

MONOGRAPH 6

Education of Teachers as a Function of State Departments of Education

By BENJAMIN W. FRAZIER
Senior Specialist in Teacher Training

BULLETIN 1940, No. 6

MONOGRAPH No. 6

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 20 cents

Contents

	Page
FOREWORD.....	v
CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
Scope of study and sources of data.....	1
Number and types of institutions engaged in teacher education.....	2
CHAPTER II. OVERHEAD CONTROL AND COORDINATION OF INSTITUTIONS THAT EDUCATE TEACHERS.....	6
State controlled institutions.....	6
Classification by general types of control.....	6
State control of teachers colleges and normal schools.....	12
Administration of institutions by State departments of education.....	13
Relationships of State departments with State institutions not under the control of the State board of education.....	17
Relationships with Federal agencies.....	22
Relationships with general State governmental agencies.....	24
Relationships with public school and college associations.....	26
County, city, local district, and privately controlled institutions.....	27
County normal schools and teacher-training high schools.....	27
City and district institutions.....	30
Privately controlled institutions.....	30
Trends in overhead control.....	31
Conditions of operation and evaluation of State systems of overhead control and coordination.....	32
Summary of findings.....	39
CHAPTER III. COMPOSITION AND PERSONNEL OF STATE BOARDS AND DE- PARTMENTS OF EDUCATION IN RELATION TO INSTITUTIONAL GOVERNMENT.....	43
State boards of education, and of higher-education institutions.....	43
State departments of education.....	44
State superintendent or commissioner of education.....	44
State director of teacher education and certification.....	46
Other State department personnel in teacher education and cer- tification.....	49
Trends.....	51
Needs.....	51
Summary of findings.....	53
CHAPTER IV. ADMINISTRATIVE AND SUPERVISORY FUNCTIONS AND SERVICES.....	55
Functions relating directly to institutions that educate teachers.....	56
Regulation of teacher supply and demand.....	56
Collection of information concerning teacher supply and demand.....	57
Regulation of student admission, recruiting, and transfer.....	58
State accreditation of institutions that educate teachers.....	62
Functions relating to college staffs.....	65
Functions relating to college financial and business administra- tion.....	67
Curriculum construction and revision.....	71
Administration of student teaching.....	79

	Page
CHAPTER IV. ADMINISTRATIVE AND SUPERVISORY FUNCTIONS AND SERVICES—Continued.	
Functions relating indirectly to institutions that educate teachers.....	82
Certification of teachers.....	82
Powers and limitations of central certification agencies.....	82
Organization.....	83
Scope of service; number and types of certificates issued.....	84
Certification requirements.....	85
Interstate relationships.....	86
Teacher placement services.....	88
Other teacher personnel functions.....	91
Summary of findings.....	92
Regulation of teacher supply and demand.....	92
State accreditation of institutions.....	93
Functions relating to college staffs.....	94
Financial and business administration.....	94
Curriculum construction and revision.....	95
Administration of student teaching.....	96
Certification of teachers.....	97
Teacher placement.....	98
CHAPTER V. SPECIFIC METHODS OF RENDERING SERVICES.....	99
Consultations at the State department.....	99
Visitation of institutions.....	100
Conferences.....	101
Surveys.....	103
Statistical reports.....	104
Research and systematic study.....	105
Teacher personnel records.....	106
Publications.....	107
Summary of findings.....	107
CHAPTER VI. SUMMARY OF SUGGESTIONS AND PROPOSALS FOR IMPROVEMENT.....	109
Overhead control and coordination of institutions.....	109
Composition and personnel of State staffs.....	112
Administrative and supervisory functions and services.....	112
Regulation of teacher supply and demand.....	112
State accreditation of institutions.....	113
Functions relating to college staffs.....	113
Financial and business administration.....	114
Curriculum construction and revision.....	114
Administration of student teaching.....	115
Certification of teachers.....	115
Teacher placement.....	116
Specific methods of rendering services.....	116
SELECTED REFERENCES.....	118

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 the States 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 monograph deals primarily with the administrative and professional functions and services of State departments of education involved in the preservice education of teachers; it treats of the overhead organization and administration of 107 teacher-education institutions governed by State boards of education and of the supervision or coordination of 1,089 other publicly and privately controlled institutions that prepare teachers; and it deals incidentally with State teacher personnel functions closely related to the education of teachers, such as teacher certification and placement.

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.

Education of Teachers as a Function of State Departments of Education

Chapter I. Introduction

THE ASSURANCE of an adequate supply of competent teachers constitutes one of the most important functions of the State departments of education in the discharge of their responsibility for the administration and improvement of the public schools. This function involves the administration, supervision, or coordination of 1,196 institutions that annually replace the losses among America's 918,715 public-school teachers and officers, and that provide trained workers to fill new positions wherever expanded educational services are introduced. It involves the original issuance and the renewal of certificates annually for one-fifth of the teaching staff of the Nation. Indirectly, it further involves the performance of a variety of teacher personnel activities, constant research and study, and other administrative and professional activities.

Scope of Study and Sources of Data

This monograph deals primarily with the functions exercised by State departments of education in their administration and supervision of the preservice education of teachers. In addition, it discusses the organization, relationships, personnel, and specific means of service of the State departments of education and of the State boards of education insofar as these affect the extent or quality of the functions that are performed. Brief treatment is accorded teacher certification, and background material only is presented with reference to other State teacher personnel activities significantly related to the preservice education of teachers.

The in-service education and the supervision of teachers as conducted by State departments of education are given treatment in a number of the monographs of the *Studies of State Departments of Education* series by the U. S. Office of Education. For that reason, the present study is concerned primarily with the preservice education of teachers. It is further concerned for the most part with teacher-education as conducted in 319 institutions under State control; for it is in such institutions that the functions and services performed by the State departments of education are most numerous and effective. Because of the great importance of teacher education in city, district, and privately controlled institutions, the significant relationships of the State departments of education to such institu-

tions are given brief consideration. Certain topics relating to the work of the State departments of education in teacher education are treated briefly, because other recent Office studies, cited at the close of this publication, discuss them in detail. These topics among others include teacher certification, State accrediting of higher-education institutions, and authority of State executive agencies over higher education.

In keeping with the limitation of the *State Studies* series of monographs to the treatment of State departments of education, the present study does not treat extensively the functions of State or local boards of education that control State institutions of higher education, but do not control the public elementary and secondary schools. This limitation is significant, for of the 343 State-controlled institutions only 113 are controlled by State boards of education that also control the public schools. However, the study includes every State, and, to some slight extent at least, every institution that educates teachers; for State departments of education exercise important functions affecting teacher personnel in every State, and in addition have certain significant supervisory or coordinating relationships with all institutions that educate teachers irrespective of the type of board control.

The sources of data used in this study include an extensive inquiry schedule completed by field workers during interviews with officials in the departments of education in 48 States; school laws; biennial or other periodical reports of State boards of education and State departments of education; and special reports, documents, and statements provided in large numbers by State department staff members. Corresponding materials were secured also from a number of State boards and administrative agencies other than the State boards and departments of education. Secondary sources also are used occasionally for authoritative evaluations of practice and for supplementary materials on special aspects of the study. Most of the secondary source references are listed in the bibliography at the close of this monograph.

Number and Types of Institutions Engaged in Teacher Education

Of the 1,709 institutions of higher education listed in the 1939 Educational Directory of the U. S. Office of Education, 1,196 are approved or recognized by the State departments of education for teacher education and certification purposes. The number of these institutions classified by types is shown in table 1. Graduates of 1 or more of the curricula of such institutions may be legally certificated or employed to teach in public elementary or secondary schools, without having to undergo further collegiate or professional work in

other institutions. In addition to the institutions of collegiate grade indicated in table 1, in 1938-39 there were about 523 teacher-training high schools and county normal schools, located in 8 States.

Table 1.—Number of institutions of higher education approved by State departments of education for the education of public-school teachers, classified by types, 1938-39¹

Type of institution	Number approved
A. STATE CONTROLLED:	
Teachers college or normal school.....	185
University or land-grant college.....	86
4-year college.....	24
Junior college.....	19
Independent professional or technical school.....	5
Total	319
B. CITY OR DISTRICT CONTROLLED:	
Teachers college or normal school.....	14
University or 4-year college.....	13
Junior college.....	73
Independent professional or technical school.....	--
Total	100
C. PRIVATELY OR DENOMINATIONALLY CONTROLLED:²	
Teachers college or normal school.....	39
University or 4-year college.....	554
Junior college.....	136
Independent professional or technical school.....	48
Total	777
Grand total	1,196

¹ Data secured from State lists of approved institutions; personal interviews with officials of State departments of education; and by correspondence. Classification of institutions follows that of the *Educational Directory* of the U. S. Office of Education.

² Two additional land-grant institutions (Negro) not here included are classified as State teachers colleges or normal schools.

³ Does not include a few institutions not listed by State departments that educate private or parochial-school teachers primarily; nor a very few business "colleges" approved for the preparation of teachers of commercial subjects only.

In 1935, there were 360 institutions of higher education listed as State controlled in the *Educational Directory* of the U. S. Office of Education. In 1940, there were 354. (In both years, these totals include a few institutions controlled by the Federal Government or its outlying possessions.) The slight apparent decrease in the number of State institutions is accounted for chiefly by changes in directory classifications, rather than by the closing of institutions. The total number of State institutions, therefore, has neither increased nor decreased to any significant extent during recent years, although they have grown steadily in enrollments, and numerous changes in the number of years of work offered by individual institutions have occurred.

Similarly, there have been few changes in the total number of State teachers colleges and normal schools for a number of years. The curricula of normal schools have been steadily lengthened, however, and the schools changed to teachers colleges at a rapid rate. The number of State teachers colleges almost quadrupled between 1920 and 1940; whereas the number of State normal schools declined correspondingly, from 138 to 30. Lengthening of normal school curricula has occurred in almost every State in the Union. The only States now (1940) having State normal schools, but no State teachers colleges, are Idaho, Oregon, and Vermont; and in 2 of these States, curricula are in process of being raised to the degree level.

There is much more difficulty and uncertainty in the accurate classification of institutions with respect to their functions in teacher education, than there is in securing approved lists of institutions that educate other professional workers, such as doctors and engineers. The fact that nearly all of the 4-year colleges and universities in most States are approved for teacher education, indicates that the lack of distinctive objectives and of acceptable standards that characterized the preparation of teachers during the last century still persists. These conditions are unfortunate in the upbuilding of a genuine profession of teaching, and in safeguarding the supply of competent teachers. The uncertainties of classification also lead to confusion in statistical and other investigations in respect to the number and characteristics of teacher-education institutions, and to inaccuracy and misleading conclusions concerning the source, extent, and nature of the supply of teachers.

A number of problems in the administration and functioning of State institutions discussed in the chapters which follow are directly traceable to lack of balance in the number, kind, and distribution of State institutions of different types. Many teacher-education institutions are poorly located with reference to the supply of prospective teachers, to the supply of pupils for practice purposes, to the teaching vacancies to be filled, and to the general advantage of the institution. In many States and areas within States, there are too many institutions; and in some, too few. Occasionally this is due to the changing concentrations of population of the State since the institutions were established. More often, however, the institutions originally were established in the towns or cities that donated the most money or the best site for a campus and plant; or that could exert the most influence in the legislature. The establishment of private institutions of higher education was equally haphazard; and their teacher-education activities often duplicated those of the teachers colleges and other State institutions in their areas. Consequently, with approximately 1,200 publicly controlled and privately controlled higher institutions educating teachers; it is not strange that, as measures

of economy, activities are almost continually under way designed to consolidate or to eliminate the weaker institutions.

In the case of State teachers colleges and other well-established 4-year State institutions, such movements to date have been almost altogether futile. It has been claimed that no State teachers college or normal school with a plant worth as much as \$25,000 has ever been closed permanently although a few have been made State colleges or universities. Municipal, county, and local district normal schools and teacher-training departments as well as privately controlled normal schools are steadily decreasing in number. While the latter movement is not due directly to State action, the increasing growth in the amount and quality of services of the State institutions is a strong contributing factor in the decline of locally supported teacher-education institutions.

In the case of junior colleges, the number approved for teacher education is decreasing rapidly, as the State boards and departments of education and the State legislatures raise certification requirements to the 3- and 4-year levels. The average amount of preparation required of teachers is increasing in the country as a whole at the rate of about 1 year each decade, so the junior colleges that do not lengthen their course of study correspondingly, soon function in teacher education somewhat as the high schools function; that is, as schools where general academic or special-subject preparatory work only may be secured by prospective teachers. The States where this situation exists are for the most part those requiring 3 or 4 years of college preparation as a minimum for elementary teachers.

Chapter II. Overhead Control and Coordination of Institutions That Educate Teachers

SO NUMEROUS are the boards that control State institutions of higher education, and so complex are the relationships of the many State agencies that administer them, that only salient features of the educational administrative organization of such institutions can be presented in this monograph. However, even brief consideration of their organization clarifies considerably the reasons for the great differences among State departments of education in the number, scope, and effectiveness of the functions they perform relative to the preservice education of teachers.

Of the 1,196 institutions of collegiate grade that are approved by State departments of education for the preparation of public-school teachers (table 1), 27 percent are State controlled; 8 percent are controlled by cities or local school districts; and 65 percent are privately or denominationally controlled. In addition to the large number of institutions of collegiate grade that educate teachers, there are 523 schools of secondary or post-secondary grade in 8 States that prepare teachers primarily for rural school service. Of these 523 schools, 51 are county normal schools, and 472 are teacher-training high schools. Their local administration and supervision is in the hands of county or local district administrative officers; but the State departments of education assist in financing most of them, and also exercise important administrative and supervisory functions that affect their work.

State Controlled Institutions

Classification by General Types of Control

Every State in the Union maintains and controls 1 or more institutions of higher education. These institutions are of several types, including universities, colleges, teachers colleges, normal schools, junior colleges, professional schools, and technical schools. The total number is 343. The number in each State varies from 1 to 18, and the average number per State is 7 (table 2).

The 343 State institutions are governed by at least 150 separate boards, authorized by the State constitutions or by the legislatures. These boards vary in number among the several States from 1 to 10; or from 1 to 15 if local boards subordinate to centralized boards are considered. In a given State, the institutions may be governed by single boards of trustees for each institution; by 1 central board for all institutions; or by 1 or more boards, each in control of 1 institu-

tion, and in addition, 1 or more semicentralized boards, each in control of 2 or more institutions. Furthermore, the powers delegated to these boards vary widely, in accordance with State laws or constitutional provisions. In 19 States, one of the boards of control is the State board of education, in charge also of the public elementary and secondary schools.

Ninety-three percent of the State institutions of higher education are recognized by State certification officers as institutions that educate teachers. All State teachers colleges, normal schools, universities, land-grant colleges, and 4-year colleges of arts and sciences are approved for teacher education and certification purposes. The 24 institutions not recognized as institutions that prepare teachers are either junior colleges, the curricula of which are too short to meet 3- or 4-year minimum requirements for teacher certification, or else they are professional or technical schools that prepare workers for vocations other than teaching. These schools are included in the figures in columns 3, 8, and 9 of table 2. In columns 4-7, all institutions included in the figures as State institutions are approved for the education of teachers.

The exact classification of some States by types of institutional control is difficult and subject to some misunderstanding because of the wide variety of types and subtypes of control that have been devised in the light of different criteria and discussed in the literature of higher education. Special conditions indicated in column 10 of table 2 exist in Pennsylvania, New York, New Jersey, and Florida that would justify a different classification of some of the institutions or States if different criteria were used in classifying the institutions. The special conditions in these and certain other States are discussed in more detail later in connection with State department functions, relationships, and means of service.

That wide variations exist in the extent of the services rendered to higher-education institutions by the several State departments of education may be inferred from the fact that in 2 of the 48 States, the State board of education in charge of the public elementary and secondary schools governs all of the State institutions; in 17 States it governs part of them; and in the remainder of the States it governs none of them. Of the 343 State-controlled institutions only 113, or 33 percent, are governed by the State boards of education.

Practically the same variations in the extent of State department services to institutions that educate teachers are to be expected, as to higher-education institutions in general. Of the 343 State-controlled institutions, 319 prepare teachers. Of the 319, 107, or 34 percent, are governed by State boards of education. Incidentally, these 107 institutions approved for teacher education and governed by State boards of education, constitute only 9 percent of the total

Table 2.—Types of boards governing State controlled institutions of higher education and number of institutions, classified by types, 1939

Type of board and State	Number of boards	Number of institutions, classified by types							Explanation and comments
		Total, all institutions	Teachers college or normal school	University	Land-grant institutions, independently organized	State college (4 years work or more)	Junior college	Professional or technical institution	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1. State Board of Education Controlling Public Schools Governs All Institutions	1	3	2	1					
Idaho							1		
Montana		6	2	1	1		1		
2. Separate Local Board(s) Govern Some Institutions, and State Board Controlling Public Schools Governs Some Institutions.									
Alabama:	3	3	5	1	1	1			State board of education and board of regents of the University of Idaho is the governing body. Each institution also has a local executive board. The University of Montana includes all State higher-education institutions. A chancellor is authorized but now not employed. Secretary reports to State board of education.
Separate; local									
Partially unified: State board of education	1	7	1						A State council of education with advisory powers coordinates the 3 institutions governed by separate boards.
California:	1	1							
Separate; local									
Partially unified: State board of education	1	8	7					1	The State council of educational planning and coordination, an advisory body only, studies means of coordinating State-supported public education. A State curriculum committee also functions.
Connecticut:	1	1							
Separate; local									
Partially unified: State board of education	1	4	4						
Kentucky:	5	5	4	1	1				
Separate; local									
State board of education	1	1							The council on public higher education also has jurisdiction over the 5 institutions
Louisiana:	1	1							
Separate; local									
Partially unified: State board of education	1	6	1		1	3	1		Each institution also has a local executive committee.
Maryland:	2	3			1	1	1		Princess Anne College, Negro land-grant institution, is governed by board of regents of University of Maryland. St. Mary's Female Seminary, a junior college, has its own local board of trustees, but is State supported and State owned.
Separate; local									
Partially unified: State board of education	1	4	3						

EDUCATION OF TEACHERS

Massachusetts: Separate; local	2	2				1		1	Does not include Massachusetts Institute of Technology, private land-grant institution.
Partially unified: State board of education	1	10	10						Teachers colleges governed by State department of education, headed by State commissioner of education and advisory board of education. Commissioner and department also have certain powers over the 2 State colleges.
Michigan: Separate; local	3	3				1		1	Land-grant college governed by State board of agriculture.
Partially unified: State board of education	1	4	4						State board of education has limited supervisory jurisdiction over public schools.
New Hampshire: Separate; local	1	1							
Partially unified: State board of education	1	2	2						
New Jersey: Separate; local	1	1				1			
Partially unified: State board of education	1	6	6						Rutgers University (also Newark College of Engineering) sustains contractual relations with State board of regents which purchases educational services from it. Rutgers University (private) operates State college of agriculture and allied units which are overseen by board of visitors of the State agricultural college. Teachers colleges, and vocational teacher-training department of Rutgers University, controlled by commissioner of education subject to approval of State board of education.
New York: Separate; local	2	2				1		1	Cornell University (private) is included for present purposes because it is a land-grant institution and administers major land-grant instructional activities under general supervision by State department of education of fiscal matters involving State funds. The State college of forestry, at Syracuse University (col. 9), has a somewhat comparable organization.
Partially unified: State board of education	1	11	11						Regents of the State of New York is governing body. Local boards exist but their powers are quite limited.
Pennsylvania: Separate; local	1	1						1	
Partially unified: State board of education	1	14	13						Each institution has a separate local board under supervision of the State council of education, but is attached and subordinate to the department of public instruction.
Tennessee: Separate; local	1	1							
Partially unified: State board of education	1	6	4			1		(?)	Board also governs Alvin C. York Agricultural Institute. The Negro land-grant college also is a teachers college.
Utah: Separate; local	2	2							
Partially unified: State board of education	1	4						4	
Vermont: Separate; local	1	1							
Partially unified: State board of education	1	3	3						
Virginia: Separate; local	5	5				1		1	
Partially unified: State board of education	1	5	4					1	
West Virginia: Separate; local	1	1							
Partially unified: State board of education	1	9	5					1	

State board of control manages fiscal affairs of all State institutions. There is an advisory council for Negro education in charge of Negro schools operating subject to State board of education approval.

See footnotes at end of table.

Table 2.—Types of boards governing State controlled institutions of higher education and number of institutions, classified by types, 1939—Continued

Type of board and State	Number of boards	Number of institutions, classified by types							Explanation and comments
		Total, all institutions	Teachers college or normal school	University	Land-grant institutions, independently organized	State college (4 years work or more)	Junior college	Professional or technical institution	
1	3	3	4	5	6	8	9	10	
3. Separate Local Board NOT Controlling Public Schools Governs Each Institution									
Arizona.....	1	3	2	1	1	2	3		
Arkansas.....	2	9	2	1	1	2	3		
Delaware.....	2	2	1	1	1	1	1		
Missouri.....	7	7	5	1	1	1	1		
Nevada.....	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		University includes school of mines and metallurgy at Rolla.
New Mexico.....	7	7	2	1	1	2	1		The combined normal and industrial department of Wilberforce University, not here included, is a State instructional unit for Negroes, operated in conjunction with Wilberforce University (private).
Ohio.....	5	5	5	5	5	5	5		
South Carolina.....	6	6	1	1	1	2	1		
Washington.....	5	5	3	1	1	1	1		State board of education has certain powers over curricula and entrance requirements of institutions.
Wyoming.....	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		
4. State Board NOT Controlling Public Schools Governs All Institutions									
Florida.....	1	3	1	1	1	1	1		State board of control governs subject to supervision of State board of education which exercises little authority.
Georgia.....	1	15	1	1	1	2	6	1	Regents of the university system of Georgia governs all higher and secondary institutions of learning; has a chancellor.
Iowa.....	1	3	1	1	1	1	1		Iowa State Board of Education in reality is a State board of higher education.
Kansas.....	1	5	2	1	1	1	1		Junior college commission administers standards for local public junior colleges.
Mississippi.....	1	6	2	1	1	1	1		Board of higher education.
North Dakota.....	1	9	5	1	1	1	2		Under State board of higher education, with chancellor.
Oregon.....	1	5	3	1	1	1	1		State board of regents governs.
Rhode Island.....	1	2	1	1	1	1	1		
South Dakota.....	1	7	4	1	1	1	1		

6. *Separate Local Board(s) Governs Some Institution(s) and Partially Unified State Board(s) NOT Controlling Public Schools Governs Some Institutions*

402584 ^a - 41	Colorado:	6	6	1	1	3	1					State board of agriculture governs land-grant college. Board of trustees of teachers colleges governs 3 institutions.
	Separate; local	1	3									
	Partially unified	1	1									
	Illinois:	1	1									
	Separate; local	1	5									
	Partially unified ^b	2	2									State teachers college board is an adjunct of executive State department of registration and education.
	Indiana:	1	2									State board of education elects 5 members of board of trustees of Indiana University, and exerts considerable influence upon management of teachers colleges.
	Separate; local	1	1									
	Partially unified	1	6									
	Maine:	1	1									
	Separate; local	1	1									State commissioner of education as executive officer of board has considerable power over institutions.
	Partially unified	1	6									
	Minnesota:	1	1									
	Separate; local	1	6									State teachers college board controls.
	Partially unified	1	1									
	Nebraska:	1	1									
	Separate; local	1	4									
	Partially unified	1	4									
	North Carolina:	9	9									
	Separate; local	1	3									Three Negro teachers colleges are operated by local boards, but under general supervision and ultimate control of State board of education.
	Partially unified	4	4									
	Oklahoma:	1	8									
	Separate; local	1	6									Board of regents of Oklahoma colleges established in 1939. Governed by State board of agriculture.
	Partially unified	3	3									Regents of the University of Texas (including Galveston medical branch) governs college of mines and metallurgy at El Paso.
	Texas:	1	2									Governed by directors of the Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas. The Negro land-grant institution is a teachers college. Governed by board of regents of the Texas State teachers colleges.
	Partially unified	1	7									Wisconsin State Board of Vocational and Adult Education and Board of Trustees of Stout Institute governs Stout Institute. 28 2-year county normal schools under separate local boards but closely supervised by department of public instruction are not included here.
	Wisconsin:	2	2									
	Separate; local	1	9									
	Partially unified ^c	1	0									
	TOTAL ^d	159	343	185	47	39	24	25	13			

^a All State institutions are approved for teacher education, except 16 junior colleges located in 7 States; and 8 professional or technical institutions, located in 5 States. Classification follows U. S. Office of Education, Educational Directory, 1939. Includes New York State College of Forestry at Syracuse University, Rutgers University (private), and Cornell University (private), because certain units of these institutions are under the direct administrative jurisdiction of the State.

^b 1 additional land-grant institution (Negro) in Tennessee and 1 in Texas are listed in column 4 as teachers colleges.
^c For Negroes only.
^d Has no State board of education controlling public schools.



of 1,196 institutions of all types—State, city, and private—that educate teachers. Obviously, the State departments of education are handicapped at the very beginning of their efforts to improve teacher education in colleges and universities, by having little or no administrative authority over by far the larger number of such institutions.

The 113 State institutions of higher education that are governed by State boards of education are classified by types as follows: State teachers colleges and normal schools, 91; State universities, 2; separately organized land-grant colleges, 6, of which 5 are for Negroes only; State 4-year colleges of arts and sciences, 6; State junior colleges, 6; and professional and technical schools, 2. Thus a total of only 22 higher-education institutions other than State teachers colleges and normal schools are governed by State boards of education. Of the 22, 6 are junior colleges, and few of the remainder are among the larger and more influential State institutions; that is, the State universities, and the larger separately organized land-grant institutions. Approximately three-fourths of the State universities are governed by separate local boards for each institution.

The powers of the institutional governing boards are usually defined by the legislatures, although 17 of the 39 States having State boards of education provide for them in their constitutions. Fourteen of the constitutions give various details concerning the boards, such as the number of ex officio members, and the length of term of office. Approximately half of the 48 State constitutions take cognizance of higher education either in general or in specific terms. State universities are mentioned more often than State teachers colleges and normal schools. Six States have provisions relating to the control of both types of institutions, and 5 to universities alone. Two States restrict the number of normal schools which may be established by the legislatures. Constitutional provisions relative to the composition of governing boards appear to have few useful purposes. For the most part they merely operate to restrict the jurisdiction of the legislatures over the institutions. In general, the constitutions do not attempt to define the functions of the boards. This power is left to the legislatures, to exercise or to delegate as they see fit.

State Control of Teachers Colleges and Normal Schools

The administrative and service relationships of the State departments of education to the State teachers colleges and normal schools are particularly significant. These institutions prepare well over half of the public elementary school teachers; and elementary school teachers constitute more than two-thirds of the total public-school teaching staff of the Nation.

One of the most important facts concerning the relationships of State departments to the State teachers colleges and normal schools

is whether or not the State board of education controls these institutions. For present purposes, 5 major types of control of State teachers colleges and normal schools may be distinguished. First, the State board of education in control of the public elementary and secondary schools governs all State teachers colleges and normal schools, and also all other State institutions of higher education. This type of control is found in 2 States, and the boards govern a total of 4 teachers colleges and normal schools. Second, the State board of education governs all State teachers colleges and normal schools, but does *not* govern all other State institutions. This type of control is found in 15 States, with a total of 87 teachers colleges and normal schools under the State board of education. It is the predominant type of control of such institutions. Third, a State board *not* in charge of the public schools governs all other State institutions of higher education. This type of control is found in 8 States, with a total of 19 teachers colleges and normal schools. Fourth, a State board *not* in charge of the public schools governs all or some of the State teachers colleges or normal schools, but not all other State institutions (in 2 States there are 2 of these boards). This type is found in 9 States, which have a total of 50 teachers colleges and normal schools. Fifth, a separate local board governs each teachers college or normal school. This type is found in 7 States, with a total of 25 teacher-education institutions.

By combining the first and second of the foregoing types, it is found that 91 State teachers colleges and normal schools, or about half of the total of 185 in 41 States, are governed by the State board of education in charge of the public schools. These 91 teachers colleges and normal schools constitute all but 16 of the total number of State-controlled institutions of all types approved for teacher education, that are governed by the State board of education:

Administration of Institutions by State Departments of Education

The administration of State teacher-education institutions that are under the control of State boards of education governing the public schools is nearly always delegated to the State superintendent of public instruction, and to his assistants in the State department of education. Of the 18 States¹ which have a State board of education governing the public schools and also governing one or more institutions that educate teachers, the State superintendent is executive officer of the board in 16 States, and is the secretary or chairman in the 2 remaining States. In the 18 States, the superintendent not only enforces the policies of the boards in respect to institutional management and supervision, but also in respect to most State

¹ The State junior colleges of Utah are controlled by the State board of education, but are not approved or teacher education.

teacher service and welfare provisions. This constitutes a very favorable administrative setting for the development of an effective coordinated teacher personnel program.

In some States the statutes accord the chief State school officer and the State department of education certain independent powers over teacher-education institutions, more or less irrespective of the powers of the governing boards of such institutions. In Massachusetts, the State board of education is largely an advisory board. The commissioner of education has supervision of all educational work in the institutions. He is specifically empowered to perform a number of duties, such as to collect statistics from the institutions, receive applications for positions, and make use of teachers college buildings and grounds. The department of education has general management of the State teachers colleges, and may direct the expenditure of money appropriated for their maintenance.

In Michigan, the superintendent of public instruction has the power to supervise general instruction in all State educational institutions, including among others the State university and the land-grant college. He has many specific duties prescribed, such as to visit the institutions and meet with the governing boards; to direct the supervision of county normal training classes, and provide rules for their management and control; and to report to the Governor concerning higher-education institutions.

In California, the State superintendent of public instruction is not only the executive officer of the State board of education but is also ex officio a director of education. This officer not only enforces the rules and regulations made by the board but also is by law empowered to administer the institutions, control and expend all State-college money, determine fees to be charged students, appoint employees of the State colleges with the approval of the board, and fix the duties and salaries of such employees; establish model and training schools; and perform a number of other important duties.

In New York, the commissioner of education has general supervision over the State normal schools and teachers colleges, in addition to many other important duties relative to higher education. Numerous specific duties are legally assigned to his office; for example, he is authorized and directed to establish and provide for the maintenance and conduct of courses of study not only in the State normal schools, but also in other institutions that educate teachers; and with the approval of the board of regents, he is charged with the duty of preparing annual estimates and requests for appropriations for State normal schools and certain other institutions, and of checking upon their expenditures of funds.

In Pennsylvania, the teachers colleges are considered parts of the public-school system. The State superintendent, therefore, has very

wide powers in respect to their government, such as to approve the facilities for instruction; to preside as chairman of the board of presidents; to prescribe and conduct such examinations of students as he deems necessary to fix standards of instruction and of graduation; to approve the cost of boarding and tuition fixed by the local trustees; to approve the bylaws and rules and regulations made by the trustees; and to prescribe all forms and to give all instructions required for carrying into full effect the act establishing and regulating the State teachers colleges not otherwise set forth in detail in the statutes.

In New Jersey, the State teachers colleges are controlled by the commissioner of education, subject to the approval of the State board of education. In Maine, which has no State board of education, the State commissioner of education is a member of the State board of normal-school trustees. He functions as the executive officer of this board and has extensive powers over the normal schools.

The State superintendent himself rarely has much time to devote to the details of institutional supervision, or to routine State department teacher-personnel activities. Such activities are delegated in about one-third of the States to a State director of teacher education and certification. This officer devotes most of his time to the preservice education of teachers. His office has been established in 17 States under various titles. He usually heads a division, bureau, or equivalent unit of the State department of education. His office is found most frequently in States that have a relatively large number of institutions that educate teachers, and that have fairly large and professionalized State departments of education with distinctly differentiated functions. Personnel data concerning this officer, and concerning the State superintendent or commissioner of education, are presented in more detail in chapter III of this study.

The State director of teacher education performs both administrative and professional functions. He is variously, from time to time, a director, supervisor, and consultant. In most States, his activities are more nearly those of a consultant or coordinator than those of an administrator. Hence, his effectiveness professionally depends to a considerable extent upon the confidence the institutions of higher education have in his professional ability, and upon his powers as an educational leader.

All State directors of teacher education and certification are responsible for the improvement of the preservice teacher-education program, including curriculum revision and other aspects of teacher preparation in institutions of higher education. Under the chief State school officer, the director has more or less administrative power in nine States. In such States, some of the institutions are controlled by the State board of education. In all but a few States, the director of teacher education is responsible for teacher certifi-

cation. He is concerned in several States with the in-service education of teachers, through extension work, teachers' institutes, and reading-circle work. Occasionally he also is responsible for State teacher placement, college accrediting, and related functions. As is the case with other State department officers, he is sometimes called upon to perform duties not directly related to his primary field of interest.

In States having no State director of teacher education and certification, a deputy or assistant superintendent often performs some of the duties of such an officer. In addition, most of the administrative and professional staff members of all State departments are directly or indirectly interested in at least some aspect of the preservice education of teachers. Among the staff members not directly in charge of preservice teacher education, the public-school supervisory and inspectorial staffs have the closest and most significant professional relationships with the institutions. The chief function of these officers is to improve the public schools; and the most effective way to improve the schools is to improve the qualifications not only of the teachers in service but also of those in preparation for future service. The State department staff members have a variety of titles, such as school inspectors; field agents; school supervisors of elementary- and high-school levels of instruction; and supervisors of various subjects or fields of instruction, such as agriculture or rural education. Usually such officers serve the entire State in their special field; but in a number of States, illustrated by Nevada and Texas, regional officers have responsibility in their respective local areas for all or most of the phases of teacher personnel administration or supervision, and other educational matters with which the State is concerned. Such staff members are variously known as deputy superintendents, school inspectors, or field agents.

Considered as a group, State department administrative and professional staff members other than those officially engaged in the supervision or oversight of preservice teacher education, spend relatively little time in the higher-education institutions. Although probably this may be an unfortunate situation at times, it is a natural one, inasmuch as the chief work of the supervisors is with teachers already in service. Some supervisors utilize the institutions as office centers for their supervisory or inspectorial work in the field. The institutions sometimes also are made to serve as centers at which supervisory and other conferences may be held with teachers.

Not infrequently, State department staff members are employed during the summer sessions as faculty members of the institutions. Through this means the staff members maintain contacts with prospective teachers, teachers in service, and college faculty members.

In addition to the State department of education, which functions

as the central State administrative and advisory agency of the State board, the presidents of the institutions function as the local executive institutional officers of the board. As such, they perform numerous functions jointly or in cooperation with the State departments of education (ch. IV). For example, the president not infrequently recommends changes in board policies affecting his institution, as well as ways and means for putting such policies into effect. His recommendations usually constitute the basis of action by the board with respect to internal institutional organization; staff and student personnel administration; curriculum determination; financial and business management; and similar functions.²

Relationships of State Departments With State Institutions Not Under the Control of the State Board of Education

In the 30 States in which the State board of education does not govern any of the State institutions that educate teachers, the maintenance of effective relationships between the State departments of education and these institutions constitutes a major problem. It is also a problem in most of the States in which the board governs only a part of the institutions. Only to the extent that means can be found to establish effective working contacts and relationships between the State department of education and the institutions governed independently of it, can the department be of assistance to them, or assure for the public schools the kind of teachers desired by the State. Specific methods of rendering services are described in chapter V of this study.

About two-thirds of the State boards and departments of education that control one or more teacher-education institutions report that they coordinate with varying degrees of success the policies and programs of the institutions under their control, and of the other teacher-education institutions of the State. State boards and departments not in control of any teacher-education institutions often attempt to coordinate the policies and programs of the institutions, but they do not report the same degree of success attained by boards that control at least some institutions.

Various means have been devised to bridge the administrative gap between the State departments and the institutions not under the control of the State board of education. One of the most effective means is an indirect one; namely, the prescription of certain curricula and courses as prerequisites for the certification of graduates of the

² A description of the duties of the presidents is not within the purview of this report. For lists of such duties, see McGinnis, Howard J. *The State teachers college president*. Pp. 32-33.

Rutledge, Samuel A. *The development of guiding principles for the administration of teachers colleges and normal schools*. Pp. 64-75. (Complete citations to these references and those which follow are given on pp. 118-19.)

institutions. Certification of teachers, and also institutional accreditation, are described in chapter IV of this study, pages 82 and 93.

In order to assist State boards of education to coordinate the activities of State institutions they do not govern, or govern only in part, the boards are occasionally accorded by statute certain limited supervisory or administrative powers over the institutions. In Texas, the State board of education is empowered to consider the financial needs of State institutions of higher education and to make recommendations concerning them; to study and make reports concerning the work of the institutions; to recommend changes in their courses of study, with special reference to the elimination of duplication of work; and to make formal recommendations concerning all proposals for the establishment of new educational institutions. The institutions are required to supply any information desired by the State board of education or by the State superintendent of public instruction. However, the laws provide also that the powers of the existing institutional governing boards shall not be lessened by reason of the foregoing powers accorded to the State board of education. In effect, therefore, the State board functions somewhat as an advisory board for the State institutions of higher education.

In Florida, the State board of education legally has the general supervision of all higher-education institutions of the State, as well as of schools of lower grade. The board is wholly *ex officio*, however, and its functions with respect to the colleges consist largely of approving the actions of the board of control, which is entrusted with the actual government of the institutions.

The State board of regents in New Jersey has general oversight over higher education and coordinating relationships with certain institutions not under its control. The board of regents of the University of the State of New York not only governs numerous teachers colleges and normal schools but also charters privately controlled institutions and performs other important supervisory and coordinating activities as well. The Indiana State Board of Education elects five of the eight members of the board of trustees of the State university. It also exercises a rather unusual amount of indirect control over institutions through its powers of certification and accreditation. Higher-education institutions by virtue of State law are occasionally represented in the membership of the State boards of education as in Arizona, Kansas, New Hampshire, Washington, and Wyoming. In the membership of the Kansas State Board of Education, for example, there is one member from each of three groups of institutions, including the State university or State college, the State teachers colleges, and the privately controlled institutions.

Among further means attempted to secure coordination of the work of the State departments and of the institutions that educate

teachers is the provision for ex officio membership of the State superintendent on the governing boards of such institutions. Through this provision direct contacts and working relationships of varying effectiveness are maintained. The State superintendent is an ex officio member of 74, or almost half, of the 150 boards that control State institutions. Such membership is provided for in 35 of the 48 States. In 29 States the superintendent is an ex officio member of boards that are in charge of higher-education institutions but not of the elementary and secondary schools. He is a member of boards in charge of every type of State institution, but most frequently is a member of boards in control of teachers colleges and normal schools. In about one-third of the 48 States he is a member of every institutional board in the State. In at least 2 States he is a member of a half-dozen or more different local institutional boards.

The State superintendent is a member of the State board of education in 24 States; its secretary in 22; its chairman in 11; and its executive officer in 25.

If he functions solely as a single ex officio member of a governing board, the superintendent has only limited power to affect action. Board members, however, tend to look to him for information and advice; and occasionally he is secretary or chairman of the board. His influence to a considerable extent depends upon his professional qualifications and his abilities as a leader. Although the boards usually do not meet frequently, the superintendent at least has opportunities to present the viewpoint of the State board of education and of the State department which he represents to the institutional boards; and from these boards he can learn of the difficulties and limitations that confront the institutions in meeting State needs.

State laws also forward institutional and State department coordinating relationships through certain specific assignments of minor powers to the State superintendents. In New Mexico, where the institutions are governed by separate local boards, the law specifies that the State superintendent of public instruction shall confer and visit with governing boards of State educational institutions; and that he shall prepare and cause to be published and distributed biennially a report of all normal schools, colleges, and private and denominational schools in the State. In Oklahoma it is the legal duty of high-school inspectors to visit all schools of college rank and to familiarize themselves with the character of work being done in them. In Oregon the State superintendent "shall visit in person when practicable all the chartered educational institutions of the State, and shall secure such statistical information * * * as he may deem advisable * * *." In Wyoming the State superintendent is legally authorized to advise with the board of trustees of the State university concerning the course of study of the State normal department there.

In Washington the State board of education has authority to approve entrance requirements and prescribe courses for the departments of education in all the State institutions and to take measures to prevent undesirable duplication of offerings in those institutions. A deputy superintendent visits all the institutions periodically and reports informally to the State board.

Various central State committees forward coordination of the work of governing boards, the State department, and the public schools. In 1938 one-fourth of the States had permanent State committees, and one-eighth of them had temporary State committees on teacher education, on teacher certification, or on both activities.³ These committees are variously constituted; some are composed of members of the State boards of education while others are representative of various educational groups, and are advisory in nature.

Special coordinating councils, boards, and similar agencies have been set up by statute in some of the States not having completely unified systems of institutional control. These coordinating agencies, which have definite legal powers, are here distinguished from a variety of curriculum committees, professional associations and organizations, and the like, which are established on a voluntary basis, and are later described in connection with the professional functions which they perform. The legally constituted coordinating agencies are usually found in States that have several independent institutional governing boards, although a few function also as auxiliary regulatory agencies in States where a considerable degree of centralized control exists. The success of these councils, boards, and other superimposed agencies depends upon a number of factors, including the scope of their legal powers; the representativeness of their membership; the size and effectiveness of their staffs; and, perhaps most important, their success in commanding the good will and cooperation of the institutions and their constituencies.

In most of the States, the presidents of the State teachers colleges confer from time to time, with or without legal authorization or mandate. Pennsylvania affords a good example of effective cooperative work that is legally initiated, and in which presidents of institutions participate. In that State, the board of presidents of State teachers colleges is legally constituted to formulate the educational policies of the institutions. The State superintendent of public instruction is the presiding officer of the board, which meets every other month. During the last few years, committees have been appointed to study and report on entrance requirements; student marking systems; interinstitutional relationships; student fees; the institutional calendar; legislation; publications; and a salary qualification schedule. When curriculum and other changes are adopted

³ Emens, John B. A study of State administration of teacher personnel. Pp. 75-76.

by the board and approved by the State superintendent, the action taken is binding on each of the State teachers colleges.⁴

In Kentucky, the council on public higher education has been created by law. It is composed of 16 members, including the presidents of the State university and the four State teachers colleges, the superintendent of public instruction who is ex officio chairman, and additional representatives from the five State institutional boards of trustees or regents and the State board of education. This council has legal power to coordinate the work and to determine the curricula, admission requirements, and fees of the five institutions, to recommend budgets, and to require and publish reports. The regulations of the council are important and effective.⁵

In Washington, a unique situation exists. Although each institution has its own governing board, the State board of education itself consists of the presidents of the University of Washington, of the State (agricultural) college, of the three state colleges of education, the State superintendent of public instruction, and three other educators appointed by the Governor. The State board of education, among other powers, has authority to prescribe entrance requirements and courses for the departments of education in all State institutions, and to take measures to prevent undesirable duplication of curricula.

Supplementary curriculum boards to work with, but not to replace separate boards of control, have been tried out in a few States. Usually their legal powers were strictly limited, their staffs inadequate, and their success small in restraining duplication of curricula by the powerful State institutions. Washington once had a joint board of higher curricula for coordinating the offerings of the State institutions. Eventually this board was abolished and its duties transferred to the State board of education. Oregon had a similar board, the duties of which were transferred to the present State board of higher education. Alabama has an advisory State council of education, the purpose of which is to coordinate the resources and efforts of the three institutions that are still governed by separate boards. The teachers colleges are governed and their curricula determined by the State board of education.

That close professional relationships should prevail at all times between all State institutions of higher education and the State board or department of education regardless of the type of control of the institutions, may be taken for granted. If for no other reason, the State institutions of higher education are parts of the educational system of the State; and the department of education is presumably

⁴ Klonower, Henry, and others. *Institutions of higher learning in relation to a State program of teacher education.* Pp. 20-21.

⁵ Kentucky department of education. *Educational leadership in Kentucky.* Pp. 51-52.

interested in their effectiveness of work and their welfare, even if it does not administer them. More important from the viewpoint of teacher education is the fact that the State department of education is vitally interested in the provision of an adequate supply of properly qualified teachers for the public schools. This means that the department should make known the quantitative and qualitative needs of the State elementary and secondary schools to all institutions that educate teachers, and see that these needs are met.

Relationships With Federal Agencies

The most significant of the purely voluntary relationships of the State teacher-education agencies with the Federal Government are involved in the professional services of the U. S. Office of Education. Such services cover a wide range, including research; the collection, compilation, and publication of teacher-education statistics and other data; national, State, and local surveys and special studies; consultative and advisory services; initiation of conferences; and the like. Three specialists in the U. S. Office of Education devote full time to teacher education. Other Office professional workers occasionally publish studies or render other services in teacher-education fields related to their specialties.

The biennial statistics of higher education, including statistics on teacher education, are the most complete of their kind in the country. Because of the lack of available data in the State department offices concerning the institutions that prepare teachers, such statistics are collected by the Office directly from the institutions through inquiry forms and field work. This service affords the State departments valuable comparative data: The *Educational Directory*, published annually, lists teachers colleges, normal schools, and schools or colleges of education, and gives the names of the chief officers. The *Directory* and other publications also contain information concerning the types of institutions and their accreditation status; and lists names and titles of State department and other public-school officers.

The report of the 3-year *National Survey of the Education of Teachers* in six volumes was made possible by a special congressional appropriation of \$180,000. Sections of national, State, and city survey reports made by the Office deal with teacher education. From time to time bulletins, pamphlets, leaflets, and articles on teacher education are published. Within the limits of available funds, consultatory and advisory services are provided State or local teacher-education agencies and officials upon request.

The education of teachers of vocational subjects, including agriculture, trade and industry, home economics, and distributive occu-

pations,⁴ is treated in a separate U. S. Office of Education bulletin.⁴ Only a few salient facts that explain the administrative and supervisory relationships of this activity to State supervision of teacher education, in general, will therefore be given place in this chapter.

Federal appropriations for the preparation of teachers of vocational subjects are made or authorized in the Smith-Hughes, George-Deen, and other congressional acts. These acts provide for a plan of cooperation between the Federal Government, the State, and the land-grant and other higher institutions that prepare such teachers.

State boards for vocational education have been established in every State to further the purposes of the vocational acts. In 35 States, these boards are identical in membership with the State boards of education in charge of the elementary and secondary schools; and they are almost identical in an additional State. In such States, problems of coordination are obviously simplified. In the 12 remaining States, there are separate boards for vocational education in nearly all of which the chief State school officer holds membership. In 44 States, the chief State school officer is the executive officer of the board for vocational education, which further assists in coordination.

Most of the boards appoint a State director of vocational education to perform the detailed administrative functions for which the boards are ultimately responsible. Supervisors, assistant supervisors, and itinerant teacher trainers variously among States, assist the director in supervisory and related activities.

The functions and duties of the State boards for vocational education that affect the institutions arise chiefly in connection with the discharge of the boards' responsibilities for planning, supervising, and directing all aspects of vocational education, including vocational teacher education. The State boards for vocational education, as such, rarely govern higher institutions. They designate specific institutions for the preparation of the types of teachers desired in each subject, and then supervise such preparation. They are responsible for the important task of preparing State plans; for determining certain qualifications of prospective vocational teachers; and for the improvement of the qualifications of the staff members they employ. Direct Federal relationships with the programs are maintained through the boards, and not through the institutions.

Standards governing the education of teachers of vocational subjects are usually formulated through cooperative action of the professional staffs of the Federal Government, the State boards, and the preparatory institutions. Policies are formulated cooperatively by the States

⁴ U. S. Office of education. - The State and the preservice preparation of teachers of vocational education. By Henry B. Swanson. Washington, U. S. Government Printing Office, 1941. (Vocational Division. Bulletin No. 219.)

and the Federal Government. Many National, regional, and State conferences as well as institutional visitation by State officers forward the numerous cooperative activities undertaken in the preparation of teachers.

Relationships With General State Governmental Agencies

Every major aspect of the administration of the preservice education of teachers by State departments of education is related to the administration and work of the agencies of general State government. Relationships with the legislature and the courts obviously are important. Relationships of the institutions with the executive departments of the State government other than the State department of education are sometimes such that the policies and administration of the institutions are seriously affected. The problems involved are discussed in considerable detail in other bulletins of the U. S. Office of Education,⁷ and are discussed briefly in a few of the monographs of the *Studies of State Department* series of Office publications. Involved are relationships with the electorate; the legislature; the judiciary; the State executive departments and officers including the Governor, budget officer, auditor, treasurer and comptroller, attorney general, and others; independent State boards and commissions; State or voluntary accrediting agencies and other agencies and instrumentalities. Only illustrative types of relationships with three of the most important agents or agencies that directly affect State department and institutional functioning are outlined in this place. Others will be mentioned in connection with the State department functions which they affect.

The electorate selects or is the ultimate instrumentality that authorizes the selection of all State governmental officers. It establishes the general pattern of State government set forth in the constitution. Through its representatives, it determines the total amount of tax money to be paid for institutional and public school support. It exercises the final determining force that makes possible the establishment and continuance of institutional boards and of State-supported institutions. Everywhere the influence of public opinion directly or indirectly determines the nature and quality of the members of the public-school teaching staff, and of the institutions that prepare them. Public opinion, i. e., the opinion of voters, has often served to restrict ambitious institutional plans for the expenditure of public funds. On the other hand, many State institutions owe their existence to the direct interposition of the electorate or of some part of it, when general State agencies immediately in control would have abolished or crippled them. Although the faith of educa-

⁷ McNeely, John H. Higher educational institutions in the scheme of State government.

— Authority of State executive agencies over higher education.

tional leaders in the judgment of the electorate may falter momentarily in times of economic depression and great public excitement, in the long run their faith remains unshaken. For one thing, it can never be forgotten that the State institutions are established solely to give the people as a whole the educational service for which they pay. Sound educational leadership is inclined to attribute violations of educational principles in the organization and administration of the institutions to faults in the machinery of government, rather than to the judgment of the people as a whole.

The legislatures are the most important of the general State agencies that control the destinies of the institutions. Within certain definite limits, the legislatures create or abolish institutions, and prescribe their functions. They create, change, or abolish institutional boards of control, and establish additional State agencies with delegated authority to manage or serve the institutions in a variety of ways. In the appropriation of funds, the legislatures have the powers of life or death over the institution. However, the legislatures do not have unrestricted powers. They must observe constitutional and judicial restrictions and mandates, which sometimes serve to protect the institutions from adverse legislative action. The legislature is a lay body which meets infrequently, and it is not a body of educational administrators or experts. Hence it is not in an advantageous position to direct State educational administrative functions, nor regularly to interfere with detailed administrative procedures. Broad powers and duties are, therefore, delegated to boards of control and the heads of institutions. Finally, the legislature is highly sensitive to public opinion, and must meet the mandates of the electorate. The institutions are in a strategic position to maintain cordial and effective relationships with the general population which they serve. If they have established such relationships with the electorate, they have gone a long way toward the establishment of similar relationships with the legislature.

The power of the Governor of a State over the teacher-education institutions under certain conditions is quite extensive. As the chief State executive officer, he has large powers in respect to the administration of State and institutional finances, and such powers tend to increase. He also has considerable influence on legislation.

Particularly important are the powers of the Governor with respect to State policy making and administrative personnel. Officers of the general State government who have jurisdiction over the institutions, or important relationships with them, often owe their appointment and tenure to the Governor. Of the 39 States having State boards of education in charge of the general school systems, 26 authorize the Governor to appoint all or a majority of the members of the board. In 34 States, the Governor has the power to remove members of one

or more college or university governing boards, for cause or without cause, although he infrequently exercises such power. In 8 States, he appoints the chief State school officer. He is an ex officio member of 14 State boards of education. In numerous additional ways the chief executive officer of the State government is an important factor to be reckoned with in the establishment and execution of policies relative to teacher-education institutions.

Relationships With Public-School and College Associations

State department officers are interested for several reasons in maintaining effective professional relationships with State education associations and other teachers' organizations. The membership of the State education associations includes more than 600,000 teachers, supervisors, and administrators in 48 States. On an average, 85 percent of the public-school teachers of a State are members. Typical purposes of such associations, as stated in their constitutions, are similar in several respects to those of the State departments of education; for example, the promotion of the interests of education, the protection of the interests of school children, and the encouragement of the professional development of teachers. Nearly half of the associations are giving attention to teachers' salaries, tenure, and retirement laws and provisions; and many are providing for the study of the professionalization of teaching.

Usually representatives of institutions that educate teachers meet in conjunction with the general State teachers association meetings. In most States, the members of the teacher-education and certification divisions of the State departments participate actively in the meetings of these associations and not infrequently hold office in them.

In general, the contacts of the State education associations and the State departments of education are mutually helpful. The associations occasionally aid in the gathering of materials for research, study, and report by the State office. Some associations have appropriated funds for the conduct of programs sponsored by the State departments. The association meetings afford good opportunities for occasional individual and group contacts of college, public-school and State department staff members; provide means for the dissemination of information concerning State policies and regulations; and occasionally afford State officers opportunities to promote intensive programs of investigation in cooperation with educational workers in the field. Limitations to the possibilities of State department and association cooperation include infrequent meetings of the association, lack of sustained programs of activities, and limited funds.

In some States, there appears to be a need for the State department of education to consolidate or coordinate professional efforts of the same kind that are conducted simultaneously by different groups of

teachers and college staff members scattered over the State. With better coordination, considerable economy of effort and more rapid advancement of professional programs affecting teachers would result.

In a number of States, illustrated by Iowa, Kentucky, Michigan, Mississippi, Missouri, North Carolina, Oklahoma, and Texas, the universities and colleges have organized college associations, committees, conferences, councils, or unions. In most States, the presidents of State teachers colleges, who have many similar problems, meet from time to time to discuss matters of common interest. The meetings of college associations and other organizations, and those of the teachers college presidents, constitute one of the chief means available to the institutions for maintaining contacts with each other, and for initiating and carrying forward such activities as they deem necessary for their welfare. One of the most important activities undertaken by the college organizations is the accrediting of institutions, described in chapter IV of this study. In most States in which organized institutional meetings are held State department officers attend and often actively participate in the proceedings as officers or committee members. In the past, State department officers have initiated the organization of some of the associations, in order to forward State department programs affecting the higher education institutions of the State.

County, City, Local District, and Privately Controlled Institutions

County Normal Schools and Teacher-Training High Schools

There are still 6 States in which teacher-training high schools are operated, and 2 States in addition in which county normal schools are maintained. The States having teacher-training high schools, and the number of schools in the latest year (1938 or 1939) for which figures are available were: Iowa, 171; Kansas, 61; Minnesota, 33; Missouri, 16; Nebraska, 187, of which 6 were private or church schools; and Wyoming, 4. The States having county normal schools were Michigan, with 23 schools; and Wisconsin, with 28. In all, there were 472 teacher-training high schools and 51 county normal schools, a total of 523 schools in the 8 States. These schools in 1937-38 enrolled more than 9,000 students in teacher-training courses of study, and they turned into the teaching market more than 4,000 newly certificated teachers.

In Wisconsin, the county normal schools offer 2 years of post-secondary school work. In Michigan, Minnesota, and Wyoming, courses of study that usually include a year of post-secondary work are offered. In the 4 remaining States having teacher-training high schools, the preparatory curricula end with the fourth year of high

school. More than three-fourths of the graduates of all teacher-training high schools or county normal schools are certificated to teach upon the basis of a year or two of normal training that is almost entirely of high-school grade.

The total amounts of State aid given in 1937-38, to teacher-training high schools and county normal schools varied from nothing in Kansas to \$225,000 in Wisconsin. Amounts of State funds granted to individual schools also varied widely. For example, each of the schools in Nebraska received \$253.15, and each of those in Michigan, \$1,739.13. State funds are supplemented in varying amounts by county and local district school boards.

There has been a steady decline in the number of States in which teachers are certificated upon the basis of work of high-school or sub-collegiate grade. In 1922-23, half the States in the Union reported the operation of teacher-training high schools or county normal schools. As requirements for teacher certification and employment were raised, two movements affecting these schools developed. The first of these was the refusal by certification authorities to recognize the professional training such schools offered. Instead, they increasingly demanded work in institutions of collegiate grade. Partially as a consequence, the number of States having subcollegiate teacher-training schools was reduced from 24 in 1922-23, to 12 in 1931-32, and to 8 in 1939. The total number of these schools dropped from 1,743 in 1922-23, to 1,146 in 1928-29, and to 523 in 1938-39. The second movement was the addition of a year or more of post-graduate work to the 4-year high-school course; but only 4 States still operate schools in which curricula were lengthened in this manner.

The decline of the teacher-training high schools in States still having considerable numbers of them is illustrated by Nebraska. In 1924-25, there were 254 normal-training high schools in that State, with an enrollment of 7,049. In 1937-38, there were 187, including 6 private and church secondary schools, with an enrollment of 2,791 in the junior and senior years. The number of teachers certificates issued to graduates upon examination in 1937-38 was 1,071. As a partial explanation of the decrease in number and enrollments, it may be noted that during the period the number of rural teachers in small schools decreased considerably; the length of service of individual teachers increased somewhat; and the teachers colleges supplied an increasing number of rural teachers.

Low salaries for rural school teachers account in considerable part for the persistence of teacher preparation of high-school grade. In 1934-35, the median salary of rural-school white teachers in all States was \$730. In 5 States having teacher-training high schools (Wyoming with only 4 schools in 1935 is excluded) the average salary of white teachers in rural schools was only \$494. The average salaries in 1-

and 2-teacher rural schools were smaller still. All of these 5 States are among the lowest fifth of the 48 States, when ranked on the basis of average salaries paid rural-school teachers in white schools.

In size, offerings, and most other significant respects the typical teacher-training high or county normal school will not bear comparison with a typical State teachers college or normal school. The typical training department graduates an average of only 8 or 9 certificated teachers annually. Except in the case of some county normal schools, the training courses are usually conducted in local high schools. The curricula consist of high-school courses, review courses in subjects later to be taught in the rural schools, and a few professional courses of an elementary nature including observation and student teaching, among others.

In the past, the supervision of teacher-training schools of sub-collegiate grade was an important function of the departments of education in many States. A number of State supervisors spent their entire time in such schools, and some excellent programs for the improvement of rural schools resulted. Most of the States still having these schools endeavor to provide as much State department supervision as possible for them. Instructional aids, including detailed courses of study and syllabi, are developed cooperatively from time to time. Particular attention is given by the State departments to the qualifications of the teachers appointed in the teacher-training schools, although the salaries paid are low.

Missouri affords an illustration of the nature of the control exercised over teacher-training high schools by the State departments of education. The State superintendent of public schools is legally authorized to designate approved first-class high schools that will offer teacher-training courses; to appoint an inspector of teacher training, to be paid from State funds; to prescribe admission requirements to teacher-training classes; and to prescribe courses of instruction, and rules and regulations governing instruction and graduation requirements. He is also empowered to make the rules for the examinations for graduation, and to issue a certificate of graduation, which constitutes a valid certificate to teach.

Although many of the instructors in the small teacher-training high schools are rendering faithful service in their efforts to meet specific rural-school needs, these small teacher-training units appear destined to disappear. In the past when the educational qualifications of teachers were much lower on the average than at present, such schools constituted a very important source of supply of rural teachers, and contributed their due part to rural-school advancement in the several States. More than half the States, however, now require 2, 3, or 4 years of college preparation as a minimum for both rural and city elementary-school teachers, and the number of such States is rapidly

increasing. Consequently, the operation of teacher-training high schools is becoming more and more out of place in American education. The continued use of State funds for their perpetuation is disapproved by practically all educational authorities, except as a strictly temporary expedient in the upbuilding of substandard rural schools.

City and District Institutions

The 14 city- or district-controlled teachers colleges and normal schools, 13 municipal universities and 4-year colleges and 73 city or district junior colleges approved for teacher education either have their own local boards of control, or else they are governed by the public-school boards in charge of local public schools. They have relatively few significant administrative relationships with the State departments of education. When administratively affiliated with the local public schools, such institutions are involved to some extent in plans for the administration of State aid to the local school systems. They are also subject to State laws which accord the State departments specific duties with respect to the public schools of which the institutions are a part. For example, in Missouri, where there are three city teachers colleges, the State superintendent of public schools is authorized to inspect and approve city teacher-training schools wherever the city school districts in which they are located receive State aid.

In several States, the State department of education has been delegated legal authority to pass upon or advise concerning the establishment of county, city, and district junior colleges. Representative States in which junior colleges are subject to such authority and in which these institutions are also approved for teacher education are Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Nebraska, and Texas. In the last-mentioned State, for example, the State board of education and the State superintendent of public instruction make recommendations concerning, or approve the establishment of, junior colleges:

Privately Controlled Institutions

Although privately controlled institutions that educate teachers outnumber nearly 2 to 1 the publicly controlled State and local district institutions, they are administered independently of the State boards of education. State boards or departments of education have certain powers to grant or approve charters of incorporation of newly organized institutions of higher education in about one-fifth of the States; and to exercise continuing regulatory supervision of privately controlled institutions to insure their compliance with the terms of their original charters in one-third of the States. The State boards of education and the State departments of education also have certain

powers to enforce legal provisions regulating in one way or another the degree- or diploma-granting privileges of such institutions in about one-third of the States.⁸ Less than one-twelfth of the States have enacted statutes prohibiting the use of the name "college" or "university" without the approval of an appropriate State agency, such as the State department of education.

Ohio requirements illustrate those of other States which regulate the degree-granting privilege. By legislative action, no institution seeking permission to offer instruction in the arts and sciences leading to degrees may be incorporated for this purpose until it has received from the State director of education a certificate of authorization. This certificate will not be issued unless the institution meets certain standards governing housing, endowment, faculty, library, laboratories, and other facilities. Standards for endowments of different types of institutions are high enough to prevent the establishment of many weak schools and "diploma mills" from which the public in most States is given no protection.

Trends in Overhead Control

Inasmuch as State teachers colleges and normal schools are devoted primarily to the education of public-school teachers, it was with sound logic that many of them when first established were placed under the administrative control of the State boards of education. Those not so placed were usually established under the control of separate institutional boards, or under single State boards of normal school trustees in charge of all of the normal schools of the State. Some of the independently governed normal schools or teachers colleges were originally private colleges or academies, with local boards that were retained when the State took over the institutions. Political considerations sometimes determined the nature of the agencies of control that were originally put into operation. Others among these independently governed teacher-education institutions were established in States at a time when the traditions and the means of centralized control by State boards of education, and of administration by departments of education, were not well established.

The outstanding trend since 1900 in the overhead control of State teachers colleges and normal schools has been the displacement of separate local boards of trustees by State boards of education, by single normal school boards of trustees in charge of all State normal schools and teachers colleges, or by other centralized State boards in charge of two or more institutions of higher education, some of which are normal schools and teachers colleges. States in which centraliza-

⁸ McNeely, John H. Supervision exercised by States over privately controlled institutions of higher education.

tion of overhead control of State teachers colleges and normal schools have occurred during the 40-year period include among others: Alabama, California, Georgia, Idaho, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Dakota, Oregon, Rhode Island, Virginia, and West Virginia. There are other States also in which local institutional boards of trustees that still persist have been losing power steadily during the period. In a few of these States, a centralized board is now practically the controlling agency. Additional States have had centralized control of the teacher-education institutions from the time of their establishment. Once established, a system of centralized control of teachers colleges and normal schools is infrequently changed to a plan of decentralized control.

There have been movements similar to the foregoing in the centralization of control of all State institutions. Such movements, however, are more marked in the case of the teachers colleges and normal schools than in the case of other State institutions. They are least marked in the consolidation of the separate boards of trustees of the State universities with other boards that govern higher-education institutions.

Inasmuch as the government of State institutions of higher education is interwoven in the whole fabric of State government, both educational and general, certain trends in State government have resulted in significant trends in the government of institutions of higher education. For example, accompanying the long-time trends in the development of stronger State departments of education, and in the centralization of increased powers in them, have come increased State department administrative powers over higher-education institutions; much wider prescription of certification requirements that affect institutional curricula; introduction of State department accreditation of institutions; and a greater variety of State supervisory activities affecting the institutions. With the general movement to centralize more control in the general State government and its executive departments has come increased assumption of control of institutional funds by State budget offices, and other kinds of general State control that affect the institutions. Increases in Federal appropriations administered in cooperation with States have resulted also in increased mandatory provisions affecting institutions that expend such funds.

Conditions of Operation and Evaluation of State Systems of Overhead Control and Coordination

The direction of the activities of higher-education institutions toward uniformly satisfactory objectives and outcomes in teacher preparation constitutes one of the most complex and difficult tasks

undertaken by State departments of education. Teachers are educated in nearly all types of higher-education institutions. The universities, liberal arts colleges, junior colleges, and technical institutions that prepare teachers have many objectives other than teacher education. Their governing boards are in control of widely varying numbers of institutions. Scores of boards control only one institution each, whereas some boards each control a dozen or more institutions. Changes in institutional objectives and in methods of control are constant. Insofar as teacher education is concerned, one of the first tasks of the State departments is to set up goals toward which such changes should point. To do this, it is necessary to consider the part that each of the major types of institutions plays in the State program of teacher education.

Of the 777 privately controlled institutions that educate teachers, only 39 teachers colleges and normal schools have the professional education of teachers in all its essential elements as their major objective. In the remainder, the liberal-cultural education of the general population, and the professional or technical preparation of workers in many fields in addition to professional education, are the primary concerns of the institutions. Although this group of institutions includes many of the largest and strongest institutions of higher education in the country, it also includes many junior colleges and 4-year colleges that are admittedly small and weak.

The professionalization of teaching, although still incomplete, has reached a point at which State departments of education need no longer tolerate certain conditions and practices that were accepted without question a generation ago. The social wastage of human effort and the threat to teaching standards caused by the long-continued oversupply of young college graduates thrown into the teaching market solely by virtue of a 4-year liberal-cultural education, plus a few semester hours in professional education, is unfortunate. Nevertheless, this situation is enabling State departments and teacher-education institutions to redefine the qualifications of high-school teachers, and to strengthen the standards governing their preparation. Inevitably, however, this involves more State supervision and coordination, if not actual administrative control, of the professional aspects of the work of the privately controlled institutions.

In the case of the 100 institutions controlled by cities and other local districts, the lack of direct State control constitutes a difficult problem only in the case of 73 junior colleges. Only a few city normal schools remain. They have been closed in large numbers in the past as their local usefulness came to an end. Seven of them have been made into teachers colleges; and these city institutions exercise stricter control over the number and quality of their students than do most State institutions. There are only 13 city colleges and uni-

versities, and these for the most part are performing satisfactory local service. In the case of the junior colleges, both public and private, present trends clearly indicate that their future role will be to provide an early part of the general education, but no significant part of the strictly professional preparation of teachers.

To make certain that the people of the State as a whole receive the amount and quality of educational service they wish from each of the several institutions at the least practicable expense constitutes a problem that most States have not yet solved. Although the 319 State institutions of all types are maintained to provide a great variety of services for the entire State, their specific instructional and geographical areas of service are usually defined in very general terms and sometimes not at all by the State constitutions or the legislatures. Each institution and its governing board is left with considerable freedom to initiate, delimit, or expand its individual offerings and services. Furthermore, the institutions have opportunities unequalled by almost any other State agencies to discover and recommend provisions to meet State educational needs. Their alumni often occupy positions of leadership in the State, including membership in the legislature. Consequently, there is often expensive duplication of certain services among some institutions, and lack of highly desirable services in others. For example, every institution in the State may be preparing history teachers, and very few institutions preparing properly qualified teachers of special subjects.

That teacher education is a purely secondary or incidental function in most of the 1,196 institutions that prepare teachers leads to some problems long since forgotten in the preparation of doctors and lawyers. These and numerous other problems would be reduced in number if the prevailing conditions of decentralized formulation of policies governing the institutions could be remedied.

Surveys and other studies of the administration of State institutions of higher education point out numerous weaknesses in highly decentralized systems of overhead control. Some weaknesses include: Harmful competition for funds and students; lack of balance in the output of prospective teachers of different subjects; waste of public money through unnecessary duplication of courses, equipment, and staff by State institutions working in the same area of service; the development of undue diversities in administrative practices and in educational standards; lack of united institutional attack on State educational problems; poor distribution of institutional services among different areas of the State or different groups of the population; and loss of public confidence in the administration of the institutions.

On the other hand, it is often argued that completely centralized control is not in keeping with democratic principles. If a State university is to contribute its best efforts toward the advancement of

the welfare of the State, it should have a considerable degree of freedom. Few really great institutions are subservient units in an overhead system of State control; and if they dominate the system, other institutions in it often suffer. Advocates of decentralized control claim that the institutions best serve the State as a whole by operating effectively in their own area. The institutions draw most of their students from surrounding counties and place most of their graduates in the same areas; and they wish freedom to expand in accordance with local as well as State-wide needs. Opponents of centralized control furthermore question the assumption that there is a real educational gain through such control; and they claim that the most significant result of centralization to date has been merely to reduce State expenditures for higher education.

No single type of overhead control that should be adopted in all States is agreed upon by all educational authorities. There are several reasons for such disagreement. Conditions are dissimilar among States, demonstrable proof of the superiority of one type of organization over another is scanty, State constitutions and laws are hard to change, and the institutions object to surrendering their independence. The best consensus of authorities found in the literature on this specific problem, however, shows unmistakable preference for some form of unified control of the public schools and of the teachers colleges, if not of other institutions that educate teachers.⁹ Street's jury of 81 authorities included State and Federal educational officers, administrators and professors of education in universities, colleges, and teachers colleges, and authorities in political science. The plans of organization were severally considered for adoption in a State having a fairly typical, divided type of control. The following descending order of preference was expressed by the jury; 69.1 percent of the jury voted either for plan 1 or plan 2, and only 4.8 percent for plan 5.

1. Control of the State university and of the State teachers colleges (including normal schools) by the State board of education (i. e., the State board in charge of the public schools).
2. Control of the State teachers colleges by the State board of education and control of the State university by a separate board of regents.
3. Control of the State university and of the State teachers colleges by one board other than the State board of education.
4. Control of the State teachers colleges by a single State teachers college board, and control of the State university by a single board; neither of these boards to be the State board of education.
5. A separate local board independent of the State board of education, for each institution of higher education.

Present practice in respect to the five foregoing plans by no means follows the order of preference expressed by educational authorities.

⁹ Street, Claude R., *State control of teacher training in the United States*. Pp. 67-69.

Plan 1, highest in order of preference by authorities, is least popular in practice. Plan 5, least popular among authorities, is found in 10 States, 2 of which have only 1 institution each. The most popular plan in practice is one in which the State board in control of the public schools governs some institutions, chiefly teachers colleges and normal schools, and separate local boards govern other State institutions, such as the State university. In general, State university authorities prefer their own governing board.

The outstanding trend in overhead organization is a gradual unification of control of independently governed institutions in one or more unified or semiunified State boards. There is a definite and a logical trend toward the centralization of control over teachers colleges in the State board of education.

Most educational authorities agree that the State teachers colleges and normal schools should be controlled by the State boards of education, when such are effectively constituted, chiefly because the sole purpose of these institutions is to prepare teachers and officers for the public schools. The educational office the State has provided to administer the public schools, namely, the State department of education, is in a better position than any other agency in the State to determine the number and quality of teachers demanded in current State educational policy, and to coordinate all teacher-education activities of the State. In nearly all States the department is legally authorized to administer teacher-certification requirements and to approve institutions for certification purposes. Through State supervisors, it maintains and advances in-service teacher education. The State department is in an unequalled position to interpret State educational needs to the institutions. Control by the State board of education is the most frequent single method of overhead control of State teachers colleges and normal schools. In 17 States one or more of the teachers colleges and normal schools are under control of this board. Furthermore, the trend is toward this method of control, and it may be expected to continue.

In reply to a question asked State department officers concerning the chief limitations and difficulties encountered by the State boards and departments of education in the performance of their functions relating to teacher-education institutions, one of the most frequent answers was lack of overhead control of the institutions. The performance of most of the major functions that might be expected of the State boards or departments of education appear to be conditioned on every hand by lack of specific authority. Institutions rather jealously guard their prerogatives, and administrative authority is very helpful, if not absolutely necessary, for the State departments in such activities as allocation of curricula among institutions; introduction of new curricula and courses needed by teachers in the schools

of the State; approval of the establishment of institutions and of their privileges of granting degrees and of conducting graduate work; limitation of enrollments to superior students; direction of State and institutional activities relating to business management and finance; and many other functions.

Whether or not State institutions in which teacher education is a secondary or incidental function should be governed by State boards of education is an issue in some States. Educational authorities disagree concerning the matter. Many authorities think that, theoretically at least, all State educational institutions and agencies from the primary schools to the State university should be under the general jurisdiction of this board. The argument that such a task would be too great for one board is scarcely tenable; the functions of the board are policy-making rather than executive, and single boards in numerous States have demonstrated that they can handle such a task satisfactorily. The characteristics of different grade levels or fields of instruction are not such as to necessitate separate State boards of control for the schools and colleges in which they are taught.

On the other hand, there are some good reasons why centralized control of all higher-education institutions by the State board of education cannot be expected for a long time to come unless some far-reaching changes in government are made. To begin with, nine States do not have such boards. The constitutions of several States would have to be changed to consolidate the control of all institutions of higher education. In some States, the organization, personnel, and powers of the State boards of education are not such as to commend them as agencies of control over institutions now governed independently to the satisfaction of their officers, patrons, and alumni. The membership of a number of these State boards is wholly or largely ex-officio, and the membership of others can be changed too easily by the Governor. All such boards may be strongly influenced by the forces of partisan politics. These conditions, however, are remediable.

Although there is a trend toward centralized control of institutions of higher education by one or more unified or semiunified boards, a trend toward control by the State board of education is not altogether clear, except in the case of State teachers colleges and normal schools. The consolidation of the control of all State institutions of higher education under a single board has been entirely effected, strictly speaking, in only 11 States that have two or more institutions each. Nevada and Wyoming, with only one institution each, are not considered here. With certain reservations necessitated chiefly by the existence of certain conjoined elements of control in a few private institutions, New York and New Jersey can be added to the

list. Of the 11 States, only 2, Idaho and Montana, have placed control of all State institutions in the hands of the State board of education. In about three-fourths of the 48 States, either separate local boards for each institution in a given State or a combination of such boards with single boards, each governing two or more institutions, are in control.

Certain trends, such as the increasing centralization of control in State governments, growing need for economies in college administration, and improved board organization, tend to advance the movement toward the control of the colleges by the State board of education. At the present time, however, most of the State departments must find means to supplement or to substitute for overhead control in their efforts to safeguard the competency of new teachers and to maintain a proper balance of teacher supply and demand. The extent to which such means has been found is revealed in the sections of this report that describe the coordinating relationships, functions, and specific means of service of the departments. It is sufficient here to say that one of the chief means available to the departments for influencing the actions of administratively independent colleges is the promotion of voluntary cooperative relationships with them. Through participating in professional organizations of college administrators and faculty members of the institutions, State-wide programs of study and investigation, informal conferences, and like activities, State department staff members can contribute in a helpful, democratic manner to the professional growth of the institutions involved. Even when least effective, such activities check the tendency for the institutions to operate in comparative isolation. When most effective, these activities may lead to such gains as State-wide revision of teacher education curricula, and the adoption of policies and practices of considerable significance in the development of an effective State-wide program of teacher education.

In States where functions relative to the education of teachers are widely dispersed among a number of State officers and agencies having no logical or clearly defined relationships, fair success in the performance of these functions is not impossible, despite the unfavorable conditions in organization that exist. Although there is no substitute for sound administrative organization, one helpful means for securing a certain amount of order in a confused administrative situation is to place in key positions policy-making and administrative officers who know how to cooperate and are willing to do so. The influence of a well-informed and forward-looking leader in any organization often justifiably transcends the narrow limits of strict accountability for the performance of specified legal or mandatory duties. Even when the necessary governmental machinery is lacking, or when the lines of administrative authority are not clearly drawn,

State educational officers can coordinate the work of the institutions to some extent, at least.

In a large number of States visited in the course of the present study, professional unity and good will in the performance of State service in higher education was often expressed by State department officials both in words and in action, despite very unfavorable administrative conditions. Nevertheless, it is too much to expect that strong, aggressive leaders serving given State institutions or groups of institutions will have very much solicitude for the advancement of institutions that are competing with their own for students and State funds. Conditions of institutional control and administration therefore should be such as to forward, and not hinder, the cooperative efforts of those who guide the policies and administer the work of the State institutions.

Summary of Findings

The major findings of this chapter are as follows:

1. Of a total of 1,709 institutions of higher education of all types, 1,196 are approved by the State departments of education for teacher education and certification purposes. Of these approved institutions, 319 are State controlled, 100 are city or district controlled, and 777 are privately controlled. All State institutions are approved for teacher education except 24 junior colleges, professional schools, and technical institutions.
2. Of the 319 State-controlled institutions approved for the education of teachers, 185 are teachers colleges or normal schools, 86 universities and land-grant colleges, 24 4-year colleges, 19 junior colleges, and 5 independent professional or technical schools.
3. The total number of State institutions changes little from year to year, but their enrollments are increasing. Curricula are being lengthened, especially in normal schools and teachers colleges. Only three States now have normal schools, but no teachers colleges.
4. Lists of institutions approved for the education of teachers unfortunately are not published by all States. Of 468 junior colleges, 228 or about half are approved for teacher education; and many small, weak 4-year colleges are also approved.
5. In 2 States, there are still 51 county normal schools, and in 6 States, 473 teacher-training high schools.
6. The 343 State institutions of higher education are governed by 150 separate boards of control. From 1 to 10 boards are found in each State.
7. In 2 States, the State board of education in charge of the public schools governs all State institutions of higher education; in 17 States, it governs part of them; and in 29 States it governs none of them.

Only 33 percent of the State institutions are governed by the State board of education. Most of these are teachers colleges and normal schools.

8. Ninety-one, or about half, of the 185 State teachers colleges and normal schools are governed by the State board of education. These 91 constitute all but 16 of the total number of State teacher-education institutions that are governed by the State board of education.

9. The State administration of institutions under the control of the State boards of education is nearly always delegated to the chief State school officer and to his assistants in the department of education.

10. In at least 5 States, the chief State school officer is accorded independent and rather broad powers over the State teachers colleges and normal schools, irrespective of State board control. In certain additional States, he is legally accorded certain minor duties such as institutional visitation, that forward the professional relationships of the State department of education and the institutions that educate teachers.

11. The detailed duties of the chief State school officer relative to teacher education and other teacher-personnel functions are delegated for the most part to the State director of teacher education and certification, and to other assistants in the State department.

12. Seventeen States have State directors of teacher education and certification. The duties of this officer vary among departments, including most frequently the administration, supervision, and coordination of preservice teacher education, and of teacher certification; in-service teacher education, including extension, institute and reading-circle work; teacher placement; college accrediting; and like services. In other States, these functions are performed on a part-time basis by deputy or assistant superintendents, State supervisors, directors of certification, and other staff members.

13. In the 30 States in which the State board of education does not govern any of the institutions that educate teachers, coordination of teacher education is attempted by various means, including ex officio membership of the chief State school officer on institutional governing boards, institutional representation on the State board of education, central State teacher-education or certification committees, special coordinating councils and similar agencies, conferences of presidents, supplementary curriculum boards, and other means. As in other States, heavy reliance is placed by the State departments upon teacher certification and institutional accreditation as means for maintaining minimum standards.

14. The relationships of State departments of education and of teacher-education institutions to Federal agencies are most significant in respect to the administration of Federal funds for the preparation of teachers of vocational subjects, and in respect to the voluntary

professional relationships that exist with the U. S. Office of Education.

15. The relationships of the State department of education with other units of the general State government are numerous and significant. Particularly significant are the relationships with the legislature, the Governor, and the central State financial and budgetary officers. The activities of these agencies and agents at times condition the programs of the institutions.

16. State department officials concerned with teacher education find it helpful to maintain close professional relationships with State associations and other organizations of teachers and of college staff members.

17. State department relationships with county, city, local district, and privately controlled institutions are largely on a voluntary basis, inasmuch as the State boards of education control none of these institutions.

18. Some 523 teacher-training high schools and county normal schools in 8 States are supervised by State department officers, who give special attention to curricula, employment of staff members, and the expenditure of State funds. These schools are quite limited in enrollments, income, staff, and equipment but they still graduate more than 4,000 prospective teachers annually. Low salaries of rural teachers account in part for the persistence of these small training schools.

19. State boards and departments of education have only a few significant administrative relationships with institutions under city or district control. Aside from the administration of State aid, teacher certification, and institutional accreditation, the most significant relationships are involved in the legal powers of the State departments in less than one-third of the States to pass upon or advise concerning the establishment of local, publicly supported junior colleges.

20. Although privately controlled institutions that educate teachers outnumber nearly 2 to 1 the publicly controlled institutions, they are administered almost independently of the State boards of education. Aside from teacher certification and institutional accreditation, the most significant relationships are involved in one-third or less of the States, where the State departments of education have certain powers to grant or approve charters of incorporation; to exercise continuing regulatory supervision of privately controlled institutions to insure compliance with the terms of their charters; and to enforce legal provisions regulating the degree- or diploma-granting privileges.

21. The outstanding trend in the overhead control of State teachers' colleges and normal schools is the displacement of separate local boards of trustees by State boards of education or by other centralized State boards. A trend toward centralized control also exists in other State institutions that educate teachers. Other trends include

centralization of control over teacher certification and increasing introduction of certification requirements that affect institutional curricula; introduction of institutional accreditation by State agencies; increase in supervisory activities affecting institutions; and increased control over institutional finances by officers of the general State government, including the Governor and the central State financial budgetary officers.

22. General conditions that retard the development of State and of institutional programs of teacher education include: The failure of many junior colleges and colleges of arts and sciences to set up professional objectives and provide appropriate professional courses and laboratory facilities for their work in teacher education; the persistence of an excessive number of weak institutions in the work of preparing teachers, especially teachers of high-school academic subjects; excessive decentralization in the organization and general control of State institutions; lack of administrative authority by the State departments of education over institutions that prepare teachers, and the consequent failure of public elementary and secondary schools in many cases to secure teachers and professional services that meet their educational needs; and lack in some States of voluntary cooperative activities by the State department of education and the independently governed teacher-education institutions of the State.

Suggestions and proposals for the improvement of the conditions and practices outlined in the foregoing findings are given in summary, chapter VI of this study, pp. 109-11.

Chapter III. Composition and Personnel of State Boards and Departments of Education in Relation to Institutional Government

THE COMPOSITION and personnel of State boards of education and of State departments of education are discussed in some detail in monograph 1 of the *Studies of State Departments of Education* series. This chapter is therefore limited to a brief review of such personnel conditions as directly affect the extent and quality of the functions performed by State boards and departments of education in the pre-service education of teachers and related activities.

State Boards of Education, and of Higher-Education Institutions

Thirty-nine States have State boards of education in control of the public elementary and secondary schools.¹ Nineteen, or about half, of these boards control one or more State institutions of higher education; and 18 of them control one or more institutions of higher education approved for the education of teachers.

The number of members comprising the 39 State boards of education ranges from 3 to 12, with a median of 7. In 26 States, all or a majority of the board members are appointed by the Governor, with or without the approval of the Senate; in 8 States, all or a majority are ex officio; in 4 States, all or a majority of the board members are elected by popular vote; in 1 State, members are selected by the State legislature. The Governor is an ex officio member in 14 States; the chief State school officer in 24 States, and other public officials in 10 States. The length of term of office of board members ranges from 2 to 12 years, and the median is 5 years.² These facts indicate that the Governor in numerous States has considerable influence over the actions of the board, particularly when their terms of office are short; that the ex officio membership of the boards renders them susceptible in many States to changing political influences; and that the chief State school officer in half the States is in a position to inform, advise, or otherwise influence the proceedings of the board through his membership in it.

In all types of boards, legal specifications often limit the discretion of the Governor or other officers who appoint board members. In at least one-third of the States legal prescriptions are made relative to the residence of members, as by counties or congressional districts. There are likewise specifications in some States in respect to the polit-

¹ North Dakota is not here included among such States.

² Keeseecker, Ward W. Selection, qualifications, and tenure of principal State school officers.

ical affiliation, occupation, age, and sex of board members. There is no convincing evidence that such specifications forward appreciably the ability of board members to serve the best interests of the institutions and of the people. On the other hand, they definitely restrict the number of eligibles that can be considered by the appointing officer, and tend to introduce nonprofessional influences in the boards that contribute in no way to the effectiveness of services the boards render to the State as a whole.

State Departments of Education

State Superintendent or Commissioner of Education

In every State, the chief State school officer has appreciable influence in the direction of the program of teacher education. In some States, he has considerable legal power over the institutions. In others, his counsel as an ex officio member or officer of policy-making bodies is often solicited in the determination of State policies respecting the institutions that educate teachers; and he is often charged with the responsibility for the execution of the policies agreed upon. He is the official head of the public school system for which the teacher-education institutions prepare teachers. In most States, the departmental staff that immediately performs State department functions and services affecting the institutions of higher education are responsible to the State superintendent or commissioner of education. In many States, their appointment and tenure are determined by him. When serious consideration is given to the extension of State control or supervision over institutions of higher education, the qualifications, powers, and political affiliations of the chief State school officer are matters that are almost invariably of concern to the institutions.

In 32 States, the chief State school officer is selected by popular vote, usually with political-party designations; and in 8, by the State board of education. In 8 States, he is appointed by the Governor. In 25 States, he is selected for a 4-year term; in 13, for 2 years; in 5, for an indefinite term; in 3, for 5 or 6 years; and in 2, for either 1- or 3-year terms.³ In 1938, almost half of these officials had been in office for 3 years or less. If, by reason of the brevity and insecurity of his tenure, and his presumed obligations to those responsible for placing him in office, the chief State school officer cannot or does not resist undesirable political or minority group pressure upon his office, his actions and influence may lead to unfortunate results when institutional control and guidance are placed in his hands.

Various legal minimum requirements for the appointment of the superintendent are made in most of the States. Sometimes these requirements have little or no relationship to merit, as for example,

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 7-18.

those pertaining to State residence, sex, and the like. Only two States require graduate work beyond the bachelor's degree. However, experience requirements of from 3 to 5 years' teaching or administrative experience are fairly common. Far more significant than legal minima are the actual qualifications of the superintendents.

Certain personnel data concerning the chief State school officers are available for 1938 in biographical references and other sources.⁴ More than two-thirds of them have taken a year or more of graduate work, chiefly in education or educational administration; and one in every 5 or 6 had an earned doctor's degree. In educational experience, the superintendents rank high; nearly all of them have been employed during most of their working years in teaching, supervision, and administration. Most of them secured all of their experience in the State schools which they now head. The appointed officers are considerably older, on the average, than the officers elected by the people. More than one-fifth of the superintendents had been employed in institutions of higher education at some time before assuming their present office. Most of the institutions in which they taught were teacher-education institutions.

The constitutions of three-fourths of the States prescribe more or less specifically the organization of various educational offices and boards, and sometimes their powers and duties. The office of the chief State school officer is provided for by 33 State constitutions, all but 2 of which specify popular election as the method of selection; and his term of office is likewise prescribed usually for 2 years but occasionally for 4, by 31 State constitutions. Even the salaries and the qualifications of the chief State school officer are prescribed by the constitutions of a few States. The great difficulty of changing certain constitutional provisions which in effect restrict the development of this office, not infrequently accounts for the opposition of officers of State universities and other important State institutions to the surrender of the overhead administration of such institutions to the State departments of education.

Salaries of the superintendents range from \$2,500 to \$15,000. The median salary is about \$5,000, a figure almost the same as that of 10 years ago. The salary of the State superintendent in a given State is usually lower than that of the superintendencies of the two or three largest cities in that State, or of the presidencies of the State university and of the land-grant college.

Although some superintendents with high qualifications, long tenure, and excellent records are elected by popular vote, the group appointed by State boards of education on the average are more highly qualified, better paid, and somewhat more secure in tenure.

⁴ Frederic, Katherine A. State personnel administration with special reference to departments of education. Pp. 34-61.

The foregoing facts are given for the entire group of 39 State boards of education, without distinguishing between boards that govern teacher-education institutions as well as elementary and secondary schools, and those that govern elementary and secondary schools only. There are no differences in the personnel for these two types of boards worthy of mention in this place, except that the boards governing elementary and secondary schools and teacher-education institutions in addition are larger by about one member than those governing elementary and secondary schools alone; and that the term of office of members of the former type of board is longer by about 1 year than that of the latter.

A comparison of the composition of the State boards of education, and of the remainder of the 150 State and local boards which govern State higher-education institutions, discloses that boards of State universities and State colleges have about two more members, on the average, than the State boards of education; and that local boards in charge of a single teachers college or normal school, have about two less. Typically, the term of office in a local board governing a single teachers college is at least 1 year shorter than in a State board of education.

While there are some differences in the methods of choosing board members who govern the different types of State institutions, the differences are not particularly significant. Appointment by the Governor, with or without the approval of the State senate, predominates in the case of the boards of all types of State institutions. The State boards of education, however, are less fortunate than other State or local boards, in having more ex officio members. All or a majority of the members of eight State boards of education are ex officio, whereas this is true of practically none of the other boards.

State Director of Teacher Education and Certification

In about one-third of the States, the detailed State department administration of the preservice education of teachers and the performance of other teacher personnel services are delegated to the State director of teacher education and certification. Because the titles and specific duties of this officer vary among State departments, the following list of 17 States having such an officer is provisional only: Alabama, Arkansas, California, Georgia, Indiana, Kentucky, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Mississippi, Nebraska, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Virginia, and West Virginia. In these States, the director is usually responsible to the chief State school officer, is professionally trained; holds professional rank, and devotes all or most of his time to the direction of a wide range of duties relative to the preservice education of teachers. In all but a few of the 17 States, he also directs the certification of teachers. In

the remainder of the 48 States, there is a director, or some other departmental staff member, who administers teacher certification.

The titles of officials primarily responsible for teacher education and certification, shown in the list which follows, indicate confused nomenclature, divergencies in ranks of officers with approximately the same duties, differences in their placement among divisions of the State department, and similar administrative differences. Each title given is used by only one State, unless more than one State is indicated in the list.

Titles of State department officials responsible primarily for teacher education and certification⁵ are as follows:

Teacher education primarily (includes certification in most States):

- Director of teacher education (or training) and certification, five States.
- Director, division of instruction, two States.
- Assistant commissioner for teacher education.
- Chief of division of teacher training and certification.
- Director of teacher training and licensing division.
- Director of teacher training.
- Director of secondary education and teacher training.
- Director, division of elementary and secondary education, and State teachers colleges.
- Director, division of professional service.
- Director of higher education.
- Secretary, State board of education.
- Director of teacher personnel.

Teacher certification primarily:

- Certification clerk (or equivalent), six States.
- Supervisor of (teacher) certification, five States.
- Director of certification, two States.
- Secretary (or executive secretary), State board of examiners, two States.
- Secretary (or executive secretary), State board of education, two States.
- Assistant superintendent in teacher certification.
- President, State board of examiners.
- Secretary, State board of examiners in charge of teachers' certificates and examinations, and chief, bureau of academic credentials.
- Chairman, certification committee.
- Director, bureau of certification.
- Chief of certification.
- Head, department of certification.
- Director of teacher personnel.
- Director of certification and acting director of physical education.
- Supervisor of certification and consultant in physical, safety, and health education.
- Assistant director of certification.
- Assistant director, elementary certification.
- Assistant director of teacher training and certification.
- Supervisor, division of certification.
- Secretary, registration and certification.
- Credential secretary.
- Assistant in teacher certification.

⁵ U. S. Office of Education. Educational directory, 1939. Pp. 5-24; and State department directories.

Personnel data are available for 8 State directors. These constitute a fair sampling of the entire group of 17. The median age of the 8 directors is 49 years, the range being from 44 to 74 years. This is a little above the median for the entire State department staff. Yeuell, in a study of 11 State directors made in 1926, found the median age to be 39 years, and the range from 32 to 55 years.⁶ All of the directors are men. Five of the eight directors in 1940 have a doctor's degree and the remainder have a master's degree as their highest. In 1926, approximately one-third of the directors had a doctor's degree, one-third a master's, and one-third a bachelor's. Nearly all of the directors in 1940 had had experience in the professional education of teachers, as such, before taking their present position; in 1926, only about one-third had had such experience. In both years, practically all the directors had had public-school experience; but in 1940, their experience was longer, gained in more important schools, and more widely diversified. All of the directors in 1940 had taught in colleges as well as in public schools, and half of them previously had been college or teachers college presidents.

The average amount of education and of professional experience of the State directors of teacher education and certification probably exceeds the average amount possessed by comparable State administrative or professional employees in the 48 States. However, the directors are a somewhat select group; they are to be found in only about one-third of the States, and are employed chiefly in large departments. The qualifications and status of the much larger group of specialists who function in teacher certification; who assist in the training of vocational teachers in agriculture, homemaking, and trade and industrial education; and who engage in other teacher personnel activities, do not appear to be significantly different from those of other State department officers of comparable rank.

The office of State director of teacher education and certification has evolved in most States since 1900, from the office of director of teacher certification. The number of State directors has increased from 11 in 1926, to 17 in 1940. As State departments of education continue to grow in size of staff and in professional activities, the number of States having directors of teacher education, certification, and other personnel activities will doubtless be further increased. The establishment of the office is a logical step in the development of State departments, and authoritative opinion approves its functioning.⁷ To assume the place of State leadership called for by his office, however, the director should be the peer of any schoolmen in the State in scholarship, professional experience, and leadership capabilities. He and his assistants also should be reason-

⁶ Yeuell, Gladstone H. The special work and the office of the State director of teacher training. P. 8.

⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 18-21.

ably secure in tenure; for in working with various State groups and institutions he is subjected to many institutional and other pressures that do not assist in the development of a sound program of teacher education in the State as a whole.

Other State Department Personnel in Teacher Education and Certification

In addition to the chief State school officer and the director of teacher education and certification; there are a number of directors, specialists, and assistants who devote full time to State teacher service and welfare provisions, such as teacher certification and placement; to preservice teacher education; and to higher education. More than 50 of these are listed with more or less distinctive titles in State department directories. Titles often mean little, however, and sometimes do not represent the real work of the holders. Moreover, the distinctions between administrative, professional, subprofessional, and clerical employees are often not clear. For example, efficient "clerks" or semiprofessional workers engaged in teacher certification are sometimes not reported as professional workers, although worthy of the rank. On the other hand, State departments sometimes report semi-clerical workers as professional employees. The certification of teachers is often administered as a clerical function, despite the fact that the proper evaluation of college credentials, the guidance of prospective teachers in securing credits, and related functions may be professional to a high degree.

Emens in 1938 presented some data concerning the number and tenure of staff members in the teacher education and certification division or unit in 43 States. The number of staff members of all classifications including assistants, filing clerks, etc., varied among States from 1 to 28 with a median of 4 members. The number of years of tenure of directors of teacher education, and of teacher certification in 37 States ranged from one-fourth year to 30 years with a median of 5 years and an average of 8 years. Fourteen States indicated that the median tenure of the previous director was 10 years.⁸

The number of staff members engaged in certification in typical States, i. e., those granting somewhere around 4,200 certificates per year, includes one specialist or person of professional rank, who devotes all or part of his time to certification; occasionally a professional assistant; and from two to four staff members including stenographers and filing clerks. The number of clerical workers is usually increased or diminished during the year, in accordance with seasonal demands for certificates. The number of certificates issued and renewed, the detail in which records are kept, the basis of issuance (examinations or college credentials), and other factors affect the number of workers.

⁸ Emens, John R. A study of State administration of teacher personnel. Pp. 93-94.

In addition to workers whose titles indicate some connection of the holders with teacher personnel services, a very large proportion of the State department staff is directly or indirectly interested in the preservice preparation of teachers, by virtue of their primary interest in the improvement of the public-schools. Such staff members include deputy or assistant superintendents; field agents; curriculum directors; supervisors of elementary, rural, or secondary schools; supervisors of special subject fields and public-school activities, and others.

With the exception of the chief State school officer and the State director of teacher education and certification, concerning whom certain facts already have been presented, the staff members engaged in activities pertaining to teacher education and certification have about the same qualifications and work under the same conditions as other State department staff members engaged in administrative and professional work. For these reasons, and because so many of the State department staff members are engaged full time or part time in teacher education and other teacher personnel activities, a few facts concerning the qualifications and working conditions of the State department staffs as a whole are pertinent.

A total of some 3,343 full-time employees served State departments of education and State boards for vocational education in 1938. The number of such employees varied from 13 in Montana and Wyoming to 751 in New York, with an approximate median of 40. Approximately 1,300 of these full-time employees were administrative or professional workers; the remainder were of clerical or semi-clerical grade. About one-third of the 1,300 administrative and professional staff members served in the field of vocational education.⁹

The majority of the State department staff are between 35 and 50 years of age. About one-fourth are women. Approximately 43 percent hold the master's degree as their highest, and 9 percent the doctor's. About half the general departmental employees have been in office for 3 years or less. Directors of certification, however, average a longer period of service. Every type of public-school experience is represented in the qualifications of staff members. A little more than 25 percent of them have had experience in college work.

Compared with respect to salaries and working conditions in industry and business, conditions of service in typical State departments of education offer few attractions.

Two-thirds of the State department administrative and professional staff members receive less than \$4,000 annually. Those holding the more responsible positions are often paid less than workers outside the department who have the same amount of preparation. Considerations apart from merit not infrequently prevail in the selection

⁹ Frederic. Op. cit., p. 66.

of staff members, and the tenure of administrative and professional workers is not sufficiently stable in typical States. Possibly half of the administrative and professional staff belong to either a general State retirement system found in about a dozen States, or to a teachers' retirement system, found in a little more than half the States.¹⁰

Trends.—Foremost among the trends of the past 40 years in respect to the administrative and professional staff members of State departments engaged in work pertaining to higher education and to teacher education, certification, and placement is a very large increase in the number of employees. Figures by Ferguson show an increase from 7 members performing the foregoing functions in 1900 to 52 in 1920 and 68 in 1923.¹¹ The number continued to increase at a rapid rate during the 1920's, but the rate of increase slackened greatly during depression years. Recently there are renewed indications of increased staff size.

Other trends include improved qualifications of the staff; increases in salaries, at least since the depths of the recent depression; and improved tenure conditions, resulting in large part from the introduction of some form of the merit system of employee selection and retention. None of these changes has been spectacular in extent in recent years, but they have been made in an increasing number of States to a degree that promises much for the future development of additional services to teacher preparation by State departments of education.

Trends in respect to the composition of State boards of education and other boards that govern State institutions include: A trend toward boards of moderate size, of from five to nine members; and the elimination of ex officio board membership.¹²

Needs.—In the course of field visitations made in connection with this study, the needs most frequently mentioned as urgent by staff members engaged in the supervision of teacher education included: Provision of more professional and clerical assistance; better promotional opportunities for staff members; and more security of tenure for qualified employees.

That staff members of outstanding professional abilities are needed is clearly implied in a published statement by the State department of education of Connecticut concerning the fundamental purpose of a department:

The fundamental purpose of a State department of education should be leadership, service, research, and planning. The State department's function is to guide the destiny of a school system by virtue of genuinely accepted scholarship rather than through legal sanction or authority. Regulatory functions should be exercised in an educational manner.

¹⁰ Frederic. Op. cit., pp. 62-157.

¹¹ Ferguson, A. W. Professional staff of State departments of education. P. 5.

¹² For other trends between 1890 and 1925, see Schrammel, Henry E. The organization of State departments of education. Pp. 2-24.

Inasmuch as the State directors who supervise and coordinate teacher-education activities must work professionally with the educational leaders of the State, both in public elementary and secondary schools and in the colleges and universities, it is clear that they should be among the ablest educators in the State. Since they must analyze and interpret the needs of the public elementary and secondary schools to the universities and colleges that educate teachers, and must demonstrate to the institutions how these needs are to be met, they should have wide experience not only in teacher-education institutions but also in the public schools. To secure persons with the requisite education and experience demands salaries and working conditions superior to those found in most State departments at the present time.

Because of the frequent changes in political situations, it is important that the State department staff members have reasonable security of tenure. In nearly all States, the staff members must assist in the coordination of institutions that educate teachers; and in more than one-third of the States, in the control of two or more State institutions of higher education. To direct these institutions along lines not paralleling the wishes of their presidents, faculties, students, alumni, or friends, even in the best interests of the State as a whole, is often an extremely difficult task in democratic American education. It is one that ordinarily cannot be undertaken successfully when the tenure of the directive officer is subject to political influences. The appointment of the chief State school officer for a long or indefinite term by a nonpolitical board, and the selection of the State director solely upon the basis of merit, are often proposed under such conditions. Reasonably long tenure of directive officers is almost essential in States where long-time or continuous programs of teacher education are undertaken.

It is certain that in the much stronger State departments of the future, which prevailing trends indicate are now in the making, the coordination of the activities of the teacher-education institutions and the development of State personnel functions and services that advance the effectiveness of the teachers of the State will be more commonly undertaken than they are today. In some States, only the barest beginnings have been made in the provision of a State department staff whose primary concern is the development of a genuinely effective program of preservice teacher education. In most States a considerably larger staff, headed by a highly competent director of teacher education, will be necessary before an effective program can be fully realized by the State departments of education. That this fact is generally appreciated is indicated by the answers of State department officials to a question concerning the chief limitations and difficulties of the State board and department in the performance

of its functions. Lack of staff, both professional and clerical, was mentioned almost as frequently as all other difficulties combined. It is significant that both private philanthropic foundations and the Federal government, in their desire to assist in the advancement of certain aspects of public education, have provided numerous State departments of education with financial means to secure staff members whose primary interests center around the improvement of the qualifications of the teachers of the State.

Summary of Findings

The major findings of this chapter are:

1. The median number of members comprising the 39 State boards of education is 7, and the range is from 3 to 12.
2. In 26 States, all or a majority of the board members are appointed by the Governor; in 8 States, all or a majority are ex officio; and in 4 States, all or a majority are elected by popular vote.
3. The medium length of term of office of board members is 5 years, and the range is from 2 to 12 years.
4. In 32 States, the chief State school officer is selected by popular vote, usually with political party designations; and in 8, by the State board of education. In 8 States, he is appointed by the Governor.
5. In nearly one-third of the States, the term of office of the chief State school officer is less than 4 years in length. His tenure is relatively insecure.
6. Various minimum legal requirements govern the appointment of the chief State school officer, but these are usually low and not very significant professionally.
7. A typical chief State school officer compares favorably in educational qualifications and experience with the superintendents of the large city school systems of the State. His scholastic education is not as great, on the average, as that of the presidents, deans, or full professors of education in the State university and the land-grant college.
8. The salary of the chief State school officer in a given State is usually lower than that of the superintendents of the largest cities or of the presidents of the State university and of the land-grant college of that State.
9. Although there are numerous exceptions, the chief State school officers appointed by State boards of education are somewhat better qualified and paid than others; and their tenure is somewhat more secure.
10. State directors of teacher education and certification function under a variety of titles in 17 States. In nearly all of the remainder of the States, a director or other staff member administers teacher certification.

11. The 17 State directors of teacher education and certification as a group compare favorably in education, professional experience, and other professional qualifications with the deans of education of the colleges and universities; and they rank high among the best-qualified members of the State department staff.

12. In addition to the 17 directors of teacher education and certification, there are more than 50 directors, assistants, and other administrative and professional staff members in the State departments who devote all or most of their time to preservice teacher education and other teacher personnel duties. Large numbers of directors, supervisors, specialists, field agents, and assistants in other educational fields also devote a limited amount of time to such duties.

13. The typical State department administrative or professional staff member has had a year or less of graduate work; has had considerable experience in a variety of public-school positions; has held his present office for only a few years; and receives less than \$4,000 annually.

14. Trends in respect to staff members engaged in preservice teacher education and other personnel activities include: Increase in numbers; improvement in professional qualifications; improvement in conditions affecting tenure; and moderate increases in salaries.

15. Lack of staff with which to perform essential functions is the most commonly reported need of the State departments of education with respect to the supervision of teacher education. Other needs include more preparation and greater security of tenure of staff members.

Proposals and suggestions for improvement based upon the foregoing findings are given in summary, chapter VI of this study, p. 112.

Chapter IV. Administrative and Supervisory Functions and Services

THE SPECIFIC functions and services performed by the State departments of education relating to preservice teacher education and other teacher personnel activities vary widely among States in number, nature, extent, and effectiveness. In a few States, teacher certification, institutional accreditation, and the activities of the State superintendent of public instruction as an ex officio member or officer of institutional governing boards, constitute nearly all the important preservice teacher education and personnel activities performed by the State departments. In some States, on the other extreme, the State department of education functions as the administrative agency of State boards of education in control of a dozen or more important institutions of higher education; accredits, coordinates, and performs leadership functions for 50 or more privately controlled institutions; and performs a wide variety of important functions in teacher personnel administration including teacher certification, placement, in-service education, and other activities.

Although State laws have an important bearing upon the extent and quality of performance of State department functions, such laws alone indicate the scope of State department activities incompletely. The State boards of education, and the chief State school officer, are often required or permitted to make such rules and regulations not prohibited by law, as they consider necessary and expedient. Some of the functions that are exercised, are authorized in such broad terms that only limitations of time, distance, and energy appear to affect the scope of activities performed. An idea of the extent of the functions discussed in this chapter that are legally authorized may be ascertained from the following list of powers and duties legally conferred upon governing boards of State teacher-education institutions in one-fourth or more of the States. A digest of such laws is given in monograph 1 of the *Studies of State Department of Education* series.

Fix admission requirements to the institutions.

Require a written declaration of intention to teach.

Prescribe tuition fees and charges.

Administer college staff personnel, including: Selection of president and other staff members; fixing of salaries; determination of tenure; and prescription of duties of officers.

Administer college financial and business affairs, including: Expenditure of funds appropriated by legislature; preparation and submission of budget estimates and reports; provision and maintenance of plant; receipt and

custody of donations and bequests; purchase of equipment and supplies; and handling of property.

Administer curricula, including: Prescription of curricula and courses; granting of diplomas and degrees; and prescription of graduation requirements.

Establish training school facilities.

Organize and make bylaws for the board itself.

In general, all boards of education in charge of State institutions of higher education direct the general policies of the institutions, and formulate the general rules and regulations that govern them. If the State board in charge of the institutions of higher education also controls the public elementary and secondary schools, the State department of education puts into effect the policies, and enforces the rules and regulations of the board. If the State or local board in control of the institutions does not control the schools of less than college grade, a secretary or other executive officer who may or may not have the assistance of a small clerical staff, usually acts as the executive officer of the board independently of the State department of education.

The contrast in the number and extent of the State department administrative functions in situations where the State board of education governs the institutions, and in situations where it does not, is constantly apparent in the discussions of chapter II of this study, which describe the overhead organization and administration of the institutions. The present chapter discloses that the contrast is equally marked between the two types of control in respect to the extent and quality of a number of the separate State department services that are predominantly of a professional nature.

Functions Relating Directly to Institutions That Educate Teachers

Regulation of Teacher Supply and Demand

One of the most important functions of the State department of education is to assure a constant inflow of competent teachers into the classrooms of the State. The department is in a strategic position to assist in regulating the balance of teacher supply and demand for the State as a whole. A central State agency is essential for this purpose, for voluntary action is infrequently taken by college administrative officers expressly to reduce the output of surplus teachers.

The problems confronting the State department of education in regulating the balance of teacher supply and teacher demand are recurring and difficult ones. Conditions of teacher oversupply and of undersupply tend to recur in cycles. Either condition if extreme, is unfortunate for the public schools, and for the profession of teaching. If there is an undersupply of qualified teachers, classrooms can be kept open only by lowering certification standards and by

employing poorly qualified teachers. If there is an oversupply of prospective teachers, public funds and human effort are wasted by the State institutions that prepare them. Furthermore, an oversupply of teachers often results in the lowering of teachers' salaries, and the usual effect of lower salaries is lower qualifications of teachers.

The methods most commonly used by the departments to control teacher supply and demand include teacher certification, and to a lesser extent, institutional accreditation. In a relatively small proportion of the States, control is exercised by the State department directly through selective admission to the student bodies of the institutions and, to some small extent, through discontinuance or consolidation of institutional curricula.

Teacher certification is helpful in regulating the supply of certified teachers, but a proper balance of teacher supply and demand cannot be maintained through certification requirements alone. Such requirements constitute a cumbersome instrument, which too often follows rather than leads the upswings and downswings of teacher supply. Accreditation by State agencies appears to have relatively little effect on the number of teachers turned out by the institutions. The institutions that graduate substantial numbers of teachers are almost invariably accredited. The discontinuance of State institutions or of curricula in such institutions offers little promise; once established with any considerable enrollments, neither institutions nor curricula are often discontinued. Selective admission of students is the most promising of all methods for controlling teacher oversupply, although its possibilities have been realized on a State-wide basis in relatively few States, and in these, chiefly for elementary teachers.

Collection of information concerning teacher supply and demand.— Before attempting to regulate teacher demand and teacher supply by any method, some central State educational agency, preferably the State department of education, must collect regularly a large amount of information concerning the factors that determine supply and demand, and make this information available to the institutions that educate teachers.

In the *National Survey of the Education of Teachers*, 15 educational factors that affect the demand for teachers and 14 affecting the supply were listed.¹ Many more factors operate that are not of an educational nature. Reports from the State departments indicate that the majority of them do not have usable information concerning most of these factors. Some departments have little, if any, information concerning even the most essential factors that affect teacher supply and demand, and related matters involved in the State administration

¹ Evenden, E. B. Summary and interpretation. National survey of the education of teachers. Vol. VI, pp. 195-97. (U. S. Department of the Interior, Office of Education, Bulletin 1933, No. 10.)

of teacher personnel. Less than one-third of the States reporting keep annual or continuing records of all the teachers certificated in the State by all certificating agencies, including State, county, city, and college authorities; of new teaching positions; of the number of teaching vacancies due to death, retirement, and other causes; and of the number of legally qualified teachers unable to secure positions. Less than half maintain up-to-date records of out-of-State teachers entering service in the State; of the number of teachers supplied annually by the institutions that educate them; of the number of students enrolled in the several teacher-education curricula; and of the number of prospective teachers preparing for each type of position. Comparatively few States receive annual data from each teacher-education institution concerning the placement of its graduates.

Even when helpful information is collected and available in State department files, it is often not compiled and made available to the institutions that educate teachers. Two-fifths of the State departments report that they practically never provide teacher supply-and-demand information to the institutions; and one-fourth of them rarely, or only occasionally, provide such information. The States that report the offering of continuous service to the institutions in this respect include, among others, Connecticut, Minnesota, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, and Vermont. Eight additional States report that they frequently provide supply-and-demand information to the institutions.

Kansas provides an example of occasional intensive studies of teacher supply and demand made by State departments of education and other agencies. A survey of conditions is being conducted in 1940-41 jointly by the State department of education, the State labor department, and the University of Kansas. All teachers in Kansas are included. Answers to a number of significant questions are being sought.

Regulation of student admission, recruiting and transfer.—In each of the 18 States in which the State board of education controls one or more institutions that educate teachers, the board officially prescribes the general admission requirements of the institutions under its control. In this as in many other functions, the State board of education is the final approving agency, rather than the agency that originally works out the requirements. In actual practice, general admission requirements usually are formulated by the presidents and other staff members of the institutions, most of which are teachers colleges. Staff members of the State departments of education may or may not participate in this work.

State departments of education not in administrative control of institutions of higher education do not often participate in setting the general admission requirements of the institutions. The State boards

of education in Washington and in Arizona, and the State commissioner of education of Maine, however, determine, or assist certain State institutions in determining, such requirements. A number of State departments of education exercise indirect control over institutional admission requirements by accrediting public high schools and setting up requirements for high-school graduation, which the institutions almost of necessity must recognize when they admit high-school graduates. Such action by the State departments has contributed materially to the movement toward liberalization of high-school curricula and graduation requirements.

General admission requirements to normal schools were once lower than those to colleges, but now the requirements are about the same for both types of institutions. The requirements usually include graduation from an accredited high school, with a minimum of 15 or 16 high-school units of credit. Of these units, 5 to 10 are usually prescribed in specific subjects.

In addition to general admission requirements, selective admission requirements are increasingly prescribed by State boards of education and other authorities in control of teacher-education institutions. Such requirements are most commonly found in the teacher-education institutions of New England and the Middle Atlantic States, and of large cities. The State departments that report programs of selective admission in all or a considerable number of the State teachers colleges or other institutions of higher education which they administer, include California, Connecticut, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, and Vermont. There are State institutions not governed by the State board of education in a few other States, such as Maine and Rhode Island, that practice selective admission, but they are not very numerous. In addition, all of the city-controlled teachers colleges and normal schools, and a number of privately controlled colleges, admit students on a selective basis.

There are three purposes of selective admission. The first is to limit the number of students admitted to correspond to the effective working capacity of the institution. The second is ultimately to limit the number of surplus applicants for teaching positions. The third is to secure the most promising students available for teacher education. To realize the last-mentioned purpose, such means for selective admission as the following are frequently employed: Ratings in high-school scholarship; intelligence tests; subject-matter achievement tests or special examinations; personal interviews; and physical examinations. Many additional means are occasionally employed.

The first step usually taken by State departments in limiting student enrollments is to determine the total number of prospective teachers

to be prepared by all the institutions of the State that are under the control of the State board of education. The next step is to determine the quota to be prepared by each institution. These procedures appear to work very well in the institutions under the control of the State board. Unfortunately for the complete success of the selective admission programs, these procedures do not work at all in respect to institutions not under the administrative control of the board; and in no State having these programs, are all the institutions that educate teachers under the control of the State board of education.

Inasmuch as most of the institutions controlled by the State board of education are teachers colleges and normal schools, selective admission applies for the most part to prospective elementary school teachers. Efforts to control the supply of high school teachers of academic subjects prepared in colleges of arts and sciences have been largely ineffective to date. Partially as a consequence, there has been an oversupply of such teachers in most States for a number of years.

Trends in selective admission follow fairly closely the changing relationships of teacher supply and demand. They follow changing vocational opportunities in fields other than teaching as well. During past depression years, when vocational opportunities for young people were unusually limited in nearly all fields, high-school graduates turned increasingly to teaching despite a marked oversupply of workers in this field. Largely as a consequence, selective admission requirements were strengthened during the last decade in practically all of the States previously mentioned as having such requirements.

A decided majority of the State directors of teacher education and corresponding officers believe that the regulation of enrollments of teacher-education institutions on a quota basis is a desirable State activity.² Several difficulties exist, however, in the setting of quotas and in selective admission. The methods used, although helpful, are not wholly satisfactory. However, they are being slowly extended and strengthened. In States where the right of individuals to secure preparation in any State institution they choose is emphasized in public policy, there is effective opposition to admission requirements much beyond graduation from an accredited high school. State laws sometimes forbid or are interpreted as forbidding the additional requirements imposed in selective admission. In most States, the organization of higher education institutions under two or more boards leads to an unfortunate element of discrimination when one board enforces selective admission and another does not. The amount of State funds allotted an institution often depends upon the number of students it enrolls, and institutional administrators are reluctant to lose income by barring students. While State and institutional authorities everywhere sincerely desire to improve student personnel

² Emens, John R. A study of State administration of teacher personnel. Pp. 292-93.

as much as possible, efforts to increase the number of students enrolled are more common and more effective in most States than efforts to improve the quality of those admitted. Most educational authorities believe that the admission of entrants to the profession of teaching should be subject to much stronger control than has hitherto existed. Nevertheless, the present decentralization of administration of higher education institutions in most States continues to perpetuate institutional competition that definitely retards the movement toward selective admission, and other means for controlling the inflow of teachers into the profession.

Lack of interest in teaching as a career by some high-school graduates who might make excellent teachers is not infrequently due to lack of guidance. Officials in less than one-eighth of the State departments of education report that they assist in recruiting prospective teachers. In most of these States, there is no evidence of more than sporadic efforts toward recruitment. Less than one-fifth of the State boards or departments administer State or local scholarships for prospective teachers. In areas where there is a marked oversupply of teachers and of applicants for admission to college, attention appears to be directed first to selective admission activities rather than to the more positive activity of guiding promising high-school graduates into teaching. The activities that are ultimately most effective in securing the high quality of prospective teachers that is desired, however, are perhaps not promotional or persuasive in nature. They may well be the more sincere and permanently helpful activities that lead to the improvement of salaries and working conditions in teaching.

Of the State boards of education that control higher education institutions, about half prescribe specific regulations for the transfer of students from one to another of these institutions. Often the presidents of the institutions recommend the regulations for the approval of the boards. The other half of the State boards leave student-transfer regulations to the institutions. If a student has a satisfactory record and does not attempt to change his course of study too much, he has little difficulty in effecting a transfer from one State institution to another, especially if both are under the same board. The transfer of junior college students to 4-year colleges is facilitated somewhat by the organization of the latter on a lower-division, upper-division basis. This organization is popular chiefly in States where junior colleges are numerous. Difficulties in the transfer of students from colleges of arts and science to teachers colleges and vice versa are commonly, and properly, met by having the student do whatever additional work is necessary to meet the requirements for graduation of the institution to which he transfers.

The accredited status of the institutions is an important factor

in the transfer of credits. However, most State institutions are accredited by some agency within the State, if not by some regional or national accrediting agency.³ This topic is discussed more fully under the topic *State Accreditation*, which follows.

State Accreditation of Institutions That Educate Teachers

The accreditation of institutions of higher education in 30 States by agencies within those States is described in detail in a recent bulletin of the U. S. Office of Education.⁴ For this reason, only a few salient characteristics of institutional accreditation by State departments of education as a means for providing lists of institutions approved for teacher education and certification, will be outlined in this monograph.

Certification authorities in each State, in order to evaluate college credits submitted by applicants for teachers' certificates, must pass upon the standing of practically all of the publicly and privately controlled institutions of higher education in the State, and upon many of the out-of-State institutions as well. In order for their graduates to be certified, the institutions must maintain the offerings and meet the standards prescribed by the State teacher-education and certification authorities.

A few State departments disclaim any intention of acting as formal accrediting agencies; that is, they have no formal standards, and publish no lists of accredited institutions. In States such as Arizona, Delaware, Nevada, and Wyoming, none of which has as many as a half dozen institutions of higher education, formal lists are scarcely necessary; and in Massachusetts, which certifies only a few specialized groups of teachers and administrators, no list of approved institutions is available.

In nearly all States, the department of education, as the executive agency of the State board of education, or as an independent agency, has sufficient legal authority to establish effective means for accrediting teacher-education institutions. The State boards and departments of education are variously empowered by State laws, expressed either in broad grants of power or in detailed statutory provisions, to approve, recognize, classify, appraise, standardize, or accredit institutions of higher education. Nevertheless, in comparison with accreditation by regional agencies, accreditation has not gone beyond its earlier stages of development in many of the States.

In a half dozen States, either the State board of education or the State department of education accredits or approves institutions of higher education not only for teacher education and certification purposes but also for general collegiate purposes, e. g., admission or

³ Ratcliffe, Ella B. *Accredited higher institutions, 1933.*

⁴ Kelly, Fred J.; Frazier, Benjamin W.; McNeely, John H.; and Ratcliffe, Ella B. *Collegiate accreditation by agencies within States.* (U. S. Office of Education, Bulletin, 1940, No. 3.)

transfer of students from one institution to another. In a few other States, the departments cooperate with other accrediting agencies, including State universities, State college associations and councils, and intercollegiate college committees, in the performance of the general collegiate accrediting function. However, the standards prepared only for use in evaluating institutions for student-admission and transfer purposes do not assist the State departments very much in evaluating the strictly professional offerings and facilities of the institutions.

In their annual task of evaluating scores and sometimes hundreds of out-of-State college transcripts of credit, State certification officers have considerable difficulty in ascertaining the standing of many of the institutions of higher education throughout the country. Consequently, these officials often find useful the accredited lists and standards of the five regional college associations, and of the American Association of Teachers Colleges. Other national lists which are sometimes useful are those of the Association of American Universities, and of more than a score of professional, technical, or special accrediting groups. The chief difficulty encountered by the departments in the use of all of these lists, except those of the American Association of Teachers Colleges, is that they afford no indication of the extent or quality of the strictly professional activities and offerings of the institutions.

The State department officers who are immediately responsible for the administration of accreditation, under the State board of education and the chief State school officer, are in most States the same officers who administer teacher education and certification. The accrediting officers variously include the State director of teacher education or of certification; the chairman or secretary of the State examining board; a deputy or assistant superintendent; or some other administrative or professional member of the State department staff. State committees on teacher education, certification, and other aspects of teacher personnel work not infrequently assist in accreditation.

In most States accredited institutions are infrequently removed or suspended from the accredited lists, although warnings are occasionally issued when recognized violations of standards persist. Visitations of accredited institutions for the specific purpose of checking standards are usually brief, and are generally made at irregular intervals by the members of the State department or institutional staffs. Approximately half the States do not require periodic written reports on the observance of standards. On the other hand, some States, such as Indiana, New York, and Pennsylvania, secure detailed reports that, combined with visitation, enable accrediting officers to make satisfactory estimates of the extent and quality of work of the institutions.

At least half the State accrediting agencies have no published standards. Some of the standards used have not been revised for years, hence do not reflect recent emphases in teacher education. A good proportion of the sets of standards presumably designed for the evaluation of teacher-education institutions do not mention such items as the professional aspects of the curricula; strictly professional preparation of the staff; availability of a training school; and the extent and quality of student teaching. Most sets of standards also do not present criteria for the evaluation of specific types of curricula.

The inconsistency involved in certificating and employing teachers for specific grade levels, subjects, or fields of work, and in accrediting institutions in their entirety rather than by specific curricula, is receiving increased attention as teaching and certification requirements become more specialized. Most of the 2-year normal schools, for example, are now accredited only for the preparation of elementary-school teachers. Similarly, institutions that specialize in special fields, such as music or art, are increasingly approved only for the preparation of teachers in such fields. Among the States that evaluate specific curricula, in accrediting, are New York, Pennsylvania, California, Illinois, Ohio, and Indiana.

The accrediting of institutions for the education of teachers has developed as the use of college credentials superseded examinations as a basis of certification, as the number of college-prepared teachers increased, and regional and national accrediting evolved. State accreditation in many States has not yet become an organized program, in which written standards, regular institutional visitation, and published lists of accredited institutions each have a place. Although becoming more usable, State lists of accredited institutions are not yet as highly selective as those of the older regional and national accrediting associations; nor even as selective as those of some colleges and universities. However, minimum certification requirements for elementary teachers are reaching the degree level in a rapidly increasing number of States; and the problem of accrediting non-degree institutions for teacher education is becoming less difficult.

Most of the State departments maintain typewritten, mimeographed, or printed lists of accredited institutions within their respective States. In some States, a complete directory of the higher-education institutions of the State would serve as well as a State department accredited list; for all of the institutions in the State are accredited. The institutions are classified in several different ways on the various State lists, which usually give little or no information concerning the institutions or their curricula, other than the fact that the institutions are approved.

In addition to the regional accrediting associations, there are more than a score of national accrediting associations. In addition to

these, two or more State agencies sometimes operate in the same State. Proposals are often made for the unification of various ones among the many National and State accrediting agencies. As the State departments become stronger in organization and personnel, and as the scope of their work is extended, their wider participation in general accreditation, and their more effective participation in accreditation for teacher education, are to be expected.

Functions Relating to College Staffs

One of the most significant functions exercised by college governing boards is the determination of policies affecting the staff personnel of the institutions. The most important among the activities whereby board policies are put into effect include the selection and appointment of the administrative officers and instructional staffs, and the determination of their tenure, compensation, and other conditions of service.

In each of 16 States in which the State board of education controls one or more institutions that educate teachers (Pennsylvania and Kentucky as special cases are not considered here), the board of education with or without the recommendation of the State department, exercise all or nearly all of the following functions: Appointment of the president; appointment of faculty members upon the recommendation of the president; determination of the qualifications and tenure of the president; and, upon the recommendation of the president, determination of the qualifications and tenure of the faculty.

So important is the function of personnel administration, that in confused administrative situations the power of appointment and dismissal of personnel is often used as the chief criterion in determining lines of administrative control. Formal lines of authority in respect to the appointment and dismissal of personnel, however, sometimes do not reveal the complete picture of the lines of authority in the administration of teacher-education institutions. For example in Pennsylvania, local boards of trustees elect teachers college presidents and upon the recommendation of the presidents, the college staff members. Nevertheless, the Governor approves the selection of a president by the board. Furthermore, the institutions are legally parts of the common school system and the boards, each of which is headed by the State superintendent, are considered as boards of trustees of State institutions within the State department of public instruction. Hence the powers of the local boards in respect to college personnel constitute only a small part of the picture of teachers-college control.

In chapter II of this study it was disclosed that in all States in which the State board of education controls one or more teacher-education institutions, the State superintendent is secretary, chair-

man, or executive officer of the board, and hence is in a position to exert considerable influence in its administration of institutional personnel. In Massachusetts, so great are his powers that he actually appoints the presidents and faculty members of the State teachers colleges. In States in which the State board of education is not in control of teacher-education institutions, the superintendent is not infrequently a member or officer of the State teachers college board, and sometimes of local institutional boards. Hence, he is in a position to advise these controlling bodies also in their selection of institutional personnel.

Although State boards of education consider it their function to determine the salaries of the presidents and, upon the recommendation of the president, the salaries of the faculties, the boards do not have the freedom of action in this respect enjoyed by many city school boards which are fiscally independent. Salaries in State institutions are partially paid with money raised by the general State government, and not by the board itself. The board customarily decides upon the salary for the president, and adopts a salary schedule for the faculty on his recommendation; but such preliminary board actions are subject, as elsewhere indicated, to various fiscal and budgetary controls by the legislature, the Governor, and the State financial or budgetary supervising officer.

It might be expected that the governing boards would prescribe in some detail the duties of the presidents, inasmuch as these officers in most States are the local administrative agents of the boards. In all but a few States such as Maryland, Nebraska, and Washington, the legislature has taken no action governing the duties of the presidents. Nevertheless, in the majority of States, the boards have no printed or other written rules governing the work of the president. When the governing boards prescribe such rules, they cover general types of duties more often than specific duties. Often the determination of the specific duties of the president, and his method of performing them, are left to general custom, institutional tradition, or the judgment of the president himself.

Although members of the governing boards and the presidents of the institutions legally determine the minimum and maximum teaching and service loads of faculty members, reports indicate that these officers have relied, to a considerable extent, in their determination of faculty load upon national, regional, and State standards for institutional accreditation. The teaching loads of faculty members average about 16 clock-hours per week, the maximum stated in most accrediting standards. The number of clock-hours averages slightly less in the larger institutions, including the State universities and land-grant colleges, and slightly more in the smaller institutions,

including the teachers colleges and normal schools. The total service load of the typical faculty member, that is, the total amount of time he devotes to all institutional responsibilities, is almost three times his teaching load. Service loads are usually determined in the institutions, rather than by overhead agencies of control.

Nearly all the institutional governing boards have final authority over the tenure of the presidents and faculty members. Although in more than half of the institutions faculty members are subject to annual reappointment, in effect their tenure is reasonably secure. The tenure of the presidents of the institutions is somewhat less secure, however, than that of their faculty members. The presidents have wider contacts with the general public, their actions are more subject to hostile scrutiny, and not infrequently they are more subject to group pressures inconsistent with the best interests of teacher education. In States where members of the governing boards are appointed for short terms by the Governor it occasionally happens that, through his appointees on the board, the Governor brings about the dismissal of presidents whose policies or actions are not in harmony with his own. The effect on the professional spirit of institutions under such conditions is usually unfortunate. On the other hand, there is a much larger number of States in which the tenure of the chief executive officers of the institutions is traditionally undisturbed so long as effective service is rendered. The tenure of such officers is practically indefinite in some States, illustrations of which are Alabama, New Hampshire, Tennessee, Vermont, and Virginia.

Sabbatical leaves of absence are available only to about one-fourth of the faculty members in State institutions of higher education. Irregular and occasional leaves of absence with or without pay, however, are granted to staff members for varying lengths of time. Typically, controlling boards make provisions for leaves of absence only upon the recommendation of the presidents.

Functions Relating to College Financial and Business Administration

The financial interest of the State in publicly controlled institutions of higher education is greater than is commonly realized. The total amount invested in property and funds of publicly controlled institutions is nearly $1\frac{1}{2}$ billion dollars. The income of publicly controlled institutions for educational and general purposes, and for plant extension purposes, totals more than \$300,000,000 annually. Of this amount, approximately half comes from State governments; that is, from appropriations of State legislatures or from fixed State taxes. Most of the total amount is expended by the 343 State institutions, although a part is used by some 23 city institutions of colle-

giate grade, and by some 199 city or district junior colleges and normal schools. The income of city and district institutions of higher education from State governments is relatively small.

The 150 boards that control State institutions of higher education, including 19 State boards of education, exercise major powers of control over the business management of the institutions in their charge. The exercise of such powers often constitutes the chief interest of board members. They also have important responsibilities and duties in connection with the financing of the institutions, at least to the point of securing funds from the State legislature. State departments of education that do not administer any institutions have relatively little to do with the financial and business management of higher education, except through the State superintendents who are members or officers of institutional boards.

The scope and importance of the task of financial administration of teacher-education institutions by the State departments of education and other State agencies is partially indicated by the amount of public funds involved. Teacher education, when a State enterprise, is supported very largely by State taxation. In 1937-38, the total general income of publicly supported teachers colleges and normal schools from State governments was \$30,756,503, which was 75 percent of their entire general income. To this may be added an estimated minimum of \$9,000,000 of State funds for increase of physical plant and other purposes. Student fees constituted 18.6 percent of the general income, and income from local county, city, and district governments constituted 4.7 percent. No other source accounts for as much as 1 percent. Total property funds amounted to \$216,619,925.

It is impossible to estimate accurately the amount of State government funds granted to State universities, land-grant colleges, colleges of arts and science, and junior colleges which is granted to these institutions for the purpose of educating college, high school, and elementary school teachers. Taking into account the relatively high cost of university graduate and undergraduate instruction and other services, it is safe to say that the totals given for teachers colleges and normal schools may be doubled, and the total cost to the public of educating all types of teachers will not have been reached. An annual expenditure of \$80,000,000 of State government funds for educating teachers of all types must be considered a low minimum estimate.

Although tuition rates in State institutions are occasionally prescribed in State laws, which sometimes specify that tuition shall be free, in actual practice State boards generally determine the exact amounts charged students for educational services. Faced with severe reductions in State appropriations during the financial stringencies of the past decade, boards in control of State institutions have

steadily increased tuition rates, sometimes under the guise of special "fees." The amounts derived from student tuition and fees in publicly controlled institutions increased from 13.5 percent of the receipts for current institutional purposes in 1925-26 to 16.2 percent in 1935-36. The percentage received from State and local governments during the same period decreased from 59.7 to 52.6.

Many city and other local boards of education have their own independent tax districts and control their own budgets. State teacher-education institutions must compete before the legislatures for State funds with numerous other State agencies, and are subject to State supervision in the expenditure of the funds they are granted. It is to be expected, therefore, that regardless of the type of board in control of the institutions, various officers in the general State government whose work is concerned with the raising, appropriation, distribution, spending, and accounting of State funds participate in some way in the financial and business operations of the State institutions of higher education. The resulting limitations in the powers of the controlling boards are illustrated in typical budgetary procedures.

Although budgetary procedures are exactly the same in no two States, the following representative pattern of action illustrates some limitations to the functions of institutional boards of control. The preparation of preliminary budget estimates for the institution is made by the president and his staff members, including his chief business officer and the heads of the departments or schools of the institution. The budget in its preliminary form then goes to the board in control of the institutions for revision and approval. Thereafter, it is submitted singly or in consolidated form with other institutional budgets to the State financial or budgetary supervising officer or agency for review and approval. Between the institutional board and the legislature, the general financial agent or agency of the State, may be a State executive department under the Governor; the Governor himself; a State fiscal officer who is responsible to the Governor; or a special fiscal board. Usually this intermediate officer or agency consults with representatives of the college board relative to changes or recommendations made by him. After a legislative committee and the legislature have taken action, the appropriation for the institution or institutions is then subject to the approval or veto of the Governor. So extensive are the powers of some of the agents or agencies intermediate between the legislature and the board of control, that they have in effect the power of financial supervision over the institutions.

Two particularly important problems often arise in the course of the foregoing budgetary procedure. The first arises when action by some agency between the institutional board or boards of control and the legislature interferes in the extremely important matter of securing

sufficient funds to run the institutions properly. The second arises when two or more separate institutional boards of control, or the presidents of institutions, engage in extreme competition for funds before the State legislature or the State financial officers. A remedy for undue competition is sometimes sought by consolidating all State institutions under one board. Complete consolidation has been effected, however, in only about one-fourth of the States. Another remedy is for the legislature and the central state budgetary office to convince separated boards and their administrative officers that voluntary cooperative activities get better results than competition. There are States in which voluntary cooperation is very effective. Colorado is a good example of several States in which the presidents of the State colleges formulate their legislative requests cooperatively, and present them as a united program.

The boards of control assume responsibility for most of the important business transactions involved in the conduct of the institutions. In most States, they approve the plans and specifications for new college buildings. Nearly all of them maintain unified systems of accounts for the several institutions under their control. In all but a few States, such accounts are examined and audited by the State auditor or equivalent officer.

Economies in purchasing by cooperative buying are being increasingly realized by the governing boards through voluntary or legally required centralization of the purchasing function in the hands of State purchasing officers. Very few of the institutional boards themselves administer centralized systems of purchasing, although voluntary associations of institutional business officers occasionally pool their purchases of similar items. The effectiveness of cooperative buying is forwarded by classification, standardization, and specification of all items of purchase; by close observance by purchasing officers of institutional specifications made in the light of educational needs; and by promptness in filling requisitions and orders promptly.

Trends in financing include a great increase in the amount of public support for teacher education during the present century. The total receipts from public funds for all teachers colleges and normal schools, both public and private in 1899-1900, was \$3,504,630. In 1937-38, corresponding receipts of publicly controlled teachers colleges and normal schools alone were more than \$40,000,000—more than 11 times as much as in 1899-1900.

During recent years, the increase in tuitions and fees paid by students is of considerable significance. Even small additional costs serve to limit the enrollments of students from the low-income economic groups of the population and to deprive them of the opportunity to receive a general and professional education.

Another trend of considerable importance is the increased assump-

tion of financial control by the executive agencies of the general State government. Usually established to assure expedient economies in State expenditures, such centralized agencies of general State financial control appear to have been organized on a permanent or semipermanent basis in some States. An additional trend has been the establishment during the past decade of much greater uniformity in the financial and business records and reports of institutions operating under different boards and in different States. The movement has spread to nearly all types of institutions of higher education, and has resulted in greater accuracy and easier comparison and consolidation on a national basis of reports made to various national and State agencies.

Curriculum Construction and Revision

In each of the 18 States in which the State board of education governs one or more institutions that educate teachers, the board has the legal right to make changes in institutional curricula or courses, through the direct channels of administrative control. Officials in each of these States report that the board prescribes the number and scope of curricula and courses of study offered by the institutions. However, in actual practice board "prescription" usually means that the board officially approves changes proposed by college staff members, or by the State department of education, or by both. Institutional curriculum revision in most States is a cooperative activity in which the institutions, the State department, and sometimes public school teachers and officials are engaged.

In States in which the State boards of education do not govern institutions of higher education, the boards with a few exceptions have no direct means of control over institutional curricula. One exception is the State board of education of Washington, which by law "approves courses for the State normal schools, for the department of education of the University of Washington, and the State College of Washington, and for all normal training departments of higher institutions within the State of Washington, which may be accredited and whose graduates may become entitled to receive teachers' life diplomas or professional certificates." A second exception is Indiana, where the State board of education is given definite legal responsibilities to arrange a regular system of professional instruction throughout the State, and to approve courses of study for specialized curricula. In Texas, the State board of education is charged with the duty of recommending changes in institutional courses of study, with special reference to the elimination of needless waste or duplication of work.

Reports from the 18 State-departments of education that administer teacher-education institutions indicate that nearly all these departments, under the authority of the State board, allocate curricula to varying extents among the institutions administered. Except in a

few States, curricula and courses are not greatly affected by such State department action. The assignment or allocation of specialized curricula to different institutions when actually effected is, however, one of the most direct and decisive means of curriculum control exercised by State governing boards. The purpose first is to concentrate the education of teachers of given grades or subjects in the institutions best fitted for such work. The second purpose is to meet the problem of institutional duplication of courses and curricula.

The problem of duplication is a serious one in some States. Eight States have a dozen or more State supported institutions of higher education each. Competition among two or more institutions offering work in the same fields has often led to unfortunate institutional conflicts and waste of State funds. Not infrequently, the State university, a separate land-grant college, a State college, and a number of State teachers colleges all offer arts and science courses and various curricula in special fields such as home economics, commerce and business, music, and the like. The work of junior colleges and various technical schools also must be considered. The problem in teacher education arises most frequently in duplication of work in arts and science and professional education between the State university and separate land-grant colleges; in the duplication of curricula in special subjects such as commerce and business among teachers colleges; and in the duplication of work on different instructional levels between the State university and State colleges, including for example, the teachers colleges on the graduate level.

Some States, such as Pennsylvania, New York, Connecticut, and a few others have attained measureable success in the allocation of curricula, especially in the teachers colleges. Only in the institutions governed by 1 board has any marked success been attained. Inasmuch as all of the State institutions and units of privately controlled institutions with State affiliations are under the control of 1 board in only 11 States (Nevada and Wyoming, with 1 institution each, are not considered), it is evident that allocation of curricula and courses among State institutions is limited in the country as a whole. Similarities among college courses and curricula are so great in most States that the departments of education and the governing boards obviously have a long way to go to effect curriculum allocations that substantially reduce duplication of offerings.

A certain amount of duplication of work among institutions in widely separated geographical areas of a State is often necessary and desirable. Most college students attend institutions relatively close to their homes. Many could not or would not attend college elsewhere. Service courses in general subjects are necessary even in highly specialized institutions. However, the unnecessary and wasteful duplication of work found among many institutions can be ex-

plained only by the fact that a State controlling or coordinating agency either is not in existence, or is not functioning.

Although a high degree of overhead State prescription of standardized courses in all or most of the teacher-education institutions of a State is nowhere desired, unquestionably more uniformity in courses of study for prospective teachers in the same fields is desirable in certain respects. State directors of teacher education, who advance uniformity in course terminology, secure more agreement among faculty members concerning course content, discourage the introduction or continuance of meager offerings in institutions where the need for them is doubtful, and otherwise coordinate or construct a teacher-education program for the entire State, are performing one of the most important functions of their office.

Two-thirds of the 18 State departments that administer teacher-education institutions report that, in varying degrees, they integrate or coordinate the curriculum programs of all the State institutions that educate teachers. In all States, the State boards of education and the departments of education have certain more or less indirect means of control over institutional curricula. The most important among these means include the prescription in certification requirements of professional, academic, and special courses and curricula uniformly for the State. A much less effective means is the prescription of standards for accreditation that involve curricula. The most effective means that is voluntarily undertaken is curriculum revision participated in by representatives of the State departments, the institutions, and occasionally the public schools or other interested agencies. Other means of State control or guidance are also occasionally reported. The legislatures by legal enactment sometimes require the teaching of certain subjects; for example, Wisconsin laws require that courses in agricultural economics shall be given in the several normal schools and in certain other specified types of institutions. In some States, among which are Alabama, Connecticut, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, and West Virginia, some control is exercised through approving the right of institutions to grant degrees or diplomas.

The organized procedures whereby curricula and courses are changed as a result of State certification and accreditation are discussed in detail in accompanying sections of this chapter. The extent to which the State departments or other State certification agencies influence institutional courses and curricula through certification depends largely upon minimum scholastic requirements and upon the extent to which specific courses are required as prerequisites for the issuance of certificates. The influence of certification course requirements is decidedly less on institutional offerings in academic subjects than in strictly professional subjects. Usually majors, minors, or

other general patterns of work in broad subject-matter fields are prescribed more frequently for certificates than specific courses in such fields.

Certification requirements are often specific and detailed in respect to courses in professional education. Every State now requires a minimum amount of college work in professional education for one or more types of certificates, and a number of States require specific professional courses or subjects. For example, student teaching in amounts ranging from two to six semester hours is required in approximately three-fourths of the States. Such State requirements have hastened materially the increase in the number of courses in professional education offered by colleges.

Some institutions, usually colleges of arts and sciences, object to specific State requirements in professional education. The provision of training schools, supervising teachers, and special professional facilities is a serious financial burden to weak institutions. Some excellent colleges of arts and sciences do not wish to vocationalize their curricula. However, the institutions that object tend to decrease in number as teachers become increasingly professionalized.

Control over curricula and courses through accreditation requirements is of a general nature only, in most States. The standards used in accreditation rarely apply directly to specific courses, and only occasionally apply to specific curricula. However, a few States elsewhere mentioned induce institutions, by applying specific standards, to strengthen their courses in certain curricula and to eliminate weak courses and curricula altogether. In most States, accreditation by State agencies is not an important element of State board control over changes in specific courses and curricula, although it may tend to hasten somewhat the general improvement of the institutions.

Although most States consider continuing revision activities their most convenient means for improving the offerings of the institutions, excellent results are obtained through occasional curriculum revision programs that are highly organized and conducted intensively for a definite period of time, with the publication of revised courses of study as an outcome. Several States have recently undertaken the latter intensive type of program. A few illustrations of such programs follow; these are chosen because of certain noteworthy features rather than because of the magnitude of the programs.

In Alabama, the central steering committee of a teachers' college curriculum revision program met first in October 1937, at the State department offices. The State director of the division of instruction presided. Representatives from four State teachers' colleges, from certain county supervisory offices, and from the State department were present. The committee proceeded to define its purposes and duties. The guiding principles which should be followed in setting

up and carrying forward the program were formulated, and its organization perfected. Later, institutional steering committees were organized, and regional meetings held in each of the four teachers' colleges. Joint meetings were later held with the State steering committees. As the program continued to expand, interest increased and new activities were undertaken; as a single example of many that could be mentioned, an evaluation by classroom teachers of teachers' college training was secured. The program was still under way in 1940.

Public-school curriculum revision programs often center in colleges, and their outcomes frequently suggest or necessitate changes in the institutional and training school teacher-education curricula. Institutional curriculum changes result in modifications of materials taught in the public schools by the graduates of the institutions. Programs in Arkansas and Texas illustrate these conditions. The chief purposes of the 5-year Arkansas program were (a) the in-service education of teachers; and (b) the revision of curricula. Considerable work in the revision program has been done in curriculum laboratories at the University of Arkansas during the summer sessions by the curriculum director and by elementary and secondary school inspectors of the State department; and the several published courses produced, while of primary interest to elementary- and secondary-school teachers in service, are being used also by those who educate teachers. In Texas, the State curriculum program is advanced through the operation of a curriculum laboratory at the University of Texas, where an annual curriculum conference for which college credit is given has been held for several years, and through summer-session activities conducted on the workshop plan in all State colleges of senior grade. Important outcomes of this program include the development of cooperative research by teachers and institutions and the development of institutional interest in public-school problems.

Ohio reports the initiation of a graduate council of Ohio institutions of higher learning, which is beginning to be assistance in the coordination of graduate offerings. In the same State, institutional committees have assisted materially in formulating certification regulations in special subjects, and in improving courses of study. Other States that report more or less intensified curriculum programs in recent years include Connecticut, Illinois, Indiana, Maine, Massachusetts, Mississippi, New York, Virginia, and West Virginia. Additional States in which curriculum-revision activities are reported to be significant and more or less continuous in nature include Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Michigan, Missouri, Minnesota, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Vermont, Washington, and Wisconsin. In a few of these States activities are quite limited, and not all

States that are doing significant curriculum work are here reported. However, the number of States listed is significant, for curriculum revision is considered one of the most important duties which can be initiated by State departments in their efforts to improve the education of teachers.

The procedures that characterize successful intensive curriculum revision programs of State department officers to improve the curricula of institutions that educate teachers are to be noted. Although flexible, the curriculum revision program is organized in accordance with sound administrative principles. Although under the nominal jurisdiction of the State superintendent, the immediate responsibility for the administration of the program is in the hands of a competent director, usually from the State department or the faculty of one of the institutions. Some one person, usually the head of a committee or subcommittee, is definitely responsible for each important step in the program. Under various titles, there is a central or executive committee, production committees, numerous special committees, State officials who serve as consultants and in various other capacities, curriculum specialists or consultants, and general and special subject committees in each institution as needed. Each person participating knows his duties, and if he needs help, is given guidance. Not only State department and institutional officers and staff members, but also public school supervisors, principals and superintendents participate; and often lay groups as well. Needs of special subject-matter groups in the institutions are met by small special committees. All groups concerned are sensitized to the needs for the program, and are kept informed concerning its progress and outcomes. Finally, the program does not end completely with the publication of courses of study; it provides for the training and encouragement of staff members in the use of the materials provided, and for the perpetuation of the program as a continuing curriculum revision activity.

Detailed institutional curriculum adjustments, selection of textbooks and references, and of course, nearly all matters pertaining to actual classroom instruction in the colleges, are not matters in which the governing boards or the State departments of education give assistance through the channels of administrative control. The help the State department staffs may offer the institutions in such matters is extended perhaps most freely in county normal schools, teacher-training high schools, and State junior colleges. Acceptance of the help that is provided is not mandatory. It is most often given through consultations, conferences, and dissemination of mimeographed or printed syllabi, statistics concerning State needs, and similar materials.

State legislatures directly or indirectly force certain curriculum

changes at times upon the State teacher-education institutions and upon their governing boards, by enacting requirements with respect to the teaching of certain elementary or secondary school subjects or topics. This is done through the requirement that certain subjects or topics shall or shall not be taught in the public schools; or that knowledge of them shall be prerequisite for teacher certification. Inasmuch as the public-school teachers are expected to be prepared in accordance with current State educational policy, the teacher-education institutions as well as the public schools must somehow provide instruction in the required subjects.

Potentially, the interference of the general State government in the determination of the curriculum is a very important issue, because such determination is commonly esteemed by educators as their own professional privilege. Practically, such interference only occasionally becomes an active issue. Most of the legislative requirements pertain to subjects that would be taught in any case, such as history of the United States, or the three R's. Other subjects, such as the nature of alcoholic drinks (required in every State), humane treatment of animals, morals, the Bible, thrift, safety, and the like would probably not be totally ignored in any State teacher-education institution, regardless of legislative mandates.

The State departments of education not infrequently serve as channels through which private philanthropy assists in curriculum building in the teacher-education institutions, and the public schools. As one example among many that could be given, the State department of education of Virginia was granted in 1939, \$36,600 by the General Education Board for use over a 3-year period, to assist in the inauguration of a system of coordinators who will serve as consultants and assistants in curriculum revision in the high schools and in four selected State teacher-education institutions. These coordinators will bring to the institutions a first-hand knowledge of the problems of adjustment required in the revision program, and perhaps initiate a permanent institutional curriculum revision program. Another example has been afforded for a number of decades by the granting of foundation and other philanthropic funds to State institutions for the preservice education of Negro teachers.

First among significant trends in curriculum construction and revision is the lengthening of normal-school and teachers-college curricula. Most of the State normal schools have become teachers colleges. The number of these schools at the close of successive decades is: 1920, 137; 1930, 66; and 1940, 30. Twenty-five or more State teachers colleges during the latter half of the same period, 1920-40, have lengthened their curricula to include at least 1 year of graduate work. Usually curriculum changes such as the foregoing are made only upon the direction or approval of the State

board of education in control of the institutions; and sometimes legislative authorization is necessary as well.

Second among curriculum trends is the increased number of courses offered, as curricula have been extended and enriched. There was a temporary slackening of this increase during the depths of the depression, but it appears to be again under way. Although the increase in the number of courses in the arts and sciences has been especially marked, the number of courses in professional education and in special or nonacademic subjects are increasing as well.

Other trends include the increasing conduct of curriculum revision programs; more emphasis upon the selection of curriculum content from a functional rather than a traditional basis; and the improvement and extension of student-teaching facilities.

Answers to a question concerning the important functions which officials of State departments of education are not now performing, but which they believe they should perform, stress the need for much more State department participation in curriculum construction and revision. State directors of teacher education suggest the need for better planning and more widespread allocation of specialized curricula. For example, graduate work for public school teachers is increasingly in demand and if introduced in all State 4-year colleges without plan beforehand, leads to much duplication and ineffective work. The directors believe that specialized work in music, art, health and physical education, adult education, and other curricula should be provided in accordance with a program planned for all State institutions. More agreement is desired among State department officials and college teachers in different States, concerning the nature of superior curricula that might be adopted uniformly in the teacher-education institutions of a number of States, or at least in all the State institutions of the same State. In order to assume leadership in curriculum revision, a larger staff and more control over the institutions are desired by some, who point out that their present control over curricula is exercised almost entirely through certification requirements.

The most effective work of a nonadministrative nature done by the State departments of education in the improvement of the curricula of institutions that educate teachers, consists in the initiation, stimulation, and organization, of curriculum revision by the institutional faculty members. Curriculum construction and reorganization in any case should be primarily in the hands of the faculties. In cooperative curriculum revision programs conducted by the several institutions, or by the institutions and the State department, the State department officers, including directors of teacher education and certification, subject-matter specialist in various fields, and others usually partici-

pate to best advantage as consultants, organizers, and coordinators in the numerous conferences, workshops, committee work in the preparation of materials, and other activities necessary in the construction and revision of courses of study.

A central coordinating and service agency is needed in most institutional programs of curriculum revision; and this the State department is in an admirable position to provide. Not infrequently, faculty members of the institutions profit through arrangements made by the State department staffs, whereby the faculty members are given opportunities to participate in public-school curriculum-revision programs. Institutional curriculum-revision programs often originate through conferences called by the State department. State department staff members not infrequently teach in summer sessions of the institutions, or assist in the conduct of curriculum workshops. In all such activities, there is no suggestion of State department prescription of the content of the subjects taught. Nevertheless, the professional abilities of the State department staff members are utilized effectively for the improvement of the curricula in the institutions that prepare the teachers of the State.

Administration of Student Teaching

Observation and student teaching facilities are essential in the education of teachers. They are provided in all State teachers colleges and normal schools, and in practically all the remaining State institutions that educate teachers. As a rule, these facilities are located in public schools, or utilize public-school pupils. Since the local administration of public schools is in the hands of local district or county authorities, the provision of ways and means to make available their unhampered use by State teacher-education institutions is a matter of primary concern to State authorities. Although some institutions are enabled to secure student-teaching facilities through the good graces and cooperation of public-school authorities, such cooperative arrangements if not legally enforceable are likely to be disrupted at any time to the great disadvantage of the institutions.

In approximately four-fifths of the States maintaining State normal schools and teachers colleges, there is more or less specific legislation that directly or by implication authorizes or legalizes the establishment of training-school facilities. In most States, the legislatures have delegated the authority for establishing training schools to the institutional governing boards. Authority has been delegated also to the chief State school officer, as in California and New York, and partially in Vermont. In some States, the presidents of the several institutions have been delegated complete or partial authority, as in Mississippi, Pennsylvania, and Tennessee. In about half the States

having teachers colleges and normal schools, the institutions have been given specific authority to contract with local school authorities for the provision of student-teaching facilities.⁵

In actual practice, the detailed arrangements with the public schools whereby adequate practice facilities are assured is the responsibility of institutional officers. Often it is a difficult one for them to meet. The even more difficult task of maintaining harmonious and effective relationships are nearly always their responsibility also. Needs for greater State assistance, either through legislation or State board and department of education action, are indicated by the nature of the problems confronting institutional officers in the provision of practice facilities.

The most difficult among these problems is the lack of pupils for practice in the area surrounding the institutions. Often due to poor location of the institutions, the only feasible remedy short of moving or closing the institution, is to transport student teachers away from the institution, or to transport pupils to it. This involves appreciable expense in money and time.

The control of the practice schools, if solely by public-school authorities, or if divided between them and the institution, often constitutes a problem. There are many adaptations necessary in the public-school curricula and schedule of classes, numerous additional demands made upon the staff, and considerable experimentation and errors in practice introduced when laboratory school work is conducted in a public school. Public-school and community good will is often stretched to the breaking point by such changes and conditions unless compensating advantages are offered by the laboratory-school program.

Financial arrangements are often the cause of friction. The proportionate share to be paid for buildings, salaries of supervising or critic teachers and other expenses must be adjusted satisfactorily to the institution and to local school authorities.

There are a number of ways in which the State agencies of overhead control are of assistance to the institutions in meeting the foregoing and related problems. In a number of States, statutes are in force that make satisfactory local arrangements possible for laboratory facilities. In others, where the institutional board of control is also the board in control of the public schools, the mandate of the board ensures satisfactory working conditions. In still others, financial arrangements on the part of the State and institutions are sufficiently liberal to induce public-school authorities to cooperate.

A particularly important function of the departments of education in some States is the establishment of standards relative to student

⁵ For a detailed discussion of this topic see:

Allen, Cecil H. Legal principles governing practice teaching in State teacher colleges, normal schools, and public schools.

Mead, Arthur B. Supervised student teaching. Pp. 681-807.

teaching, and the enforcement of such standards after they are established. Enforcement in institutions not governed by the State board of education is usually undertaken, if at all, through the processes of institutional accreditation and teacher certification. Such standards govern the ratio of practice pupils to student teachers, the ratio of student teachers to supervising teachers and critics, the amount of time to be given to student teaching by prospective teachers, the amount of credit in student teaching required for certification, and other practices and requirements.

Certain conditions characterize institutional situations in which satisfactory laboratory-school facilities exist. The institution is located where a fairly abundant supply of pupils reside near the institution. The State has provided an institutional campus school entirely under the control of the institution; and, in addition, public schools are available nearby in which representative public-school situations exist. In the major portion of the schools or classes provided for training, the selection of the teaching and supervisory staff is made, or at least approved, by the institution. Changes in the course of study, material facilities, time schedules, methods of instruction, and the like can be made with reasonable freedom by those directing the training program. Experimentation is not unduly cramped. Both campus and cooperating public schools receive public-school funds. In Connecticut, for example, the State board of education contracts with local school boards for elementary-school facilities, and except for attendance, administers through the teachers colleges the elementary schools provided. The State board is recompensed at the end of the year by the local board for the training given pupils in these schools.

In satisfactory laboratory-school situations, cooperative work is conducted that is advantageous alike to the teacher-education institution, to the laboratory school, and to public-school pupils. In Maine, for example, the State department of education assists financially in a form of in-service teacher education in the normal schools, and of off-campus student teaching, that involves an exchange of places by public-school teachers with limited training, and competent student teachers. The public-school teacher attends the normal school for a 6 weeks' program and the student teacher, under close supervision, serves as her substitute in the public schools. The State department assists by paying the expenses of the critic teacher and of the institutional director of training to and from the normal school, and the school where the student teacher is assigned. Although few other States have plans similar to those of Maine, many States have institutions offering laboratory school work in cooperating public schools that is so superior to that in the surrounding public schools, that public school authorities, patrons, and pupils alike raise little if any

question concerning the use of the school for practice purposes.

It is becoming common practice for the State board to supplement salaries of public-school teachers who assist as part-time critics or supervisors of student teachers in affiliated public schools. High tuition fees are considered regrettable in public schools. Transportation of pupils to the schools is increasingly believed to be the concern of the public schools rather than of the institution.

In many States, realization of the foregoing conditions would be greatly forwarded by statutes giving the State board of education broad powers and definite responsibilities for directing and unifying the institutional and the public-school facilities used for laboratory purposes and by more effective control and supervision by the State department of education. Additional funds added to the budgets of the institutions would make possible the supplementing of salaries of specially qualified supervisors in the public schools, who assist student teachers. The State director of teacher education and certification logically would have important functions in advancing effective local relationships through recommendations and advisory services.

Functions Relating Indirectly to Institutions That Educate Teachers

A detailed presentation of certification practices and requirements in 1937 is made in another bulletin of the U. S. Office of Education.⁶ Only such aspects of certification as are of particular pertinacy in the *Studies of State Department of Education* are presented in this section.

Certification of Teachers

Powers and limitations of central State certification agencies.—Although the selection and the employment of teachers are almost invariably the functions of local school authorities, each State may prescribe such qualifications for teachers as public policy may demand. The State places its final sanction upon such employees by certifying them. Every State in the Union, with the exception of Massachusetts, makes legal provisions for the certification of all or most of its public-school teachers. Massachusetts makes provisions for the State certification of certain special types of teachers or administrators only.

Directors of certification perform a wide variety of functions, chief among which are: Advisory service to applicants for certificates; issuance of certificates, and recording of those issued; evaluation of credentials and passing upon merits of applicants; publication and interpretation of certification requirements; approval of institutions from which certification credentials are submitted; and making

⁶ Frazier, Benjamin W. *Development of State programs for the certification of teachers.*

of recommendations concerning desirable changes in certification requirements.

In all States, certification requirements are expressed as minimum requirements. Employment requirements of school employing officers may and often do exceed the certification minima that are prescribed. In more than two-thirds of the States, requirements are not made for private-school teachers.

The certification laws of some States specify little more than the officers who shall issue certificates, and the general conditions whereby certificates are to be issued. In other States, the legislatures specify the requirements for different types of certificates in much detail. Educators regard the formulation of detailed certification requirements as a function that should be performed by professional staff members of the State department of education, and not by the legislature.

Organization.—There has been a trend toward the centralization of the function of teacher certification into the hands of a single State agency, since State government began. Although the trend has progressed so far that in most States centralization is complete or almost so, there are still numerous States in which several agencies issue certificates, more or less under the supervision of the State departments of education. The State board of education is the principal controlling agency for the certification of teachers in approximately two-thirds of the States, and the chief State school officer in somewhat less than one-third. A State board of examiners usually affiliated with the State department, grants all or some of the certificates in eight States. In every State there are one or more centralized certifying agencies that grant certificates.

In a score of States, there are one or more county or local agents or agencies that grant certificates under more or less control of the State board of education and of the State department of education. These may be county superintendents, or county boards of education or examiners; city superintendents, or city boards of education or examiners; and institutions of higher education. In 5 States, county boards of education or of examiners, or county superintendents of schools, issue certificates. These are issued, under varying degrees of State control, in Arkansas, Illinois, Missouri, Mississippi, and California. In an additional State, Massachusetts, only a limited number of State certificates are issued; but local town committees have wide powers of certification. In 9 States, certain State teachers colleges, normal schools, universities, and colleges that educate teachers issue certificates; or the college degrees or diplomas in themselves constitute certificates. The 9 States are: Colorado, Idaho, Kansas, Missouri, Montana, New York, North Dakota, Utah, and Washington. In 12 States, 1 or more cities are authorized to issue certificates.

These States include Colorado, Delaware, Illinois, Kansas, Maryland, Massachusetts, Missouri, New Jersey, New York, North Dakota, Oregon, and Washington. In typical States in which cities or institutions issue certificates, a fairly high degree of State control is maintained over such issuance.

State boards of educational examiners are found in eight States—Colorado, Illinois, Iowa, Mississippi, Montana, New Jersey, Ohio, and Texas. Each board grants some or all of the State certificates, or recommends their issuance. The boards operate in such close conjunction with the departments of education, that from a functional viewpoint most of them are considered units of the departments.

No two boards function exactly alike. In Illinois, the State examining board, the superintendent of public instruction, the county superintendents, and the board of education of a city having a population exceeding 200,000, all issue certificates. Those issued by county superintendents and by the State examining board are limited in scope and length of validity. The superintendent of public instruction is chairman of the State examining board, all members of which consist of professional educators.

In Iowa, the superintendent of public instruction is the president and executive officer of the board of educational examiners. The four additional members of the board are appointed by the Governor. One is president of a State college; one is president of a private college that educates teachers; one is a city superintendent of schools; and one is a county superintendent of schools. The board issues and renews certificates; approves teacher-training courses in colleges and universities, and performs other duties prescribed by law. The board has an executive secretary, who in addition to the supervision of the issuance of certificates, coordinates the work in the field and assists in forwarding the teacher-preparation program through visitation and other contacts with the institutions. In New Jersey, the State board of examiners holds examinations, and grants and revokes certificates, under rules and regulations prescribed by the State board of education.

Scope of service; number and types of certificates issued.—There are more than a million holders of teachers' certificates in this country. According to partially estimated figures by Emens, approximately 199,750 certificates were granted in 1938 in the 48 States. The number varied by States, from less than 150 in Delaware and in Massachusetts, to more than 17,000 in Pennsylvania. The average number granted per State was approximately 4,160. The percentage that the number of certificates granted annually in given States, was of the number of teachers in those States, varied from less than 10 percent to more than 80 percent.⁷

⁷ Emens, John R. *State administration of teacher personnel*. Pp. 216-18.

The different kinds of certificates are numbered by the hundreds. In no two States are they exactly the same. Different types of certificates are variously issued among States, to elementary teachers of different grade levels, to junior-high-school teachers, and to senior-high-school teachers of different academic subjects. Furthermore, special certificates are issued to superintendents, principals, general supervisors, supervisors and teachers of special subjects, school librarians, and a wide variety of other workers in education.

Certification requirements.—The most significant differences in certification among the several States are found in the scholarship requirements for certificates. Minimum requirements for elementary teachers range from the indefinite requirements of examinations, given in 12 States to high-school graduates and to persons of less preparation, to 4 years of college work, required by 9 States. In typical States, the minimum level averages nearly 3 years for elementary-school teachers, and 4 years for high-school teachers. The 9 States that require 4 years of college work as a minimum include Arizona, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Indiana, Louisiana, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, and Rhode Island. The States that in May 1940, definitely planned to reach the 4-year minimum before the close of 1942 included New York, Ohio, Utah, Virginia, and Washington.

Minimum requirements in professional education for inexperienced teachers of academic high-school subjects range from 6 to 25 semester-hours. The median of such requirements is approximately 18 semester hours. Student teaching is one of the most important prescribed subjects in professional education. It is required in 35 States to an extent, on the average, of 3 to 4 semester hours.

Minimum age requirements, specified in 37 States, range from 17 to 20 years; typically, the requirement is 18 years. Twenty-five States require proof of good health; 20 States, citizenship or declaration of intention to assume citizenship; and 20 States, an oath of allegiance to the Constitution of the United States or to the State constitution.

Certificates are issued upon any one of three bases: Upon college credentials, upon examination, or in exchange for certificates already issued. Every State issues one or more types of certificates upon the basis of college credentials. Nineteen States also issue one or more types of certificates in addition, upon the basis of examinations administered either by the State departments of education, or by county or other local school authorities. Most of these certificates are of very low grade, and there is a tendency to abolish them. Only seven States will exchange their certificates for certificates issued by other States; and they will do this only under certain prescribed conditions. One reason for the limited interstate exchange of certificates is, that the terminology, standards and requirements for cer-

tificates differ so much among States, that it is extremely difficult for certification officers of different States to ascertain the equivalency of the certificates issued.

Interstate relationships.—Although the administration of education is reserved to the Several States, there are National as well as State needs that should receive consideration in the administration of teacher certification and other teacher personnel functions. There is a widespread movement of teachers and teachers-in-training from State to State. Although this is desirable, differences among States in certification regulations and requirements for teachers' certificates constitute difficulties and in some cases formidable barriers to the interstate migration of teachers. Some requirements are specifically designed to favor State residents; other requirements do so indirectly. Partially as a consequence, there are inequalities among States in teacher supply and demand, in the proficiency of teachers, in vocational opportunities for prospective teachers, and in career opportunities for teachers in service. Only cooperative action among States can obviate such difficulties.

There have been promising movements recently among State directors of teacher education and certification, and cooperating institutional agencies, in attaining agreement on principles of reciprocity in certification among States. Inevitably, the problem of what constitutes acceptable standards, practices, and requirements in teacher education have also been considered. The representatives of the teacher education divisions of selected southern State departments of education, the teacher-training committee of the Southern University Conference, a committee of the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, and the General Education Board have joined during the past 4 year in a cooperative study of uniformity and reciprocity in certification and related problems. Committees were appointed in each State, regional conferences were held in selected centers, and a general conference was held. Criteria as guides for the education and certification of teachers were set up, and the beginnings of concrete patterns of practice were initiated.

Promising interstate cooperative efforts among the Southern States have been followed in recent months by the initiation of work along somewhat similar lines by the North Central Association Committee on the *Preparation of Secondary School Teachers*, which has received a grant from the General Education Board for a series of conferences in connection with a 1-year study of the certification of secondary-school teachers in the north-central area. A subcommittee on teacher certification and accrediting agencies has initiated activities with promising results.

Still another development began in 1938, that involved the inter-

state cooperation of certification directors. This was the conferences and conference report of the Midwest Regional Conference on Certification, in Des Moines, Iowa. In this conference, certification directors and others joined in deliberations and in the collection and exchange of information concerning certification of out-of-State teachers, teacher supply and demand, certification and teacher-education programs, and the improvement of certification standards. Meetings of other regional groups of State directors also are held occasionally; and there is a National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification, which annually considers problems of interstate reciprocity in certification and related problems.

In States having the most widely approved plans of certification, certain trends are under way which include: (1) A steady elevation of the scholastic requirements for teachers, averaging about 1 year of work each decade; (2) increased specialization of certificates for specific subjects and types of work; (3) a decrease in the number and kinds of certificates issued by county and other local authorities; (4) prescription, in increasing amounts and by an increasing number of States, of professional education; and (5), increasing emphasis upon the issuance of probationary certificates that are renewable only after additional college preparation has been secured.

There has been a very significant trend in the centralization of teacher certification in the hands of the State board, superintendent, or department of education. Once certification was almost entirely the concern of local school districts. The number of State systems in which the issuance of all certificates is completely controlled by the State (city and institutional issuance not considered) increased from 3 in 1898 to 42 in 1940. During the same period, the number of full-time professional staff officers of the departments of education performing the certification function increased at a fairly steady rate from fewer than six in all States to one or more in practically every State.

The relationships of teacher certification and teacher education are close and vital. It will be observed that most of the foregoing trends directly affect the curricula or the courses of the teacher-education institutions. On the other hand, certification requirements are determined very largely by the nature of the education given teachers by the institutions, and by the supply of applicants for certificates. Coordination of teacher-education and certification requirements exists in varying degrees among States, and is entirely complete in none, because of great variations in the degree of centralized control exercised over teacher education by the several State offices, and because of the lack of coordination of the work of the different teacher-education institutions by the institutions themselves.

Teacher-Placement Services

The placement of public-school teachers, supervisors, and administrators in the positions best fitted to them is an important step in the series of activities involved in the administration of State teacher personnel. Teacher-placement organizations and agencies exist in great number and variety, but for the most part their activities are uncoordinated. Most of the 1,196 institutions that educate teachers assist their graduates with widely varying effectiveness to secure positions. However, institutional placement is generally confined to local areas. During recent years, the institutions usually have had a surplus of unplaced graduates, who were not informed concerning vacancies in areas served by other institutions. Scores of commercial teachers' agencies assist in placement, but they charge commissions and fees that many teachers do not care to pay. Only a few of the State education associations assist teachers to secure positions. Sometimes employers of teachers visit teacher-education institutions and school systems and invite teachers and prospective teachers to apply for or to accept positions, but most teachers do not receive such invitations.

To a very large extent, the finding of teaching vacancies is dependent upon the individual initiative and efforts of the teachers themselves. Without definite information concerning vacancies, an applicant at considerable expense of time and effort may send out a dozen or more applications, thus confusing the process of appointment and giving employing officers a false sense of teacher oversupply. One school system may have scores of satisfactory applications for a single vacancy, whereas another may have none. Under such conditions, many poor teachers secure positions, while many good ones remain unplaced, partly because the supply of applicants is unequally distributed among different schools and States.

The frequent lack of effectiveness in teacher placement due to the foregoing conditions is of direct concern to State departments of education. No other agency is in as good a position as the departments to coordinate the work of the different local teacher-placement offices; to assist out-of-State teachers to secure positions within the State; to assist in the equalization of the supply of teachers throughout the State; and to perform similar services.

In practically all States, local school employing officers upon occasion informally request State department staff members for help in finding teachers, or for recommendations concerning applicants. Similarly, teachers not infrequently write to, or interview, the State officers concerning possible vacancies. Directors of teacher education and State supervisors rightfully feel that even if they are not held directly responsible for teacher placement, it is a professional service of high

order that is worthy of their attention. Informed concerning a worthy teacher out of work, or a teaching vacancy, departmental employers pass the information along to interested inquirers orally or by correspondence. When requests become numerous, the departmental staff members may simply list the names of applicants who wish positions, and send the lists to prospective employers upon request. Application blanks, record forms, names of references, and other materials invaluable in effective placement may or may not be required for the State department files. Very little is done, however, to coordinate or to supplement the placement activities of the State teacher-education institutions, or to assist worthy out-of-State teachers in three-fourths of the States where no organized placement service of any kind is maintained.

In 12 States, the departments of education conduct teacher-placement bureaus or organized placement services. These States include Alabama, Florida, Idaho, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, New Hampshire, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Vermont, and Wyoming. In a few of these States, services are quite limited; in others, they are extensive. If the States in which departmental officers and supervisors render only informal, occasional, or incidental placement services were included in the foregoing list, it would be considerably lengthened. Illustrative States rendering informal placement services are: Delaware, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, New Mexico, and Texas. In several States, supervisors or directors of vocational education are active in the placement of vocational teachers. In most of the States having State placement offices, the placement of teachers is conducted only as a part-time job by one or more employees of the department of education.

The State placement offices do not contribute very largely to the placement of teachers in the country as a whole. In a study of the means whereby 8,416 teachers in cities, independent high schools, and counties were located in positions in 1929-30, it was found that less than 1 percent were located through State appointment bureaus. Both institutional placement bureaus and commercial teachers' agencies placed far more teachers than the State placement services.⁸ The situation has not changed materially since this study was made.

The trend toward the establishment of State placement services was quite marked between 1910, when such services were reported by only 1 State, and 1923, when 17 States reported them.⁹ Since 1923, the number of States having such services has not changed greatly, although the number of teachers placed by each office has increased in several States. During recent years, the decline in the rate of

⁸ Deffenbaugh, W. S., and Zeigel, William H. Selection and appointment of teachers.

⁹ Ferguson, Arthur W. Professional staff of State departments of education. P. 7.

growth in the number of new teachers has doubtless affected somewhat the extent of State placement services.

In a few States, teacher placement is considered an essential part of the State department teacher-personnel program. Typical among such States is Pennsylvania, which began to offer placement services soon after the first World War. For some time this service has been considered one of the important functions of the office of teacher education and certification. The practices of the placement office are similar in many respects to those of a well-organized university teacher-placement bureau. Any persons qualified to teach in Pennsylvania may register for the service, which is free to registrants and to school officials. The placement officers of the teacher-education institutions and their organization, the Pennsylvania Institutional Placement Association, are invited to use the State placement service and to cooperate in its work. Such cooperation has been found essential. Throughout the years of its service up to and including August 31, 1938, 48,350 candidates had registered in the office, and 9,814 requests for their services had been received.

Another well-developed State teachers' employment bureau is conducted by the State department of education of Minnesota. The total number of teachers enrolled with the bureau from April 23, 1913, to June 30, 1938, was 39,215. The number of teachers for whom positions were secured was 15,756; and their aggregate salaries totaled more than 17 million dollars. In a single year, 1937-38, the bureau enrolled 1,317 teachers. Of these, 223 were placed. In some years, the proportion of registrants placed is much higher.

Recently a new departure in State placement services has appeared, in the teachers' placement divisions of the State employment services that are affiliated with the U. S. Employment Service. These cooperate with, but are not usually organized in, the State departments of education. In May 1940, these divisions were operating in 11 States: Colorado, Georgia, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, Utah, and Wisconsin. The States having such services, which are free to employers and teachers, are growing in numbers. The operation of these placement divisions is not greatly different from that of other organized placement agencies.

There are differences of opinion among State officers concerning the desirability of teacher placement as a State department activity. As in the case of certain other activities, those officers having well-developed services are inclined to think that such work is essential not only in their own States, but also in others. On the other hand, when such services are not offered, there is likely to be doubt as to their desirability, regardless of whether or not they have been tried or the need for them explored.

Educational authorities who favor the State teacher-placement

agency, rightly point out that teacher placement is conducted ineffectively in many places, because of lack of teacher-placement agencies, the smallness of the offices that exist, and the lack of central coordination of the placement activities of such offices. The State departments of education are in an excellent position to secure all the information they need concerning teachers and the schools that need their services. The departments usually could serve a wider area than any given teacher-education institution, and not infrequently could be of assistance to it in the placement of its graduates. A placement organization is needed that would assist out-of-State applicants or surplus applicants within the State, to make contacts with prospective employers. Fees and commissions for placement could be eliminated. It would appear that the State could perform few functions that would be more helpful to its schools, than to help them to secure the best teachers the market provides.

Despite a demonstrated need for better teacher-placement services, there are some objections stated to the establishment of State placement agencies. It is claimed that the departments already have so much to do that there is no time for teacher placement, which would duplicate the work of existing agencies in any case. Lack of personnel, office space, and equipment for the work is frequently reported. Doubtless complaints of employers and teachers concerning delay in submitting and revising lists of applicants, incomplete lists of vacancies, incomplete information about registrants, and the like are ultimately attributable to a lack of workers in the placement offices.

It may be observed with reference to the foregoing arguments that there is an undoubted need for some centralized free public placement agency to coordinate and extend the work of existing placement agencies, and to assist in forwarding the mobility of competent teachers both within and without the States. Despite the acknowledged limitations of typical teacher-placement services conducted by State departments of education, to date no more appropriate agency to meet the needs indicated has been found.

Other Teacher Personnel Functions

State departments of education perform or assist in the performance of several teacher-personnel functions other than those previously discussed. Treatment of these additional functions is not within the purview of this monograph. They are mentioned here only in order to indicate their general scope. State-wide teacher retirement or pension systems are found in 33 States. Although these systems are administered directly by the State board of education in fewer than 6 States, some of the State departments have important duties with

respect to them, such as the appointment of retirement board members, and the performance of executive services for the boards. Another function is the administration of State salary standards, established in some form in 24 States, and recognized to some extent in 6 others in the apportionment of State-aid funds. Still another function is the enforcement of State teacher-tenure laws and provisions, which are expressed as permanent tenure laws on a State-wide basis in 6 States, and as provisions authorizing long-time contracts and similar arrangements by local boards in 13 others. Finally, a very important function is the in-service improvement and supervision of public-school teachers in service. This is one of the most important functions performed by the State departments of education, and its various aspects constitute the subject of several monographs published by the U. S. Office of Education.

Summary of Findings

1. The general nature of the functions and services performed by the chief State educational agencies concerned with institutions that educate teachers is as follows: State boards of education in control of higher education institutions direct the general policies of such institutions on behalf of the State, and formulate the general rules and regulations that govern them. The State departments of education act as the administrative and advisory agencies of the boards with respect to the institutions under control of the boards, and as supervising or coordinating agencies with respect to other institutions. The presidents of the institutions act as the local executive officers of the controlling boards. In addition, they are usually accorded advisory powers with respect to board and departmental policies and administrative activities. With respect to State teacher-personnel activities, the board is the policy-making agency; the department, the administrative and advisory body.

2. Administrative and professional functions and services performed by State departments of education relating to the preservice education of teachers and other teacher-personnel activities vary widely among States. They range from little more than the administration of teacher certification, and some incidental or part-time activities of one or more officers of the State department, to the performance of numerous functions including the administration of a dozen or more State higher education institutions, the coordination or oversight on behalf of the State of 50 or more additional institutions, and the performance of a wide range of teacher-personnel functions such as teacher certification, placement, in-service education, and retirement.

Regulation of Teacher Supply and Demand

1. Regulation of the balance of teacher supply and demand through teacher certification, institutional accreditation, discontinuance of

institutions and of curricula, and voluntary limitation of enrollments by individual institutions, is not very effective.

2. Selective admission of students is an effective means of limiting the output of teachers, but its possibilities have been realized in few States.

3. In order for the State departments of education to regulate teacher supply and demand intelligently, it is essential for them to collect information concerning a large number of factors such as the number of teachers that are supplied by State and out-of-State institutions, and that are certificated, placed, unemployed, retired, and the like. Very few States collect such information to an extent that renders intelligent and effective regulation possible.

4. Selective admission requirements are increasingly prescribed. They are enforced chiefly in the Northeastern States, and in municipal teachers colleges and normal schools.

5. In States having selective admission, State and institutional quotas are usually prescribed by the State boards of education. Unfortunately, such quotas do not apply to institutions not under the control of the boards. They are applied chiefly in teachers colleges and normal schools, hence chiefly to prospective elementary-school teachers.

6. Recruitment of promising high-school students specifically for teaching is infrequently undertaken by State departments of education.

State Accreditation of Institutions

1. Nearly all State departments of education either informally approve or formally accredit institutions for teacher certification and education purposes. Some of them accredit also for student admission and transfer purposes. In addition, one or more State agencies including college associations and other organizations accredit institutions in some States for student admission and transfer purposes.

2. Accreditation by typical State agencies is not as rigidly nor as carefully done as accrediting by regional associations and by some national associations.

3. Many States have no standards for accrediting; some have very brief or very old standards; and only a limited number have standards pertaining to facilities specifically provided for the education of teachers, such as laboratory schools. Most State agencies accredit the institution as a whole, rather than its various curricula.

4. Because of the lack of selectivity in State lists of accredited institutions, State certification authorities and college admission officers have considerable difficulty in ascertaining the standing of many small out-of-State institutions from which prospective teachers and students submit credentials. Very little information of any kind is given concerning the institutions on most State accredited lists.

5. Several marked weaknesses in accreditation by State agencies are due to the recency of its development, to the operation of multiple accrediting agencies, and to a lack of staff members in the State department to develop and administer the work.

Functions Relating to College Staffs

1. Probably the most important duty of the governing boards of State institutions is to select the presidents of the institutions, and upon the recommendation of the presidents, appoint the college faculties. The boards also determine the tenure of staff members. Political and other outside interference in the performance of these functions exists in some States. There is a constant danger that such interference will interrupt the continuity of local institutional programs, upset faculty morale, and have other unfortunate effects.

2. Governing boards approve or recommend the amounts of salaries to be paid the presidents and faculty members. The boards can finally determine salaries only within definite limits, because the funds involved are subject to the control of the legislature and to some extent of the central financial agencies of the general State government.

3. Presidents of institutions are the local executive officers of the State boards of control, and usually are allowed considerable initiative in determining their own detailed duties and activities. Typically, there is much decentralization of institutional administration in the hands of the presidents. The counsel of the presidents often influences board policies.

Financial and Business Administration

1. The importance of State functions relative to college financial and business administration is indicated by the fact that the income of publicly controlled institutions for educational and general purposes, and for plant-extension purposes, totals more than \$300,000,000 annually; of which amount approximately half comes from State governments. There is an annual expenditure of approximately \$40,000,000 of State funds for the support of teachers colleges and normal schools alone, and double that amount, or more, for teacher education in all types of publicly controlled institutions.

2. The percentage of the current receipts of State institutions derived from student fees is steadily increasing, while the percentage received from State and local governments is decreasing.

3. There are important limitations in the powers of the institutional controlling boards in budgetary and other financial operations because of the interposition of control by the financial agencies of general State government. In some States, the agents or agencies intermediate between the legislatures and the institutional boards of control have in effect the power of financial supervision over the

institutions. These intermediate agents or agencies are usually directly responsible to the Governor.

4. Methods employed for reducing institutional competition for funds include among others, the consolidation of separate governing boards; submission of budgets to State budgetary officers prior to action by the legislature; and cooperative action by the presidents or boards of the institutions. Consolidation of governing boards appears the most satisfactory method.

5. There is danger of permanent and unnecessary damage to the institutions by the heavy curtailment of institutional funds by the financial agencies of general State government, if economies are undertaken unintelligently, that is, without the counsel and advice of institutional boards of control and their executive officers.

6. Trends in financing and business management include an eleven-fold or greater increase in the amount of public funds granted to teachers colleges and normal schools during the present century, an increase in the percentage of receipts from student fees, the increased assumption of financial and business control by the executive agencies of general State government, and the recent establishment of more uniform financial and business records and reports.

Curriculum Construction and Revision

1. In 18 States the State board of education has the legal right to initiate or approve changes in institutional curricula or courses in the teacher-education institutions it governs. The board brings about curriculum changes in institutions not under its control chiefly by indirect methods, such as teacher certification and stimulation of institutions to revise their curricula.

2. Although nearly all the State departments report that they allocate curricula among the institutions they assist in administering, the problem of unnecessary duplication of curricula and courses nevertheless remains a serious one among nearly all such institutions, as well as among those that are independently governed. State institutions in which most success is attained in the allocation of curricula are the teachers colleges and normal schools in certain New England and Middle Atlantic States.

3. There is great diversity in the titles of courses in professional education, and wide differences in curriculum requirements, for prospective teachers of the same subjects or in the same fields. Although two-thirds of the 18 State departments administering teacher-education institutions report that they coordinate or integrate the curriculum programs of the institutions, typically this is done to a limited extent only.

4. One of the most effective means of coordinating curricula and courses in different institutions is voluntary curriculum revision

participated in by representatives of the State department, the institutions, and the public schools. The participation in revision programs by lay groups and other interested agencies is often desirable.

5. Failure of some junior colleges, colleges of arts and sciences, and other institutions, to professionalize their liberal-cultural offerings has a retarding effect on the development by State departments of a genuinely professional State teaching corps.

6. Characteristics of successful institutional curriculum revision programs include: Sound organization and management of committees, consultants, and other participants; democratic procedure and adequate recognition of all participating subject-matter groups; initiation and stimulation, rather than domination, of activities by the State department; and introduction of the college faculties to the use of the curriculum materials formulated.

7. There is a need for more participation by State directors of teacher education in curriculum construction and revision in teacher-education institutions.

8. Trends in State administration of curriculum revision and construction include: Lengthening of normal-school curricula to 4 years, and lengthening of teachers-college curricula to 1-year graduate levels; increase in the number of courses in professional education and other subjects; increase in curriculum revision programs and activities; increasing emphasis upon the selection of curriculum content from a functional rather than a traditional basis; and the improvement and extension of student-teaching facilities.

9. The most effective work of a nonadministrative nature done by State departments in college-curriculum revision is the initiation, stimulation, and organization of voluntary curriculum-revision programs by faculty members, and in rendering central coordinating and other services in such programs.

Administration of Student Teaching

1. Although the laws of most States authorize the establishment of institutional laboratory-school facilities, the administration of the public schools by local public-school authorities often renders difficult the task of providing and administering practice facilities that can be utilized to maximum effectiveness by the institutions.

2. The most effective laboratory-school facilities include a combination of (a) an institutional campus school, entirely under the control of the institution, and (b) one or more cooperating public schools, sufficiently under the control of the institution to enable its officers to conduct an unhampered professional program.

3. Arrangements for laboratory-school facilities are most effective when the State board of education in charge of the public schools is also in charge of the teacher-education institutions that utilize

practice facilities; when the statutes make the provision of facilities mandatory; when satisfactory financial arrangements are made, providing if necessary for liberal State supplementary funds for cooperating public schools; and when the instruction in the cooperating public schools is of high quality.

Certification of Teachers

1. Practically all States make provisions for the certification of public-school teachers. Less than one-third of the States provide for the certification of private-school teachers.

2. Certification laws vary greatly in the detail to which they prescribe requirements for certificates. The formulation of such requirements, at least above minimum prescriptions, is believed by authorities properly to be the function of the State board of education and the State department of education.

3. There are one or more centralized State certifying agencies—State board of education, chief State school officer, or board of examiners—in every State. In addition in 20 States some other agency—county, city, or institutional—issues certificates more or less under the control of the central State certifying agency.

4. Under various titles a director of teacher education and certification, or a director of certification, administers certification in most of the 48 States. In some States an assistant or deputy superintendent or other professional staff member administers certification as a part-time activity.

5. That certification offices often are understaffed with respect to workers who could assist in the further development and utilization of certification and other teacher records as a means to advance teacher-personnel programs is indicated by a marked lack of essential personnel data and usable compilations of such data in numerous States.

6. There is great diversity in terminology applied to different grades and types of certificates; almost complete lack of uniformity among certificates of different States; and wide differences in standards governing the professional, academic, and special requirements.

7. The most significant differences among the certificates of different States are found in the scholarship requirements. Minimum requirements vary from indefinite requirements for examinations covering elementary and high-school subjects to 4 years or more of college work. The typical minimum is nearly 3 years of college work for elementary-school teachers and 4 years for high-school teachers. Requirements are rising steadily, at an average rate for all States of about 1 year each decade.

8. Requirements in professional education for inexperienced teachers of high-school academic subjects range from 6 to 25 semester

hours, with a median of approximately 18 semester hours. Student teaching is required in 35 States to an extent, on the average, of 3 to 4 semester hours.

9. "Blanket" certificates are still issued, each of which authorizes the holder to teach a number of subjects. In some of these subjects he may have little, if any, preparation.

10. State certificates are issued upon any one of three bases: College credentials, examination, and exchange for certificates already issued.

11. State certification officers in several regions of the country have initiated cooperative conferences with a view to increased coordination of certification among States.

12. Significant trends in certification include: Elevation of minimum requirements, increased specialization of certificates, decrease in the number of certificates issued by examination, increased prescription of professional education, increased issuance of probationary certificates, and steady centralization of certification in the hands of the State board or of the chief State school officer.

Teacher Placement

1. A serious lack of coordination of the many hundreds of college and other placement offices exists. Many of them function ineffectively. Some are expensive to teachers. Partially as a consequence, there is poor distribution of the supply of teachers in and among the several States, much wasted effort by teachers in securing positions, and frequent failures by teachers to secure appointment in the positions for which they are best qualified.

2. State department officers are frequently asked for information concerning teachers available for positions, and concerning vacancies. Twelve departments maintain more or less definitely organized placement services; the remainder offer either no services, or incidental services.

3. Probably less than 1 percent of all unemployed teachers appointed annually are placed by State placement bureaus.

4. Although State department officers differ concerning the desirability of having the State departments of education maintain placement bureaus, most of the arguments offered against such bureaus appear to be inspired by lack of staff and facilities for the work. It is admitted that no better and more economical instrumentality has been found to coordinate and extend the work of existing public placement offices within a given State, than a central State placement office.

Chapter V. Specific Methods of Rendering Services

THE SPECIFIC methods or means used by State departments of education to perform functions or render services are quite numerous. The more important that are reported include: Personal consultation service at State department offices; institutional visitation by State department staff members; initiation, organization, or conduct of local, State or regional conferences and meetings; initiation or conduct of State surveys of institutions, individually or by groups; securing part-time services of State or out-of-State consultants or leaders in teacher education; collection of statistical or other reports from institutions; conduct of organized research or study of the institutions; keeping of centralized teacher personnel records, and dissemination of information through various means such as printed or mimeographed publications, public addresses; correspondence and wire services; and the like.

The extent to which the foregoing methods or means of service is utilized depends to a considerable degree upon the funds available to the State department. The utilization of many of them is also dependent upon other factors, such as the overhead control of the institutions of higher education; the influence of State custom, tradition, or policy; the geographical features of the State; the professional and personal qualifications of the State department staff members; and the extent to which a forward-moving State program of teacher education has been developed.

Consultations at the State Department

Like most officers engaged in public service, State department staff members working in the field of teacher personnel including teacher education have many visitors at the State capital. The opportunities for service to educational officers and to the people of the State that exist through office consultation are so numerous that few departmental staffs have time to utilize more than a fraction of them. Illustrative types of consultative service that could be extended with larger staffs include: Guidance to prospective teachers concerning institutions, or courses of study that would best fit them for teaching; dissemination of information to faculty members of given institutions concerning good practices observed in others; discussion of qualifications of different candidates for important institutional positions; consideration of institutional standards to be observed in accreditation; and description to institutional officers of new types of instructional services recently introduced or needed in the public

schools, and of the kind of teachers needed for them. Not infrequently the State department officers, in addition to giving counsel and advice, may do much toward interpreting the program of teacher-education institutions to those not well informed, and toward building up good will toward the institutions.

Visitation of Institutions

As a means of arriving at mutual understanding, of reaching important decisions, and of approving plans, personal contacts and discussions between State department officers and the staff members of the institutions and of the public schools are essential. Although teachers and prospective teachers, college staff members, board members, and laymen visit the State departments of education upon occasion, much of the work of members of the State departments of education is conducted through field visitation. Improved means of transportation during the present century have greatly increased the geographical range of operation of State department staff members, and reduced much of the waste of time in travel formerly involved in visiting remote institutions.

Although the visitation of institutions of higher education is undertaken frequently or occasionally in most of the States, there are some in which visits are rarely made. The number of visits depends upon several factors, among which are the number of staff members of the department engaged in teacher education, the amount of travel funds, and the type of control of the institutions. In some States, such as New Mexico, Oklahoma, and Oregon, institutional visitation of the institutions of higher education by the State superintendent or members of his staff is required by law. In several States, laws authorizing accreditation of institutions impel their visitation. As members of institutional boards of trustees, State superintendents are called upon to visit institutions upon the occasion of board meetings. Other things being equal, the institutions most often visited are, in order of frequency: First, State institutions under control of the State board of education, or institutions formally accredited by the board; second, State institutions not under control of the board; and third, local district or privately controlled institutions. While visits by departmental staff members to institutions not under the direct administrative control of the State board of education are reported by well over half the States, it is significant that in nearly one-fifth of the States such visits are rarely or never made.

Sometimes visits are made to the private institutions only upon invitation. Ordinarily this is not because of lack of good will. Often it is because there is no State department officer assigned full time to teacher education. That visitations to the privately controlled insti-

tutions are highly advisable is indicated by the fact that from one-third to one-half of all teachers holding bachelor's degrees in 1930-31 had received them from privately controlled colleges and universities, and the proportions of teachers with advanced degrees from such institutions were even higher.¹

Much of the visitation of institutions by State department staff members is undertaken in connection with institutional accreditation. Usually less than a day suffices for a routine conference or inspection. Not infrequently, the visit is made in connection with a field trip for other purposes, such as for making an address, or for visiting public schools in the neighborhood of the institution.

Visitation of institutions by board members is rarely done systematically. Individual visits, or visits by committees, are made occasionally. Illustrations of the nature of board visitations are afforded by Idaho, Louisiana, and Maine. In Idaho the board appoints a committee for each institution, consisting of two board members and the president of the institution. In Louisiana, a special committee on education of the State board visits the institutions. In Maine, certain institutions are assigned to each member of the board, who visits them upon occasion.

Visits made by State department staff members in certain fields to faculty members who work in the same fields appear to be particularly helpful. The services rendered to the institutions by State department specialists are very great in States which have very large and highly trained staffs, such as New York and Pennsylvania. State department specialists usually are thoroughly informed concerning the needs of the State with respect to specialized subject-matter instruction, whereas college faculty members often are not. There is a tendency in many institutions that educate teachers to become academically minded, and to remain more or less isolated from the public schools that they are presumed to serve. State department specialists and officers, by virtue of their first-hand knowledge of conditions throughout the State, are in a unique position to serve such institutions.

Conferences

More than half of the State departments hold or participate regularly in college conferences. Group conferences are most frequent in States having active programs of institutional improvement and coordination. The States reporting frequent conferences of teacher education and other institutions of higher education include among others: Alabama, Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Georgia, Kentucky, Massachusetts, Maine, Missouri, Nebraska, New Jersey, New

¹ U. S. Department of the Interior, Office of Education. National survey of the education of teachers. Vol. II, p. 49.

York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Vermont, and Virginia. In half of these States, the State board of education controls one or more of the institutions. Numerous other States report occasional institutional conferences, many of which include representatives from privately controlled as well as publicly controlled institutions that educate teachers.

Group conferences are held for many purposes, both general and special. One of the most important purposes of the State departments is to initiate, stimulate, or organize cooperative institutional efforts toward self-improvement. The departments can achieve maximum results with the limited staff provided them, only by mobilizing the efforts of those they wish to assist. With no administrative authority over the institutions, conferences constitute one of the most effective means available to the State director of teacher education and certification to formulate and forward State programs of teacher education and related activities. Even when the departments have considerable administrative responsibility over institutions, they have found that unless the institutions cooperate, effective administration is practically impossible.

College conferences may be called by any one of several officers, such as the chief State school officer, or the dean of the college of education of the State university. Participants in the conferences usually include representatives from all the institutions of higher education presumed to be interested in the proceedings, and from the State department of education. Representatives from the public schools often participate also, and occasionally lay groups as well.

Approximately one-third of the State departments report that they secure at varying intervals, the part-time services of State or out-of-State consultants or leaders in teacher education, for the benefit of the institutions that educate teachers. Among such consultants are curriculum experts, survey staff members, and others.

Two illustrations will suffice to indicate the general nature of institutional group conferences. In Georgia, State-wide conferences of representatives of each of the numerous public and private colleges in the State and of the public schools have been called by the State director of teacher training and certification, on problems of curricula and certification. A central advisory committee on teacher education and curriculum, and local institutional study groups have been very helpful in the revision of certification requirements, setting standards of institutional work, establishment of easier and more effective working relationships with the State department, and in other ways.

In Missouri, cooperative relations between the State department of education and the institutions that educate teachers are maintained through the educational conference. This voluntary conference is composed of representatives of the State department and of

the University of Missouri, the five State teachers colleges, Harris Teachers College of St. Louis, and Kansas City Teachers College. A wide variety of topics are discussed at the meetings, including for example, the preparation of teachers in specific fields, the professional education of administrators, certification requirements, and matters of general policy. Through these conferences, demonstrable progress has been made in the unification of educational efforts and in arriving at common bases of understanding among the several institutions.

Surveys

More than three-fourths of the State institutions that educate teachers have been included in surveys at one time or another. Most of the surveys of State teacher-education institutions and activities are made as parts of more inclusive surveys of higher education, or of public-school education, that are conducted on a national, State, or institutional basis. Schools of education, normal schools, and teachers colleges are given specific treatment in 90 or more different survey reports. Seventeen of these reports deal exclusively with normal schools and teachers colleges.²

Some of the outstanding national surveys of teacher education made during the past decade that included State institutions are the *National Survey of the Education of Teachers*, the *Survey of Land-grant Colleges and Universities*, and the *Cooperative Study of Teacher Education*, conducted by the commission on teacher education of the American Council on Education. The last-mentioned study, which is still under way, is characterized by several unique cooperative features. Among the older State survey reports of teacher education, the Missouri survey report, published in 1920 following an earlier investigation, is most noted.

Surveys of State institutions have been sponsored or initiated by the legislatures, State or institutional boards, the Governors, college associations, the institutions surveyed, and other agencies. The agencies most frequently making the surveys include special committees or organizations set up for the purpose; universities and colleges; and national organizations including, among others, the U. S. Office of Education and private philanthropic foundations.

The chief purpose of the surveys is to improve the work of the institutions. A few appear to have been made primarily to find means for economizing in the expenditures of State funds. Most of the surveys made for the purpose of improving the work of the institutions appear to have been helpful, to a degree roughly corresponding to the intensiveness of the investigations, and to the special qualifications and abilities of the surveyors. Although not easily evaluated,

² Eells, Walter C., *Surveys of American Higher Education*. Pp. 379-422.

it is possible that the extent of participation in the surveys by the staffs of the institutions surveyed, might also indicate in some measure the success of the studies.

Statistical Reports

Usable statistics concerning the public elementary and secondary schools are regularly secured on a comparable basis by the U. S. Office of Education from all State departments of education. It might, therefore, be expected that the State departments would collect and publish detailed statistical reports concerning at least the State institutions of higher education. Such is not the case, however, in many States. When national agencies wish to obtain statistics concerning the State institutions of higher education, it is usually necessary for them to go directly to the institutions or the secretaries of their boards for the information desired. This is true also, of course, of the county, city, local, district, and privately controlled institutions.

Each governing board, or its administrative office, collects the statistics of the institution or institutions it controls. Often such statistics are not in comparable form; and State departments of education in any case do not often attempt to bring them together. Statistics collected by the State departments from the institutions they administer are usually published in the biennial or other reports of the State boards and departments of education.

Since statistical reports are made chiefly to the different boards, or to national agencies, it is not surprising that less than half the State departments report that they have detailed and up-to-date records of the major activities of the higher-education institutions of the State. State departments that collect considerable statistical information from institutions they do not administer, include those in Alabama, Indiana, Kentucky, Maryland, New Jersey, New Mexico, Ohio, Texas, Washington, and a few other States. State departments that administer well-developed accreditation systems not infrequently have considerable information about all the institutions in the State.

Considerable progress during the past decade has been made in securing greater uniformity in the blanks on which the institutions make their reports to the different governing agencies within States. More agreement has also been reached concerning the meaning of the items reported. Differences in methods of institutional accounting and reporting have long been great. The movement toward simplification and uniformity began in the colleges and universities, and has now been extended to the teachers colleges and normal schools in many States. The differences in the information called for by various

governing boards in order to meet different legal requirements in respect to financial and other reports still occasion considerable difficulty, however, in securing comparable information from institutions in all the States.

In requesting out-of-State college transcripts or statements of credits to be used as a basis of teacher certification, the several State departments of education use forms that rarely call for exactly the same items of information. This makes considerable unnecessary work for the registrars. Sometimes questions are asked that the registrars are unable to answer accurately. The work of college registrars would be made easier and more accurate if greater agreement could be reached among the State departments in respect to the items of information they desire. Unfortunately, certification laws, rules, and regulations differ greatly among States; and the blank forms used more or less necessarily reflect such differences. However, college registrars are convinced that a number of items could be made more uniform and more significant.

Research and Systematic Study

About half of the State departments of education report that at least some intensive study of institutional work and offerings is undertaken through one or more methods of approach. The methods reported by two or more States are as follows in descending order of frequency:

- Occasional studies by regular staff members of the department.
- Cooperation of staff members with institutional curriculum committees.
- Studies by special commissions or committees.
- Work of research bureau of the department.
- Surveys of institutions of higher education.
- Cooperative studies with graduate schools of the State.

In most of the foregoing activities, the assistance of specialists outside of the department is utilized. Because of the limited number of professional workers in the State departments, and the heavy demands upon their time for office and field administrative and supervisory duties, they unfortunately have little time as a rule for intensive research. Under present conditions, intensive types of research can often be conducted to best advantage by the large State and private universities and colleges.

In a few States, such as Pennsylvania, systematic efforts are made to acquaint the larger graduate schools with State school problems that constitute promising fields for university study. The cooperative study of State educational problems in which State department representatives participate with those most affected by the conditions studied is also an approved and growing practice.

That research and related fact-finding and fact-disseminating

activities are not necessarily confined to large, highly specialized departments of education is demonstrated by Connecticut. The four major divisions of the department include administration, instruction, law, and research and planning. An important feature of the work of the division of research and planning is its cooperation not only with State and national research agencies, but also with lay organizations interested in educational research and study, such as the League of Women Voters and the American Association of University Women. To disseminate the results of research and study, which often suggests changes in advance of current practice, popular understanding, and legislative support, and to utilize the counsel of citizens in the development of a State educational program, a State lay council composed of 25 representatives of major organizations and outstanding leaders in the State, and five regional citizens' councils, have been formed. The secretary of each regional council is a member of one of the teachers college faculties. To aid in the research and to act as an advisory committee on instruction, the State committee on instruction and five regional committees have been formed in the same manner as the lay councils. All school levels are studied. In higher education and teacher education, initial problems include coordination of higher education, and admission requirements.

About one-third of the State departments report that they sponsor experiments by the institutions with a view to improving offerings and practices. Whether sponsored by the State departments or not, there is a tremendous variety of practices and offerings among the 48 States, which in a sense constitutes experimentation on a very broad scale. Unfortunately, such "experimentation" is largely uncontrolled; and the outcomes, both favorable and unfavorable, are only occasionally made known to other institutions. Much good could be done in States having a considerable number of institutions of higher education, if some central State agency could assume a clearing-house function of disseminating to all the institutions accounts of the plans, experiences, and techniques of colleges that have undertaken promising innovations and improved programs of instruction in teacher education. In typical States, the logical agency for this purpose is the State department of education.

Teacher Personnel Records

A necessary procedure in constructing a program for State teacher-personnel improvement is the maintenance of detailed teacher-personnel records in the State department of education. Although no attempt was made in the present study to analyze in detail the teacher-personnel data available in the offices of the State directors of teacher education and certification, Emens in 1938 secured data that show marked deficiencies in such records in many States. The

number of States having available certain selected items of information in the State department office relative to teachers follow: Citizenship, 22; age, 33; birthplace, 21; religion, 4; race, 16; marital status, 20; doctor's statement concerning health, 7; record of physical handicap, 10; transcript of high-school record, 28; transcript of college record, 41; degrees received, 43; record of student teaching, 40; places taught, 29; grades taught, 31; years taught, 31; subjects taught, 26; and statement of successful teaching, 20.³ Although the compilation of records that are not used is a waste of time and effort, there are sufficient needs for improved teacher-personnel programs to justify the compilations of much more detailed personnel records in many if not most States.

Publications

Catalogs, annual or biennial reports, study and research findings, and many other materials that report the offerings, activities, and research contributions of the institutions are usually published by the institutional boards of control, or by the institutions themselves under the authority of the boards. The State boards of education publish such materials chiefly for institutions under their control, rather than for other institutions. Occasionally, however, the State department publishes curricula and courses of study and particularly significant studies worked out by the institutions for the benefit of the public elementary and secondary schools. This service could be extended considerably to the great advantage of the public schools if a larger amount of funds for printing were provided the State departments.

Summary of Findings

1. Among the most important means used by State department officers to perform functions or render services relating to teacher education are: Consultations at the State department, visitation of institutions, college conferences, surveys, collection and interpretation of statistical reports, research and systematic study, use of teacher-personnel records; and dissemination of published materials.
2. Although the extent to which different methods or means of service are utilized depends to a considerable degree upon the amount of funds and the number of staff members available, numerous other factors, such as the type of institutional control and the qualifications of the departmental staff, affect the nature of the methods used.
3. Numerous opportunities for offering expert professional service through conferences at the State department exist that cannot be utilized because of lack of staff.
4. Visits to privately controlled and to city- and district-controlled

³ Emens, John R. A study of State administration of teacher personnel. P. 82.

institutions by departmental staff members are sometimes quite infrequent, although privately controlled institutions prepare more than one-third of the teachers with degrees. Usually visits are not sufficiently extended to permit the collection of very much information about the institutions.

5. College-group conferences initiated or stimulated by State department officers constitute one of the most effective means through which professional services can be rendered to the institutions. These are held for many purposes, both general and special; for example, to pass upon proposed State certification requirements; initiate, develop, and conduct extended programs of institutional improvement; plan new courses or curricula to meet State needs; and advise the State department with respect to its policies and administrative actions.

6. More than three-fourths of the State institutions that educate teachers have been surveyed either alone or with other schools. The best known surveys of teacher education were intensive investigations conducted by experts thoroughly familiar with this field. Participation in the surveys by the staff members of the institutions surveyed contributes to the ultimate success of the investigations.

7. Each institutional governing board and national agencies collect and compile most of the statistics of higher education. The State departments, with some exceptions, do not collect statistics of the institutions not under the control of the State board of education.

8. Considerable progress has been made during recent years in securing greater uniformity in institutional records and reports and in securing agreement concerning the meaning of the items on which information is reported.

9. Compared to the amount of graduate and research work done by the State universities, the amount of research and systematic study undertaken by State department staff members is quite limited. No other agency in the State is in a better position to study and interpret the needs of the public schools than the department.

10. Most of the systematic investigations undertaken in State departments conducted by State department staff members consist of occasional studies undertaken by individual staff members. Outside workers or research agencies are utilized extensively to conduct research and study sponsored by the State department of education.

11. There are marked deficiencies in State teacher-personnel records in most States that could easily be remedied by providing additional staff members.

12. State departments of education often publish or sponsor the publication of material produced by the institutions they administer, but only occasionally publish material produced by or concerning other institutions.

Chapter VI. Summary of Suggestions and Proposals for Improvement

THE SUMMARIES of findings given at the close of preceding chapters indicate unmistakably that the State departments of education are in an active transition period of development. Although the period of their greatest expansion in functions and services relating to teacher education and other teacher-personnel activities has been confined largely to the present century, gains in the extent and quality of such services are significant, and promise much greater gains for the future. In the present chapter, suggestions are offered concerning the directions in which future improvement may be expected to occur. In addition, some proposals are made for heightening the effectiveness of the organization and personnel, and for extending and improving the functions and services, of the State officers responsible for maintaining and protecting the inflow of teachers to the public schools.

Because of the marked differences among States in social, economic, political, and educational conditions the proposals which follow are made primarily for States in which fairly typical conditions prevail. Special conditions may be recognized in certain States by modifications of some of the proposals. In such States, the proposals are suggested as ultimate rather than immediate goals.

The findings upon which the proposals in this chapter are based are not here repeated. They are summarized at the close of each of the preceding chapters II to V, inclusive, and may be consulted readily by referring to the pages indicated in the footnotes under each major topic which follows.

Overhead Control and Coordination of Institutions

The proposals which follow relative to institutional organization and administration are in accord for the most part with the judgments of a majority of approximately 200 authorities in different fields of educational and governmental administration. These judgments are reported by Street,² who presents the group opinions of a jury of 81 outstanding authorities in government and in 3 different fields of educational administration; by Emens,³ who reported the opinions of 48 State officials in charge of teacher education and certification; by Black,⁴ with a similar report of opinions from the chief executive

¹ For summarized findings of chapter II, see pp. 30-42.

² Street, Claude W. *State control of teacher training in the United States.* Pp. 67-99.

³ Black, George H. *The State and the education of teachers.* Pp. 44-111.

⁴ Emens, John R. *A study of State administration of teacher personnel.* Pp. 282-329.

officers of the central State agency of educational control in each State; and by Rutledge,⁵ who reported the judgments of a jury of 36 outstanding men in the field of educational administration, including university professors, State superintendents and other State department officials, and presidents of teachers colleges and normal schools.

1. In States having a long-continued oversupply of legally qualified teachers whose scholastic qualifications do not meet commonly accepted standards, it should be the policy of the State board of education constantly to raise the standards of approval relative to teacher-education institutions.

2. In States still having teacher-training high schools, county or State normal schools, junior colleges, and 4-year colleges with teacher-education curricula less than 4 years in length, the controlling State agencies should eliminate such short curricula at the earliest practicable date.

3. Every State should have available for distribution, an accurate list of all institutions approved for teacher education. The lists should show the classification of the institutions by types, and the curricula that are approved.

4. The State board of education should be properly constituted, in accordance with established educational and administrative principles, for effective general control or supervision of all State elementary, secondary, and teacher-education activities.⁶

5. The functions of the State board of education relative to State institutions should be those of a legislative, and not of an executive agency. The administration of board policies should be delegated to the chief executive officer of the board and his staff.

6. All State teachers colleges and normal schools should be governed by the State board of education which controls the public elementary and secondary schools provided such board is properly constituted and effectively staffed.

7. All State institutions of higher education, in addition to teachers colleges and normal schools, should be governed by a single unifying board of control. If properly constituted for the control of such institutions, this board should be the State board of education.

8. If the State institutions of higher education are not governed by the State board of education, this board should be accorded definite legal responsibility and authority to accredit all of their teacher-education curricula and courses; to require periodical reports from them

⁵ Rutledge, Samuel A. The development of guiding principles for the administration of teachers colleges and normal schools. Pp. 9-21.

⁶ For suggestions concerning a properly constituted board, see *Composition and Personnel of State Staffs*. P. 112.

with respect to teacher-education offerings and facilities; to visit them at regular intervals; to approve the establishment of new institutions; to approve institutional degree- and diploma-granting privileges; and otherwise to exercise general powers of supervision over major institutional activities and offerings relating specifically to teacher education.

9. The State board of education should have general control or supervision of all State teacher personnel activities, including those involved in teachers' service and welfare provisions.

10. The chief State school officer should be the executive officer of the board and should be responsible for the execution of the policies it adopts with respect to the institutions it governs. He should be well qualified, reasonably secure in tenure, and free from political domination.

11. The duties of the State superintendent as executive officer of the board in control of State teacher-education institutions should include the following, among others: to advise the board concerning the selection of the presidents of the institutions; to encourage and facilitate the cooperation of the presidents of the institutions and the institutional deans of education in the development of a State-wide program of teacher preparation; to assist in determining the teacher-education services each institution should render the State; and to assist the institutions in numerous other functions (ch. IV). His duties should further include the development and administration of effective teacher-personnel services in the State department of education.

12. Insofar as is consistent with properly unified and coordinated control of all the institutions by the State board, the president of each State institution should have full authority for its local government and administration.

13. State department officials should maintain close professional relationships with State associations and other organizations of college and of public-school teachers and officers.

14. Constant efforts should be made by State department officers to stimulate voluntary coordinating and unifying activities by independently governed institutions, so that a coherent and continuous State program of teacher education may be initiated and maintained by interinstitutional action.

15. The major responsibilities and powers of the State board of education and of the chief State school officer with respect to the administration of teacher personnel and of teacher education should be specified in the laws as broad grants of power; but specifically itemized duties and methods of performing them usually should not be written into the statutes.

Composition and Personnel of State Staffs⁷

The following proposals are suggested for consideration:

1. The membership of the State board of education, constituted to govern all teacher-education institutions and public elementary and secondary schools, should consist of five, seven, or nine members, and should be composed entirely of laymen who are representative of the best ability and highest ideals of the State.

2. Members of the State board should be appointed by the Governor or elected by the people. One of them should be selected annually, and no restrictions should be placed upon them in respect to age, sex, residence, occupation, or political affiliation.

3. Board members should be unpaid, except for expenses in performing their duties.

4. The chief State school officer should be appointed by the State board of education, for a term of indefinite length.

5. In educational and other professional qualifications the chief State school officer should rank with the most highly qualified schoolmen in the State.

6. In all State departments in which any considerable number of beginning teachers are employed annually, a State director of teacher education and certification should be appointed.

7. In professional qualifications, the State director of teacher education and certification should rank with the most highly qualified administrators of higher-education institutions in the State. His appointment and tenure should be strictly on a merit basis.

8. More uniformity should be observed in the nomenclature of the titles of the full-time directors of the several teacher-personnel services, and of their professional assistants; and also in the designation of the divisions or other administrative units in which their work is organized.

9. In typical State departments of education, a considerably larger staff should be appointed to perform the essential teacher-personnel services that are now neglected or performed only in part. The appointment and tenure of these staff members should be on a merit basis. Increasingly higher standards should govern their professional qualifications, and their compensation should be adjusted accordingly.

Administrative and Supervisory Functions and Services⁸

Regulation of Teacher Supply and Demand

1. State departments of education should periodically collect and disseminate to all teacher-education institutions, sufficient informa-

⁷ For summarized findings of chapter III, see pp. 53-54.

⁸ For summarized findings of chapter IV, see pp. 93-98.

tion concerning the nature and extent of teacher supply from different sources, and the continuing needs of the State for different types of teachers, to enable the institutions to adjust intelligently their training program to fit State needs.

2. In any State having continuously a marked oversupply of teachers, certification requirements should be raised until a high standard is reached. If the oversupply persists, consideration should be given to the establishment of a program of selective admission formulated in cooperation with the institutions. Particular care should be taken to apply the best selective measures that can be found.

3. In States where, by State law or other reasons, selective admission cannot be enforced for first-year entrants into the institutions, its application should be considered for entrance to professional curricula beginning after the first or second college year.

4. Consideration should be given by State departments to the provision of guidance materials to high-school graduates concerning teaching opportunities in different subjects, and conditions of service in the public schools.

State Accreditation of Institutions

1. In each State having a considerable number of institutions that prepare teachers, but no effective accrediting system, the State department of education, under the State board of education, should establish or initiate the establishment of a definite system of accreditation that is capable of meeting fully State department needs for approved lists of institutions within the State. If multiple accrediting systems exist, they should be consolidated when possible.

2. State systems of accreditation should provide for the participation or counsel of the institutions accredited, in the formulation of standards and in other aspects of accreditation.

3. Standards relative to teacher-education institutions should be periodically revised and published. They should contain provisions relative to the offerings and facilities provided specifically for the education of teachers.

4. Accreditation should provide for an appraisal of each teacher-education curriculum offered by the institution.

5. Typical State accredited lists of teacher-education institutions should be improved by: Making them genuinely selective, indicating curricula that are approved, and revising lists annually.

Functions Relating to College Staffs

1. The selection of presidents, and upon nomination of the presidents, the faculty members of institutions, should be solely the function of the controlling boards. Effectual outside interferences

should be avoided by properly organizing and constituting the boards (ch. II).

2. Within general budgetary limits, the individual salaries of the presidents and staff members should be fixed by the boards.

3. Although there should be centralization of control of the institutions in the hands of the State boards and departments of education, there should be decentralization of the details of institutional administration in the hands of the presidents.

Financial and Business Administration

1. Increases in student tuitions and fees should not be permitted beyond the point at which appreciable numbers of superior high-school students with limited funds are lost to State service.

2. The powers of central State budgetary or other fiscal agencies should not extend to the determination of detailed budgetary items. Within general budgetary allotments, the determination of detailed budgetary items should be the function of the presidents of the institutions and their governing boards.

3. When consolidation of institutional control has not been effected, cooperative action by the presidents and separate boards of control in respect to requests for funds should be made in order to reduce harmful institutional competition.

Curriculum Construction and Revision

1. Although some duplication of courses and curricula among institutions is desirable to meet the needs of different areas of the State, much more extensive efforts should be made in typical States to reduce unnecessary and wasteful duplication in college work.

2. Allocation of curricula to the institutions best equipped to offer them should be considered as a means to reduce duplication of curricula.

3. State department staff members, as central State coordinating officers, should assist the institutions to reach greater agreement in such matters as course terminology; the amount and nature of the prescribed work in professional education; the nature of curricula offered; and related matters important in the integration or coordination of teacher-education curricula.

4. If there have been no recent curriculum-revision programs under way in the State, the State director of teacher education should consider the initiation of a voluntary curriculum-revision program in which the college faculties, departmental representatives, public-school officials, and possibly interested laymen may participate. The program should be soundly organized and carefully managed, and should provide for meeting the needs of all participants.

5. In accordance with current curriculum trends, State directors should assist the institutions in their efforts toward the eventual elimination of all teacher-education curricula of less than 4 years in length; the elevation of the education of high-school teachers, at least, to graduate levels; the elimination of, or withdrawal of approval from, weak institutional curricula; the selection of curriculum content on a functional basis; and the increasing professionalization of teacher-education curricula.

Administration of Student Teaching

1. Every effort possible should be made by the State department of education to assist the institutions that educate teachers to secure ample laboratory-school facilities and to operate them effectively. Ideally, such facilities include a campus school maintained wholly by the institution, and, in addition, representative public schools under sufficient control of the institution to enable it to conduct an unhampered practice program.

2. Among the means to be considered for assisting the institutions to maintain adequate laboratory-school facilities, are: Statutes making the provision of such facilities mandatory; State financial subsidies to the cooperating public schools sufficiently large to enable the institution to conduct demonstrably superior instruction in them; and placement of the institution under the control of the State board of education which is also in charge of the public schools.

Certification of Teachers

1. Certification requirements, other than those expressing minimum or general standards, should be set by the State board of education, rather than by statute.

2. Complete control over the administration of certification, and over the issuance of certificates, should be in the hands of the State board of education and its professional staff.

3. Control over teacher certification in a given State, and the control or supervision exercised over teacher education in that State, should be consolidated in the same division of the chief State education office.

4. A professional staff should be provided that has adequate time and facilities regularly to assemble the basic data necessary in an effective State program of teacher education and certification.

5. Scholastic requirements for certificates should be set at the highest levels that the supply of teachers permits; and certification should be differentiated to provide for all distinctive types of public-school service.

6. All certificates issued to inexperienced teachers should be of a

probationary nature, and their duration should be limited. Provisions should be made requiring holders of all certificates to keep professionally up to date.

7. Certification requirements should stand primarily on a foundation of preparation in approved teacher-education institutions.

Teacher Placement

1. In States having no State placement office, but having a very poor geographical distribution of unemployed teachers of different subjects, lack of coordination of the activities of different placement offices, and a considerable number of vacancies to fill annually, consideration should be given to the establishment of a centralized State placement office.

2. A placement office, if maintained, should be adequately staffed and equipped, and should give careful, individual attention to the placement of qualified applicants in the schools or school systems for which they are best fitted.

Specific Methods of Rendering Services¹

1. Increased consideration should be given, in typical State departments, to the broadening of the range of specific means and methods utilized for rendering services in teacher education. Such means and methods may be extended by increasing the number of staff members; requiring higher or more specialized qualifications of departmental workers; increasing the number of institutions administered by the departments; providing increased funds for travel and publication; and similar means.

2. Visitation of privately controlled and other independently governed institutions that educate teachers should be made more frequently and more purposefully.

3. Carefully planned and continuing college group conferences should be initiated by the departments of education in all States not now having them, in order that the departments and the institutions may share counsel and plans.

4. Surveys of teacher-education institutions should be made by experts thoroughly familiar with the needs of the public schools. Insofar as possible, the staff members of the institutions should participate in the fact-finding and related activities of the survey staff.

5. State departments of education should extend their collection and compilation of statistics and related information to include all higher-education institutions² of the State, at least to the extent where they have available usable, detailed, and up-to-date information concerning such institutions.

¹ For summarized findings of chapter V, see pp. 107-8.

6. Efforts should be continued to secure reasonable uniformity in the records and reports of all the higher-education institutions of the State, regardless of the number of agencies governing such institutions; and insofar as practicable, to maintain records and reports that are in a form comparable to that of other States.

7. Much more extensive and usable information necessary in upbuilding constructive teacher personnel programs should be collected and made available by the State departments.

8. When State department facilities are inadequate to conduct needed research on State teacher-education problems, efforts should be made to secure the assistance of research departments of the State university and other institutions and research agencies, by making known to them specific problems on which assistance is needed; the data available in the State department; and the means the departments have for assisting in the desired research.

9. The State departments of education should act as clearing houses of information concerning new and improved developments in preservice teacher education, for the benefit of all the colleges and universities that contribute to the supply of teachers for the public schools of the State.

Selected References

This brief bibliography gives in complete form references to the secondary sources cited in briefer form in the text of this monograph. It does not list State school laws, biennial and other reports of State boards and State departments of education, and similar original sources consulted in the study.

- AGNEW, WALTER D. The administration of professional schools for teachers. Baltimore, Md., Warwick and York, 1924. 262 p.
- ALLEN, CECIL H. Legal principles governing practice teaching in State teachers colleges, normal schools, and public schools. Doctor's thesis. Nashville, Tenn., George Peabody College for Teachers, 1937. 160 p. (Contributions to education, no. 184.)
- BLACK, GEORGE H. The State and the education of teachers. Doctor's thesis. New York, N. Y., New York University, 1933. 152 p. (ms.)
- CHAMBERS, MERRITT M. Some features of State educational-administrative organization. Washington, D. C., American Council on Education, 1936. 283 p. (mimeo.)
- ELLS, WALTER C. Surveys of American higher education. New York, N. Y., The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1937. 538 p.
- EMENS, JOHN R. A study of State administration of teacher personnel. Doctor's thesis. Ann Arbor, Mich., University of Michigan, 1938. 329 p. (ms.)
- FREDERIC, KATHERINE A. State personnel administration with special reference to departments of education. Washington, U. S. Government Printing Office, 1939. 272 p. (Advisory committee on education. Staff study no. 3.)
- HILL, LAWRENCE B. The legislative control of State normal schools. Doctor's dissertation. New York, N. Y., Teachers College, Columbia University, 1921.
- KENTUCKY DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION. Educational leadership in Kentucky. Frankfort, The Department, 1939. 76 p. (Educational bulletin. Vol. VI, January 1939.)
- KLONOWER, HENRY; KRINER, HARRY S.; and WILLIAMS, C. O. Institutions of higher learning in relation to a State program of teacher education. Harrisburg, Pa., Department of Public Instruction, 1939. 29 p. (Bulletin 156.)
- MCGINNIS, HOWARD J. The State teachers college president. Doctor's thesis. Nashville, Tenn., George Peabody College for Teachers, 1932. 187 p. (Contributions to education, no. 104.)
- MEAD, ARTHUR R. Supervised student teaching. Richmond, Va., Johnson Publishing Company, 1930. 891 p.
- NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION. Research division and National council on teacher retirement. Analysis of the statutory provisions for State teachers retirement systems. Washington, D. C., The Association, 1939. 30 p.
- RUTLEDGE, SAMUEL A. The development of guiding principles for the administration of teachers colleges and normal schools. Doctor's dissertation. New York, N. Y., Teachers College, Columbia University, 1930. 107 p. (Contributions to education, No. 449.)
- SCHRAMMEL, HENRY E. The organization of State departments of education. Columbus, Ohio, The Ohio State University Press, 1925. 171 p. (Ohio State university studies. Bureau of educational research monographs, No. 6.)
- STREET, CLAUDE W. State control of teacher training in the United States.

- Pittsburg, Kans., Kansas State Teachers College, 1932. 103 p. (Bureau of educational research. Monograph No. 2.)
- U. S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. Accredited higher institutions, 1938. By Ella B. Ratchliffe. Washington, U. S. Government Printing Office, 1939. 212 p. (Bulletin 1938, No. 16.)
- Authority of State executive agencies over higher education. By John H. McNeely. Washington, U. S. Government Printing Office, 1936. 57 p. (Bulletin 1936, No. 15.)
- Collegiate accreditation by agencies within States. By Frederick J. Kelly; Benjamin W. Frazier; John H. McNeely; and Ella B. Ratchliffe. Washington, U. S. Government Printing Office, 1940. 219 p. (Bulletin 1940, No. 3.)
- Development of State programs for the certification of teachers. By Benjamin W. Frazier. Washington, U. S. Government Printing Office, 1938. 166 p. (Bulletin 1938, No. 12.)
- Educational directory. 1939. In 4 parts. Washington, U. S. Government Printing Office, 1939. 233 p. (Bulletin 1939, No. 1.)
- Fiscal control over State higher education. By John H. McNeely. Washington, U. S. Government Printing Office, 1940. 49 p. (Bulletin 1940, No. 8.)
- Higher-educational institutions in the scheme of State government. By John H. McNeely. Washington, U. S. Government Printing Office, 1939. 108 p. (Bulletin 1939, No. 3.)
- Professional staff of State departments of education. By Arthur W. Ferguson. Washington, U. S. Government Printing Office, 1925. 64 p. (Bulletin 1925, No. 17.)
- Selection and appointment of teachers. By W. S. Deffenbaugh and William H. Zeigel. Washington, U. S. Government Printing Office, 1933. 36 p. (Bulletin 1932, No. 17. National survey of secondary education. Monograph No. 12.)
- Selection, qualifications, and tenure of principal State school officers. By Ward W. Keesecker. Washington, The Office, January 1, 1939. 13 p. (mimeo.) (Circular No. 166.)
- Statistics of higher education, 1937-38. Vol. 2. Ch. 4. Biennial survey of education, 1936-38. Washington, U. S. Government Printing Office, 1940. 377 p. (Bulletin, 1940, No. 2.)
- Summary and interpretation. By Edward S. Evenden. Washington, U. S. Government Printing Office, 1935. 253 p. (Bulletin 1933, No. 10. National survey of the education of teachers. Vol. VI.)
- Supervision exercised by States over privately controlled institutions of higher education. By John H. McNeely. Washington, U. S. Government Printing Office, 1934. 64 p. (Bulletin 1934, No. 8.)
- The State and the preservice preparation of teachers of vocational education. By Henry S. Swanson. Washington, U. S. Government Printing Office, 1941. (Vocational Division. Bulletin No. 219.)
- Teacher personnel in the United States. By Edward S. Evenden; Guy C. Gamble; and Harold G. Blue. Washington, U. S. Government Printing Office, 1935. (Bulletin 1933, No. 10. National survey of the education of teachers. Vol. II.)
- YEBULL, GLADSTONE H. The special work and the office of the State director of teacher training. Doctor's dissertation. Cincinnati, Ohio, University of Cincinnati, 1927. 21 p.