publications, for the most part, is done during the summer months. The heavy schedules of school visiting, conferences, consultation, and correspondence during the school year make it impossible generally for State supervisors to do much research or manuscript work while the schools are in session.

Surveys

The making of comprehensive school surveys is not an important activity of State supervisors at the secondary-school level. The making of limited studies and investigations on invitation from local school systems is rather common; some of these are community studies, especially as such studies have a bearing upon school building policies and the program of studies. In some of the States, New York and Wisconsin, for instance, the supervisory staff spends in the aggregate considerable time making limited surveys, each of which is of short duration.

State supervisors of vocational education make a number of special surveys. These surveys are usually based on a questionnaire in order to secure the reaction of the teachers of the State to some special problem at a particular time. Similar surveys are often made to secure the reactions of school administrators and members of farm,

labor, or community organizations, to certain phases of a vocational education program to determine if it is meeting with approval, or if certain improvement can be made, and if so, how. In the field of trade and industrial education, special surveys are often made by calling together representative committees of employers and employees for a given area, at which time it is a comparatively easy matter to determine the need for trade training in a specific occupation. At such meetings it is also possible to determine whether there is a scarcity of workers in certain occupations, and therefore a need for vocational training of the trade-preparatory type, or whether there is a sufficient number of workers already employed who, however, need additional vocational training through trade extension classes to make them more occupationally competent.

Perhaps in no other phase of education is it necessary to meet the immediate needs of the people it is designed to serve, or to depend upon them so much for suggestions as to training content of the instruction offered, as is true of vocational education. In fact the very existence of vocational education is largely dependent upon this democratic procedure. If a group of adult farmers, bricklayers, carpenters, merchants, or housewives do not receive the kind of practical functioning instruction they need in their daily work, as a result of their attendance at an evening vocational class designed for their particular group, the teacher will soon find himself without a class to teach. To a certain extent, but in a lesser degree, the same situation obtains in vocational classes of the all-day type.

In the case of agriculture and home economics it is always recommended that teachers make local surveys, either formally or informally, for the purpose of getting acquainted with the opportunities and problems of the community insofar as their particular work is concerned. It is especially desirable that such surveys be made in every instance where a new department is being established or in case of a change of teachers. While State supervisors do not actually make these surveys, they often assist the local teacher in planning for or in making them.

State supervisors of vocational education make surveys through the cooperation of county and local superintendents of schools and other agencies to determine the needs for organizing vocational classes in communities not previously served. Such surveys are concerned, primarily with school enrollments, extent and nature of the major farming, business, or manufacturing interests of the community, home activities and responsibilities of young people, tax valuation of the district, fluctuation or spending habits of consumers, and likelihood of changes in population.

In addition, supervisors of vocational education cooperate with others, usually specialists from outside the States, in the making of

surveys of teacher-training institutions and departments. Such surveys are made to discover and remedy, if possible, weaknesses in curricular offerings, facilities, working conditions of teacher trainers, and provisions for student teaching. Fifty-fifty cooperative surveys of teacher-training programs in home economics education have been made by the Federal agents for home economics education in various States during the last 5 years. Teacher-training surveys in agriculture have been made in 59 institutions throughout the country.

Summer-School Teaching

A number of State supervisors teach in summer schools every year. When summer-school teaching is carried on as a separate activity by taking time off from the regular State supervisory job, it probably does not have large significance for the State supervisory program. When the teaching in a summer session, however, is integrated with the on-going program of the State department for improvement in instruction or in curriculum, the assignment of one or more staff members to summer teaching takes on an added significance.

At least 5 States (Arkansas, Florida, Michigan, Tennessee, and Virginia) make a regular practice of assigning personnel of the State staff to work with teachers attending summer sessions in higher institutions. Florida and Virginia emphasize, in addition to the development of curriculum materials in the summer laboratories or workshops, the continuous try-out and improvement of these materials throughout the school year. Five higher institutions in Tennessee operate curriculum laboratories during the summer; 2 of these are under direction of instructors who during the school year serve as State high-school supervisors; the chief supervisor visits all 5 laboratories. The Rhode Island State Department of Education in cooperation with Rhode Island College of Education follows the unique plan of offering special courses from time to time during the school year which are attended by 1 teacher from each of the 65 school systems within the State; a 1-week course of this kind was given on safety some time ago; another 2-hours-every-Saturday course on speech education was given at a later time; as a result of these and other activities schools throughout the State have been stimulated to introduce courses in safety and in speech education. It is to be noted that the States which maintain the closest contact with summer schools are usually those which have in operation special curriculum and instructional programs.

Checking Reports From the Schools

One of the common activities of the high-school supervisory staff is the checking of reports from the schools. The supervisors do a great deal of this report work in connection with the general super-

vision of curriculum offerings; teaching assignments and teaching load; buildings and equipment; library services; health and sanitation; attendance and enrollment; school records; transportation routes; and State financial aid of various sorts. The prevalence of some form of school accrediting and the general requirement that a report be submitted by every school applying for accrediting indicate that the examination of these reports is a time-consuming job for most State high-school supervisors. Statistical divisions often assume general responsibility for records of attendance, enrollment, State aid, and the like, but even in States having such divisions the high-school supervisors are usually not free of responsibility in connection with the reports from schools; and in States which have no special statistical service, the high-school supervisors are frequently relied upon for the checking of such reports.

State supervisors of vocational education have this report-checking responsibility to an unusual degree since the national vocational acts make available for distribution annually among the States over \$21,000,000 of Federal funds for vocational education. One of the major responsibilities of State supervisors of vocational education is that of evaluating the vocational education program for their particular field of service in each of the schools of the State that has applied for reimbursement from State or Federal funds or both. Approval or disapproval is given depending upon whether or not the standards set up in the State plan are being met. Supervisors of vocational education examine carefully the applications for reimbursement together with the sworn statements showing the expenditures already incurred for the purpose of certifying the amount of funds to which each vocational school or class is entitled.

Committee Service

All supervisors, both vocational and nonvocational, in addition to serving on committees within the department to which they may be assigned from time to time, are frequently appointed to positions of responsibility on committees of State and national professional and lay organizations. A few examples of the types of committees on which members of State supervisory staffs serve are the following:

- (a) Committees of the American Vocational Association, the National Educational Association, the National Association of Secondary School Principals, and other national organizations.
- (b) Various committees of State education associations.
- (c) Committees of farm organizations such as the National Grange, American Farm or Home Bureau Federation, Farmers' Union, Cooperative Marketing Organizations.
- (d) State planning board committees.
- (e) Committees of labor organizations and employee organizations.
- (f) Parent-teacher association committees.

- (g) Committees of various civic organizations, such as Chamber of Commerce, Rotary and Kiwanis Clubs, etc.
- (h) Various subject committees appointed by such organizations as the American Home Economics Association, the Department of the Social Studies of the National Education Association, and the National Council of Teachers of English.
- (i) Committees of regional associations of colleges and secondary schools.
- (j) State athletic committees, and committees on nonathletic contests.
- (k) Textbook committees.
- (l) Committees in miscellaneous activities and types of organizations, such as federation of women's clubs, college seminar groups, women's legislative councils, and child health institutes.

Addresses

Members of State supervisory staffs spend an appreciable amount of their time preparing and delivering addresses before various groups. Included are the types of organizations mentioned above under committee assignments. In addition, large numbers of speeches are delivered each year by State supervisors before local groups, such as teachers' meetings, school clubs, pupil assemblies, commencements, county institutes, and discussion groups.

Other Activities

The busy lives of State supervisors at the secondary-school level are made still busier by the performance of a number of miscellaneous activities. Naturally great variety exists in these activities and no one of them is performed in all of the States; on the other hand, probably no supervisor is free of all of them.

Some of the activities of State high-school supervisors have only remote or indirect connection with improvement of instruction, but nevertheless enter into the daily programs of these officials. Among such activities may be mentioned approval of school bus routes and general supervision of bus transportation, operation of State employment bureaus for teachers, issuance of high-school diplomas by the State, and supervision and administration of NYA aid to high-school pupils. Undoubtedly there are numerous other semisupervisory or administrative duties which are performed but which were not mentioned by those interviewed since they are somewhat removed from supervisory work.

State supervisors of agricultural education exercise administrative control over the Future Farmers of America, the national organization of farm boys studying vocational agriculture. Some persons may think of this as a special phase related to the vocational agriculture program. This is not a correct viewpoint since the activities of this organization are officially recognized as an integral part of the training program of vocational education in agriculture. In addition, the Future Farmers of America provides an excellent opportunity for keeping in

close contact and rendering further assistance to farm boys after they have left school and are in the process of establishing themselves in a farming occupation.

Finally, State supervisors are called upon to render numerous services at the secondary level for which no other provision is made in the State department. Twenty-two States have school building services, but the other 26 have no such specialized service; the checking of high-school building plans and equipment lists in some of these States is the responsibility of the high-school supervisors; and even in the States which have a school building service the high-school supervisors are frequently consulted. Eleven States have supervisors of libraries in their State departments; in more than three-fourths of the States whatever assistance is given to high-school libraries must issue from the State supervisor's office or from library agencies whose primary interest is not centered in school libraries. In 23 States there is no State department representative, either full-time or part-time, assigned to health education; promotion and plans for State health programs for high schools in these States, insofar as they exist, must be developed by other officers, principally by supervisors, with such assistance as they can secure from State departments of health and similar agencies. The same principle applies to the various subject fields and numerous other areas of service to secondary schools: When no special service exists, the high-school supervisory staff is usually relied upon to supply such assistance as it can. No wonder that an unlimited variety of activities are performed by State supervisory staff members working at the high-school level.

V. Cooperative Relationships

Relationships Within State Departments

The chief State school officer in every State obviously may demand as much cooperation among divisions and individuals within divisions as he wishes and finds practicable. In most of the States the chief State school officer apparently prefers to secure that cooperation through informal means and on a volunteer basis. In a number of States the more or less frequent staff-meeting was mentioned as one of the coordinating forces. In at least 2 States, Connecticut and Missouri, a staff council has been set up and is called together at regular intervals. As already mentioned, a number of States attempt to bring coordination into their supervisory programs through organization of a division of instruction to which are assigned the various supervisors having responsibility for rural, elementary, and high schools, adult education, and the various subject matter fields. Some States have developed a program for the improvement of instruction

with or without organization of a division of instruction, of curriculum, or of supervision.

In States which have not organized a division of instruction integration is usually secured through bringing together members of the staff for consultation whenever necessary; useful working relationships are thus established among individuals and divisions. So far as the staff for secondary supervision is concerned such coordination of activities occurs most frequently with the supervisory staffs for rural and elementary education. In the States which have separate schools for white and Negro pupils the respective supervisory staffs are usually in close coordination. In States having special curriculum services similar close relationships exist between curriculum staff and secondary education supervision; in New York State, for instance, the service to secondary education is in two principal areas, namely, supervision and curriculum. Other divisions or individuals with whom State secondary-school supervisors have more or less close contact are services on school libraries, buildings, statistics, adult education, health and physical education, music and fine arts, and other subject areas, insofar as these services exist.

The extent of the cooperation between State supervisors of secondary education and supervisors of vocational education varies with personalities and conditions. The variation runs through all the stages from that observed in Pennsylvania and Vermont, where supervision of vocational education is made an integral part of secondary school supervision, to an almost complete divorcement of vocational education supervision from the State superintendent's office as occurs in Washington and Wisconsin. In most States the chief State school officer is a member or an officer of the State board for vocational education and in 13 States he is designated as director of vocational education; under these circumstances the facility for securing coordination is present. Where the vocational supervisors are located in higher institutions, however, or elsewhere away from the desks of the chief State school officer and his staff, integration of services at the secondary level is made more difficult of achievement. The legal, budgetary, and organizational deterrents to coordination are many; the fact that coordination does exist is a tribute to the reasonableness and cooperative spirit of supervisors in both vocational and nonvocational fields.

In some States, supervisors of vocational education when visiting small isolated or inaccessible schools where other members of the State staff visit at infrequent intervals, also inspect other phases of the school program and report on them to the State superintendent, thus eliminating the need for another trip by another member of the State staff. Frequently they are requested by the State superintendent to

represent him or other members of the State staff at a local town meeting or at a conference with a local superintendent of schools.

In the case of State supervisors of vocational education in agriculture and home economics, it is a common practice for them to visit and extend supervisory services to high-school classes in general agriculture and general home economics for the purpose of upgrading them, with a view to stimulating and assisting them to render increasingly useful service. Supervisory assistance is also rendered to rural elementary schools in some States where general agriculture and home economics are required by law to be taught in the public schools. In like manner supervisors of trade and industrial education, because of their special training and experience, render valuable supervisory service through the State to teachers of industrial arts in elementary and secondary schools. In Maryland, for instance, all industrial arts and general home economics are the responsibility of the vocational supervisors; here, also, the director of vocational education is the representative of the State department of public instruction in connection with transportation of pupils.

In many instances supervisors of vocational education in agriculture and home economics develop cooperative programs to be put into operation in local schools that maintain both types of programs. For example, in rural communities the agricultural and home economics classes often meet jointly at stated intervals to receive instruction in problems of child care, family budgets, family relationships, the home garden, the farm poultry flock, and problems of farm and home business such as insurance, taxation, mortgages, deeds, farm credit, etc. In like manner similar cooperative programs are often developed by State supervisors of vocational education in trades and industries and home economics to be put into operation in the larger towns and cities of the State where both types of instruction are being maintained. There are a few types of occupations the training for which might be classified as either home economics or trades and industries, depending upon the objective of the individual concerned. A few such examples are: Training in cooking either as a part of homemaking education or to prepare for a job as a cook or chef; training in sewing either as a part of homemaking education programs or to prepare for dressmaking; general training in all household duties as a part of homemaking or in order to qualify for a job as a housemaid. The program is organized differently, however, when set up to meet the wage-earning objectives than when set up as a part of homemaking education. In the field of business education there is also opportunity for cooperation with other vocational groups through the giving of special instruction in cooperative buying and selling activities.

Relationships With Other State Agencies

Close cooperation usually exists between the State supervisory staff for secondary education and the higher institutions of the State, especially those that are supported by public funds. Mention has already been made of the role played by the State universities in the accrediting of high schools. In some States, Minnesota and Wisconsin, for example, the State university accredits private secondary schools even if it takes no responsibility for the accrediting of public high schools. Reference has been made also to the conferences of administrators and teachers called by the university or by the university and State department jointly. In connection with summer schools in numerous State universities and teachers colleges, curriculum workshops are set up, frequently in cooperation with the State supervisory staff. In some States faculty members of the State university have been the guiding force in high-school curriculum revision within the State. In Tennessee part of the State supervisory staff is supplied by the teachers colleges. In Iowa and Ohio State testing programs are operated by the higher institutions. In many of the States important State contests in athletics, forensics, music, and other fields involving secondary schools and secondary-school supervisors are developed under the auspices of the higher institutions. In Oregon many of the policies for secondary education grow out of collaboration of the university, the State principals association, and the State department of public instruction.

It is, however, principally in the field of training of teachers for the secondary schools that relationships are established between the State department and the higher institutions. Occasionally this cooperation is a part of the fundamental plan for education in the State, as in Massachusetts where the State department is the responsible agent for the operation of the State teachers colleges. In Rhode Island, too, a close cooperation exists in connection with practice teaching in the public schools of the State and the payment of salaries of critic teachers. More often, the cooperation is dictated by the mutual interest of the State department and teacher-training institutions in the improvement of teachers and teacher-training programs. The relationship is so important that one of the bulletins in this series of publications deals with that subject.¹⁰

The relationship of vocational education to higher institutions is especially close. Insofar as State universities and State colleges may be designated in a State plan by a State board for vocational education as institutions for the training of vocational teachers, there develops simultaneously a need for the closest of cooperation between the supervisory staff of the State department of education and the

¹⁰ U. S. Office of Education. Bulletin 1940, No. 6, Monograph No. 8. Education of Teachers as a Function of State Departments of Education, by Ben W. Frazier.

teacher-training staff of the designated teacher-training institution. This cooperation is necessary in every phase of the program involving pre-employment, postgraduate, and itinerant or in-service training, if a sound functioning program is to be maintained.

Technically and legally, under the provisions of the Federal Vocational Education Acts, the supervision of the training of vocational teachers is a function of the State board for vocational education. This supervision, however, usually takes the form of a cooperative working agreement where supervisors and teacher trainers join forces in the development of a common program. For instance, supervisory and teacher-training staffs work together in the development of the teacher-training curriculum; they may exchange work; that is, the supervisors will conduct the resident teacher-training classes for a week or two, while the teacher trainer takes a field trip over the State in the capacity of an itinerant teacher trainer or assistant supervisor; they confer with each other in the matter of developing a State program of work and in the placement of teachers; they work together on summer conference programs designed for the professional training of teachers in service; they cooperate in the development and dissemination of subject-matter teaching materials and in the publishing of news or service letters; and they work together on common problems of research.

In general, supervisors and teacher trainers may be said to cooperate on almost every phase of the program of vocational education in their particular field of service.

Education in State correctional schools and in other State institutions is largely at the secondary level, and naturally plans for cooperation with the agency in charge of such institutions exist in many States. The State supervisory staffs in the field of trade and industrial education are active in such cooperation more frequently than other supervisory officers since correctional schools generally have given major attention to training in trade and industrial-arts types of education. Many of these schools bear the name *Industrial School*. Because of this situation, State supervisors of trade and industrial education, in many States, have been helpful to administrators and teachers in such schools in the matter of giving supervisory service consisting of suggestions for improvement of the local program and the training or improvement of the teachers. In many instances this teacher-training service on the job has included studies of opportunities for training as well as analyses of the occupations in which training is offered. State supervisors of trade and industrial education in the States of Arizona, California, Idaho, Minnesota, New York, and Washington as well as numerous other States have been most helpful in an advisory and teacher-training capacity to such institutions.

State supervisors of home economics often work as consultants and advisers with State industrial schools for girls.

Very excellent cooperative relationships exist in practically every State of the Union between State departments of agriculture and the State supervisors of agricultural and home economics education and their staffs. State supervisors cooperate with the State department of agriculture in securing wider use of its publications as reference material in vocational classes and help serve as a clearing house for the dissemination of all important information on regulatory functions promulgated by the State department of agriculture. In turn, the State department of agriculture is usually in charge of the operation of the State fair and provides special prizes, ribbons, and other assistance for students of vocational agriculture and Future Farmer members who show their prize livestock, poultry, crops, and vegetables at the State fair.

In a few States, of which Idaho and Oregon are examples, the State supervisor of vocational agriculture and the State director of the Farm Security Administration have developed cooperative programs whereby the Farm Security Administration has undertaken to extend "character loans" up to as much as \$75 to F. F. A. boys whose parents are borrowers from the Farm Security Administration and who are needy, deserving, and recommended by their local teacher. If these loans that are now being made to help boys get a start in project work prove successful, no doubt the plan will be rapidly extended throughout the country.

Ever since the Farm Credit Administration was established it has taken a keen interest in vocational education in agriculture and has seen in this national program an excellent opportunity for teaching the principles of sound business financing and credit to farm people through the facilities of the all-day, part-time, and evening classes in vocational agriculture that are being conducted throughout the entire country.

The Farm Credit Administration has published a series of bulletins on farm credit and financing, designed primarily for use by teachers of vocational agriculture. These bulletins were prepared jointly and cooperatively with the agricultural education service of the United States Office of Education. A bulletin, *Credit Problems of Families*, has been prepared cooperatively by the Farm Credit Administration and the home economics education service of the United States Office of Education (Bulletin No. 206).

In addition, the Farm Credit Administration has been instrumental in establishing in local Future Farm chapters miniature production credit associations which were patterned after the regular set-up of a local production credit association and in which the mem-

bers and officers were made up of local F. F. A. chapter members. This procedure serves the double purpose of providing production credit association loans to F. F. A. boys at a low interest rate and in addition teaches them how to secure production credit association loans when they become adult farmers. State supervisors of agricultural education, of course, have the major responsibility for promoting this program within their particular States.

Two departments with which State supervisors maintain close contact are those charged with responsibility for health and safety. The department of health is frequently asked to pass upon sanitation facilities in the schools. In a number of States employees of the department of health spend considerable time in the schools, some being employed on a full-time basis for work with school problems of health and sanitation. Another important contribution of departments of health is in the field of curriculum materials and health manuals for use in the schools. Where no special service in health education exists within the State department of public instruction, great reliance is generally placed upon representatives of State boards of health for service in this area.

The same may be said about safety education with the important difference that whereas more than half of the States have health specialists in their State departments only five (Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Massachusetts, and New Jersey) reported having officials whose titles include the word "safety". Consequently, highway departments or safety departments, by whatever name they may be called, frequently are asked to assist the State supervisors in their efforts to improve safety in the schools. To date much of the work done has centered about school busses and safety on the highways and at street crossings, but an increasing number of States are developing safety manuals and other materials designed for use in the classrooms as well. To these efforts the highway departments make important contributions in a number of States.

Three States (Oklahoma, Tennessee, and West Virginia) reported that the State agencies in charge of conservation were cooperating in producing curriculum materials. Reliance upon State planning boards for research data of various kinds was reported by 4 States. State library commissions occasionally supply book lists and one State department indicated cooperation with the State museum.

Supervisors of trade and industrial education work closely with State employment agencies. Many persons who are registered with these agencies enroll in trade-preparatory and trade-extension classes in order to enhance their opportunity to secure jobs and in many instances the State employment agency is helpful in securing jobs or promotions for persons who have completed vocational training

in some particular trade or occupation. The advice of the employment agencies regarding the need for trained workers is usually secured before new training courses are started.

Relationships With Professional and Lay Groups

Supervisors at the secondary level, both vocational and nonvocational, cooperate in many ways with educational organizations, national, regional, State, and local. They hold active membership and stimulate similar support from teachers under their supervision. Often they are officers in these associations. They cooperate in formulating programs for the conventions and meetings, encourage teachers to attend and participate in the discussions, and appear in person as speakers on those programs. Their service on committees has already been discussed; in addition they cooperate with legislative committees of teachers' organizations and help to secure support from lay organizations for progressive school legislation. In the Southern, Central, North Central, and Northwest areas special responsibilities exist in connection with accrediting programs maintained by the regional associations of colleges and secondary schools operating in the 41 States included in these 4 areas. In most of these States the high-school supervisors are members and, more often than not, chairmen of the State accrediting committees, with all the work and responsibility which members must take in planning, visiting, checking, consulting, and preparing recommended lists of schools for consideration by the associations. Moreover, these regional associations undertake extensive research studies in which the supervisors participate. A good illustration of such a program is the *Cooperative Study of Secondary School Standards* initiated by the regional associations and carried forward during the past 7 years with the assistance of State high-school and vocational supervisors.

The lay organizations with which cooperative relationships are maintained by State supervisors are numerous. Included are service clubs; the American Legion; the Grange, Farm Bureau, Farmer's Union, and other leading farm organizations; the American Association of University Women and State and local business and professional women's clubs; Young Men's Christian Association and Young Women's Christian Association; the 4-H clubs; State and local parent-teacher associations; and a large variety of clubs and organizations representing churches, labor, business, and so forth.

A type of cooperation which deserves special mention is maintained by trade and industrial supervisors with labor organizations and employers' organizations. While each of these organizations is representative of two distinct groups, nevertheless the cooperative relationships that have been developed between them and State supervisors of trade and industrial education are similar at least so

far as purpose and functions of cooperation are concerned. In general, it may be said that the cooperative relationships that have been developed between State supervisors of trade and industrial education and these organizations are twofold: First, it is through these organizations that State supervisors are helped to discover the possibilities and needs for training programs in the various trades in the different communities of a State; and second, it is through working with these groups that analyses of the various jobs in the several trades are made upon which a training program is developed. It is largely through working with labor organizations and organizations of employers that State supervisors are able to determine whether the vocational training should be of the trade-preparatory or trade-extension type. The former is designed specifically for the training of new and additional workers for a specific trade in which it is found that additional workers are needed, while the latter is designed for the giving of such training on the job as will increase the occupational competency of those persons already employed. Similar cooperative working relationships have been and are being developed in the field of vocational education in distributive occupations between State supervisors and retailers' organizations.

VI. Some Recurring Practices

The account here presented of the organization, functions, activities, and relationships characteristic of State supervision at the secondary level should convince the most skeptical that those who engage in this work successfully must be possessed of initiative, resourcefulness, energy, and industry. The variety in the undertakings and responsibilities is such that generalization is difficult; and yet it is possible to discover certain common patterns. These common patterns emerge most clearly in vocational education because of the national legislation which forms the background for operation of the vocational program. But there are also similarities worthy of mention in nonvocational supervision. This is owing partly to likenesses in the development and needs of certain States and regions, and partly to the need for selection of areas for emphasis, since the field is so broad and the number of staff members so small; in making the selections it is natural that the experiences of neighboring States should exert an influence. The following features recur frequently enough to warrant the conclusion that they are not accidental:

1. The services in vocational supervision are supplied in the areas of agriculture, home economics, trades and industry, and distributive occupations, with teacher-training programs in each of these areas.
2. Districting of the State for supervisory purposes is found in four Middle Western States, Illinois, Iowa, Missouri, and Wisconsin.

3. Nine of the eleven Southern States have provided for integration of their supervisory services through a division of instruction (or supervision) or through development of a State-wide movement called a program for the improvement of instruction or by some similar name.
4. The steps in programs for the improvement of instruction are similar in character and in sequence.
5. Accrediting as a function is well-nigh universal among the States; moreover, programs for accrediting are increasingly emphasizing progressive improvement of schools as distinct from reaching a minimum standard.
6. The departments of three New England States, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Connecticut, pay particular attention to problems connected with the training of teachers in higher institutions.
7. In the Middle West, attention has been centered upon training of rural school teachers; consequently, teacher training in high schools survives in Wisconsin, Michigan, Minnesota, Iowa, Missouri, Nebraska, Kansas, and Wyoming.
8. Activities of supervisors of vocational education fall principally in four areas, namely, promotional and cooperative service, upgrading and professional improvement of teachers, administration and regulation of funds, and research studies and investigations.
9. Supervision as a function of State departments got under way rather late; consequently, few States have a sufficient number of supervisors, except in vocational education, to maintain close supervision of secondary schools. That the need for State supervision of secondary education is recognized generally may be judged from the fact that 43 States have one or more staff members assigned specifically to high-school supervision.

