

TRENDS IN THE ORGANIZATION OF STATE  
DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION IN THE  
UNITED STATES

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE DEPARTMENT OF  
EDUCATION AND THE GRADUATE COUNCIL OF THE KANSAS STATE  
TEACHERS COLLEGE OF EMPORIA IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF  
THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF  
MASTER OF SCIENCE

By

E. R. SONNENBERG

June, 1956

Approved for the Major Department

Approved for the Graduate Council

## ACKNOWLEDGMENT

At the suggestion of Dr. Edwin J. Brown, I undertook the investigation of the subject of this study. Whatever there may be of value in it, is due, to a very large extent, to his advice and guidance. I am indebted to Dr. H. E. Schrammel for council in ranking the states and for permission to use the results of his studies in this field. I owe thanks to the librarian and his assistants for many personal courtesies.

-- E.R.S.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
Nature of the Study . . . . .	1
Previous Studies . . . . .	1
Scope of the Study . . . . .	2
Method of Procedure . . . . .	2
Types of Data Collected . . . . .	3
Presentation of Data . . . . .	4
Definition of Terms . . . . .	4
II. THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION . . . . .	6
Composition of State Board of Education . . . . .	8
Size of Boards . . . . .	14
Recent Changes . . . . .	15
Measures Before 1935 Legislatures . . . . .	15
Term of Office of Board Members . . . . .	16
Legal Qualifications for State Board Members in 1935 . . . . .	18
Compensation of State Board Members in 1935 . . . . .	20
Number of Fixed Meetings . . . . .	23
The General Duties of the State Board . . . . .	23
Summary of Present Tendencies . . . . .	25
III. THE STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION . . . . .	26
The State Superintendent . . . . .	26
How Selected . . . . .	26
Term of Office . . . . .	29

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

CHAPTER	PAGE
III. (Continued)	
Salary . . . . .	32
Statutory Qualifications . . . . .	35
Legislative Action in 1935 . . . . .	37
Summary . . . . .	38
IV. RANKING OF THE STATES ACCORDING TO EDUCATIONAL	
ACHIEVEMENTS IN 1934 . . . . .	40
The Criteria Employed . . . . .	40
Value of Each Criterion . . . . .	41
Method of Evaluating Efficiency of State School Systems . . . . .	43
Highest and Lowest Limits in Each Criterion . . . . .	44
Rank of Each State on Each Criterion in 1934 . . . . .	45
Rank of the States in Each of Four Periods . . . . .	46
Comparison of Rankings Made by Others . . . . .	50
Types of Organization of the State Departments of Education . . . . .	50
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS . . . . .	58
Summary . . . . .	58
Conclusions . . . . .	59
Recommendations . . . . .	60
APPENDIX . . . . .	62
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	67

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
I. Composition of State Boards of Education . . . . .	9
II. Size of Boards . . . . .	13
III. Term of Office of Board Members in 1935 . . . . .	17
IV. Compensation of State Board Members in 1935 . . . . .	21
V. Number of Fixed Meetings . . . . .	22
VI. Method of Selecting the Chief School Official 1935 . . . . .	27
VII. Term of Office for the Chief School Officer 1935 and 1925 . . . . .	29
VIII. Relation Between Manner of Selecting the Chief State School Officer and his Term of Office in 1935 . . . . .	30
IX. Salaries of Chief State School Officials in 1935 According to Method by Which Elected . . . . .	32
X. Salaries of Certain Educators in 1928-29 . . . . .	34
XI. Highest and Lowest Limits of Each Criterion in 1920 and 1935 . . . . .	44
XII. Rank of Each State on Each Criterion in 1934 . . . . .	47
XIII. A Comparison of the Rankings of the States by Ayres, Phillips, and the Methods Used in This Study in Table XII . . . . .	50
XIV. Type of Organization of the State Departments of Education in 1935 . . . . .	52
XV. Rank of the Type of State Educational Organization Had by Each State in 1925 and 1935 . . . . .	55

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE

PAGE

I. Rank of States in Each of Four Periods . . . . . 49

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

#### Nature of the Study

This study purposes to trace the development in the field of state educational administration since 1925, including conditions affecting the state board of education, the state department of education, and the chief state school officer. An attempt will be made to discover what relation, if any, exists between type of organization which each state has and the educational efficiency of the forty-eight states as measured by eleven selected criteria.

#### Previous Studies

Studies relating to state departments of education have been made and published by many of the individual states. Studies of recent date which indicate trends in the organization and practices of state departments are of much value, but none makes an attempt to trace development in the entire field included among the forty-eight states.\*

But two studies have been found which tend to show the relationship between the type of organization a state may have had, and the desirable educational achievements resulting from it. H. E. Schrammel published a Doctor's Dissertation in 1926, on The Organization of State Departments of Education.<sup>1</sup>

---

\* For a partial list of such publications see the Bibliography, page

<sup>1</sup> H. E. Schrammel, The Organization of State Departments of Education The Ohio State University Press, Columbus, 1926.



The Research Division of the National Education Association<sup>2</sup> published Studies in State Educational Administration, in March 1931.

### Scope of the Study

The study of Dr. Schrammel traced the development of state education in the United States from the year 1890 up to 1925. Eleven criteria were set up as a measuring stick to determine state ranking on a basis of objective educational achievements. Trends in organization were pointed out.

The National Education Association study deals with staffs and salaries in state departments of education and presents findings to 1930.

The year 1925 was chosen as the period from which this study of educational tendencies, influences, and factors would begin because no complete study has been made since that time.

It is not assumed that all the factors which have to do with educational efficiency are presented and evaluated, but many of the important ones can be, and are, appraised. The organization of each state department of education will be studied to determine relative merits and demerits, in order, if possible, to arrive at some conclusion as to what constitutes the most efficient state organization, and what the trends have been during the past ten years.

### Method of Procedure

A study of state educational administration must of necessity be based upon original sources, because developments in this field have as their starting point legislative acts. Because of this, school laws, including

---

<sup>2</sup> Research Division, Studies in State Educational Administration, Washington, D. C., National Education Association, March, 1931.

3

legislation passed up to and including the year 1935, have been secured and are used as reference sources for this study.\*

Recommendations resulting from state surveys in different states by such organizations as the Brookings Institution, the United States Department of the Interior, and state legislatures, have been analyzed and compiled to indicate trends of thought in regard to procedures intended to strengthen state departments of education.

Latest reports from the United States Department of the Interior, Office of Education, and the Fifteenth Census of the United States have been used to secure data for ranking the objective educational achievements of the forty-eight states. This ranking has been checked against the type of organization a state has, in an attempt to show what relation, if any, exists. The eleven criteria used are the ones utilized by H. E. Schrammel in his study and are in this research because they lend themselves readily to an objective analysis, and because the data involved are available for each state and to a great extent have all been collected and compiled by the same agency the United States Government.

#### Types of Data Collected

Studies have been made in nearly every state of the Union on the subject of state educational administration. This has resulted in the building up of quite an extensive bibliography, much of which, however, is out of date. An attempt has been made for this study, to prepare a selected bibliography listing the most timely, pertinent, and recent studies under three

---

\* The writer wishes to express his obligation to the Graduate Division of the Kansas State Teachers College which through its exchange privileges secured the most recent copies of school laws from each state.

heads:\*

- A. General Theory.
- B. General Studies of Present Status.
- C. Surveys in Individual States.

For the study the following sources have been used:

- I. State Surveys.
- II. State School Laws.
- III. Studies in Official Publication.
- IV. Books.
- V. Magazine Articles.
- VI. Results of fact finding bodies such as  
Brookings Institution.
- VII. Interviews.

#### Presentation of Data

Data will be presented for the most part in the form of tables. A study of forty-eight separate state units of educational administration show many common items which lend themselves to grouping, but due to the lack of complete similarity, individual presentation has been necessary for some of the states.

#### Definition of Terms

Terminology does not differ greatly in the text of school laws enacted by the forty-eight state legislatures, however, for the sake of clarity and brevity, the following definitions of terms which have been used in this study are presented.

I. State Department of Education: That department in each state which is the agency for carrying into effect the state's educational policy as developed by legislative enactments and state board rules.

---

\* The office of the Executive Secretary of the Department of Superintendence, of the National Education Association, furnished the writer with a copy of the latest bibliography compiled by that association.

II. State Board of Education: That body which has general control and supervision of the public school system in each state, as prescribed by legislative enactments.

III. State Superintendent of Schools: The chief executive school officer of each state.

IV. Secondary Schools: Those schools supported by public taxes and offering studies in grades nine, ten, eleven, and twelve, in part or all four grades.

V. Elementary Schools: Those schools supported by public taxes and offering studies ranging by grades from kindergarten to and including the eighth grade.

VI. Total Population of each State: As listed in the Fifteenth Census of the United States Population.

VII. Illiteracy: As defined by the United States Government for purpose of census enumerators in taking the Fifteenth Census.

VIII. High School Graduates: Those pupils who have completed a prescribed four year high school course.

## CHAPTER II

### THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

Cubberley<sup>1</sup> in his discussion of early state boards of education credits New York state with having the first board, created in 1784 and known as "The Board of Regents of the University of the State of New York." This board is still in existence, but until the reorganization of 1909 it did not have supervisory control over elementary, secondary, and higher schools.

Continuing, the same writer says:<sup>2</sup>

The year 1837 was significant educationally for the creation of the Massachusetts State Board of Education. This was due in a large part to the efforts of Horace Mann, who became its first secretary and served the State in this capacity for twelve years. This board, consisting of the Governor, Lieutenant Governor, and eight citizens to be appointed by the Governor for eight year terms, one to retire each year, and with the power to appoint a secretary who should serve as their executive officer, marked a new form of state oversight in school organization and administration, and one the wisdom of which we are only now beginning to appreciate. The stimulating effect of the Massachusetts educational revival, which followed its creation, was felt all over the Northern States. Connecticut followed the Massachusetts plan in 1839. . . . . Since that time other boards have been created, the character and personnel has been changed, the powers and duties have been increased, and a number of new types of state boards have been created.

Obviously, it is a far cry from 1784, with one state board, to the year 1935 when Illinois, Maine, Nebraska, North Dakota, and Ohio are the only states in the Union not having state boards of education. Today (1935) forty-three states have state boards of education.

Education has grown by leaps and bounds in the United States since 1890. In that year one hundred fourteen millions of dollars were spent for

---

<sup>1</sup> Ellwood P. Cubberley, State School Administration, Boston, Houghton Mifflin Co., 1927, p. 282.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid., pp. 282-283.

current expense of running the schools along with a capital outlay of twenty six million more. This can be contrasted with the educational expenditures for 1935, which amounted to over one and one half billion dollars for current expense and over fifty nine millions of dollars for capital outlay. This of course for public education alone, not to mention money spent for private institutions of educational classification.

Education has become the chief business of the states. For its support the state and local units of county, district, township, municipality and the Federal Government spend more money annually than for any other permanent thing of public concern.

The public school system extending from the kindergarten to the university has come to be our greatest cooperative enterprise, requiring for its management and control professional and administrative ability of the highest character. There is reason to believe that thoughtful Americans are beginning to realize this as never before. The scrutiny of the tax payer, the demands of the social order upon education for better citizenry, are sounding a warning that education shall not lag behind civilization. From the standpoint of statesmanship and the public welfare, all the people are interested alike in the schools. The practice of small things in education still exist in state departments of education in some instances. State superintendents are elected on partisan political tickets, or without full regard for their professional or administrative ability are appointed by governors so elected. Many state boards of education are made up wholly or in part of persons appointed for the performance of other and quite different duties in offices supposed to be worthy of being filled by persons elected or appointed directly to them. Other boards are indefinitely constituted. Much improvement has been made during the last ten years, especially

as regards the separation of education from partisan politics.

The movement toward the establishment of state boards of education as the administrative head of the educational systems gained momentum during the interval between 1890 and 1920. During that time, the number of boards was increased by thirteen. Since 1925 Iowa and South Dakota have established state boards of education. The latter state organized its board under the session laws of 1935. North Dakota abolished its state board since 1925.

#### COMPOSITION OF STATE BOARDS OF EDUCATION

The composition of the boards having functions relative to the general school systems in the several states has undergone some change since 1925. The following series of tables show the present status in regard to the number of ex officio members in each board, the officers designated as ex officio members, number of appointive or elective members, by whom appointed or elected, length of term, remuneration, and number of meetings. Duties in general are listed. To present all of these items in detail would prove an endless and likely a pointless task. Changes made through reorganization in any state since 1925, have been pointed out, if they represent a radical departure from the old procedures.

At the present time (1935) there are forty-three states operating their educational set-up with state boards of education. Of these, six are composed entirely of ex officio members who are officers of the state with offices at the state capitol. These six are: Colorado, Florida, Mississippi, Missouri, North Carolina, and Oregon. Boards created in recent years are practically without exception of the governor appointed type. Twelve boards have no ex officio members. The governor is an ex officio member in sixteen states. Other state political officers than the state superintendent of

TABLE I  
COMPOSITION OF STATE BOARDS OF EDUCATION

	Ex Officio						Appointed or Elected				Term in Years	Total Ex Officio Members	Total Appointed or Elected Members	Total Number on Board
	Governor	Other State Officers	State Superintendent	Pres., State University	Pres. Ag. College	Pres. Teachers College	In Educational Work	Not in Educational Work	May or may not be in Educational Work	Appointed or Elected by				
Ala.	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	3	Gov.	6	2	3	10
Ariz.	1	1	1	1	1	2	3	1	1	Gov.	2	5	3	8
Ark.	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	7	1	Vot.	7	1	7	8
Calif.	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	Gov.	4	0	10	10
Colo.	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	Vot.	1	3	0	3
Conn.	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	Gov.	6	0	2	9
Dela.	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	3	1	Gov.	6	0	3	6
Fla.	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	Vot.	1	4	0	4
Ga.	1	1	1	1	1	1	3	1	1	Gov.	2	2	2	6
Idaho	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	5	1	Gov.	5	1	5	6
Indiana	1	1	1	1	1	1	4	2	1	Gov.	4	3	6	9
Iowa	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	Gov.	6	0	2	9
Kan.	1	1	1	1	1	1	3	0	1	Gov.	4	1	3	9
Ky.	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	7	0	Gov.	4	1	7	8
La.	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	11	0	Gov.	3	0	11	11
Md.	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	7	1	Gov.	7	0	7	7
Mass.	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	3	0	Gov.	3	0	7	7
Mich.	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	3	0	Vot.	3	1	3	4
Minn.	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	5	1	Gov.	5	0	5	5
Miss.	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	Vot.	1	3	0	3
Mo.	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	Vot.	1	4	0	4
Mont.	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	3	1	Gov.	4	3	3	11
Nev.	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	5	1	Vot.	4	2	5	7
N. H.	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	7	1	Gov.	5	1	7	8
N. J.	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	10	1	Gov.	3	0	10	10
N. Y.	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	12	1	Leg.	12	0	12	12
N. C.	1	5	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	Vot.	1	7	0	7
Okla.	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	4	1	Fov.	6	1	6	7
Ore.	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	Vot.	1	3	0	3
Pa.	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	9	1	Gov.	6	1	9	10



TABLE I (Continued)

	Ex Officio						Appointed or Elected					Term in Years	Total Ex Officio Members	Total Appointed or Elected Members	Total Number on Board
	Governor	Other State Officers	State Superintendent	Pres., State University	Pres. Ag. College	Pres. Teachers College	In Educational Work	Not in Educational Work	May or may not be in Educational Work	Appointed or Elected by					
R. I.	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	7	Leg.	3	2	7	9	
S. C.	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	7	Gov.	4	2	7	9	
S. D.	-	-	1	1	1	-	1	6	1	Gov.	4	3	4	7	
Tenn.	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	9	9	Gov.	6	2	9	11	
Texas	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9	-	Gov.	6	0	9	9	
Utah	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	9	9	b	7	1	1	10	
Vt.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	5	Gov.	10	0	5	5	
Va.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7	7	Gov.	4	0	7	7	
Wash.	-	-	1	1	1	1	3	1	1	Gov. <sup>c</sup>	2	4	3	7	
W. Va.	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	6	6	Gov.	6	1	6	7	
Wis. (1921)	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	3	3	d	5	2	3	10	
Wyom.	-	-	1	-	-	-	2	1	4	St.	6	1	6	7	
N. M.	1	-	1	-	-	-	3	-	2	Gov.	4	2	5	7	

a. Term of office is indefinite.

b. Seven selected by regional school board conventions--two by governor.

c. Presidents of State Normal Schools elect one from their group.

d. Governor appoints five, University Board of Regents one, Normal School Regents one, Vocational Education Board one.

Read table thus: In Alabama the governor is 1 ex officio State Board Member.

schools are found in the state board of education in eight states. The state superintendent is on the board, ex officio, in twenty-nine states. The president of the state university is on the board in three states. The president of the agricultural college serves in two states; and, presidents of the state teachers college are found in the organization of the state board in two states.

#### Appointment of the State Board of Education

Of the thirty-seven states having appointed or elective members on the state board, thirty-two leave the appointment to the governor, subject to approval, in twelve states, by the senate or general assembly. In two states, New York and Rhode Island, the members are selected by the state legislature. Arkansas, Michigan, and Nevada ask voters to elect board members at the regular state elections. In Wyoming the state superintendent appoints members, subject to the approval of the governor. In Wisconsin\* the governor appoints five members, and the University Board of Regents, the Normal School Regents, and the Vocational Education Board each selects one member.

The Utah legislature of 1935 changed the composition and method of selecting the state board of education in that state. All ex officio members except the state superintendent of school were eliminated from the board. A state board consisting of the state superintendent of education and nine other persons was provided for. Of these nine members, seven are selected for seven year terms by regional school board conventions (one convention to be held annually in one of the seven judicial districts of the state), and the remaining members are selected by the governor.

---

\* Based on the last available report

Previously the state board of education in Utah consisted of the state superintendent, president of the state university, president of the state agricultural college, and six other persons appointed by the governor. The state superintendent was ex officio chairman. Under the new plan the state board elects from its members a chairman and a vice chairman for two year terms.

This procedure marks a most decided step toward local school board members determining their state board membership, and should be a step toward getting away from the factor of partisan politics entering into the personnel of the state board of education.

With respect to qualifications of appointive board members, Arizona and Washington require all appointive members to be persons engaged in school work. Georgia, Indiana, Kansas, Massachusetts, New Mexico, Oklahoma, South Dakota, and Wyoming require that a specified number of appointive members shall be engaged in educational work. Kentucky, Louisiana, New Hampshire, New York, and Texas require that none of the members shall be engaged in educational work. Kansas says two, and South Dakota, three, members shall not be in educational work.

Alabama and Arkansas choose one member from each congressional district. Connecticut chooses one from each county. Delaware, New Jersey, and West Virginia have attempted to take partisan politics out of appointments as much as possible. Respectively they say, not more than, three, five, and four from the same political party. Texas seems to have an eye on the textbook situation with this provision, "Board members shall have no connection in any way with textbook companies or publishers of text books."

Wyoming seems to have considered the matter quite carefully. The plan here says, "Six citizens, representing different parts of the state,

not more than four from the same political party, persons of mature age, known for their integrity, culture, public spirit, business ability, interest in public education, and chosen solely because of their character and fitness, shall be appointed to the board membership. Two shall be actively engaged in educational work."

The general tendency seems to be that board members shall be selected by the governor and appointed by him. This method, under proper restrictions, has these merits. First, it recognizes the executive head of the state as the person responsible for the efficient operation of each department of public service. The state board is made responsible to the people who furnish support. Second, responsibility is centered where it can be definitely located. When the legislature elects, it becomes a task to definitely locate responsibility. Third, requiring that appointments be made from an eligible list, or in some other way throwing proper definite limitations around the appointing power, provides against abuse and protects the board from undue political interference. It is doubtful if it is ever advisable to make the governor a member of the state board of education, even though sixteen states do this.

Careful studies of state boards of education have reached the conclusion in a majority of their recommendations for reorganization of boards, that there should be no ex officio members on the boards. One argument presented is that the time of ex officio members is taken up with their primary duties in their official offices. Their interest in the state school system tends to be secondary. There is the further disadvantage that the ex officio member may be displaced at the next election. Ex officio boards do not inspire public confidence. Some writers hold that the ex officio board is definitely on its way out and that in time it will become obsolete.

City administration has pointed the way which clearly indicates that boards of education should be non-professional. A lay body representing the state at large and composed of members who are liberal in their thinking on broad aspects of educational policy should make up the state board. Professional duties are best carried out by a professional executive and his staff. There is the possibility that members of a professional board may represent their own personal educational interests to the exclusion of all others. Situations like this may make for contention and undemocratic procedure. A state superintendent, who desires professional advice, may ask for it and report to his board with far more freedom, if he has a lay board.

TABLE II

## SIZE OF BOARDS

Number of Members	Number of States Having Each Number		
	1910	1925	1935
None	17	7	5
Three	7	6	3
Five	3	4	2
Six	3	4	5
Four	3	2	3
Seven	5	9	12
Eight	3	6	3
Nine	4	3	7
Ten	0	1	6
Eleven	2	4	3
Twelve	1	1	1
Thirteen	0	1	0
Total	48	48	48
Median	3	6	7
Mode	17	7	7

Read table thus: In 1910 seventeen states had no board members.

## SIZE OF BOARDS

The size of boards varies from three to twelve members. The median size in 1925 was seven. It remains that in 1935. In 1910 five states had boards of seven, today (1935) twelve states have that size board. As the tendency to let the governor appoint board members has developed, the size of boards has tended to centralize itself around a board numbering seven to nine persons; twenty-two boards falling within this classification. Of the six boards which are entirely ex officio, three have three members, each, two have five, and one has seven.

Thirteen boards have no ex officio members. In this group, three have five members, one has six, four have seven, three have nine, one has eleven, and one has twelve. Here again the greater number centers around seven and nine members.

The twenty-four remaining boards have both ex officio and elective or appointive members. One has four members, two have six, eight have seven, three have eight, four have nine, four have ten, and two have eleven. The tendency is here too, centered around boards of from seven to nine members.

State school surveys, in nearly every instance, point out that the state board of education should consist of not less than four members nor more than nine. It should be said that there is little evidence that larger boards are inefficient; it would likely be nearer the truth to say that many are efficient in spite of the handicap involved in too large numbers. Administratively, the principle of more than four and less than five is sound. This is not only theory, but it is also an accepted practice. Small boards may be dominated by one person either within or without the board. Large boards may disagree over trivialities; expeditious action is often hard to secure. The argument has been put forth that the larger the board, the more

special interests represented, however, it is highly doubtful whether it is legitimate for a board of education to represent special interests. The general public is the logical group to be represented. For all general purposes the small group can represent public interests quite as well as the many, if not better. The median membership in twenty-nine boards, in 1890, was five; in 1900, five; in 1910, 6.5; in 1920, seven; and in 1935, seven. Six states operate without a State Board of Education.

#### RECENT CHANGES

Delaware changed in 1931 from four to six members.

Kentucky reorganized in 1934 and increased the number from three, who were elective state officials, to eight; seven lay members and the state superintendent of public instruction.

Nevada changed in 1931, from a membership of three, who were elective state officials, to a board of seven; the state superintendent, the governor, and five lay members.

Utah changed in 1935 (previous mention has been made).

Vermont amended its law in 1935. The membership of the board was increased from three to five members. The term of office of the members was increased from six years to ten years.

#### MEASURES BEFORE 1935 LEGISLATURE

Ohio: Would organize the state department of education under the general guidance and direction of the state board of education composed of nine members, one from each court of appeals district, appointed by the court thereof for a term of six years. The state board of education would be empowered to determine all matters of policy committed by law to the state de-

partment of education or the chief officers thereof and establish rules for carrying into effect its policies and the laws of the state relating to education. This measure would also empower the state board of education to elect the director of education to serve at the pleasure of the board.

Tennessee: Proposed a state board of education composed of nine members appointed by the governor which, "shall be responsible for determining the policies of the entire educational program, including the elementary schools, high schools, colleges, adult education, eleemosynary institutions, (state university excepted)."

New Mexico: The legislature voted to submit the following proposed amendment to the state constitution (to be voted on by the voters at the next general election). The amendment, if adopted, will provide for a state board of education, appointed by the governor for six year overlapping terms, and will vest the board with control, management, and direction of all public schools and give to it all powers now vested in the present state board of education and the state superintendent of public instruction. The new board to appoint a commissioner of education, who must be an experienced educator and selected solely on the basis of merit, administrative ability, and professional preparation. The commissioner to hold office at the pleasure of the board and to receive a salary fixed by the board.

Two or four years is usually the length of term of the office for ex officio members, terminating at the expiration of their term of office.

Reference to Table III indicates that twenty-four states have five or more years term of office for board members. States are almost unanimous in providing for overlapping terms of office. Five years or more is highly desirable as a term because this interval, along with overlapping terms, is long enough to reduce political interference to a minimum. Enough flexibility



TABLE III

## TERM OF OFFICE OF BOARD MEMBERS IN 1935\*

Years of Term	Number States Having Each
(1)	(2)
Two	1
Three	1
Four	11
Five	4
Six	12
Seven	3
Eight	2
Ten	1
Twelve	1
Not Specified	1
Total	36

Read table thus: Two years is the length of term in 1 state.

\* Ex officio boards are omitted from this table.

is present to make possible, conservative alterations in policy, should changing needs or conditions demand them. Writers agree that five years or more is most desirable. Recent surveys in the following states recommended, for Indiana, a term of six years, for Vermont, a five year term. Seven years was recommended in California. An eight year term in Arizona. Nine years for Utah and Texas. Twelve years for Alabama. The writer was unable to find recommendations for a term of less than five years, in any of the accepted literature consulted, which deals with the subject.

Overlapping terms make for continuity of policy and practice. It is unfortunate to have an entire board changed in a very short interval of time. Enough old members should always be left to orient the new members and to insure the continuation of policies. Needed reforms take time, if the public is to be educated to acceptance of them.

In line with this same policy is that of removal of a member from office. Authorities agree that there should be no removal or summary dismissal of an officer of the board. When removed, it should only be for proved charges of neglect of duty.

Such a requirement as this tends to give the member a feeling of confidence and freedom of action which is necessary for a reasonable continuity of policy. Further, the member is protected from removal through political reasons or for personal reasons of the governor. Such reasons are antagonistic to the welfare of the public schools. These conditions should be made impossible in any state.

✓ LEGAL QUALIFICATIONS FOR APPOINTIVE BOARD MEMBERS

Residential:

- One from each county . . . . . Connecticut  
Rhode Island<sup>a</sup>
- One from each congressional district . . . . . Arkansas  
Alabama  
Louisiana  
South Carolina
- One third from each grand division of state . . . . . Tennessee
- Each district (judicial) at least one member . . . . . New York
- Not more than one from each county; five or more  
years residence in the state . . . . . New Jersey
- Adequate representation for entire state . . . . . Vermont  
Wyoming

Political:

- Not more than five from same political party . . . . . New Jersey  
Iowa
- Not more than four from same political party . . . . . West Virginia  
Wyoming
- Not more than three from same political party  
and resident of state for five years . . . . . Delaware

---

<sup>a</sup> Except the county of Providence, which has three state board members

## Professional:

Three experienced Georgia teachers . . . . .	Georgia
Four actively engaged in educational work . . . . .	Indiana
One teacher of the commonwealth . . . . .	Massachusetts
One person engaged in educational work . . . . .	New Mexico
Two with actual teaching experience of four years, two of it in Oklahoma . . . . .	Oklahoma
Two actively engaged in educational work . . . . .	Wyoming
One county superintendent of schools . . . . .	Arizona
	Kansas
	New Mexico
	Washington
One city superintendent of schools . . . . .	Arizona
and one high school principal	Kansas
	Washington
One head of a state educational institution . . . . .	New Mexico
	Washington
One superintendent or principal of an independent school district . . . . .	South Dakota
One from the State University or the Kansas State College and one from a private or denomina- tional college in the state . . . . .	Kansas

## Miscellaneous:

Two citizens either, farmers, business or professional men . . . . .	Kansas
Two university trustees . . . . .	New Hampshire
Only one alumnus of each institution of higher learning on the board at one time . . . . .	Iowa
At least two women . . . . .	Massachusetts
	New Jersey
No members to be professional educators at time of appointment . . . . .	Kentucky
	New Hampshire
	Texas
	South Dakota
A laborer, a farmer, and a home maker (woman), no connection in any way with textbooks or textbook publishers . . . . .	Texas
Qualified electors and taxpayers . . . . .	Idaho

State legislatures seeming to realize that it is a problem to secure suitable appointees for state board of education membership, have provided certain qualifications for members. The general intention in providing these qualifications has been to serve the interests of all the people through the members of the board.

## COMPENSATION OF STATE BOARD MEMBERS IN 1935

The office of state board member, in all states having boards, is primarily a position of honor and public trust. The compensation is sufficient in all instances to meet necessary expenses incident to board meetings. This makes it possible for persons of efficiency and ability to serve on these boards. Payment of large salaries or honorariums, since the governor in most instances makes the appointments, would lead to having the office sought for by political appointees who might or might not be worthy board members.

Three plans for remuneration of board members were in effect in 1935. States allow expenses only, a small per diem and expenses, or an honorarium. The practice of a small per diem and expenses is most suitable. Reference to Table IV shows, however, that seventeen states pay their board members expenses only, while attending meeting of the board. Writers on this subject read for this study, seem to agree that there is no legitimate reason for a salary or for full time service by board members.

TABLE IV

COMPENSATION OF STATE BOARD MEMBERS IN 1935

Compensation (1)	States (2)
Expenses only . . . . .	Arkansas California Connecticut Iowa Kentucky Maryland Massachusetts Montana Nevada New Hampshire New Jersey North Carolina Pennsylvania Rhode Island South Dakota Virginia Wyoming
Expenses and per diem	
\$25 per day, not more than 1 day a month . . . . .	Delaware
\$10 per day . . . . .	Alabama <sup>a</sup> Louisiana Minnesota Texas
\$8 per day, not over 60 days per year . . . . . (1921)	Wisconsin
\$6 per day, \$3 per day hotel expenses . . . . .	Oklahoma
\$5 per day . . . . .	Arizona Indiana <sup>b</sup> Kansas <sup>c</sup> New Mexico <sup>d</sup> Tennessee Vermont <sup>e</sup> Washington
\$4 per day . . . . .	South Carolina <sup>f</sup> Utah
\$3 per day . . . . .	Michigan
\$250 per annum and expenses . . . . .	Georgia
\$1000 per annum and expenses . . . . .	West Virginia

- a. Not more than 25 days.
- b. Five cents per mile travel expenses.
- c. Not to exceed ten days in any one year.
- d. Six cents per mile travel expense.
- e. Only compensation received.
- f. Not exceeding 20 days in any one year.

Read table thus: Expenses only are paid to members of the Arkansas State Board.

TABLE V  
NUMBER OF FIXED MEETINGS

Meetings per year	States
(1)	(2)
Annually . . . . .	Alabama Colorado Delaware Indiana Louisiana Michigan Washington
Semi-annually . . . . .	Idaho Nevada Oregon Wyoming
Quarterly . . . . .	Arizona Arkansas California Georgia Iowa Kentucky Maryland Minnesota Montana New Mexico Rhode Island South Dakota Tennessee Texas Vermont
Every two months . . . . .	New Hampshire
Monthly . . . . .	Massachusetts New Jersey
Hold at least six during the year . . . . .	West Virginia
At call . . . . .	Connecticut Florida Kansas Mississippi Missouri South Carolina Pennsylvania
All states make provision for called meeting when occasion arises for its need.	

education, the conditions and needs of the state to make plans for the improvement of the public schools. Establish courses of instruction for the institutions of learning. Determine all questions of educational policy within its powers. Grant teaching certificates.

New Hampshire: Has a particularly good set-up. This board has the same power over schools that a business directorate has over business. Makes all rules and regulations; sets qualification standards; employs a commissioner of education and such assistants as may be recommended by him.

Pennsylvania: Report and recommend to the governor and the general assembly, regarding legislation needed by the schools. Equalize, by special appropriations of funds, educational advantages. Encourage and promote agricultural education, manual training, domestic science, and other vocational and practical education. Investigate and make recommendations for schools of design, of industrial arts, or other educational institutions financed by the general assembly. Promulgate and determine standards for certificates to teach elementary and secondary schools of the state.

Iowa:\* The board shall:

1. Each even numbered year elect, from its members, a president of the board, who shall serve for two years and until his successor is elected and qualified.
2. Elect a president of said institutions of higher learning; a superintendent of each of said institutions; a treasurer and secretarial officer for each institution annually; professors and instructors, officers and employees; and fix their compensation.
3. Make rules for admission to and for the government of said institutions, and not inconsistent with law.
4. Manage and control the property, both real and personal, belonging to said institutions.

5. With the approval of the executive council, acquire real estate for the proper uses of said institutions, and dispose of real estate belonging to said institutions when not necessary for their purposes.

6. Accept and administer trusts deemed by it beneficial to, and perform obligations of the institutions.

7. Direct the expenditure of all appropriations made to said institutions.

8. Collect highest rate of interest, consistent with safety, obtainable on daily balances in the hands of the treasurer of each institution.

#### SUMMARY OF PRESENT TENDENCIES

The most effective agency for administering the state's educational affairs is a state board of education as the administrative head of the educational system; this board to be made up of men who have a working knowledge of the business which they are to administer; a board which shall be appointed by the governor of the state, with restrictions imposed to guarantee the fitness of those chosen and to guard against arbitrary use or abuse of the appointive power. A board having five to nine members, who shall be appointed for a term of at least five years, and whose term of office shall overlap so that small groups may retire from the board at one time. This, so that there may be continuity of policy, freedom from political interference, and effective service by the board member. A board which receives a small per diem salary and expenses, while attending meetings at least four times a year. Finally, a board made responsible directly to the governor and through him to the citizens of the state, for all the educational interests of the state, and given full power to administer the business.



## CHAPTER III

### THE STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

#### The State Superintendent

The state department of education is usually made the agency for carrying into effect the state's educational policy as developed by legislative enactments and state board rules. In addition to this large and increasing legal authority assigned to this office, an almost unlimited field of advisory and guidance functions in every phase of educational administration is open to it.

Education in the United States is not the function of the Federal Government; the states carry the primary responsibility for public education. The state school officials are responsible for the education of all persons within their jurisdiction. Heading up this responsibility, directing, and administering it, are the forty-eight chief school officers of the states. Educational progress depends immeasurably upon the vision and professional skill of these chief officials and their staffs.

In thirty-three states the office of state superintendent of public instruction was created as a political office and remains an office to be filled by vote of the people today (1935). It is difficult to change this plan. The state board of education appoints the chief school officer in Arkansas, Delaware, Idaho,\* Maryland, Minnesota, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and Vermont. The governor appoints the chief school officer in Maine, Massachusetts, New Jersey, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, and Virginia. The

---

\* Idaho and Wyoming each has a commissioner of education, appointed by the governor, in addition to a state superintendent of public instruction.

Board of Regents appoints in New York. One state, Wyoming, permits the state board of education to appoint but requires the approval of the governor to the appointment.

TABLE VI

## METHOD OF SELECTING THE CHIEF SCHOOL OFFICIAL IN 1935

Method Employed	1925	1935
(1)	(2)	(3)
Election by popular vote	33	33
Appointment by the governor	6	7
Appointment by state board	9	8
Appointment by board of regents	0	1
State board and governor	0	1
Total	48	50*

Read table thus: In 1925, 33 states elected their chief school official by popular vote.

\* This total includes two officials each, from the states of Wyoming and Idaho.

Educational writers on the subject of method in selecting the chief school official agree that the office should not be a political one, but they disagree as to how, in the interests of greater efficiency, he ought to be appointed. The majority seem to favor his appointment by a non-partisan state board of education. Objections to the office being political are based upon the following assumptions: this method of appointment limits the field from which the man is selected; he must be a citizen of the given state. In states where the chief school officer is chosen by the state board of education, and in the states where he is chosen by the governor, he may be

selected from the country at large. This practice of choosing at large, is in accordance with action taken by city boards of education in selecting superintendents; college, university and private educational institutions select executive heads of these institutions from the country at large.

In states where the chief school officer is elected by popular vote the salary is fixed beforehand by law; the salary cannot be adjusted to fit the man desired, but the man must be found to fit the salary. Where the officer is elected by popular vote, the term of office is short, two to four years, and uncertain reappointment. Continuity of policy becomes uncertain. Long time educational planning may be impossible. A final criticism is that under popular vote the office is strictly a political one, subject to all the fluctuations of party and factional politics. No one can look to it as a career.

Election by popular vote has its merits. The voters have a voice in the selection of the official who is to manage their schools. Public interest is created in education and places the office on equal rank with that of other elective state offices.

The appointment of the chief school officer of the state by the state board of education is comparable to the commission form of city government. The board appoints an expert executive from the country at large, chosen by virtue of his ability and qualifications for the office; it determines his salary, and his term of office, removing him if he proves incompetent.

Those who would have the governor appoint, present much the same arguments advanced for having the state board of education do the appointing. The objection also is raised, that the chief school officer is subject to too much political dictation when so appointed and that the governor is not capable of finding the right person, as is the board which deals more closely

with the educational situation. On the whole, appointment by the state board of education seems to have more arguments in favor of it than opposed to it.

### TERM OF OFFICE

TABLE VII

TERM OF OFFICE FOR THE CHIEF SCHOOL OFFICER IN 1925 and 1935

Length of Term in Years	Number of States	
	1925	1935
(1)	(2)	(3)
One	2	2
Two	14	12
Three	1	1
Four	24	26
Five	2	2
Six	1	1
Indefinite	4	6
<b>Total</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>50*</b>

Read table thus: In 1925 two states had chief state school officers holding office for a term of one year.

\* Includes two officials from each state in Wyoming and Idaho.

Table VII shows that there has been little change during the last year interval, in term of the chief school official. The weight of competent opinion, as shown in the recommendations of state school surveys, and elsewhere, agrees almost unanimously that there is need for longer or indefinite terms of office for chief state school executives.

The survey made for the state of Alabama<sup>1</sup> in 1932 recommends in part

---

<sup>1</sup> Brookings Institution, Institute for Government Research. Organization and Administration of State Government of Alabama, pp. 325-36.

that the state superintendent should be appointed by the state board of education; he should serve without term; that he be removable, at pleasure, by the board; that no limit be established by law with regard to his residence at the time of his appointment. The Brookings findings are duplicated in part in nearly every other survey which deals with the topic of the chief state school official.

Provisions such as these just listed, especially as regards the length of term, make possible the consistent and unhampered development of a constructive educational program. It will be observed from Table VIII that twenty-six states make provision for at least a four-year term for the chief state school officials.

TABLE VIII

RELATION BETWEEN MANNER OF SELECTING THE CHIEF STATE SCHOOL OFFICER AND HIS TERM OF OFFICE IN 1935

Term in Years	Elected by People	Appointed by Governor	Appointed by State Board
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
One	--	--	2
Two	10	1	1
Three	--	1	--
Four	23	3	1
Five	--	2	--
Six	--	--	1
Indefinite	--	--	6

Read table thus: Two chief state school officers were appointed by the state board of education for a term of one year.

The term of office of those selected by popular vote is either two or four years. The governor appointees hold office from two to five years. Those appointed by the state board from one year to an indefinite length of

time.

Reeder<sup>2</sup> in summarizing results of his studies in the selection, duties and term of office of the chief state school officer has this to say in relation to that officials term of office:

A long and fixed term has the advantage of protecting from political interference a strong official who is engaged in carrying out a constructive educational policy. Such provision, however, has the inherent weakness of making it difficult, if not practically impossible, to get rid of a weak official before the expiration of his term. Inability to dispense with the services of such an individual might mean, in some instances, long suffering for the schools. The term should be determined in such a manner that the interests of neither the chief school officer nor the schools would suffer.

Indefinite tenure, which might permit the strong official to retain his office and would permit the removal of the weak official, seems to be the one method which meets this need.

Cook<sup>3</sup> writing in favor of indefinite tenure for the chief state school official says, "The typical state superintendent barely comes to the climax of his personal touch with the field by the conclusion of his term."

---

<sup>2</sup> Ward G. Reeder, The Chief State School Official. p. 29.

<sup>3</sup> William A. Cook, Federal and State School Administration. p. 43.

TABLE IX  
SALARIES OF CHIEF STATE SCHOOL OFFICIALS IN 1935  
ACCORDING TO METHODS BY WHICH ELECTED

Salary Groups	Popular Vote	Appointed by		Total
		State Bd.	Governor	
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
\$ 2000-Under	1	---	---	1
2001-2500	---	---	---	1
2501-3000	5	---	---	5
3001-3500	---	---	---	---
3501-4000	10	---	1	11
4001-4500	2	---	---	2
4501-5000	8	2	1	11
5001-6000	4	2	1	7
6001-7000	1	1	1	3
7001-8000	2	2	0	4
8001-9000	---	---	1	1
9001-10000	---	2	---	2
10001-12000	---	---	1	1
15000	---	1	1	2
Total	33	10	7	50*
Median	\$4500	\$6250		
Range	\$1800-7500	\$2400-15000	\$5000-15000	

Read table thus: The salary of the chief school official, elected by popular vote, was \$2000 or less, for a year.

\* Includes the salaries of both Commissioner of Education and State Superintendent of Public Instruction for the states of Wyoming and Idaho.

The salary of the chief state school officer varies with the method employed for selection. (Table IX shows that the lowest salaries are paid those states where the school officer is chosen by popular vote. The median salary in these states is \$4500. The median salary for those appointed the state board of education is \$6250 and for those appointed by governor \$7225. Of the eighteen chief school officials receiving \$4000 or less,

but one are elected by vote of the people. Nevertheless, some appointed officials receive less than elected officials. A further explanation of the lower salary level of the popular vote group of chief school officers, is that many states selecting by popular vote have constitutional provisions fixing the salary to be paid by the state.

Just what amount constitutes an adequate salary for the chief school officer is difficult to measure, since it depends upon conditions which vary among the several states. A general estimate of the inadequacy of his salary may be derived from a study of salaries paid to the superintendents of large city school systems in the same state and to heads of the higher institutions. Such a comparison was made by the National Education Association Research Division, Staffs and Salaries in State Departments of Education. Number 9, March, 1931. Washington, D. C. The comparison referred to is found under Table 24, page 45, of the study. It presents such a graphic picture of the salary comparisons that the writer has included it in this study under the title, Table X, Salaries of Certain Educators.

Table X shows for each of forty-seven states the salary\* of the chief state school official, the salary of the highest paid city superintendency and the salary of the president of the state university or land-grant college. Of the forty-nine chief state school officials included in this study, for three receive a lower salary than the highest paid city superintendent in their respective states. Twenty of these officials receive salaries which are only one half or less than one half of that of their highest paid city superintendents. Data for this relationship may be found in column 5 of Table X.

Column 6 of Table X makes a comparison of the salaries of the chief

---

\* These salaries are in effect today (1935) for the most part.



TABLE X  
SALARIES OF CERTAIN EDUCATORS (1928-1929)

	Chief State School Officer	Highest Sal- ary Paid City Super- intendent	President of State University	Per cent Column 2 is of	
				Column 3	Column 4
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Ala.	6,000	12,000	12,000	50.00	50.00
Ariz.	4,500	8,500	10,500	52.94	42.86
Ark.	5,000	6,000	10,500	83.33	50.00
Calif.	5,000	12,000	15,000 <sup>2</sup>	41.67	33.33
Colo.	3,000	10,000	8,500	30.00	35.29
Conn.	10,000	11,000	9,000 <sup>3</sup>	90.91	111.11
Dela.	6,500	6,500	8,000	100.00	81.25
Fla.	6,000	6,750	10,000	88.89	60.00
Ga.	4,500	7,500	8,500	60.00	52.94
Idaho	2,400 <sup>4</sup> 7,500 <sup>5</sup>	5,000	10,000	48.00 150.00	24.00 75.00
Ill.	7,500	15,000	20,000	50.00	37.50
Indiana	5,000	12,000	12,000	41.67	41.67
Iowa	4,000	10,000	15,000 <sup>3</sup>	40.00	26.67
Kan.	3,000	7,500	10,000	40.00	30.00
Ky.	4,000	5,000	12,000 <sup>2</sup>	80.00	33.33
La.	7,500	10,000	10,000	75.00	75.00
Me.	5,000	5,000	9,000	100.00	55.56
Md.	10,000	10,000	15,000	100.00	66.67
Mass.	9,000	12,000	7,500 <sup>5</sup>	75.00	120.00
Mich.	6,000	17,000	20,000 <sup>2</sup>	35.29	30.00
Minn.	5,000	10,000	18,000	50.00	27.78
Miss.	4,000	6,000	4,800	66.67	83.33
Mo.	3,000	11,000	.....	27.27	.....
Mont.	3,600	6,000	6,500	60.00	53.38
Nebr.	5,000	10,000	12,000	50.00	41.67
Nev.	3,800	4,000	12,000	90.00	30.00
N. H.	5,000	9,000	9,000	55.56	55.56
N. J.	15,000	15,000	15,000 <sup>3</sup>	100.00	100.00
N. M.	3,000	4,800	7,500	62.50	40.00
N. Y.	15,000	25,000	20,000 <sup>3</sup>	60.00	75.00
N. C.	5,000	6,600	10,000	75.75	50.00
N. D.	3,000	5,000	7,500	60.00	40.00
Ohio	6,500	15,000	12,000	43.33	54.17
Okla.	6,000	13,800	12,500	43.48	48.00
Ore.	4,000	8,000	12,600	50.00	31.75

TABLE X (Continued)

	Chief State School Officer	Highest Salary Paid City Superintendent	President of State University	Per cent Column 2 is of	
				Column 3	Column 4
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Pa.	12,000	15,000	.....	80.00	.....
R. I.	6,000	7,800	6,000	76.92	100.00
S. C.	5,000	5,400	9,000	92.59	55.56
S. D.	1,800	5,750	10,000	31.30	18.00
Texas	4,000	11,000	10,000	36.36	40.00
Utah	4,000	8,000	10,000	50.00	40.00
Vt.	6,000	4,500	12,000	133.33	50.00
Va.	6,000	7,750	15,000	77.42	40.00
Wash.	4,000	11,000	12,000	36.36	33.33
W. Va.	7,000	10,000	15,000	70.00	46.67
Wis.	5,000	10,000	20,400	50.00	24.51
Wyom.	4,000 <sup>4</sup>	5,500	12,500	72.73	32.00
	4,800 <sup>5</sup>			87.27	38.40
Median	5,000	9,000	10,500	55.56	47.62

1. Cash salary.
2. Salary for 1928-29.
3. Salary paid head of land-grant college.
4. State Superintendent of Public Instruction.
5. Commissioner of Education.

Read table thus: In Alabama, the Chief School Officer receives a salary of \$6,000.

state school officials with those of the presidents of state universities or where there is no state university, or the salary of the president is not reported, with the salary of the president of the land-grant college. Only two salaries paid chief state school officials are greater than the salary of the head of the higher institutions in the same state. Two receive the same salary, and forty-three receive a lower salary. Thirty-seven state school officials receive less than two thirds of the salary paid the head of the state higher institutions. Twenty-six receive less than one half and ten receive less than one third.

In making the above comparison, it would be of little avail to attempt to compare the importance or difficulty of the work done by each group. All of these officials are carrying out important functions and all positions should carry a salary which will attract men of ability and leadership. Other things being equal, a state is likely to secure the kind of educational leadership it is willing to pay for. Writers consulted, agree that it is undesirable to name a salary suitable throughout all states.

#### STATUTORY QUALIFICATION OF THE CHIEF SCHOOL OFFICIAL

In thirty-three states the chief school official is a constitutional state officer. Qualifications relating to his age, residence and civil status are laid down by law. Supplementary requirements have from time to time been added to the qualifications originally prescribed by law. The legal qualifications of the state chief school official, in effect in 1935 and 1925 are here presented.

<u>Requirements</u>	<u>Number of States</u>	
	1935	1925
State Certificate . . . . .	6	6
College or University Graduate . . . . .	12	8
Two years Graduate Study . . . . .	1	1
Special Training and Experience . . . . .	16	6
Three to Seven Years Experience . . . . .	16	5

In 1925 eighteen states made some sort of educational requirements for the chief school official. In 1935 twenty-seven states made requirements regarding qualifications for election or appointment. No doubt the other twenty-one states, especially those in which the chief state official is appointed, have qualification requirements which may be equal to or greater than, those prescribed by state statutes.

Limiting choice of the appointed chief state school officer to residence in the state from which he is chosen, is completely out. The seventeen states which have the chief school officer appointed, specify in each instance, that choice of the appointee shall not be limited to state residents. This trend points to the significance attached to the functions of control and leadership in the office. Professional leadership can best be secured, if the field of choice is not limited.

Qualifications, indicating trends in qualifications for appointive chief school officials designed to give the appointing agency freedom to secure the best candidate, are to be found in the following selected states.

Idaho: The commissioner of education shall be chosen upon merit, and because of special fitness to propose and execute beneficial educational policies for the general supervision, government, and control of the state educational institutions and the public schools of the state.

Maryland: A graduate of a standard college and in addition, two years of university training. An experienced and competent educator with a

least seven years' experience in teaching and administration.

Vermont: A trained and skillful executive officer, who shall have had special training and experience in educational work.

Wyoming: A person of literary and scientific attainments, versed in history, theory, and principles of education, with practical knowledge of the organization and management of the schools. Graduate of a standard four year college or university, or have an equivalent education and training. He shall be an experienced educator, actively engaged in educational work at the time or within two years of the time of his assuming the duties of office.

Minnesota: The commissioner of education shall possess educational attainment and breadth of experience in the administration of public education, and of the finance pertaining thereto, commensurate with the spirit and intent of the act.

#### LEGISLATIVE ACTION IN 1935 AFFECTING THE OFFICE OF THE CHIEF STATE SCHOOL OFFICIAL

New Mexico: If the electors adopt a proposed amendment to the state constitution at the next general election in that state, the office of state superintendent of schools will be dispensed with and will be replaced by the office of state commissioner of education.

South Dakota: Voters will decide for or reject an amendment to the constitution to provide for the election of the state superintendent of public instruction on a non-political ballot.

Utah: Submits to the electors a proposal to amend the constitution so as to permit the removal of the state superintendent of public instruction from politics and providing for his appointment by the state board of education. This measure must be passed upon by the people at the next election.

(1936)

3

EDUCATIONAL MEASURES RELATING TO THE CHIEF STATE SCHOOL

OFFICER BEFORE 1935 LEGISLATURES

Idaho: Would require that all candidates for the office of state superintendent of public instruction be holders of not less than a master's degree in education from a college or university approved by the state board of education and that such candidates be actively engaged in educational work in the state.\*

SUMMARY

There are five different methods of selecting the chief state school official, in use today, 1935. Election by the people, appointment by the state board of education, and appointment by the governor, account for filling the office in forty-six states. Popular election is the most common method. Appointment by the state board of education or the governor is more desirable than the first method.

One to six years is the term of office of the chief state school official. Six states specify an indefinite term of years. If there has been much tendency at all since 1925, it has been toward a lengthened term of office. Five years or longer is most in favor because it provides continuity of policy, and for long time educational planning.

Salaries vary from a minimum of \$1800 to a maximum of \$15,000 for the chief school official. In most cases, the salary is, in amount, far under that paid superintendents and presidents of higher institutions of learning in the same state. Appointive chief school officials draw a larger salary.

---

\* Idaho probably had in mind setting up standards for its state superintendent of public instruction, comparable to those qualifications required of its commissioner of education.

in most instances, than do those elected by the people.

In 1935 twenty-seven states had legal educational requirements for the chief school officers. The requirements have to do with, certification, college or university graduation, special training, experience, fitness for the office. The trend is toward better qualifications for control and leadership. There is a growing tendency to remove the office of chief school official away from the field of partisan politics.

CHAPTER IV  
RANKING OF STATES ACCORDING TO EDUCATIONAL  
ACHIEVEMENTS IN 1934

Chapters II and III of this study have considered the state board of education and the chief state school official for the purpose of determining the present status and for indicating trends tending to make these offices more efficient educationally.

An effort has been made in Chapter IV to rank the forty-eight states according to their educational efficiency, by the use of certain selected criteria. The criteria chosen, were used because they are significant as desirable achievements in education, and are readily adaptable for composite ranking.

THE CRITERIA EMPLOYED

1. The length of the school term in average number of days the schools were in session.
2. The per cent of the total population enrolled in public elementary and secondary schools.
3. The per cent of the school population, five to eighteen years of age, enrolled in public elementary and secondary schools.
4. The per cent of the pupils enrolled in schools, who are in average daily attendance.
5. The per cent that public secondary school enrollment is of the total public school enrollment.
6. The per cent of those enrolled who graduate from the public secondary schools.



- 4
7. Per cent of the total population ten years of age and over that is literate.
  8. The per cent of illiteracy eliminated during the past decade.
  9. The amount expended for education per capita of total population.
  10. The amount spent for education per pupil in average daily attendance.
  11. The amount expended for education per \$1000 of estimated true value of all property.

#### VALUE OF EACH CRITERION

These criteria are the ones used in the Schrammel<sup>1</sup> study. Dr. Schrammel has the following to say about the value of each criterion.

The significance and value of each of these eleven criteria in securing a composite ranking of the state school systems will be briefly pointed out in the following paragraphs.

1. The average number of days the schools were in session is significant because, other things being equal, a long school term provides greater educational opportunity for the pupils attending school and shows more effort on the part of the tax-paying public than does a shorter school term. The fact that the average school year for the country has increased from 135 days in 1890 to 162 days in 1920 is itself a significant evidence of the upward trend in this factor.\*

2. The per cent of the total population enrolled in public schools, other things being equal, is a valuable criterion. Standing alone, it is subject to criticism, but taken in conjunction with the other ten criteria, it is of value for it presents the extent to which the general population is retained in school. If some states have a larger population, in proportion to the total population, than others have, that apparent advantage will be offset in a measure by the third criterion.

3. The per cent of the school population, from five to eighteen years of age, enrolled in the public schools is a complement of the criterion--the per cent of the total population enrolled in school.

---

<sup>1</sup> H. E. Schrammel, The Organization of State Departments of Education. pp. 117-119.

\* The average number of days schools were in session in the year 1933-1934 was 171.2.

Together they show the extent to which effort is put forth to secure the enrollment of the whole school population, and they may be taken as a crude measure of the educational provisions made by the pupils who have passed the compulsory age of school attendance.

4. The per cent that the pupils in average daily attendance is of those enrolled in the public schools is a valid criterion, because it shows how efficient the schools of a state are in keeping the pupils in regular attendance.

5. The per cent that the public secondary school enrollment is of the total public school enrollment shows the holding power of the schools throughout the grades and the high school, and to a certain extent is an index of the provision for, and the efficiency of, the secondary schools.

6. The criterion, the per cent of those enrolled who graduate from public secondary schools, shows the holding power of the secondary schools. The fact that the per cent of those enrolled who are graduated is almost twice as great in some states as in others, indicates that this is a valid criterion for comparing the efficiency of the state educational systems.

7. The per cent of the total population ten years of age and more that is literate is a measure of the efficiency of the educational systems, which shows to what extent the schools have reached the whole population. To rank the states on this criterion alone would not be just, for they have not had an equal start. Hence, it is necessary to balance this inequality by another criterion, which will show more nearly the effort that states have made toward the elimination of illiteracy (Criterion 8).

8. The per cent of illiteracy eliminated during the preceding decade is a measure of the effort put forth toward eliminating illiteracy within reach of the state. As a supplement to Criterion 7, this one seems highly desirable.

9. The amount expended for education per capita of total population is an index of the effort exerted by taxpayers.

10. The amount expended for education per pupil in average daily attendance is a valid criterion, for the emphasis is here laid upon the pupils who actually attend school.

11. The amount expended for education proportional to each \$1,000 of wealth supplements Criterion 9, which represents expenditure from the point of view of the taxpayers, and Criterion 10, which expresses it from the point of view of the school child for which provision is made, because it is an index of wealth or ability to make expenditures. Any of these three criteria alone would be insufficient; taken together, however, that constitute a combination that is just and valid, nor do they give expenditure too great weight in the composite ranking of the states.

## METHOD OF EVALUATING EFFICIENCY OF

## STATE SCHOOL SYSTEMS

In evaluating the state school systems, the states were ranked from 1 to 48 on each of the eleven criteria..... The eleven tanks which a state thus received were totalled. The states were then given a final rank on these totals, giving first rank to the state having the smallest total, second rank to the one having the next smallest, and so on. In other words, they were ranked inversely, according to the size of the total of all the ranks each had received.

TABLE XI  
 HIGHEST AND LOWEST LIMITS IN EACH CRITERION  
 IN 1920 AND 1935

Criterion (1)	1920		1935	
	Lowest (2)	Highest (3)	Lowest (4)	Highest (5)
1. Length of school term in days..	109.6	189	132.5	193.1
2. Per cent of population enrolled.....	14.9	29.1	16.7	30.25
3. Per cent of school population enrolled.....	63.5	100.0	69.2	100.0
4. Per cent in average daily attendance.....	60.4	90.4	74.48	95.95
5. Per cent high school enrollment is of the total enrollment...	2.2	15.5	10.64	30.9
6. Per cent of high school enrollment graduating.....	6.7	15.6	5.86	15.5
7. Per cent of population literate.....	78.1	98.9	84.1	99.2
8. Per cent of illiteracy eliminated.....	-17.0 <sup>a</sup>	31.8	12.5	41.17
9. Expenditures per capita of population (dollars).....	3.1	22.2	4.22	21.15
10. Expenditures per pupil in average daily attendance (dollars)	19.4	136.6	22.66	124.13
11. Expenditures per \$1,000 wealth (dollars).....	2.1	5.7	12.29	6.99

Read table thus: The lowest range of length of the school term in days, in 1920, was 109.6. The longest term was 189 days.

<sup>a</sup> This figure is the per cent of increase in illiteracy during the preceding decade.

Table XI presents figures which justify the criteria used in ranking the states. There is an increase in the case of almost everyone of the eleven criteria during the interval from 1920 to 1935. For example, the shortest school term in 1920 was 109.6 days; by 1935 this figure had been raised to a minimum of 132.5 days. Per cent in average daily attendance increased on both highest and lowest levels. High school enrollment picked up over 100 per cent in the fifteen year interval. In 1920 the high school enrollment in the United States was 2,200,389, in 1935 it was 5,656,412. Illiteracy too is being gradually eliminated. Each state showed a gain during the past decade in reducing illiteracy.

Expenditures have shown a falling off in all items except criterion 11 which shows a gain in the number of dollars spent, per \$1,000 of actual wealth, for education. Decrease in figures listed under criterions 9 and 10 might logically be expected, since schools as well as other tax supported public agencies have felt the effects of the economic stress of the last few years.

These facts tend further to show that changes in the relative position of a state school system in any one criterion, or in a combination of criteria, are not a matter of chance, but are a mark of relative educational efficiency.

#### RANK OF EACH STATE ON EACH CRITERION IN 1934

Table XII shows the ranks of the states for the year 1934\* on each of the eleven criteria. The total of the ranks for each state is also included as is the final ranking.

---

\* Figures for the year 1934 were the latest available, and were supplied through the courtesy of the United States Department of the Interior Office of Education. October, 1935.

## RANK OF THE STATES IN EACH OF FOUR PERIODS

In Figure I, the states have been arranged in order of their ranks, from the highest to the lowest, and have been brought together for the years 1890, 1900, 1920, and 1934. Iowa ranks first in each of three periods and stands ninth in 1934. No other state has been so consistent in holding its ranking near the top. In general, the southern states rank consistently low. The western states rank high.

The lines drawn from column to column join the four ranks of each state and show whether a state has moved upward or downward in relative standing, as shown by the rank number. A first glance at these criss-cross lines leaves the impression that there has been much shifting of ranks from one period through to the next. Really this is not true.

For example, in the interval from 1920 to 1934 only a few states made extensive shifts upward in rank. Most noticeable is New York, which moved from thirty-second to seventh place; Delaware from thirty-ninth to seventeenth; Pennsylvania from thirty-first to fifteenth; Wyoming jumped from seventeenth to first place. California moved up from thirteenth position to fifth. Other states which ranked higher do not show decided changes.

On the other hand a group of states dropped considerably in the rank of 1920. Most of these states are from among the mid-western section. Kansas, Nebraska, Iowa, South Dakota, Oklahoma, Colorado, Missouri, and North Dakota were in this group.

The southern states which hold the lower rankings vary back and forth during the last fourteen years. A few have advanced, a few have dropped back, but in general their ranks remain about the same.

TABLE XII

RANK OF EACH STATE ON EACH CRITERION 1934

States	Average Length of School Term	Per cent of total Population Enrolled in Public Schools	Per cent of Population 5-18 years Enrolled	Per cent of Pupils in Average Daily Attendance	Per cent of Total Pupils Enrolled in High School	Per cent of High School Pupils Enrolled who Graduate	Per cent of Population 10 years old that is Literate	Per cent of Illiteracy Eliminated	Expenditures per capita Population	Expenditures per Pupil Average Daily Attendance	Expenditures per Pupil for each \$1000 Wealth	Total of Ranks	Final Ranking
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)		
Ala.	43	13.5	39.5	38	47	18	44	38	44	43	8	377 <sup>a</sup>	41
Ariz.	35	29	25.5	36	33	19	43	6	15	14	19	274.5 <sup>b</sup>	31
Ark.	45	12	31	47	46	20	37	17	48	48	44	395	47
Calif.	17	38	6	5	36	17	20	40	4	3	1	187	5
Colo.	13	18	9	39	29.5	46	24	48	9	13	15	263.5	29
Conn.	7	35	36	17.5	22	34	32	19	11	9	21	243.5	22
Dela.	5	40	43	22	24	42	30	10	7	6	5	234	17
Fla.	38	7	7	42	40	40	38	25	38	38	16	329 <sup>c</sup>	36
Ga.	47	6	20.5	46	44	48	41	3	47	45	32	379.5	43
Idaho	37	5	10	13	10	23	4	21.5	16	33	34	206.5	8
Ill.	14	45	37	27	6	21	19	13.5	26	12	27	247.5	24
Ind.	30	28	15	3	11	10	12	36	23	26	18	212 <sup>d</sup>	10
Iowa	21	22	13	20	20	2	1	20	20	23	46	208	9
Kan.	36	21	14	17.5	15	4	8	29.5	29	27	41	242 <sup>e</sup>	20
Ky.	42	16	28.5	45	41	35	35	39	43	42	23	389.5	44
La.	41	23	45	37	39	38	47	4	40	41	35	390	45
Me.	22	33	23	7	27.5	12	21	42	33	34	31	285.5	34
Md.	3	47	47	23	5	25	28	11	31	20	22	262	28
Mass.	12	42	42	12	4	26	26	26	6	5	48	249	25
Mich.	23	41	28.5	1	17	32	15	7.5	25	22	9	221	13
Minn.	18	25.5	18.5	24	18	15	9	16	12	15	25	196	6
Miss.	48	1	5	48	48	47	45	32	46	47	10	377	42
Mo.	24	37	34	26	25	24	17	35	35	31	42	330	37
Mont.	8	24	18.5	6	7	14	13	24	8	11	37	170.5	4
Nebr.	15	19	12	14	19	1	5	47	30	30	45	237	19
Nev.	25	30	1	31	16	8	31	28	1	2	39	212	11
N. H.	19	48	48	9.5	14	7	22	2	28	10	29	236.5	18
N. J.	2	34	24	28	23	44	29	27	5	4	3	223	14
N. M.	28	25.5	17	2	42	6	46	45	27	32	4	274.5	32
N. Y.	4	44	38	15	9	45	27	18	2	1	2	205	7

TABLE XII (Continued)

States	Average Length of School Term	Per cent of total Population Enrolled in Public Schools	Per cent of Population 5-18 years Enrolled	Per cent of Pupils in Average Daily Attendance	Per cent of Total Pupils Enrolled in High School	Per cent of High School Pupils Enrolled who Graduate	Per cent of Population 10 years old that is Literate	Per cent of Illiteracy Eliminated	Expenditures per capita Population	Expenditures per Pupil Average Daily Attendance	Expenditures per Pupil for each \$1000 Wealth	Total of Ranks	Final Ranking
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)		
N. C.	40	2	22	29	37	29	42	34	45	46	28	354	39
N. D.	11	13.5	27	31	29.5	3	10	15	18	24	36	220	12
Ohio	27	39	32.5	4	13	41	18	44	17	17	6	258.5	27
Okla.	31	8	2.5	41	34	13	23	23	36	37	7	255.5	26
Ore.	32.5	31	8	33	8	22	2	7.5	24	21	43	232	16
Pa.	10	32	39.5	16	26	28	25	9	13	16	17	231.5	15
R. I.	6	46	46	19	21	43	34	31	14	8	11	279	33
S. C.	44	3	30	44	45	31	48	46	42	44	24	401	43
S. D.	32.5	17	20.5	25	27.5	5	7	13.5	22	25	47	242	21
Tenn.	46	10	16	43	43	27	39	12	41	40	36	353	38
Texas	39	20	35	40	31	30	36	43	37	36	12	359	40
Utah	29	4	11	8	3	33	6	5	10	29	13	151	2
Vt.	1	43	44	11	32	9	16	21.5	34	28	26	265.5	30
Va.	34	15	25.5	35	38	39	40	37	39	39	40	391.5	46
Wash.	9	27	4	34	2	11	3	1	21	19	33	164	3
W. Va.	36	9	32.5	21	35	36	33	29.5	32	35	30	329	35
Wis.	16	36	41	9.5	1	37	14	41	19	18	14	246.5	23
Wyom.	20	11	2.5	31	12	16	11	1	3	7	20	134.5	1

- a. Tie between Alabama and Mississippi eliminated by totaling per cent ranking of all criteria.  
 b. Same for Arizona and New Mexico.  
 c. Same for Florida and West Virginia.  
 d. Same for Indiana and Nevada.  
 e. Same for Kansas and South Dakota.

Read table thus; Alabama ranked 43rd on Criterion 1 (the average length of the school term in days).



It will be noted from Table XII that there is a considerable variation in the ranks for the individual criteria among the states. None holds consistently to any one position. A first glance at the items in the table would seem to show that they are distributed without any central tendency. A more careful consideration of the column, "Total of Ranks," shows that there is central tendency. For example, Wyoming which ranked highest, has a total of 134.5 points, whereas South Carolina, which ranks lowest, has a total of 401 points. There is a wide variation between these two extremes, most of the states have a few both high and low ranks, but taking the rankings as a whole, high ranks indicated by small numbers, and low ranks, indicated by large numbers, are found to be grouped together with consistency.

Minnesota, for example, ranked sixth; following are the ranks of this state in order, beginning with criterion 1, 18; 25.5; 18.5; 24; 18; 15; 9; 16; 12; 15; 25 for a total of 196. Here the tendency is to group around rank eighteen in seven of the eleven criteria, indicated by underscoring.

Arkansas, which had a final ranking of forty-seventh place, holds consistently in the forty group, with but five exceptions, two of which are in the thirty ranks. The underscored ranks indicate the central tendency in this state. The rankings are, criteria 1 to 11, 45, 12, 31, 47, 46, 20, 37, 17, 48, 48, 44.

The states are arranged in alphabetical order to facilitate reference in locating their ranks.

FIGURE I  
RANK OF STATES IN EACH OF FOUR PERIODS

1890	1900	1920	1934
1. Iowa	Iowa	Iowa	Wyo.
2. Mass.	Mass.	Idaho	Utah
3. Ohio	Nebr.	N. D.	Wash.
4. Kans.	S. D.	Wash.	Mont.
5. Conn.	Ind.	Utah	Calif.
6. Nebr.	Wash.	Nebr.	Minn.
7. Ill.	Ore.	Kans.	N. Y.
8. Calif.	Vt.	Minn.	Idaho
9. S. D.	N. D.	Mont.	Iowa
10. Ind.	Ohio	Ore.	Ind.
11. Me.	Nev.	Ind.	Nev.
12. Mich.	Conn.	S. D.	N. D.
13. Minn.	Calif.	Calif.	Mich.
14. Mo.	Kans.	Mich.	N. J.
15. Nev.	Mich.	Okla.	Pa.
16. Ore.	Colo.	Colo.	Ore.
17. R. I.	Utah	Wyo.	Dela.
18. Vt.	Me.	Vt.	N. H.
19. N. Y.	Ill.	Nev.	Nebr.
20. N. H.	Minn.	Ohio	Kans.
21. Pa.	Wis.	Me.	S. D.
22. W. Va.	N. Y.	Conn.	Conn.
23. Colo.	N. H.	N. J.	Wis.
24. N. J.	Pa.	Wis.	Ill.
25. Wis.	Dela.	Mo.	Mass.
26. Fla.	N. J.	Mass.	Okla.
27. Wash.	Mo.	Ariz.	Ohio
28. Tenn.	R. I.	Ill.	Md.
29. Wyo.	Idaho	N. H.	Colo.
30. Mont.	W. Va.	N. M.	Vt.
31. Dela.	Mont.	Pa.	Ariz.
32. Idaho.	Md.	N. Y.	N. M.
33. N. D.	Wyo.	W. Va.	R. I.
34. Md.	Tenn.	Fla.	Me.
35. Texas	Okla.	R. I.	W. Va.
36. Ky.	Ky.	Ark.	Fla.
37. Va.	Fla.	Md.	Mo.
38. Miss.	Texas	Texas	Tenn.
39. Ark.	Ariz.	Dela.	N. C.
40. Utah	Ark.	Tenn.	Texas
41. N. M.	Miss.	N. C.	Ala.
42. La.	La.	S. C.	Miss.
43. Ariz.	Ga.	Va.	Ga.
44. Ala.	Va.	La.	Ky.
45. Ga.	S. C.	Ky.	La.
46. N. C.	Ala.	Ala.	Va.
47. S. C.	N. M.	Ga.	Ark.
	N. C.	Miss.	S. C.

of states that ranked under the year 1890 then

Loss of rank in many states, such as characterized the middle western group, cannot be said to be due to any inefficiency or neglect of the state educational departments. Economic factors such as drought, crop curtailment, loss of markets, non payment of taxes, and other conditions, are beyond the control of any state department of education, but they do have their effect upon educational progress. Advance in rank must be credited to superior effort put forth within the state.

A COMPARISON OF THE RANKINGS OF AYRES, PHILLIPS, AND THE  
METHODS USED IN THIS STUDY IN TABLE XII FOR THE  
YEAR 1934

Table XIII is presented for comparison of the rankings made by Ayres and Phillips, who did not use the same criteria for their rankings which were used in this study, but did include a part of them, with the ranking obtained by use of eleven selected criteria for this study. It will be observed that the ranks do not differ materially, regardless of which group of criteria is used. The reader is referred to the article indicated by footnote 1, Table XIII, for details as to the Phillips and Ayres rankings.

TABLE XIII

A COMPARISON OF THE RANKINGS OF THE STATES BY AYRES, PHILLIPS,  
AND THE METHODS USED IN THIS STUDY IN TABLE XII

States	Ayres Method (1) 1930	Phillips (2) 1930	Corder* (3) 1930	Sonnenberg 1934
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Alabama	44	45	47	41
Arizona	12	26	24	31
Arkansas	45	46	42	47
California	3	4	10	5
Colorado	13	17	15	29

TABLE XIII (Continued)

States	Ayres Method (1) 1930	Phillips (2) 1930	Corder* (3) 1930	Sonnenberg 1934
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Connecticut	10	18	26	22
Delaware	9	10	31	17
Florida	38	40	40	36
Georgia	48	47	41	43
Idaho	27	20	7	8
Illinois	5	6	22	24
Indiana	19	9	13	10
Iowa	16	16	9	9
Kansas	21	21	11	20
Kentucky	41	39	45	44
Louisiana	40	43	39	45
Maine	33	22	30	34
Maryland	26	30	34	28
Massachusetts	8	11	18	25
Michigan	15	5	5	13
Minnesota	22	27	14	6
Mississippi	46	42	38	42
Missouri	28	19	33	37
Montana	11	2	8	4
Nebraska	29	29	19	19
Nevada	2	12	16	11
New Hampshire	25	22	27	18
New Jersey	4	8	20	14
New Mexico	34	38	44	32
New York	1	3	17	7
North Carolina	39	37	36	39
North Dakota	32	31	4	12
Ohio	6	7	21	27
Oklahoma	37	36	23	26
Oregon	14	13	6	16
Pennsylvania	20	15	25	15
Rhode Island	23	33	37	33
South Carolina	47	48	46	48
Tennessee	43	41	43	38
South Dakota	30	25	12	21
Texas	35	35	35	40
Utah	17	14	3	2
Vermont	31	32	29	30
Virginia	42	44	48	46
Washington	7	1	1	3
West Virginia	36	34	32	35
Wisconsin	24	24	23	23
Wyoming	16	23	2	1

1 F. M. Phillips, "Educational Rank of States," American School

2 Ibid.

3 Lee Corder, "Research Problem II, The Educational Rank of States, 1930." Unpublished. On file in office of Bureau of Measurements, Kansas

TYPES OF ORGANIZATION OF THE STATE DEPARTMENTS  
OF EDUCATION IN 1935

Schrammel,<sup>4</sup> in 1925, devised a method of classifying the states according to the type of organization of their state departments of education. The various organizations, which had at some time or other existed in one or more states from 1890 to 1925, were classified into seventeen distinct types. These types were ranked by experts in state school administration, from one to seventeen according to efficiency of organization.

In 1935 only eleven of these types were in operation in one or more of the forty-eight states. The chief characteristics of these types and the states in which each type is in operation are shown in Table XIV.

TABLE XIV  
TYPES OF ORGANIZATION OF THE STATE DEPARTMENTS  
OF EDUCATION IN 1935

Classification of Types (1)	States (2)
1a. No state board Chief state school officer elected by popular vote	Illinois, Nebraska, North Dakota
1b. No state board Chief school officer appointed by governor or state legislature	Maine, Ohio
2a. An <u>ex officio</u> state board composed of from three to seven officers. Chief school officer elected by popular vote, a member of state board	Colorado, Mississippi, Florida, Missouri, North Carolina, Oregon

<sup>4</sup> H. E. Schrammel, Organization of State Departments of Education, pp. 89-91.

TABLE XIV (Continued)

Classification of Types	States
(1)	(2)
5b. The state board comprised of one or two state officers, <u>ex officio</u> , from two to six educational officers, <u>ex officio</u> , and from three to six appointive members. Chief school officer elected by popular vote and an <u>ex officio</u> member of the state board.	Arizona, Washington
4a. State board composed of from one to three <u>ex officio</u> state officers and from two to nine appointive members. Chief school officer elected by popular vote and an <u>ex officio</u> member of the board.	Georgia, Indiana, Montana, New Mexico, South Carolina, South Dakota, Wisconsin, Alabama
4b. Same as 4a, except chief school officer appointed by governor or state legislature.	Tennessee
4c. Same as 4a, except chief school officer appointed by state board, but not a member of the board.	New Hampshire, Rhode Island
6a. State board composed of the chief school officer, <u>ex officio</u> , and from three to seven appointive members. The chief school officer elected by popular vote.	Arkansas, Idaho, Kansas, Kentucky, Michigan, Oklahoma, West Virginia, Wyoming
7a. State board composed of from five to twelve appointive or elective members only. Chief school officer elected by the people, and not a member of board.	California, Iowa, Texas
7b. Same as 7a, except chief school officer appointed by the governor.	Massachusetts, New Jersey, Virginia
7c. State board of education composed of from five to twelve appointive or elective members only. Chief school officer appointed by state board and not a member of the board.	Connecticut, Delaware, Louisiana, Maryland, Minnesota, New York, Vermont

The ranks of efficiency which were assigned each of the various types, with those types which are no longer in existence eliminated, are as follows:

TYPE	RANK
7c .....	1
7b .....	2
4c .....	3
7a .....	4
6a .....	5
4b .....	6
4a .....	7
3b .....	8
1b .....	9
2a .....	10
1a .....	11

It will be noted that the high ranking types are those which are composed of an appointive state board of education and a chief state school official appointed either by the state board of education or by the governor. Types 7c, 7b, 4c, 7a, and 6a, are departments which, in general, consist of such organizations. The highest type, in rank, is 7c, which consists of a state board of education composed of from five to twelve appointive or elective members only. The chief school officer being appointed by the state board of education, but is not a member of that board.

The low ranking types consist, in general, either of an organization without a state board of education and a politically elected chief school officer, or of an ex officio state board of education and a politically elected chief school officer.

That a non-political state educational organization is more efficient and more conducive to functioning according to sound business and educational policies, than a political organization, is self evident. The rank of the states according to the efficiency of the state departments of education, in force in 1935, is shown in Table XV.

TABLE XV

RANK OF THE TYPE OF STATE EDUCATIONAL ORGANIZATION  
HAD BY EACH STATE IN 1925 AND 1935

States	Ranking of Type	
	1925	1935
(1)	(2)	(3)
Alabama	9	8
Arizona	9	9
Arkansas	6	6
California	5	5
Colorado	13	13
Connecticut	3	1
Delaware	1	1
Florida	13	13
Georgia	8	8
Idaho	6	6
Illinois	14	14
Indiana	8	8
Iowa	14	5
Kansas	9	6
Kentucky	13	6
Louisiana	1	1
Maine	11	11
Maryland	1	1
Massachusetts	2	2
Michigan	6	6
Minnesota	1	1
Mississippi	13	13
Missouri	13	13
Montana	8	8
Nebraska	14	14
Nevada	12	8
New Hampshire	3	3
New Jersey	2	2
New Mexico	8	8
New York	1	1
North Carolina	13	13
North Dakota	9	14
Ohio	11	11
Oklahoma	6	6
Oregon	13	13



TABLE XV (Continued)

States	Ranking of Type	
	1925	1935
(1)	(2)	(3)
Pennsylvania	4	4
Rhode Island	3	3
South Carolina	8	8
South Dakota	14	3
Tennessee	7	7
Texas	15	5
Utah	9	4
Vermont	1	1
Virginia	8	2
Washington	9	9
West Virginia	6	6
Wisconsin	14	8
Wyoming	6	6

Read table thus: Alabama ranked 9th in 1925.

For purposes of comparison, the rank of the states according to organization, in 1925, is shown in the same table. For the most part, there has been little change during the last ten years. For the most part, the changes which have been made, have tended to be in the general direction of a closer approach toward types similar to 7c. For the convenience of the reader, who may care to check up on specific changes, by reference to Table XV, the status of the states which made changes, are listed for the years, 1925 and 1935. They are:

## STATES MAKING CHANGES

State	Type in 1935	Type in 1935
Alabama	3b	4a
Connecticut	4c	7c
Iowa	No Board	6a
Kansas	3b	4b
Kentucky	2a	4b
Nevada	3a	3b
North Dakota	4a	No Board
South Dakota	No Board	3b
Texas	2a	6a
Utah	3b	7a
Virginia	4a	7b
Wisconsin	No Board	3b

The question of chief importance in this study is as to what relation exists, if any, between the efficiency of organization in the type of state department of education and efficiency in educational achievement. In 1925 Schrammel<sup>5</sup> found a correlation between these two factors of  $r = .20$ . The correlation in 1935 between the ranks in achievement and organization is  $r = .17$ .

This low relationship between organization and educational efficiency seems to show that type of organization has very little influence on educational efficiency. Educational efficiency in each of the states undoubtedly is the result of innumerable factors of which the type of state organization of the state department of education is only one. It is possible that for this reason a greater positive relationship is not obtained and perhaps should not be expected.

---

<sup>5</sup> Ibid, p. 134.

## CHAPTER V

### SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

#### SUMMARY

The purpose of this study is to trace the development in the field of state educational administration, since 1925, including conditions affecting the state board of education, the state department of education, and the chief state school officer. An attempt has been made to show what relation, if any, exists between the type of organization and educational efficiency of states as measured by eleven selected criteria.

A further purpose is to determine what constitutes good practice in state educational administration considered from the standpoint of prevailing best practices, and from the recommendations of the writers, fact finding bodies, organized educational and lay groups interested in educational progress.

The scope of this investigation includes a study of forty-eight copies of school laws. These laws were furnished by the state departments of education and are the latest available. Legislative action in 1935 affecting education and legislative measures proposed by 1935 legislatures, in states where sessions were held, were studied to determine trends.

For the ranking of the states on the basis of educational achievement, statistics were compiled for the eleven criteria, from reports sent out from the United States Department of the Interior, Office of Education, and from the Fifteenth Census of the United States Population. Care has been taken in compilation of statistics, but the writer is aware that error in handling data which are subject to subjective judgment is possible and probable. The methods used in computations are explained in detail in the Appendix.

## CONCLUSIONS

1. From the standpoint of statistical comparison there is very little relation between the particular kind of organization which prevails in state departments of education and the educational progress which states have made as measured by eleven selected criteria. This is evidenced by:

a. The correlation between The Rank of the States in Organization as found in Table XIII and The Rank of the States in Educational Efficiency as found in Table XII was  $r = .17$ .

2. The state board of education should be predominantly a lay body, representing the state at large, be appointed by the governor, and have few ex officio members. This is evidenced by:

a. The Composition of State Boards of Education, 1935, Table I, page 9.

3. The state board of education should consist of more than four and less than ten members. This is evidenced by:

a. Table II, Size of Boards, page 14.

b. Recent changes among the states as listed on page 16.

c. Measures before 1935 legislatures indicating trends, page 17.

4. The term of office of the state board of education members should be at least five years and overlap. This is evidenced by:

a. Table III, Term of Office of Board Members in 1935, page 18.

b. Recent surveys, page 19.

5. A majority of the states find it advisable to pay their state board members expenses only, or expenses and a small per diem, while attending meetings of the board. This is evidenced by:

a. Table IV, page 23.

6. The majority of states having state boards of education find it good practice to meet four times a year or oftener. This is evidenced by:

a. Table V, page 24.

7. The term of office of the chief state school officer should be four years or longer, with provisions for possible reappointment or reelection.

This is evidenced by:

a. Table VIII, page 31, showing present status.

b. By state school surveys, page 32.

8. The salary of the chief state school officer is inadequate in nearly every state, upon a basis of comparison with the salaries of certain other educators in the same state. This is evidenced by:

a. Table X, page 36.

9. The chief state school officer should be a professional educator.

This is evidenced by:

a. Requirements in 1925 and in 1935, page 38.

#### RECOMMENDATIONS

These recommendations are deemed advisable by the writer:

1. The state board of education should be predominantly a body representing the state at large. This board should have few, if any, ex officio members, should number less than four and not more than ten members, whose term of office should be for five years at least, with provision for overlapping terms to provide for continuity of policy.

2. The governor should appoint the members of the board.

3. The office of chief school officer should be taken entirely out of the realm of politics. (This same condition should prevail in the case of county superintendents of schools in Kansas and other states which provide for

such officials.)

4. The state board of education should appoint the chief state school officer, determine his salary and term of office. The board should not be restricted in its choice by state residence requirements, but should select its official from the country at large.

## APPENDIX

### Sources of Certain Criteria

Eleven criteria were used to rank the states according to educational achievements. The sources of certain criteria are listed here. Some were obtained by computation. The sources and the methods of computation follow.

Criterion 1. Average length of school term. Data for the school year 1933-1934 were obtained from United States Department of the Interior, Office of Education, "Preliminary Statistics of State School Systems 1933-1934." Circular No. 151, October, 1935. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office. 7 pp.

Other data: U. S. Department of the Interior, Office of Education, Bulletin 1933, No. 2, Biennial Survey of Education 1930-1932. P. 60.

Criterion 2. Per cent of Total Population Enrolled in Public Elementary and Secondary Schools. Figures for enrollments are from Circular No. 151 mentioned in criterion 1. Figures for population of each state are from the Fifteenth Census of the United States Population, Vol. I, Table 5, page 10, 1930.

The computation for 1935 was as follows: 
$$\frac{\text{Total number enrolled}}{\text{Population of state}}$$

Criterion 3. Per cent of the School Population, five to Eighteen Years of Age, enrolled in the Public Elementary and Secondary Schools.

Data were secured from U. S. Department of the Interior, Office of Education, Bulletin No. 2, 1933, Biennial Survey of Education 1930-1932, Table 3, page 49, Column 17.

Criterion 4. Per cent of Pupils Enrolled in Public Schools who were in Average Daily Attendance.

Data secured from Circular No. 151 mentioned in Criterion 1.

The computation was as follows: 
$$\frac{\text{Average Daily attendance}}{\text{Total number enrolled}}$$

Criterion 5. Per cent That Public Secondary School Enrollment is of the Total Public School Enrollment.

Data secured from Circular 151, mentioned in Criterion 1.

The computation was as follows: 
$$\frac{\text{Total secondary enrollment}}{\text{Total number enrolled}}$$

Criterion 6. Per cent of Those Enrolled Who Graduate From Public Secondary Schools.

The data were obtained from the following sources:

Number of Graduates:

Biennial Survey of Education, 1928-1930. Bulletin, 1931, No. 20.  
Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1932. Vol. II,  
pp. 758-59.

(Note: Later figures are now in the process of compilation at the  
U. S. Department of Education but were not available in time for use  
in this study.)

Secondary Enrollment figures:

Bulletin 151 mentioned in Criterion 1.

Method of Computation: 
$$\frac{\text{Total number graduating}}{\text{Total secondary school enrollment}}$$

Criterion 7. Per cent of Total Population Ten Years of Age and Over That  
Literate.

The data for 1930 were obtained from the 1930 United States Census  
Vol. III, Part 1, Table 50, page 51.

Method of Computation: 100% -- % illiterate.

Criterion 8. Per cent of Illiteracy Eliminated During the Preceding Decade

Data as follows: For 1920, from the Fourteenth Census of the United  
States; for 1930, from the Fifteenth Census of the United States  
Population, Vol. III, Part 1, Table 50, page 51.

The computation for 1930 was as follows:

Illiteracy Elim. during decade 
$$\frac{1920\% \text{ of Illiteracy} - 1930\% \text{ of Illiteracy}}{1920\% \text{ of Illiteracy}}$$

Criterion 9. Amount Expended for Education Per Capita of Total Population

The data were obtained from the following sources:

The current expenses for education were taken from Circular No. 151,  
mentioned in Criterion 1.

The populations were obtained from the Fifteenth Census of the  
United States Population, Vol. III, Part 1, Table 50, page 51.

Computation: 
$$\frac{\text{Per capita Exp. for Ed.}}{\text{Total Amount Expended for Education}} \times \text{Total Population}$$

Criterion 10. Amount Expended Per Pupil in Average Daily Attendance.

The data were obtained from Circular No. 151, cited in Criterion 1,  
page 3, Column 12.

Criterion 11. Amount Expended for Education Per \$1000 Wealth.



SCHOOL LAWS

Through the exchange facilities of the Graduate Division of the Kansas State Teachers College, the following school laws were made available for study.\*

Alabama, <u>Alabama School Code</u> .....	1
Arizona, <u>School Laws of Arizona</u> .....	1
Arkansas, <u>The School Law of Arkansas</u> .....	1
California, <u>School Code of the State of California</u> .....	1
Connecticut, <u>Laws Relating to Education</u> .....	1
Colorado, <u>School Laws of the State of Colorado</u> .....	1
Delaware, <u>School Laws of Delaware</u> .....	1
Florida, <u>School Laws of the State of Florida</u> .....	1
Georgia, <u>Georgia School Laws</u> .....	1
Idaho, <u>School Laws of the State of Idaho</u> .....	1
Illinois, <u>The School Law of Illinois</u> .....	1
Indiana, <u>School Laws of the State of Indiana</u> .....	1
Iowa, <u>School Laws</u> .....	1
Kansas, <u>School Laws of Kansas Revised</u> .....	1
Kentucky, <u>Kentucky Common School Laws</u> .....	1
Louisiana, <u>Fourteenth Compilation of School Laws</u> .....	1
Maine, <u>Laws Relating to Public Schools</u> .....	1
Maryland, <u>Maryland Public School Laws</u> .....	1
Massachusetts, <u>General Laws Relating to Education</u> .....	1
Michigan, <u>General School Laws</u> .....	1
Minnesota, <u>Laws of Minnesota Relating to the Public School System</u> .....	1
Mississippi, <u>School Laws of the State of Mississippi</u> .....	1
Missouri, <u>Revised School Laws</u> .....	1
Montana, <u>School Laws of the State of Montana</u> .....	1
Nebraska, <u>Nebraska School Laws</u> .....	1
New Jersey, <u>New Jersey School Laws</u> .....	1
New Hampshire, <u>Laws of New Hampshire Relating to Public Schools,</u> <u>Chapters 116-123, Public Laws</u> .....	1
Nevada, <u>The School Code, 1935</u> .....	1
New Mexico, <u>New Mexico School Code</u> .....	1
New York, <u>Education Law</u> .....	1
North Carolina, <u>The Public School Law of North Carolina</u> .....	1
North Dakota, <u>General School Laws</u> .....	1

---

\* The date following each law indicates the most recent publication available to the writer. Latest supplements to the school laws are included.

## SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

### A. General Theory

Buck, A. E., Administrative Consolidation in State Governments. Technical Pamphlet Series No. 2. Fifth Edition, revised January, 1930. New York: National Municipal League, 1930. 59 pp.

Describes 15 consolidation plans in operation and proposed plans for 18 states. One of the standards with respect to state administrative organization and integration requires department heads to be appointed by the governor.

Chambers, M. H., "Is the Present State Control of Education Satisfactory?" Nation's Schools, 9:41-42, June, 1922.

Argues for state control consolidation of education on one governing board, entrusted with the responsibility for the state's educational policy as a whole.

Cook, William A., Federal and State School Administration. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1927. Chapter 7, "State Educational Machinery," pp. 134-63, and Chapters 11-14, "Types and Aspects of State Control," pp. 215-89. 373 pp.

Coxe, W. W., "The Function of a Research Bureau in the State Department of Education." Journal of Educational Research, 21:7-14, January, 1930.

Points out how research in the state department helps to professionalize education and aid in developing policies.

Cubberley, Ellwood P., State School Administration. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1927. Chapter 11, "State Educational Organization," pp. 270-308. 773 pp.

Discusses "The State Superintendent of Schools," "State Educational Board," "The Form for State Educational Organization," "Fundamental State Administrative Problems."

Deffenbaugh, W. S., School Administration in State Educational Survey Reports. U. S. Department of the Interior, Office of Education, Bulletin, 1930, No. 35. Washington, D. C., Government Printing Office 1931. 54 pp.

Summarizes recommendations in surveys of thirteen states, all made since 1920. Studies the state board of education.

Engelhardt, Fred, Public School Organization and Administration. Boston: Ginn and Co., 1931. pp. 570-77. 595 pp.

Discusses recent developments in state educational reorganization, organization of the state department of education, and functions of the state commissioner.

Graves, Frank P., The Administration of American Education. New York: Macmillan Co., 1932. Chapter 25, "The State or Central Unit." pp. 525-65. 631 pp.

Describes the development of state boards of education, their composition, powers, qualifications, and selection.

Lide, Edwin S., Constitutional Basis of Public School Education. U. S. Department of the Interior, Office of Education, Leaflet No. 40. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1931. 11 pp.

Studies provisions relating to the chief state school officials and to the state boards of education.

Matzen, John M., State Constitutional Provisions for Education. Contributions to Education, No. 462. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1931. Chapter 2, "Constitutional Provisions Relating to the State Board of Education," pp. 4-35; Chapter 3, "Constitutional Provisions Relating to the Chief State School Officer," pp. 36-76.

Presents findings on the number of members composing state boards of education, their compensation, duties, terms, etc.

National Education Association, Department of Superintendence, "Educational Leadership--Progress and Possibilities." Eleventh Yearbook. Washington, D. C.: The Association, February, 1933. Chapter 2, "State Leadership in Education."

Presents information on the development of state educational organization.

National Education Association, Research Division, "A Self-Survey Plan for State School Systems. Part I: Checklists. Part II: Handbook." Research Bulletin 8: pp. 74-75, 91-63; March, May, 1930. Washington, D. C., The Association.

Discusses criteria set up for judging state practices pertaining to the functions and methods of selection of state school superintendents and state boards of education.

University of Wisconsin, School of Education, Bureau of Educational Research. A Survey of the Organization and Functions of State Boards of Education. Madison, Wisconsin. University of Wisconsin, School of Education, Bureau of Educational Research, no date. Mimeo. 17 pp.

Discusses relation of State Superintendent of schools to educational progress.

## B. General Studies of Present Status

Carle, Herbert M., Organization, Housing and Staffing of State Departments of Education. Bureau of Education, Statistical Circular No. 5. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, July, 1925. 16 pp.

Date concerning the chief state school officer and the size, personnel and activities of state department of education staffs are included.

Counts, George Sylvester, The Social Composition of Boards of Education. Supplementary Educational Monograph, No. 35, July, 1927. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1927. 100 pp.

A study of 1,654 state, county, and city boards of education to find the education, ages, length of service, and occupation of members, size of membership, and method of appointment.

Deffenbaugh, W. S., "School Administration." Biennial Survey of Education in the United States, 1929-1930. United States Department of the Interior, Office of Education Bulletin, 1931, No. 20, Vol. I, Chapter 1. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1931. Part I, pp. 2-14.

Presents 1930 data regarding state boards of education, chief state school officers, and staff members of state departments of education.

Hunke, Homer L., "Some Observations on State Boards of Education." American School Board Journal, 34:51, February, 1932.

Presents a variety of findings concerning state boards.

Keesecker, Ward W., "Review of Educational Legislation, 1929-1930." Biennial Survey of Education in the United States, 1928-1930. U. S. Department of the Interior, Office of Education, Bulletin, 1931, No. 20, Vol. I, Chapter 23. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1931, pp. 4-6.

Describes 1929 and 1930 legislation affecting state departments of education.

National Education Association, Research Division, State School Legislation 1929-31. Washington, D. C.: The Association, 1929, 1930, 1932. Studies in State Educational Administration, No. 1, pp. 12-13, 37-38. No. 6, p. 9; No. 10, p. 16.

Summarizes 1929-31 legislation affecting state school organization.

Reeder, Ward G., The Chief State School Official. U. S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Education, Bulletin, 1924, No. 5. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1924. 67 pp.

7

A study of the historical background, practices and tendencies pertaining to the office of chief state school officials in the various states. Data presented extends through 1932.

Schrammel, H. E., The Organization of State Departments of Education. Ohio State University Studies, Bureau of Educational Research Monographs, No. 6. Columbus, Ohio. Ohio State University Press, 1926. 171 pp.

Traces the development in the field of state educational administration, including conditions affecting the state board of education, the chief state school officer and the staff, between 1890 and 1925. Seeks to discover what relation, if any, exists between type of organization and educational efficiency of state as measured by eleven criteria.

### C. Surveys in Individual States

Brookings, Institution, Institute for Government Research. Organization and Administration of the State Government of Alabama. Report on a Survey submitted to Governor B. M. Miller, Vol. I, Part 1. Washington, D. C.; The Institution, 1932. pp. 201-35, 325-36.

Consideration of recent trends in State Educational Administration.

Brookings Institution. Report on a Survey of the Organization and Administration of the State Government of North Carolina. Washington, D. C. The Institution, 1930. pp. 152-75.

Reviews the situation in North Carolina and recommends a state board of education of seven members, appointed by the governor for seven year overlapping terms, and the appointment of a commissioner of education by this board.

California State Department of Education, The Director of Education. California State Department of Education. Bulletin G-2. Sacramento, California; California State Printing Office, 1928. 24 pp.

Reviews California situation and suggests reform in organization which would make for better integration.

Campbell, Earl C., and Kibby, Leo P., "Educational Organization and Reorganization in New Mexico." School and Society, 34;59-62, July 11, 1931.

Describes state educational organization in New Mexico.

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, Commission of Seven. State Higher Education in California. A Report. Sacramento, California; State of California, 1932. 82 pp.

Makes recommendations involving: the establishment of a State Council for Educational Planning and Coordination in California.

Chamber, M. W., "State Administration of Higher Education." Educational Research Bulletin 10, pp. 395-403, October 28, 1931. Columbus, Ohio State University.

Recommends an open minded study of the merits and demerits of educational administrative organization now in use in other states.

Dersey, Susan M., Chairman, Report of the California Commission for the Study of Educational Problems. Vol. I, pp. 97-101 and Vol. II, pp. 63-68. Sacramento, California; California State Printing Office, 1931.

Recommends the election of the state board of education and the appointment of the state superintendent of schools by that board.

Florida Educational Survey Commission, Official Report to the Senate and House of Representatives, Florida State Legislature. Tallahassee, Florida; State of Florida, April 2, 1929. pp. 29-30 and 49-9.

Graves, Frank P., The University of the State of New York, Its History and Functions. Albany, New York; University of the State of New York Press, 1931. 8 pp.

Describes the system of state control of education in New York from its early beginnings in 1784 up to now.

Kansas State School Code Commission. Report. Vol. I. "Some Problems Confronting the School Code Commission Together with Supporting Data." Topeka, Kansas; Kansas State Printing Plant, June, 1928. pp. 56-

McConnell, Robert Irvis, A History of the Development of the Department of Public Instruction in Iowa. University of Iowa Studies in Education Vol. VI, No. 1, October, 1930. Iowa City; University of Iowa, 1930. 122 pp.

History of the Iowa Department of Education. Chapter headings are the "State Board of Education"; "Recent Developments of the State Department."

Missouri, Eightieth Report of the Public Schools, School Year Ending June 1929. Parts I, II, and III. Jefferson City; Missouri State Department of Education, 1930. Chapter 1, "The Administration of Schools" pp. 23-31.

Recommends that the governor appoint the board of education of seven members who select the commissioner, who, in turn, selects his staff and the supervising assistant commissioners.

Nanninga, Simon Peter, A Plan of Organization of the State Department of Education. University of New Mexico Bulletin, Vol. V, No. 2. Education Series, Whole No. 197. Albuquerque, N. M.; University of New Mexico, 1931. 19 pp.

A study of types of state boards of education, number of members, terms of office, compensation of members, functions of state boards, qualifications of chief school official and his term of office.

New Jersey, Report of the Commission to Survey Public Education. Harlan Updegraff, Director. Trenton, N. J.; State of New Jersey, 1930. pp. 154-160.

O'Shea, M. V., Director, Public Education in Virginia. Superintendent of the Public Printing, 1928. pp. 295-306.

Discusses function of the State Board of Education, the State Superintendent, and the Divisions of the State Department of Education.

Sheffer, W. E., "Improvement in the State Department of Education." Kansas Teacher, "School Code Number," 28, 28-30.

Stacey, W. A., Editor. School Laws of Kansas Revised, Kansas State Printing Plant, Topeka, Kansas. 1933.

School Laws of each of the other 47 states of the United States of America.

U. S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Education. Survey of Education Utah. Bulletin, 1926, No. 18. Washington, D. C.; Government Printing Office, 510 pp.

Also State School Surveys for Arizona, South Dakota, Alabama, Oklahoma, Arkansas, and Colorado. All of which were made by the United States Department of the Interior, Office of Education.