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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The Problem

Nature and direction of the problem.--The problem under consideration is restricted to determining whether the administration of the common schools of District Four in Texas can be made to function more effectively without changing the external structure of the administrative organization and to determine whether the administrative duties are being performed in a fairly uniform manner by those best qualified to perform them without duplications, omissions, and waste of effort. The crucial problem is to determine whether or not administrative responsibility is effectively allocated and properly fixed.

The trend of the discussion centers about such questions as the following: What administrative functions are performed in the common schools of District Four? Who performs these functions? Who should perform them? What questionable practices exist, if any? How do the present practices of administration in the schools under consideration compare with recognized standards of school administration; and, finally, how may the existing administrative agencies function more harmoniously and effectively?

Explanation of terms.--"Common schools" refers to all schools that are maintained in the common school districts
of District Four that are under the more specific control of the local boards of trustees and at the same time are under the general management and control of the county superintendents and the county boards. The term "rural schools" is used synonymously with the term "common schools."

"District Four" has reference to eleven counties; Archer, Baylor, Clay, Jack, Montague, Palo Pinto, Throckmorton, Wichita, Wilbarger, and Young. It is one of the twenty-four districts that exist under the division of supervision of the schools of Texas.

The term "present set-up", is used to limit the problem by narrowing its scope. This term is used almost synonymously with "present organization" but is more inclusive. It is in fairly common usage in educational literature.

The statement of the problem by including the words "under the present set-up", bars all suggestions of improvements that might result from creating larger units, and eliminating one or more than one of the administrative agencies. It also bars making any of a number of more external changes that might be suggested. The task then of determining ways and means of securing more effective administration is confined to that of detecting and purging the system of internal faults. It is a task of seeking for weaknesses and of discovering points of administrative leaks in the present system. Regardless of their desirability, all suggested means of improvement must come within the present "set-up".
This must not be taken to mean, however, that changes of an internal nature which deal with factors such as the redistribution of authority, delegation of certain functions, adoption of new policies, improvement of personnel, and changes that lead to a better understanding and more centralized effort are to be barred. The exclusion of these avenues of improvement would so narrow the problem as to defeat its own purpose.

Justification of the problem.—Under the present organization of the common schools of District Four there are three units of administration: the state district, the county, and the local district. In each unit there is from one to two administrative agents; the county superintendent and the county board of trustees in the county unit; the head teacher and the district board of trustees in the local district; and the deputy state superintendent in the state district. This makes for a complex situation of control and presents ample opportunity for administrative waste. Such a division of authority in any organization warrants careful study, since it too often leads to inefficiency, duplication of effort, misunderstandings, lack of economy, and neglect of important functions. This state of affairs need not necessarily exist, but the barest possibility of its presence would justify the problem under consideration.

Cyr in the following quotation indicates that the
problem of improving rural school administration by re-
allocating administrative responsibility as well as by the
enlargement of the local unit of control has received con-
siderable attention.

Bobbitt, in discussing the division of responsibilities for rural school administration, says:
"The most complex and baffling problems are those
that relate to the division of responsibilities among
the several administrative units.
So long as the people oppose the administrative
machinery that is necessary for decentralized control,
they are forcing upon the State department the necessity
of continuing this centralized control until such time
as it can be relinquished without jeopardizing the edu-
cational interests of the State."

The [quote] quoted emphasizes the importance of the
whole problem of developing more adequate educational ad-
ministration for rural areas, and the specific problem
of reallocating administrative responsibility.

... state surveys of public education have re-
ferred to this problem. The surveys of Indiana, Kansas,
Mississippi, Missouri, New Jersey, North Carolina, Texas,
Utah, Virginia, and West Virginia all contain proposals
for the development of more effective local administra-
tive organization and enlargement of the local unit. The
New York, New Jersey, and Kansas Surveys recommend the
accomplishment of this primarily through some modifica-
tion of the community district; others recommend its
accomplishment through the allotting of additional respons-
sibility to the county. ¹

Butterworth in discussing the distribution of educational
control suggests the prevalence of administrative maladjust-
ment in rural schools in saying:

Within any state may be found varying practices as
to the responsibility for schools assumed by lay and pro-
fessional people. In a city one is now likely to find
such a significant responsibility as the selection of the
teaching staff assumed rather fully by the professional

¹Frank W. Cyr, Responsibilities for Rural School Admin-
istration, pp. 6-8.
officers, while in many a village the principal has little or nothing to say about it. Similar variations may be found in dealing with other school duties.

The foregoing situations illustrate the fact that responsibility for educational control is in a state of flux. Without implying that control should be uniformly distributed without regard to differences in conditions we should nevertheless seek to evaluate the tendencies in order that future policies may be as sound as possible.

The need for such a study as this is also emphasized by the common conception that the rural schools are decidedly inferior to city schools in organization and administration and by the prevalence in educational literature of statements that imply general inefficiency of rural education. The following excerpt is typical.

"The average farmer and rural teacher think of the rural school as a little house on a little ground, with equipment where a little teacher, for a little salary teaches little children, little things." Had he added to this description with a little assessed valuation in which people of little vision do little for themselves and their little children, the picture of a typical rural school in a typical rural district . . . would have been complete.

During the school year of 1936-1937, 17,970 children were enumerated in the common schools of District Four. If the educational opportunities of these children are in any manner jeopardized by questionable practices in the administration of the schools, this study will be justified provided it brings to light any possible remedies for the

2 Julian E. Butterworth, Principles of Rural School Administration, p. 63.

3 Julius Bernhard Arp, Rural Education and the Consolidated School, p. 34.

4 Public School Directory 1936-37
situation.

It is hoped that at least a limited number of administrators and school officials in common school districts will find this work useful in the solution of their own problems.

Origin of the problem.—The problem under consideration grew out of the writer's personal experiences and contacts as a head teacher in the common schools of one of the counties in District Four. In this capacity a number of seemingly irregular and inconsistent administrative practices have been observed that obviously have hampered the progress of the schools. Similar expressions have come from county superintendents, trustees, deputy state superintendents, and other head teachers.

In the majority of the cases in which these expressions were made it seemed that the purported dissatisfaction and maladjustment had arisen because the different administrative agents had no clear conception of their duties and responsibilities. Practices seemed to vary from one school to the other, according to custom, to such an extent that head teachers have reported that experience in one school, instead of being an asset, might prove to be a real hindrance in serving in a new system. Uniformity seemed to be so lacking in many instances that each administrative group apparently functioned almost independently of others that were working toward the same end.
The writer, in contacting other school officials, became convinced that his views were shared by so many others that the problem of this thesis was undertaken to test the validity of the opinions.

Selection of Administrative Duties for Special Study

In attacking the problem one of the first steps was that of selecting a number of clearly defined administrative duties to incorporate into a questionnaire which was used in determining the existing practices relative to the allocation of responsibilities among the school officials and in determining the actual role of each administrative agent.

Since there is such a multitude of administrative activities involved in the management of schools, it was necessary to limit the investigation to a number of duties that would be especially significant for this study. To perfect such a list the following guiding principles were adopted: (1) The duty must be one whose allocation is somewhat controversial. (2) The duty must be important in carrying on the regular school program. (3) The duty must be sufficiently specific to clearly distinguish it from others. (4) The duty must be commonly performed in the schools of the district. (5) Duties must be so selected that the work of executive, legislative, and approving agencies will be represented in the study.

Several lists of administrative functions were available from which a suitable set for the study could be compiled. Some of the lists that were best suited for this purpose are
given by Butterworth\textsuperscript{5}, Cyr\textsuperscript{6}, Ayres\textsuperscript{7}, and Langston\textsuperscript{8}. After examining these lists, it was decided that the duties mentioned by Langston\textsuperscript{9} would with minor changes in them, serve the purpose admirably and be useful as a basis for further comparison. The list which was finally accepted is given herewith:

1. Employing the head teacher
2. Employing teachers
3. Employing janitors, clerks, etc.
4. Dismissing employees
5. Fixing employees' salaries that are not already determined by state regulation
6. Fixing length of school term
7. Setting up type of organization (number of grades taught etc.)
8. Establishing curricula and course of study (determining what is to be taught in each grade.)
9. Allowing or refusing transfers
10. Making rules and regulations

\textsuperscript{5}Butterworth, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 181-182.
\textsuperscript{6}Cyr, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 25-26
\textsuperscript{7}Fred C. Ayres, "Duties of the Public School Administrators", \textit{The American School Board Journal}, Vols. 78 and 79 February, March, April, May, June, August, October and December 1920\textsuperscript{8}
\textsuperscript{9}Ibid
11. Purchasing supplies, equipment, and furniture
12. Making the budget
13. Raising funds (levying taxes)
14. Developing a program for building
15. Selecting a site for school buildings
16. Planning the school building
17. Erecting new buildings
18. Supervising the work of all employees including teachers, janitors, bus drivers, clerks
19. Assigning employees to their positions and duties
20. Disciplining, promoting, and grading pupils
21. Preparing school programs
22. Preparing reports
23. Supplying the public with information
24. Attending to the business details of the school
25. Keeping pupil records
26. Keeping financial records
27. Determining policies
28. Administering the budget
29. Changing the course of study or subjects offered
30. Considering requests from citizens and organizations
31. Controlling the use of school property and school buildings by other organizations

How the Data Were Secured

To secure the necessary data relative to the allocation of responsibility in practice, the deputy state superintend-
ent of the district and the ten county superintendents were interviewed, and questionnaires were sent to 100 head teachers who were located at various points throughout the district.

One purpose of the interview with the county superintendents was to determine the general practice that is followed throughout each county in allocating the responsibility for each of the 31 administrative duties that had been selected for study. This information was secured in a fairly objective manner with reference to the 31 administrative duties since each county superintendent was asked to indicate which of the five administrative agents; the county superintendent, the head teacher, the county board, the local board, or the deputy state superintendent; most commonly performs each duty. The county superintendent was requested to designate, for each duty, the agent, if any, that commonly makes recommendations to the performing agent.

Additional data relative to the number and size of the schools, the number of teachers, and the number and size of the local boards were secured from the annual reports of the head teachers in each county, at the time of the interview with the county superintendent.

The deputy state superintendent was interviewed for the purpose of determining the extent to which he is an administrative officer in the district. To determine this, he was asked to indicate what administrative responsibility, if any,
he discharges relative to each duty that was selected for study.

As a third means of securing data, questionnaires were sent to 100 head teachers from whom 71 usable reports were received.* The questionnaire was in two parts. The first part immediately followed a letter of explanation. It was a detachable sheet that was designed for registration purposes only. The second and major part of the questionnaire was designed to determine how the responsibility for the selected administrative duties is allocated and discharged in the local district. Each duty was listed and numbered, with possible responses following each duty so that the head teacher by underlining the proper response could indicate who performs the given duty and who makes the recommendation relative to its performance.

Other data and information relative to the present status of administration in common and rural schools and relative to an effective administration of them was secured from a survey of educational literature dealing with the subject.

Each of the other steps in the solution of the problem appear in separate succeeding chapters in the thesis. In Chapter II a criterion giving the proper allocation of administrative responsibilities is set up. Chapter III gives an

*Note: See appendix for a copy of the questionnaire
analysis of the existing status of administration in District Four, points out questionable practices, and offers remedial suggestions on the basis of the criterion set up. In chapter IV the chief avenues through which improvements can be made are suggested, plans by which remedial suggestions can be made effective are presented, and general conclusions are given.
CHAPTER II

CRITERION FOR THE ALLOCATION OF ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSIBILITIES

It is the purpose of this chapter to set up a criterion upon which administrative responsibilities may be satisfactorily and effectively allocated among existing administrative agents. This criterion should state the basic principles for any remedial suggestions that may be made.

Such a criterion is not easily set up because the situation being dealt with is rather complex. It is first a problem of deciding which unit should assume responsibility for given duties and then a problem of determining the proper division of responsibility among the agents within each unit for each duty considered. It is obvious that the criterion set up must be founded upon broad underlying principles. These principles make up the first division of this chapter.

Underlying Principles

If the criterion for allocating administrative responsibility is to function effectively in the "set-up" under consideration it must have the following provisions:

(1) It must provide for democratic control of the schools.

(2) It must provide for specialization of functions so
far as possible.
(3) It must provide for the most efficient and economical operation possible.
(4) It must provide for the proper relationship between lay boards and professional executives.
(5) It must provide for definite allocation of responsibility that results in clear cut relationships.
(6) It must provide for uniform practices.

Democratic Control of Schools

Responsibility for the control of education in the United States ultimately reverts to the people. This control is exercised through the state by virtue of the fact that the people have delegated their authority to the state. By the tenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States all matters not specifically mentioned, of which education is one, are left to the states or to the people.

The American state has, therefore, complete legal responsibility for education at the present time. This responsibility does not come from any inherent right that the state possesses but from the fact that the citizens of the state have given it this responsibility. What citizens have given they could, of course, at any time withdraw by the use of methods of action authorized by the laws which they have themselves established.¹

These statements, however, are not to be construed as indicating that the people or the state should control educational matters in their details. These details are at

¹Butterworth, op. cit., pp. 221-222.
present and should be in the future left to the more local units. Butterworth continues his statement:

It does not follow because the state has the legal authority to control education that the state should exercise that authority in all its phases. On the contrary the spirit of American government has been to give the local communities considerable responsibility in self-government. In education there has been a gradual tendency... to shift authority from local to higher units.2

Concerning the manner in which democratic control is to function, Cyr says:

The people legally exercise democratic control over education through the election of representatives, through general referendum, through meetings of the qualified voters of the district, and by petitions. This control is exercised both through the governmental machinery of the state as a whole and through the governmental machinery of subdivisions of the state, such as the county and small local districts. The American system of administering schools is one of local self-government... Absolute local control, however, would violate the very principle it is seeking to perpetuate since the welfare of the people in any locality to some extent affects, and is affected by the welfare of those outside the locality. For example, the locality might refuse to provide schools and thus supply the state with ignorant, undesirable citizens. The will of the whole people must be exercised, therefore, over large areas to the extent that interests are common. Such control is necessary to preserve the common good.3

Cyr has here pointed out the important principle that democratic control is not always secured by giving a great deal of authority to local units. It is evident, however, that the will of the people will be exercised largely through the county and local units.

The next question then is to determine the division

2Ibid., p. 222.
3Cyr, op. cit., pp. 132-133.
of responsibilities between the county and the local districts as units of administration in order to provide for democratic control. Relative to this question, Cyr sets up three requirements that must be fulfilled:

First, the needs and desires of the people served must be thoroughly understood and provided for, as far as resources will permit, in the development of an educational program; second, the people through and with their representatives must actively participate in the provision and direction of the educational program; and third, the administrative organization must be able to employ professionally trained leadership which is capable of understanding and interpreting the educational needs of the people and capable of putting into effect a program commensurate with the needs, desires, and resources of those served.  

On this same question Butterworth makes these comments:

We should not take the attitude of giving to the higher units all the responsibilities that the lower units are willing to surrender. Such an attitude does not tend to stimulate the development of ability to assume responsibilities. . . .

We may then state the general principle underlying the division of responsibility among the different units thus: Give to lesser units such responsibilities as they are likely to perform as well as or better than the higher units.

When democratic control is thought of in terms of functioning in behalf of the people over an area whose extent is determined by the extent of common interest, it is readily seen that democratic control may often be expressed more effectively through the county rather than the local

---

4 Cyr, Ibid.
5 Butterworth, op. cit., pp. 222-223.
district as the unit of administration, if it makes for greater efficiency. Butterworth points out that the larger units may function more effectively than the smaller one as follows:

... greater ability than can be provided by the ordinary locality ... is needed in dealing with certain problems. ...

Greater economy, both of energy and of money, may justify some higher unit in taking over a function even though the locality could in some cases perform efficiently. ...... ......... ......

Cooperative action is desirable in attacking some problems. For this reason localities may properly turn over to the county the function of providing special supervisors in music, physical education, and the like.

... The need for disinterested service as in the adjustment of district boundaries sometimes makes it necessary to preclude the locality from exercising certain functions.

Uniformity is much to be desired in some matters, such as the methods of collecting, recording and reporting school statistics.

From these remarks and those in preceding paragraphs it is evident that democratic control can be provided for to a large extent by an intelligent allocation of responsibilities among the units of administration. A detailed presentation of this allocation, since it is dependent upon several other factors yet to be discussed, is reserved for the second division of this chapter.

Specialization of Functions

The second principle underlying the criterion for the

\[\text{Ibid.}, \text{p. 72-73} \]
proper allocation of administrative responsibility is that, in so far as possible, specialization of functions must be provided for.

Under the present "set-up" in District Four, complete specialization cannot hope to be attained since that is possible in a large system only. The larger the system, the greater possibility of a high degree of specialization, is a recognized principle. The small districts in the present organization cannot provide for a great deal of specialized functions; and since the statement of the problem prohibits redistricting the units, the words "so far as possible" were included in the statement of this principle.

To the most casual observer it is evident that the function of providing educational facilities is becoming more specialized in all of its divisions. This is especially true in the field of educational administration; and in so far as possible, the advantages resulting from professionalized administration should, in the allocation of administrative duties, be provided for the schools being studied.

Cyr in this connection states:

The administration of an educational program involves a large number of diverse responsibilities, many of which require a special type of ability and a high degree of knowledge and skill. The requisite knowledge and skill can only be obtained where specialization is permitted, through division of responsibilities. This principle is recognized in the establishment and administration of an educational program within a state. . . .
The division of responsibilities, however, goes farther. . . . A wide variety of responsibilities is found in even the smallest elementary school system and a certain degree of specialization is necessary to the development of an effective educational program.

The small district cannot afford to pay for the specialization required. However, by providing an administrative organization which is responsible for certain duties over a large area such as the county, the smaller local administrative organization can perform more efficiently the remaining duties. This permits specialization for both professional staff and board. The work of the executive of the larger unit or county will correspond in a general way, to that of a city superintendent, while the work of the executive of the small local unit will more nearly approximate the work of the city school principal.

Should more complete specialization be sought? An affirmative answer to this question has been one of the reasons for the development of the state school-building divisions, high school inspectors, etc., instead of having these duties performed by local . . . units.

From these quotations it is seen that specialization in functions is desirable and to a large extent feasible in the administration of a system such as the one being considered.

To provide for proper specialization, it is evident that specialized administrative agents must first of all be provided, especially in the county unit; and then administrative duties must be so allocated and centralized, other things being equal, as to place responsibility upon the agent that is best qualified to discharge it.

Concerning the provision for specialization of functions, Cyr sets up the following requirements:

---

8Butterworth, op. cit., p. 225.
Following are minimum requirements for an effective division of responsibilities between the small local unit and the county in states maintaining the strong local district:

The functions of the county organization will be specifically defined by statute. The functions of its constituent districts will include all those duties and responsibilities not otherwise assigned. This requirement is necessary to clarify of division of functions. It is the basis on which Federal and state relations have been developed.

The county organization will determine broad, countywide educational policies. The constituent districts will administer these policies in terms of the local school.

The county will tend to emphasize the supervisory functions and the problems of personnel, while the functions of the constituent units are more directly administrative.

The county will perform those administrative duties which can be uniformly administered to the entire area without injury to the educational program. It will provide those special educational services, or that part of them, which can be more economically and efficiently provided by the larger unit. It will perform those occasional administrative duties which require a highly specialized knowledge. The constituent districts will utilize the services of the county organization to meet the individual needs of their pupils and community.

The county organization will guarantee a minimum educational program if it wishes to go beyond the state's minimum program. The constituent districts will exercise their initiative in developing programs to meet their individual needs, and will, if they desire go beyond the county minimum.

Responsibilities then, should be so allocated as to provide specialized services for the local units.

Efficient and Economical Operation

The third principle states that the most efficient and economical operation possible must be provided for.

9Cyr, op. cit., p. 135.
Here again, as in the preceding principle, it is to be remembered that the provisions made must be in accordance with the present "set-up".

One of the cardinal principles of efficiency and economy is centralization of control. It brings about unity of effort; detects multiple-executive direction, duplication and omission of duties; and fixes responsibility. All of these of course make for efficiency and economy; for in the words of Reeder, "... centralized control is considered to be, at least in all other fields of endeavor a first principle of efficient management".\(^\text{10}\)

In keeping with these principles it seems logical that with other things being equal those administrative functions in which economy and efficiency are vital factors should be allocated to the county or state units.

Cyr\(^\text{11}\) in reference to economy and efficiency in operation says that the administration must be so organized as to "be able to utilize the best educational thought and use the most effective techniques for transforming its resources into educational results". He then states that the important elements of a satisfactory educational program cannot be provided by any one part of the total organization, and that highly professional leadership and certain types of


\(^{11}\)See Cyr, *op. cit.*, p. 131.
instruction needed for efficient operation cannot be economically provided by the small local district and must, therefore, be supplied through the larger unit. To summarize his requirements he states:

... an adequate administrative organization must meet at least two requirements if it is to operate efficiently and economically; (1) it must be capable of efficiently transferring its resources into a satisfactory educational program, and (2) it must so allocate responsibility for administrative duties that each duty will be performed by the type of organization which can perform it most effectively. 12

Proper Relationships Between Lay Boards and Professional Executives

The fourth underlying principle states that the proper relationship between lay boards and professional executives must be provided for.

Experts in the field of school administration are agreed that there is a clear distinction between the functions of the lay board and the professional executive.

Butterworth gives a clear distinction between the two groups and gives the basis for the authority upon which each operates.

1. Ultimate authority should be in the hands of the lay group, the citizens themselves. They may exercise some of all of these functions directly, but the general tendency now is, as has been said, to delegate most of the authority to their representatives, the Board of Education.

Lay people should have the ultimate authority

12 Ibid, p. 132.
because they are the ones who pay the required taxes and whose children are to be educated. There is danger of our forgetting that the authority of the professional group is derived rather than original. Undoubtedly, it is desirable to set up safeguards, through law or through organization, to encourage the use of professional knowledge.

2. Authority should be in the board of education as a body not in members as individuals. Representation of the community should be undertaken only when all or a majority of the members of the board are meeting in the capacity of educational representatives of the community. When the board is adjourned each member is again merely a citizen except as he has been specifically directed by the board to perform certain duties.

3. The board of education should have the authority to direct in a large way the professional activities of the professional group, but the professional group should have no such authority over the board. This principle follows as a result of placing ultimate authority in the hands of the lay group. This board should not, of course, undertake minute direction of professional activities. It will set up large policies and leave the details to the superintendent and the teachers to carry out as they think best.

4. The only limitations to the authority of the lay representatives are those set by the standards of the whole body of citizens or those prescribed by law. Every group of citizens has standards of justice, of educational achievements, and of decency that ordinarily may not be violated with impunity. A board of education is therefore limited by these standards whether it operates for better or for poorer schools.

The problem of providing for the proper relationship between the lay and professional groups now resolves itself into setting up the proper division of the administrative functions between the county board and the county superintendent on the one hand, and between the head teacher and the local board on the other.

Cubberley, a master among school authorities makes the following suggestions relative to the question:

The board's work as the representatives of the people, is to sit in judgement on proposals and to determine the general policy of the school system. A school board is elected primarily as a board of control to determine policies, select experts, approve new undertakings, and to determine expenditures. . . . The school board should elect experts for the executive work, and should govern by deciding upon the larger matters of policy, expansion, and expenditures, and not to administer in any detail the school system under its control. The nature of the work of the board is largely legislative. 14

Reeder makes a clear distinction between the duties of the two groups:

The administration of a school system requires the performance of three functions, namely, the legislative function is that of formulating and adopting policies of enacting legislation. . . . [This] function should be performed by the board of education.

Boards of education, however, should not enact legislation, should not make policies, without the recommendations of . . . their chief executive officer. . . . In a well administered school system not much, if any, legislation will be enacted by the board of education which has not been recommended by the superintendent.

The execution of policies should be left wholly to the professional experts of the board of education—that is, the superintendent, the principals, business officials, teachers, and other employees. Boards of education do not have the time to execute policies; nor do they usually have the acumen which is necessary for such work; they have not been trained to execute policies. The function of the school board is not to run the schools but to see that they are run. . . .

After legislation has been enacted by the board of education and has been duly executed by the professional experts of the board, the task remains to ascertain how well it has been executed. This is the inspectorial, or

14E. P. Cubberley, Public School Administration, p. 120.
appraisal function, and it should be exercised primarily by the board of education. The board will exercise it primarily on the basis of definite information which it secures from its executive officers.

In a very definite fashion Almack in discussing the duties of the board states:

I. The board should not delegate the duties of
1. Selecting the superintendent or other leading administrative official.
2. Approving the budget.
3. Adopting rules and regulations.
4. Fixing the qualifications of teachers and other employees.
5. Planning the system of school organization.
6. Deciding working procedure for its meetings.
7. Making contracts for building and grounds.
8. Passing finally upon the employment of teachers.
9. Expanding and otherwise modifying the educational program.

II. The board should delegate the duties of
1. Selecting teachers and other employees; that is, making nominations.
2. Supervising and directing all employees in service.
3. Purchasing supplies and equipment.
4. Making the curriculum.
5. Measuring the results of instruction.
6. Recording, accounting, and reporting.
7. Preparing the budget.
8. Drawing up rules and regulations.
9. Conducting investigations and gathering data.

In keeping with the preceding principles in allocating responsibilities, it may be said that all responsibilities of a determinate, legislative, or appraisal nature should be exercised by the lay board while all those of an executive, or advisory nature should be exercised by the professional executive.

15 Reeder, op. cit., pp. 14-15

16 J. C. Almack, The School Board Member, pp. 53-54.
Definite Allocation of Responsibilities

The fifth underlying principle of the criterion states that a definite allocation of responsibilities which result in clear cut relationships must be provided for. This principle, in a measure, is complimentary to the preceding one, for if the proper relationships are provided for between the lay and professional bodies, a long step will have been made in meeting the requirements of the principle now under consideration.

Few would question the value of clearly defined lines of responsibility in any organization that is operating under a type or system of multiple-control such as the common schools of Texas are now operating under. Until responsibility is definitely allocated, no unit or individual can be charged with inefficiency, or neglect of duty. Without the fixation of responsibility there is little incentive for accomplishment since neither praise nor blame can justly be offered when it is lacking. The lack of clear-cut relationships within each unit and between the units may result in misunderstandings, duplication, over-lapping of efforts, and deadening initiative. It breeds jealousy between the agents of administration. It may hamper efficient operation to a very marked degree.

Langston verifies these statements in saying "to avoid discord and unpleasantness, the executive and the school board should be fully aware of their respective rights and
functions. 17

He then quotes Ashworth as follows:

Certainly it is only common sense to assume that any group governing a business enterprise should have clearly defined duties for members of the organization. Yet it is true that boards and superintendents in many districts have no such understanding. It is the rule rather than the exception, particularly in the smaller system, for the superintendent to have no sure knowledge as to where his authority and duties begin and where they end. It is by no means uncommon to find a superintendent hampered by board interference in matters which belong to him, and it is frequently true that board members resent what seems to them unwarranted assumption of authority on the part of the superintendent. Such a state of affairs cannot work for efficiency or peace. 18

In emphasizing the value of providing for definitely fixing responsibility Reeder makes this statement:

Each employee would know his functions, and responsibility could, therefore, be definitely placed. The result would be less muddling, less meddling, and less characterized by that administrative pastime which is commonly known as "passing the buck". Much of the friction which now exists between boards of education and superintendents of schools, between educational and business employees—in brief, between all employees—would be obviated. 19

Cyr makes the following very pointed remarks concerning definiteness of allocation and clarity of relationships:

Uncertainty as to allocation of responsibilities and the relationships involved hinders efficiency of operation and hampers democratic control. It prevents the smooth functioning of administrative machinery

---

17 Langston, op. cit., p. 48.
19 Reeder, op. cit., p. 17.
and causes a confusion which prevents the people from exercising their will intelligently and effectively. This principle requires a consideration of the relationships between lay boards of education and professional executives both within and between administrative units. 20

Uniform Practices

The last underlying principle of the criterion states that uniform practices must be provided for in allocating administrative responsibilities.

A high degree of uniformity, in so far as fixing administrative responsibility in the common schools of District Four is concerned, is desirable. With respect to geography, type of people, occupations, social beliefs, governmental control, and common interests, there is little to prevent a more uniform management of the schools. Uniform practices in administration would materially aid pupils, teachers, and patrons to fit into a new system as they transfer from one school district to another. It would shorten the period of "breaking in" that teachers, pupils, and executives must pass through as they go from one system of control to another. It would facilitate supervision, provide for comparisons, tend to break down narrow district divisions, aid in meeting state standards, and provide a more adequate program of education in general.

An absolute type of uniformity could be provided for

\[20\] Cyr, op. cit., p. 136.
by centralizing all authority in higher units. Absolute uniformity however, is not desirable. Each system has its individual differences in environmental conditions that affect the work of the school. Each local unit must have some freedom of choice and some real problems to solve. A deadening of local initiative and local interest in the school program would result from any "lock step" set-up that absolute uniformity would create.

To provide for local initiative and to insure cooperative action from that angle, many administrative functions may wisely be allocated to the local unit. So long as the locality is functioning in harmony with other units in pursuit of a common end and in accordance with policies and regulations agreed upon, it may make a distinct contribution to the progress of education. Butterworth makes the following statement in this connection:

Functions should be assigned as near to the local unit as is consistent with reasonable proficiency. The effect of this would be to relieve the higher units so that their energy could be directed to constructive work on the larger educational problems. At the same time it stimulates both lay and professional people in the lower units to contribute to the making of a better education. . . .

Muller expresses the same idea in saying:

Not all educational matters should be placed in the hands of the county board of education. If they are, the local community is left without representation and consequently without initiative and responsibility

---

which is just as bad as too much local control.\textsuperscript{22}

A desirable degree of uniformity in administration, then, should be provided for without sacrificing a desirable degree of local control. This may be done by properly allocating administrative responsibilities through a district policy system that outlines the capacity in which school officials, both county and local, may function.

The underlying principles of the criterion that have now been set up should prove to be very helpful in determining the capacity in which each of the agents of administration in the district should function. The next section of this chapter is devoted to a consideration of this topic.

\textbf{Allocation of Functions Among the Units of Administration}

The criterion for properly allocating administrative duties should clearly state the capacities in which each of the responsible agents may legitimately function. It should more clearly define the role of each agent. This is the purpose of this division. For it, guiding principles have just been set up.

The discussion that is to follow is divided into three major divisions. Each major division presents the responsibilities that may be allocated to each of the units, the state district, the county, and the local district. To

\textsuperscript{22}A. D. Muller, \textit{Progressive Trends in Rural Education}, p. 17.
make this presentation clear in dealing with the county and the local units, one subdivision is employed to present the capacities in which the professional executive may function, another to present the capacities in which the lay board may function, and a third subdivision to state the specific duties that should be allocated to each unit. Such subdivisions, however, are not necessary in dealing with the state district, since it has only one administrative agent, the deputy state superintendent.

Throughout this section of the chapter it must be borne in mind that ultimate responsibility rests in the lay boards, but that progressive practice demands that executive duties be delegated to professional executives.

The District Unit

Since the deputy superintendent is the only administrative agent for the state district, the functions which should be allocated to it will be conterminous with those of the deputy state superintendent. By virtue of his central position, particular qualifications, and fitness for the office; and in keeping with the fact that he is the direct agent of the state superintendent of education; the deputy superintendent has the most unique opportunity of bringing about that degree of uniformity and cooperation among the various units and agencies as to make of the district a real unit in educational administration. He should,
therefore, function to a certain extent as a chief executive of the district and as such should have broad, but general administrative authority in the fields of policy making, program-planning, and supervision. As the agent of the state he is in position to know better than any one else in the district the policies and program of the state. It, then, should be his duty to interpret the state program to the constituent units of the district and to recommend procedures. He should be chief advisor and informant for each unit. He should initiate general movements, fix the trend, and set the pace of educational progress for the section.

He should not attempt to execute policies directly. He is not in a position to do so. This is the function of more local units. His function should be to stimulate, guide, direct, and supervise the local units in executing the state's program.

The capacity in which the deputy superintendent should function differs slightly from that in which he is already serving by giving him the executive functions of formulating general policies and outlining the general program for the schools of the district as a whole.

Recommendations as to how the deputy superintendent may function more effectively in this capacity are given in Chapter IV.
The County Unit

In the discussion that is to follow, the capacity in which the county board may serve, together with the special duties it should perform is first presented; general functions of the county superintendent and special duties which he should perform are then given; and finally, the more specific duties which should be performed through the county unit under the proper board-executive relationship are suggested.

The county board.—In accordance with the underlying principles of the criterion, the county board should execute a greater degree of administrative control than it is now exercising. It may wisely be allowed to discharge many of the responsibilities that county boards of county unit systems are now discharging. Generally speaking, it should perform those duties that have to do with financial control, adoption of the program and general policies for the county, and the equalization of educational opportunities. The county board should continue to function as an appellate board and as a board of control.

Concerning the general capacity in which the county board should serve Cyr says:

The major capacity in which the county board will act will be as a board of control. In this capacity it will determine educational policies and appraise the results of such policies in those matters assigned to it by statute. . . . The county board will also act as an appellate board with authority to affirm, modify, or reverse certain decisions of the local board, on appeal.
In this capacity the county board will have such appellate jurisdiction over those matters only which are assigned to it by statute. Such jurisdiction will usually be exercised over matters not directly related to the curriculum. It will primarily concern adjustments of district boundaries, reorganization and consolidations of districts, transfer of pupils or property from one district to another, determination of transportation routes, location of school sites, and similar matters which may affect the welfare of children in more than one district, when responsibilities for such matters are assigned to the local board.23

Considerable attention should now be given to a special duty, that of appointing the county superintendent, which must be given to the county board if the maximum of improvement in the administration of the common schools of the district is to be secured. This suggestion is within the scope of this work since it only entails a delegation of responsibility by the people to their elected representatives and in no wise alters the external administrative organization of the common schools. This change in the method of selecting the county superintendent is vital to any extensive change in the present administrative system. It seems to be the initial step toward greater progress in rural education since the county superintendent should occupy the key position in the control of the county schools. By virtue of this fact he must be a professional executive, trained for his work. That the present system does not insure the selection of a county

23Cyr., op. cit., p. 139.
superintendent of this type will be shown anon.

That the county superintendent should be appointed by the county board is a question that has ceased to be controversial among authorities in the field of rural school administration, but the persistency of the present system in Texas of electing the county superintendent by popular vote eloquently testifies that a further consideration of the issue is pertinent.

The recommendations of the Texas Educational Survey Commission with respect to the selection of the county superintendent is worthy of serious consideration.

The county board of education in Texas lacks one power which if possessed could be so used as to do much to improve conditions in rural schools. It should have the authority to elect the county superintendent of schools instead of having that official chosen by popular vote, as is now the case.

The county board of education should be free to select a superintendent from any place it chooses, the only restrictions imposed upon it should be those relating to professional attainments. The board should fix his salary within the restrictions imposed by legislation and should be free to elect him for whatever period it chooses with a maximum of five years.

In the selection and retention of high-grade men and women in the office of superintendent county boards of education will have one of their largest opportunities to render constructive service to the schools under their jurisdiction.

The statutory relations between the county superintendent and the county school trustees is particularly unfortunate in one respect at present. In case of dissatisfaction with an action of a county superintendent, appeal lies to the county board. An examination of the minutes of board meetings shows that in some counties, at least, it is not uncommon for the county board of education to reverse the decision of a superintendent. There can be little doubt that, if the board and superintendent acted as a unit on matters within their authority, it would make for more satis-
factory development of a school program. 24

That such a change is imperative and that it would not seriously alter the present status of the democratic control of the school system is pointed out by Lewis in the following quotation:

The power to select the county superintendent is one of the most important functions that the school board can possess, and one that it should always have. If the superintendent is elected by the people, or is appointed by some person or group other than the school board, he will not be amenable to the board. Such a condition often results in a lack of harmony between the board and superintendent, and an uncertainty on the part of the public as to where authority and responsibility actually reside. If the board is elected by the direct vote of the people, and the superintendent is elected by the board, there can be no question as to the board's responsibility for the schools or the duty of the superintendent to be subordinate to the board. If the board and the superintendent cannot work together harmoniously it is the duty of the board to find a superintendent with whom it can work. In case the board is in the wrong the voters will have the power to pass ultimate judgement at the polls. The board should be given freedom to seek where it wishes for a person of ability, character, and experience to serve as superintendent. It should be restricted only by statutory regulations governing age, academic and professional training, and experience. In no other way can the rural schools be provided with an efficient professional administrative control. An elective superintendent is, of necessity, a resident of the county which elects him, and there is little likelihood that a county court, or other appointing body, will go outside of the county to secure such an official. Only by providing for a superintendent appointed by the board can there be developed a professional group of county superintendents to serve rural schools. Young men and women will not train specifically for this field of service if they are to be restricted to their home counties for employment. 25

That the direct responsibility of selecting the county superintendent should be shifted from the people to the county board, the direct representative of the people, is defended by many educators in Texas. Former State Superintendent, Annie Webb Blanton\textsuperscript{26}, points out that the shift in responsibility would result in a more democratic method of selection and a more efficient county superintendent. G. O. Clough\textsuperscript{27} stoutly recommends the appointment of the county superintendent by the county board. He says that this method of selection is endorsed by the best authority and is rapidly becoming the practice today. He shows that in many counties under the present law, since the voters in independent districts far out number the voters in common districts, that the county superintendent can be elected by the people over whose schools he has no control. On the other hand, he states that the county board directly represents the people whom the county superintendent serves, and a change to the plan recommended would not take the matter out of the hands of the people, but would result in good democracy, good common sense, and good sound policy.

It may now be concluded that to provide for more democratic control, proper board-executive relationships, professional leadership, and greater efficiency in general; the

\textsuperscript{26}Annie Webb Blanton, \textit{A Handbook of Information as to Education in Texas 1918-1922}, pp. 15-16.

county board should appoint its chief executive officer, the county superintendent.

The county superintendent. — After outlining the general functions that the county board should exercise and emphasizing that the county superintendent is its chief executive, and after describing the relationship that should exist between the lay board and its professional executive; there remains little to be said about the capacity in which the county superintendent should function except to mention some of the special duties which he may perform.

In addition to his duties as the professional executive of the county board, the county superintendent may be of special service in other positions. He may act as a representative of the deputy state superintendent and of the state superintendent and of the state department in informing the county and local organizations of the activities, policies, and requirements of the state. He should secure or furnish such information, records, and reports as the state superintendent may request. In a limited number of cases the county superintendent may act as the chief executive of the local board. This is especially true in the employment of the head teacher. Otherwise the local board in performing this most important duty would probably function without professional leadership when it is readily available. In other cases in which the head teacher is
incapacitated by lack of professional training and experience, the county superintendent may serve as chief executive to the local board. This relationship between the county superintendent and the local board may often function to advantage in planning buildings, insuring school property, preparing the budget, and approving contracts. In every case of this nature, however, the head teacher should be cognizant of the relationship; and if feasible, should take the initiative in securing the services of the county superintendent and attend the meetings when this relationship is exercised.

In discussing the capacity in which the county superintendent should function Cyr says:

The major function of the county superintendent will be to act as executive of the county board of education in the performance of those duties assigned to the county organization. In the performance of such duties the principles set forth for the development of board-executive relationships will be followed.

The county superintendent will act as executive of the local board of education in the performance of a limited number of functions definitely specified by statute. In this capacity he will supply professional leadership and advice to the local board in the performance of duties which occur only at intervals, such as planning buildings, insuring school property, recommending teachers, and preparing the annual budget. The proper development of this county-superintendent-local-board relationship seems to provide one of the most promising avenues through which more effective administrative practices may be introduced. It permits further specialization on the part of executives and provides highly trained professional leadership which could not otherwise be afforded. . . .

The county superintendent will act in certain matters as a representative of the state department. He will keep the county and local administrative organizations informed as to the policies, activities, and re-
quirements of the state department. He will actively assist the state department in the accomplishment of its policies within limited fields. He will also secure for the department such records and reports as it may require.28

The county superintendent should also function, as the statutes prescribe, as chief supervisor of the common schools of the county.

Duties allocated to the county unit.--After presenting the general capacity in which both the county superintendent and the county board should function and defining the special duties that each should perform, it remains to show those specific duties which should be allocated to the county unit for the county board and the county superintendent acting as a unit to perform. In the discharge of these responsibilities the county board will be responsible to the people; but in actual practice the county superintendent, in keeping with the proper board-executive relationships, will frequently be the performing agent.

In accordance with the provisions that have been given, the county officials should perform the following duties:

1. Determine county school policies

2. Prescribe general rules and regulations for the

28Cyr. op. cit., p. 140.
schools
3. Select the county superintendent's immediate assistants
4. Fix a uniform county school tax and distribute all school funds
5. Provide special educational services that cannot be provided by the local districts
6. Approve the making and administration of all local district budgets
7. Purchase supplies in excess of $10,000 for all schools
8. Approve the sale of school property by the local board
9. Fix salaries of all county and local district school employees in accordance with state regulations and recommendations from the local board
10. Purchase, maintain, and route school busses
11. Allow or refuse transfers
12. Provide for proper supervision under the policies outlined by the deputy state superintendent
13. Adjust district boundaries
14. Recommend the reorganization and consolidation of local districts
15. Classify all schools
16. Maintain a uniform course of study with recommendations from the deputy superintendent and the head
17. Recommend and approve new building sites
18. Approve all local district building programs
19. Hear appeals from all decisions of the local board

This allocation of responsibilities gives to the county unit almost complete financial control of the common schools. The wisdom of this step will perhaps be questioned. It is desirable, however, to provide for the proper centralization of financial control, which makes for economical administration and facilitates provisions for more nearly equal educational opportunities for the children within the county.

Although an extended study of the financial support of the common school district is not within the scope of this study, some of the implications of giving the county board greater financial responsibility should be considered, since school administration is directly concerned with equalizing educational opportunities and economical operation.

The writer knows of no work that shows specifically the extent to which the present system of financial administration in District Four is inadequate. From the fact that the local district is now the unit of financial control and from conditions that exist in other counties in Texas, it may be concluded that the present system of administration in District Four cannot provide for equal educational opportunities, democratic financial support, and economical operation within any given county.
Some districts are wealthy or may become so because they are abundantly blessed with valuable resources. Others in the same county are poverty stricken from no fault of their own. Some districts with a very low tax rate can provide better educational facilities than its neighbor district can provide with a much higher tax rate. Some may spend lavishly, others miserly, some wisely, and still others foolishly so long as the local district exercises the financial control of schools as it now does. Some districts may even go so far as to levy no local tax at all and operate altogether on state support.

That these conditions not only may exist, but that they are common in practically every county of Texas is verified from a study of the report of the Texas Educational Survey Commission on financial support of schools in Texas. 29

Further support for the position that the county unit should exercise greater financial control of the common schools is found in a report of the financial conditions of the common schools of Wichita County - one of the counties of District Four - in a work by Davis from which the following paragraph is taken:

Figure No. 1 on page 11 shows the financial condition of the rural schools of Wichita County as it exists under the present district system of financial support. The striking thing about this figure is that

the districts with the highest school tax rates have the smallest amounts of school funds and those with the lowest school tax rates have the largest amounts of school funds. Notice that Districts Nos. 13, 16, and 22 have had to reduce their tax rates from 50 cents to 5 cents, 20 cents, and 20 cents, respectively, in order to keep from having more school funds than they can use. On the other hand, Districts Nos. 23, 24, and 25 with tax rates of 100 cents, 100 cents, and 90 cents, respectively, came out in debt at the end of the school year.30

Arp gives further evidence of weakness of the present district system of financial control in saying:

The indictment against the district system is that, for the meager results produced, it is expensive, wasteful, inefficient, unprogressive, totally inadequate to present-day needs, and unfair to country children. Its supposed democracy is a delusion, for true democracy in education means equal opportunities for the children of one district with those of other districts and also a fairly well-equalized financial burden for the patrons. In both these respects, the small district [system of control] fails completely.31

Placing more complete financial control of the common schools into the hands of the county unit cannot remove all the inequalities referred to. But can this ever be accomplished until the state and ultimately the federal government recognizes its responsibility in this respect? The recommendation that the county be given more nearly complete financial control of the common schools would, however, render it possible to make the most of the situation and provide for uniform support and more nearly equal educational opportunities within each county.

30 Davis, op. cit., p. 10.

31 J. B. Arp, Rural Education and the Consolidated School, pp. 34-35.
To accomplish this the local unit should relinquish control as it has done in the recognized county unit systems, and the county board should be empowered to levy a uniform county tax so that all the wealth of the county may contribute to the education of all of the children of the county. The total revenue from this tax, together with the total from the other regular sources should then be apportioned by the county board to the local districts on the basis of need for the support of the educational program throughout the county.

In defense of a change from district support to county support Arp maintains that:

Owing to the unequal distribution of wealth in modern times, district taxation as the basis of school support is most unfair if not supplemented by substantial county or state levies. . . . Uniform school taxes by townships and an equal distribution of the same to all the township schools is a step towards equitable and fair school support; but even the township is too small a unit of support if the difference in wealth between the several townships of the county is pronounced. Where this is true, the county should be made the local unit of support, especially if a large part of the school tax is raised locally and does not come in the form of state tax or state aid. 32

Provisions for such a system of taxation would, of course, have to be made by a special act of the legislature.

In keeping with the provision for greater economy that would result from greater financial control by the county unit, the responsibility for the making and administration of the budget should be exercised by the county unit. Under

32 Ibid., p. 46.
the present system the law provides as follows:

Immediately after the county superintendent receives notice of the apportionment made by the State Board of Education, . . . he shall prepare a budget for each common school district in the county. . . . When so prepared, the budget for each common school district shall be submitted to the board of trustees in each district for approval, and when so approved, . . . it shall be filed in the office of the county superintendent, and no expenditure shall be made in the district except as provided for in the budget. . . .

Under the present system there is a question as to who is ultimately responsible for the budget since an elected official of one unit functions for the approval of the board of another unit in which neither is directly responsible to the other. What would happen if the trustees failed to approve the budget?

With financial control vested in the county unit, the budget should be prepared by the county superintendent and approved by the county board. This preserves the proper line of authority. The local district officials should be asked to make recommendations, advise the county superintendent of local needs, and otherwise represent their schools in the preparation of the budget. It does not seem axiomatic to suggest also that a duplicate copy of the budget should be provided the head teacher for the service of the local unit in making requisitions, in planning the school programs, and in making expenditures.

The county superintendent as the budget maker should

---

33 Public School Laws of the State of Texas 1858, p. 7.
also be the budget administrator. With financial control largely vested in the county board, this task should be comparatively simple. All expenditures would, of course, be approved by the county superintendent and the local district officials should understand that expenditures not provided for in the budget would not be approved.

In keeping with the principle of centralized financial control and good budgeting, the county unit should also purchase supplies and fix salaries that are not fixed by state regulations. So long as the budget is made and administered by the county superintendent this provision would, in reality, take little or no control out of the hands of the local unit since the revenue that may be spent for either supplies or salaries is determined in the making of the budget. It would, however, give the county unit an excellent opportunity to serve its constituent districts. Just how this may be done, so far as providing supplies are concerned, is pointed out by Davis. He says that the county board acting through the county superintendent by purchasing the necessary supplies through bids, could save the common schools thousands of dollars and free local boards of a great deal of unnecessary work.

Before passing from the discussion of the financial control of the common schools, it should be stated that the item of allocation that gives the county unit the responsibility of providing for special educational services which

34 Davis, op. cit., p. 41.
the local districts cannot provide should receive special mention. It is easily conceivable that many local districts are unable to provide for instruction in many of the special subjects such as music, art, and penmanship; but under a system wherein the county unit has almost complete financial control, it would be possible to engage special teachers or supervisors as assistants to the county superintendent to care for instruction in the special subjects on a county-wide basis. Such a plan as this could be put into effect at a minimum cost with a maximum of efficiency by a county organization that has both the leadership of a specially trained executive and discretionary control of the schools' funds.

Although it is not within the scope of this work to go into the problem of public school transportation; it seems reasonable to suggest that if the county agents of administration are to have the degree of financial control that has been indicated, they should have the responsibility of controlling school bus transportation to the extent of purchasing, maintaining, and routing school buses. Such arrangement would provide for the economy of cooperative bargaining plus the economy that might result from properly loaded buses and the elimination of routes or parts of routes that are covered by two or more buses from different districts. These economies should be especially significant in counties where the practice of trans-
ferring whole schools or grades by contract is prevalent.

The Local Unit

In the presentation of responsibilities that should be allocated to the local district, the same plan will be followed that was used in the preceding division. The general capacity in which the local board should serve, together with special duties it should perform is first given. A similar discussion of the head teacher's responsibility then follows. The third division enumerates the specific duties which the local unit should perform under the proper board-executive relationship.

The local board.—When the duties of the county board are clearly defined, it remains that all other more local responsibilities attending the administration of the schools will be allocated to the local district board. In this capacity it will continue to exercise a great deal of control in the local unit. Concerning the capacity in which the local board should serve and is now serving, Cyr says:

The local district board is a board of control which determines policies and appraises educational results. It maintains proper relationships with the local superintendent or principal as its executive in all functions not allocated elsewhere. It maintains the same relationships with the county superintendent for those functions in which he is assigned responsibility as executive of the local board. When no local executive is employed, the county superintendent will act as executive of the local board in the performance of all duties for which the local principal would otherwise be responsible.

The board of education in a small rural district, either village or open country, tends to become more of an administrative board than is consistent with the
principles outlined. A study of data from Pennsylvania, Nebraska, Idaho, and Indiana reveals counties in which lay boards of small local districts are performing duties that belong to the professional executive. . . . However, the board of the small local district will probably always tend to be more of an administrative board than the board of the county unit. . . . The administrative duties of these local boards may in the future tend to center around the physical plant. Such a tendency would permit greater specialization on the part of the local executive in administration of the more directly educational features of the school system.

In addition to those regular functions which the local board should exercise in connection with the duties that are allocated to the local unit; there is one special responsibility, the election of the head teacher, that should receive mention here.

The local board has no other single responsibility equal to it in importance. It is constantly occurring and in performing it, the board should realize that the key position in the school system is being filled. The responsibility for the success or failure of the school largely rests upon the head teacher. It is he who sets the pace, who stimulates, and to a large extent directs the efforts of the other teachers in the system. He largely determines the morale of the school, and it in turn reflects those habits and ideals of industry, orderliness, cleanliness, and morality that are exhibited in the personality of the head teacher. In this connection the words of Ward G. Reeder relative to the city board's responsibility in the choice of

35Cyr, op. cit., p. 140-141.
its superintendent may be interpolated without injustice to Reeder:

More than any other person, the head teacher determines whether the school system will be efficient or inefficient. No function, therefore, which a local board of education is called upon to perform is as important as the selection of the head teacher; no function requires greater perspicacity and devotion to duty. A mistake made in the selection will often bring disaster to the school and untold grief to the local board of education, whereas a happy selection will mean progress for the school and a blissful tenure for the local school-board members.

For several reasons the local board should always have the recommendations of the county superintendent in selecting the head teacher. It should be aware that in making the selection it is not only selecting the chief teacher, but that it is likewise choosing the chief executive of the board. This adds to the responsibility of the selection and makes it doubly advisable that the board have professional leadership in making it.

Again, the state has set up for the head teacher's position certain minimum requirements which are constantly being changed and may continue to be changed. Few, if any board members will have the inclination or the opportunity to acquaint themselves with these requirements. It should not be necessary for them to do so; this is not the work of laymen. The county superintendent acting as a recommending agent should relieve the board of this responsibility; for the county superintendent, when properly chosen by the

---

36 Reeder, op. cit., pp. 46-47.
county board, is in better position to pass upon the professional training of the head teacher than any one else with whom the local board is ordinarily connected. If the board would invariably follow this suggestion, not only in the selection but in the dismissal of the head teacher as well, it would do much to bring about more amiable relations; and would establish a much needed line of authority in the administration of the common schools.

This placement of responsibility is based on the underlying principles of the criterion which states that specialization of function, the proper board-executive relationship, definiteness of allocation, and greater uniformity of practice must be provided for in allocating responsibility.

The head teacher.—It is unnecessary to go into a detailed discussion of the capacity in which the head teacher should function. It should, however, be said that he should be the chief executive of the local board and as such should perform for his board those executive duties which the professional executive in the county unit performs for his board with the exceptions that have been mentioned. He should recognize the county superintendent as his superior officer and advisor, and this he will do if the proper line of authority is kept intact in his selection. His position is well defined by Cyr.

The local superintendent or principal is primarily the executive of the local board. . . .

The local principal or superintendent will bear the
same relationships to the county superintendent as a principal ordinarily bears to his superintendent in a city school system, for those functions in which the county superintendent is executive of the local board, or has direct jurisdiction over him, as, for example, in the making of reports. 37

If the head teacher in many instances is not well trained and therefore incapable of acting as the professional executive of the local board, the question should be raised as to who, then, among the local officials is qualified for the position. Who among the local officials but the head teacher has been trained to evaluate educational policies? Who but he, is in a position to furnish vital information relative to the needs of the school and to the success of policies that have been adopted? Who is in a better position than he to represent both the pupils and the teachers in the board meeting? Granting that the head teacher is, in many schools, poorly qualified for the work; it then becomes a question of whether it is better to operate with a poorly qualified executive or to operate with none at all. If he is the best that can be provided, he should exercise the function. If for no other reason, the head teacher should act in this capacity since he is the only representative of the purely educational program in the board meeting.

These remarks will serve to make the position of the head teacher clear until final recommendations are reached.

37Cyr., op. cit., p. 141.
Duties allocated to the local unit.—For the sake of clarity and to be more specific the following detailed list of duties which the local agents, acting under the principles of proper board-executive relationship, should perform is given:

1. Employ assistant teachers, janitors, bus drivers, etc.
2. Dismiss employees
3. Recommend transfers
4. Present a list of needed supplies to the county superintendent
5. Advise and recommend in budget making and cooperate in budget administration
6. Initiate the building program
7. Select a site for buildings with the approval of the county board
8. Plan and supervise the erection of school buildings with recommendations from the county superintendent
9. Provide the more detailed supervision of local employees
10. Assign employees their positions and duties
11. Discipline, promote, and grade pupils
12. Prepare necessary reports for the county superintendent
13. Supply the public with proper information
14. Keep detailed pupil records
15. Keep such financial records as will aid in an intel-

iligent administration of the budget

16. Adopt local policies in harmony with those of the county and state

17. Recommend changes in the course of study

18. Purchase, control, and sell school property, other than the school bus, with the approval of the county board

If the underlying principles of the criterion and the allocation of responsibilities to the county board that has been suggested are acceptable, there should be little question concerning the placement of responsibilities with the exception of two items. They are the ones that place upon the local agents the function of employing and dismissing the school's employees.

In view of the fact that financial control, including the fixing of salaries, is centered in the county unit, and that the county agents should be more professionally prepared; it may reasonably be contended that the selection and dismissal of all employees should be a function of the county unit. This contention is entirely justifiable from the standpoint of economy.

Under the present organization, however, in which the local unit is to retain its present status; it seems possible that the local unit may select and dismiss its employees with equal or more satisfactory results than if the function is performed by the county agents, supposing it
would be professionally done in both cases. This means that the professional executive will always nominate those whose work he is responsible for, and that his lay board will exercise the power to approve or reject his nominations. On the basis of this principle it is reasonable to assume that the head teacher may effectively recommend and the local board finally approve the selection and dismissal of all local school employees. This statement warrants further examination.

The head teacher should recommend his helpers, including janitors and bus drivers. This is consistent with the responsibility placed upon him. In a progressively organized system, the board should first of all select a capable leader, the head teacher, and delegate to him the responsibility of conducting the school in accordance with the most progressive trends. It should then give him authority to exercise that responsibility. One of the first needs of the head teacher then will be qualified helpers, and who should know better than he the helpers that he will need? If he is worthy of his position, he will have definite plans and goals for the future. Into those plans and goals the teachers, and to a large extent all other employees, must fit. If he is to have no voice in the selection and dismissal of his assistants, then it stands to reason that he cannot legitimately be held responsible for the work they do; nor can he effectively exercise any authority over them, for
there is no line of authority.

If the head teacher should recommend the election of employees for the local schools; it follows that the local board should, of course, be the agent that approves or rejects the recommendations. This point will be commonly accepted if it can be more fully justified that the responsibility of employing assistants should be allocated to the local unit.

Butterworth has been quoted as saying:

We may, then, state the general principle underlying the division of responsibility among the different units thus: Give to lesser units such responsibilities as they are likely to perform as well as or better than the higher units. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .

Functions should be assigned as near to the local unit as is consistent with reasonable proficiency. The effect of this would be to relieve the higher units so that their energy could be directed to constructive work on the larger educational problems. At the same time it stimulates both lay and professional people in the lower units to contribute to the making of a better education.58

It should be pointed out that the division of responsibility that has been recommended would not eliminate the professional leadership of the county superintendent so long as the county superintendent nominates the head teacher and recommends his dismissal. Under this arrangement it is evident that the county superintendent would be frequently consulted by the head teacher before making his own recommendations to the board. This arrangement would also

make it easy for the county superintendent to take the
initiative in making recommendations to the head teacher
relative to the employment of the school officials. It
seems that the line of authority provided for—employees
responsible to the head teacher, the head teacher directly
responsible to the board and indirectly to the county
superintendent, the county superintendent directly respon-
sible to the county board, and both boards directly re-
sponsible to the people—is very desirable under the present
"set-up".

In this chapter an effective criterion for allocating
administrative responsibilities has been set up by stating
the underlying principles for the allocation, by defining
the capacity in which the agents and units of administration
may function, and by listing the specific duties which
should be performed through each of the units of adminis-
tration.
CHAPTER III

ANALYSIS OF THE EXISTING STATUS OF ADMINISTRATION

IN DISTRICT FOUR WITH REWEDIAL SUGGESTIONS

Existing Organization

Units of Organization

Concerning regular statutory provisions, the structure of the administrative machinery in the common schools of District Four does not differ from that which obtains in the other districts of Texas. According to these provisions four units of organization are discernible. In the order of size they are: the state, the state district, the county, and the local district.

In Texas, as in all other states of the union, "By the tenth amendment to the federal constitution all matters not specifically mentioned, of which education is one, are left to the states or to the people."¹ The states have in turn delegated the details of control to the more local units and reserved the general administration and supervision of education for the state. In Texas at the present the state exercises its control through two units. That one of these, the state district corresponding to District

¹Butterworth, op. cit., p. 221.
Four, is largely a supervisory division and exercises no distinct administrative influence other than that which it performs for the state will be shown later. It is, therefore, the direct agent of the state. The county is the other unit through which state control functions. In many instances the state has delegated its authority directly to the county; but in others it has made the county, like the district, its direct agent, as in the matter of securing reports.

In District Four as in other districts of the state, the county is an intermediate unit in that it performs some state functions and some local and occupies an intermediate position between the two units. It is primarily a political division and not a school district. Because of the limited degree of responsibility given to the county in Texas, the county unit is classed as "weak". Mueller explains this classification thus:

In the weak county unit form the district authorities constitute the dominant administrative agencies, and the district board is given the dominant corporate control. The county remains a contributor to school finance. The county superintendent is elected by popular vote, rather than being appointed by the county board as in the strong form. However many may be the powers of the board, if the district authorities have dominant power for local school purposes, the weak county unit form exists.

Arizona, Arkansas, California, parts of Georgia, Mississippi, Ohio, South Carolina, Texas, and Washington have this type of organization.2

The position of the county will be treated further in discussing the agencies of control. One other unit of organization remains to be mentioned, the common school district. "It is the most important factor in the administration of rural schools in Texas." 3

Arp has this to say about its origin and prevalence in the United States:

It is nearly as old as the settlement of the country itself, it has held sway in nearly every state, for a time at least, and is still the basic school organization in more than half the states. People ... cling tenaciously to the prerogatives that this system brought with it from the earliest times. 4

There are 262 common school districts in District Four. 4 The number in each county ranges from 16 in Baylor County to 46 in Montague County. During the 1936-1937 school term, 17,970 school children were enumerated in these 262 common school districts. 5

Agents of Administration

The administration of the common schools of District Four, as in all similar districts, is divided by statutory provision among five distinct agents, namely: the deputy state superintendent, the county superintendent-


4Arp, op. cit., p. 32.

5Public School Directory of Texas 1936-1937.

*Note: This can be verified by referring to Table 1 on page 66.
ent, the county board, the local head teacher,* and the local board. This division of duty alone points to the possibility of misunderstandings, confusion, and inefficiency; but does not imply their existence. Such a condition of control, however, does demand effective organization, a clear distribution of duties, and proper fixation of responsibility.

In this administrative "set-up" the chief bond of union and the only centralizing factor among the counties of District Four is the office of the deputy state superintendent. Through this office pass all policies effecting the schools by virtue of their membership in the district. The deputy state superintendent is the direct agent of the State Department of Education especially of the State Superintendent and the Division of Supervision. In a report of the Division of Supervision, the following reference is made indicating the capacity in which this official serves:

These supervisors, now known as deputy state superintendents, have established residence in their respective districts, that they may be near their fields of service. The State Department of Public Instruction has sent them out as representatives of the State Department of Education. They take to their respective districts the State's point of view concerning educational progress and work with and through the county school boards, the county superintendents, trustees of local school districts, superintendents of independent districts, and teachers in the direction of greater

*Note: The position of head teacher is not directly provided for by statutes, but it exists by legal delegation of authority.
efficiency in public education in Texas. 6

In this capacity the deputy superintendent is hardly classed as an administrator. His chief duties lie in the field of supervision, but as an advisor and informant to the more local school executives, his influence is felt in the administration of the common schools. He should therefore, be mentioned as an administrative agent.

A second administrative agent operating under the present "set-up" is the county board. It is composed of five members elected for a term of two years. According to law, "One member. . . shall be elected from the county at large by qualified voters of the common and consolidated independent school districts of the county, and one from each Commissioners Precinct by qualified voters of each Commissioner's Precinct." 7

In providing for the body the law states that, "the general management and control of the public free schools in each county of the State shall be vested in five (5) county school trustees." 8 In accordance with this provision there are ten county boards and fifty county trustees in District Four.

A third administrative agent under the present "set-up" is the county superintendent. This official occupies a

7 Public School Laws of the State of Texas 1938, p.31.
8 Ibid, p.31.
strategic position in the management of the common schools. Legal provision for the elected superintendent is made in Article 2688 of the school laws of Texas, and the provision for the ex-officio county superintendent is made in Article 2701. 9 Reference to Table 1 page 66 shows that out of the ten superintendents in District Four seven are regularly elected while three are county judges.

The fourth administrative agent for consideration in the existing "set-up" is the local district board of trustees, a body corporate. The state law provides that the qualified voters of the common school district shall elect three trustees for each regular district. In certain consolidated independent districts the number may be seven according to the type of consolidation. Data recorded in Table 1 page 66 shows that in District Four there are 224 district boards composed of three members and 38 boards composed of seven members, making a total of 913 district trustees.

According to legal provisions, the authority for the details of school control is vested in the district trustees, but in practice a great number of the details of management and some of the more important administrative duties are delegated to the head teacher. The extent and degree to which this is done may vary widely from district to district.

9 Public School Laws 1938, p. 41.
Such delegation of authority need not necessarily exist from the legal point of view, but it may exist to a very marked degree in schools in which the board is inclined to delegate the authority.

In the schools in which this practice is followed, the head teacher must necessarily be classified as an administrator in the "set-up" under consideration. He, then may be classed as the fifth agent of administration. According to data collected there are at present 231 head teachers in District Four.

A summary of the existing organization and other conditions is given in Table 1. The following facts shown by the table are interesting:

In the administration of 262 common schools of the district, 60 county trustees, 913 local trustees, 10 county superintendents, and 231 head teachers are engaged.

Seven of the counties have regularly elected county superintendents, and three have county judges acting as ex-officio county superintendents. Out of these ten counties, five; Archer, Baylor, Jack, Palo Pinto, and Wichita have practically the same number of scholastics in the common schools; yet two of the five, Archer and Baylor, have ex-officio county superintendents while the other three have elected superintendents. At the same time Archer, with an ex-officio superintendent, has more scholastics than Jack with an elected superintendent.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Counties</th>
<th>No. of Schools in Common School Districts</th>
<th>No. of Schools in Independent School Districts</th>
<th>Total No. of Schools</th>
<th>Total No. of Common School Districts</th>
<th>Total No. of Trustees</th>
<th>Total No. of Teachers</th>
<th>Kind of Co. Supt. or Ex. Officer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Archer</td>
<td>1311</td>
<td>1290</td>
<td>2601</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baylor</td>
<td>1149</td>
<td>1206</td>
<td>2355</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clay</td>
<td>2475</td>
<td>1287</td>
<td>3762</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack</td>
<td>1309</td>
<td>1348</td>
<td>2657</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montague</td>
<td>3154</td>
<td>2643</td>
<td>5797</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palo Pinto</td>
<td>1436</td>
<td>2954</td>
<td>4390</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Throckmorton</td>
<td>826</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>1418</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wichita</td>
<td>1400</td>
<td>15393</td>
<td>16793</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilberger</td>
<td>2867</td>
<td>3230</td>
<td>6097</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young</td>
<td>2043</td>
<td>3470</td>
<td>5513</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>17970</strong></td>
<td><strong>33413</strong></td>
<td><strong>51383</strong></td>
<td><strong>31</strong></td>
<td><strong>231</strong></td>
<td><strong>262</strong></td>
<td><strong>224</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: The data for each county was secured from the county superintendent of that county.*
Another disparity of this nature should be noticed. The amount of the salary of the county superintendent, according to law, depends upon the total number of scholastics in the county, regardless of the fact that he has no control over the scholastics of independent schools. Yet there is a wide variation from county to county in the ratio of scholastics in independent districts to those in common school districts. In four of the counties, Palo Pinto, Young, Wilbarger, and especially Wichita; the number of scholastics in independent districts is greater than the scholastics in the common school districts. On the other extreme, in three of the counties, Throckmorton, Montague, and Clay there are more scholastics in common schools than in independent schools. Hence, an unfair salary situation exists in the county superintendency of District Four. For example, the county superintendent of Wichita County, having a salary based upon 16,793 scholastics, exercises administrative control over but 1,400 pupils in 19 schools, while the county superintendent of Clay County, with a salary based on 3,762 scholastics, exercises control over 2,465 pupils in 41 schools.

In the 262 districts, 634 teachers are employed. This gives a ratio of almost three local trustees for every two teachers employed.

There are 224 districts that have three board members in each district, and in 38 of the districts seven members
compose the board. The administrative duties in District Four are performed through the state, the county, and the local district as units of control. These duties are performed by the deputy state superintendent, the county superintendents, and the county boards, the local boards, and the head teachers as agents.

**Allocation of Responsibility Relative to Administrative Units**

**Statutory Provisions for the Responsibility of Each Agent**

At the time when the units and agents of administration referred to in the preceding section were established, laws were enacted; and as occasion has demanded since, legal provisions have been made to designate the duties and fix the responsibilities of the officials in the units. These laws in most cases are stated in rather general terms. They were not designed to specify the details of administration but to act as guiding principles. Because they have had significant bearing on the present allocation of responsibility, the provisions of those relating to this study are briefly presented herewith.

The provision for the state district and the duties of the deputy state superintendents of Texas are set forth by J. W. O'Banion, Director of Supervision of the State Department of Education as follows:
In the interest of both economy and efficiency in representing the State Superintendent in the administration of the public schools, the State has been divided into twenty-four regional supervisory districts. A deputy state superintendent is required by the law to make his home in the district which he supervises.

The twenty-four supervisors, as provided by the state, have been given the title of deputy state superintendent. This title is justified because of the peculiar functional service which each and every deputy performs for the State Superintendent. The deputies bear a tremendous responsibility in their work with the schools, and for the sake of information we enumerate the chief duties:

1. Providing more supervision and less inspection.
2. Aiding local superintendents in the arrangement of new courses of study and new programs, with special reference to subject placement.
3. Evaluating classroom instruction and eliminating the necessity of prepared exhibits being sent to the control office of the Department of evaluation for credit.
4. Gathering and tabulating information concerning the schools of supervisory districts with suggestions concerning their betterment.
5. Visiting all schools in the district.
6. Checking and advising school administrators concerning Southern Association standards.
7. Giving expert advice concerning the application of the Equalization Fund.
8. Urging upon local school authorities the importance of budget making and of conducting the school affairs on a business-like basis.
9. Holding county-wide conferences with people interested in public education with the thought of explaining school laws concerning equalization of school funds, high school tuition, salary aid, etc.
10. Sitting with and advising county boards in the proper classification of schools and in establishment of bus transportation.
11. Leading and inspiring local school people in the proper study of curriculum revision.
12. Encouraging improvement and extension of county district libraries.
13. Availing himself of opportunity to study local school problems as they exist and bring these problems to the attention of the State Department and the Legislature.
14. Encouraging standardization of rural schools with the thought of bringing such schools in line with
the State's program of work.

15. Encouraging school plant improvement and
beautification of school grounds and disseminating
information concerning the construction of proper
school plants.

16. Assisting county superintendents where assist-
ance is desired and needed in the organization of
study groups.

17. Affording accessibility for school administra-
tors, teachers, and boards of education for conference
pertaining to local school problems.

18. Dispensing with all school controversies lo-
cally which otherwise would be taken to Austin for con-
sideration of the Department.

19. Aiding in selling to the public, through newspa-
pers, by radio, and other agencies a good program
for the public school.

20. Rendering a more sympathetic personal service
with local school authorities and others interested in
the public schools of the State.\footnote{State Department of Education, With Texas Public
Schools, 1937-38, Activities of the Division of Supervision
of the State Department of Education, Vol. II, no. 6, pp. 1-2.}

From these remarks it is seen that the deputy super-
intendent functions in an advisory capacity.

According to the school laws of Texas,\footnote{See School Laws 1938, pp. 31-39.} the county
board may exercise, among others, the following functions:

1. Apportion in cooperation with the county superin-
tendent all available state and county funds to the dis-
tricts exclusive of independent districts having more than
150 schoolastics.

2. Under certain conditions employ an attendance offi-
cer and an assistant to the county superintendent

3. Classify the schools of the county
4. Subdivide the county into school districts and make changes in district lines
5. Cancel the transfer of children from one district to the other
6. Acquire and hold real property
7. Act as a body of appeals from the decisions of the county superintendent

Under these provisions the county board is an important factor in common school administration.

The county superintendent shall, according to Texas school law perform among others the following duties:

1. Have immediate supervision of the schools in the county to wit:

   The county superintendent shall have, under the direction of the State Superintendent, the immediate supervision of all matters pertaining to public education in his county. He shall confer with the teachers and trustees and give them advice when needed, visit and examine schools, and deliver lectures that shall tend to create an interest in public education. He shall spend four days each week visiting the schools while they are in session, when it is possible for him to do so. He shall have authority over all of the public schools within his county, except such of the independent school districts as have a scholastic population of five hundred or more.\(^{12}\)

2. Apportion, in cooperation with the county board, all available state and county funds
3. Approve all vouchers drawn against the school funds of his county
4. Transfer pupils of one district in the county to

\(^{12}\text{Ibid, p. 41.}\)
any other district in the same county

5. Approve all contracts between the trustees and teachers of his county

6. Serve as secretary and executive officer of the county board

7. Distribute textbooks and report blanks, and make reports to the state superintendent

In the common school district the local board is given broad administrative powers by law as follows:

Said trustees shall have the management and control of the public schools and public school grounds; and they shall determine how many schools shall be maintained in their school district, and at what points they shall be located; . . . and they shall determine when the schools shall be opened and when closed. They shall contract with teachers and manage and supervise the schools, subject to the rules and regulations of the county and State superintendents; they shall approve all claims against school funds of their district; provided, that the trustees in making contracts with teachers, shall not create a deficiency debt against the district.13

Other statutory provisions empower the local board to:

1. Contract for buildings

2. Sell school property under certain conditions

3. Control the school property of the district

In contracting with teachers and in expending school funds the board must have the approval of the county superintendents.

Regarding the legal status of the head teacher it should be made perfectly clear that the head teacher is

13Ibid, p. 73.
vested with no legal authority. He is the direct agent of the local board and responsible solely to it. The board is ultimately responsible to the people for the professional actions of the head teacher regardless of whether he is acting under specific direction from it or within his general delegated authority.

Existing Practice

Even though the same statutes apply in similar manner to the administration of each of the common schools, the interpretation and application of them may vary widely in practice in the different local units. This is to be expected and is as it should be. Laws that demand absolute uniformity in matters of detail would stifle local initiative and be contrary to the ideal of American government. The extent to which practice varies in allocating and exercising administrative responsibility is the topic of major consideration in this chapter.

Table 2 shows in summary form the results of the interviews with the ten county superintendents in which each of them indicated the most prevalent practice regarding the distribution of responsibilities among the administrative agents of the schools of his county. It should be remembered that the conditions shown by the table do not apply to any particular school or county since the superintendent in each county, according to his opinion gave for the county as a whole the most commonly followed practice.
### Table 2

Allocation of Administrative Responsibilities Expressed in Percentages as Reported by Ten County Superintendents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative Duty</th>
<th>Administrative Authority Responsible With Author Making Recommendations</th>
<th>County Dept. With Recommendations</th>
<th>County Board With Recommendations</th>
<th>Local Board With Recommendations</th>
<th>State Dept. With Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Duty Head Teacher</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Duty Assistant</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Duty Superintendent</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Duty School Nurse</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Duty School Nurse</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Duty Nurse</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Duty Nurse</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Duty Teacher</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Duty Teacher</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Duty Teacher</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Duty Teacher</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
- A: Board
- B: County Dept.
- C: County Board
- D: Local Board
- E: State Dept.
Immediately following Table 2, Table 3 is given for comparative purposes. It gives a summary of the responses made by seventy-one head teachers to the questionnaires presented to them. These questionnaires were designed to secure from the head teacher the same information relative to the allocation of administrative responsibility as was secured from the county superintendent in the interviews. Table 3 is, therefore, a summary of the head teachers' opinions relative to the allocation of administrative responsibilities among the officials of the common schools of District Four.

In reading both tables it should be understood that the words "responsible" and "responsibilities" refer to performing responsibility rather than to ultimate responsibility.

The two tables are directly comparable. In the first vertical column the administrative duties are listed. Each of the other columns shows the per cent of cases in which a particular agent discharges the responsibility for each duty given. Then the per cent of cases in which an agent exercises responsibility for a particular duty is so divided as to show the agent or agents that make recommendations.

By comparison of the two tables, the following practices concerning the allocation of administrative responsibility are evident:

(1) Employing the head teacher. -- According to the
county superintendents' replies, recorded in Table 2, the local board employs the head teacher in 100 per cent of the cases with the county superintendent making recommendations in 50 per cent of the cases and no one making recommendations in 50 per cent of the cases. The replies of the head teachers, as seen in Table 3, show that the local board employs the head teacher in 100 per cent of the cases with the county superintendent making recommendations in 10 per cent of the cases and no one making recommendations in 90 per cent of the cases.

The replies agree in showing that the local board exercises the responsibility in 100 per cent of the cases, and that in at least 50 per cent of them it acts without recommendations. They disagree sharply relative to the activity of the county superintendent as a recommending agent. It is probably true in this case that the head teacher is not fully aware of the influence of the county superintendent as an advisor to the local boards.

In keeping with the provisions of the criterion of good practice set up in chapter II, it is recommended that in all cases the local board employ the head teacher from the county superintendent's recommendations.

(2) Employing the assistant teachers.-- According to Table 2 the county superintendents' replies show that the local board employs the assistant teachers in 100 per cent of the cases, with recommendations from the county superin-
tendent in 40 per cent of the cases, with recommendations from the head teacher in 10 per cent of the cases, and without recommendations in 50 per cent of the cases. The head teachers' replies, according to Table 3 show that the local board employs the assistant teachers in 100 per cent of the cases, with recommendations from the county superintendent in 1 per cent of the cases, with recommendations from the head teacher in 47 per cent of the cases, and without recommendations in 52 per cent of the cases.

The replies agree in showing that the local board exercises responsibility in all cases, and that in at least 50 per cent of them it acts without recommendations. They disagree sharply relative to the activity of the county superintendent and the head teacher as recommending agents.

According to the provisions of the criterion, the local board in all cases should employ assistant teachers from the recommendations of the head teacher. This does not bar recommendations from the county superintendent, since they may come through the head teacher.

(3) Employing janitors, clerks, etc.—From the county superintendents' replies, recorded in Table 3, it is seen that the county superintendent employs this personnel with recommendations from the local board in 10 per cent of the cases; and that the local board employs this personnel from the head teacher's recommendations in 10 per cent of the cases, from the county superintendent's recommendations in
10 per cent of the cases, and without recommendations in 70 per cent of the cases. Thus, the county superintendent is reported as the performing agent in 10 per cent of the cases and the local board in 90 per cent of the cases.

The head teachers' replies, given in Table 3, show that the local board is the only performing agent; and that the head teacher makes recommendations in 53 per cent of the cases, the county superintendent in 1 per cent of the cases, and no one in 46 per cent of the cases.

The replies agree in showing that the local board exercises responsibility in at least 90 per cent of the cases, and that in at least 46 per cent of them it acts without recommendations. They disagree sharply relative to the activity of the county superintendent and the head teacher as recommending agents.

In keeping with the provisions of the criterion, the local board should employ the janitors, clerks, etc. from the head teacher's recommendations.

(4) **Dismissing school employees**.—From the county superintendents' replies, shown in Table 2, it is seen that the local board dismisses employees, with the county superintendent's recommendations in 20 per cent of the cases, with the head teacher's recommendations in 10 per cent of the cases, and without recommendations in 70 per cent of the cases. The head teachers' replies, recorded in Table 3, show that the local board dismisses employees with the
head teacher making recommendations in 45 per cent of the cases, with the county superintendent's recommendations in 3 per cent of the cases, and without recommendations in 52 per cent of the cases.

The reports agree in showing that the local board performs the activity in all cases, and that in at least 43 per cent of them it acts without recommendations. The tables disagree sharply relative to the activity of the county superintendent and the head teacher as recommending agents.

In keeping with the provisions of the criterion, the local board before dismissing an employee should ordinarily have a recommendation to that effect from the agent that recommended his employment.

(5) Fixing salaries that are not fixed by the state.---
It is seen from the county superintendents' replies, recorded in Table 2, that the local board fixes the salaries that are not fixed by the state, with the county superintendent's recommendations in 50 per cent of the cases, with recommendations from the county board in 10 per cent of the cases, and without recommendations in 40 per cent of the cases. The head teachers' replies, recorded in Table 3, show that the local board fixes the salaries that are not fixed by the state, with the head teacher making recommendations in 21 per cent of the cases, with the county superintendent making recommendations in 36 per cent of the cases, and without recommendations in 43 per cent of the cases.
The replies agree in showing that the local board in all cases fixes salaries where the state has not done so, and that in at least 40 per cent of the cases it acts without recommendations. They disagree sharply relative to the activity of the county superintendent and the head teacher as recommending agents.

In keeping with the provisions of the criterion in centralizing financial control in the hands of the county unit, salaries which the state does not set should be fixed by the county board with recommendations from the county superintendent and upon the advice of the local unit. It is recommended that the practice be changed to conform with this provision.

(6) **Fixing the length of the school term.**—From the county superintendents' replies recorded in Table 2, it is seen that the length of the school term is fixed by the county superintendent with recommendations from the local board in 10 per cent of the cases; and that the local board fixes the length of the school term with recommendations from the county superintendent in 80 per cent of the cases, and with recommendations from the county board in 10 per cent of the cases. The head teachers' replies, recorded in Table 3, show that the local board fixes the length of the school term, with the head teacher's recommendations in 21 per cent of the cases, with the county superintendent's recommendations in 49 per cent of the cases,
and without recommendations in 30 per cent of the cases.

The replies agree in showing that the local board
determines the length of the school term in at least 90
per cent of the cases, and that in at least 49 per cent of
them it has the recommendations of the county superintend-
ent. They disagree slightly in the division of ultimate
responsibility and rather sharply relative to the activity
of the county superintendent, the county board, and the
head teacher as recommending agents.

In keeping with the provisions of the criterion, the
ultimate responsibility of fixing the length of the school
term should be exercised by the county board with recommenda-
tions from the county superintendent and advice from the
local units. It is suggested that this practice be adopted
throughout the district to replace the prevalent practice.

(7) Set up type of organization.--It is seen from the
county superintendents' replies, recorded in Table 2, that
the type of school organization is set up by the county
board with the county superintendent's recommendations in
80 per cent of the cases, and by the local board with the
county superintendent's recommendations in 20 per cent of
the cases. The head teachers' replies, given in Table 3,
show that the county board sets up the type of organiza-
tion with recommendations from the local board in 67 per
cent of the cases; and that the local board performs the
duty with recommendations from the head teacher in 13 per
cent of the cases, with the county superintendent's recommendation in 10 per cent of the cases, and without recommendations in 10 per cent of the cases.

The replies agree in showing that the county board sets up the type of organization in at least 67 per cent of the cases, and that the local board performs the duty in at least 20 per cent of the cases. They disagree sharply relative to the recommending agents.

According to the provisions of the criterion the county board subject to the deputy superintendent's final approval, should set up the type of organization from the recommendations of the county superintendent and with advice from the local units. This practice should be adopted.

(8) Establishing the course of study. -- It is seen from the county superintendents' replies, shown in Table 2, that the course of study is established by the head teacher with the county superintendent's recommendation in 40 per cent of the cases, with the deputy superintendents' recommendation in 20 per cent of the cases, and without recommendation in 30 per cent of the cases; and that the local board establishes the course of study with the county superintendent's recommendation in 10 per cent of the cases. The head teachers' replies, recorded in Table 3, show that in establishing the course of study the head teacher exercises full responsibility in 57 per cent of the cases, the county superintendent in 24 per cent of the cases, and that the local board per-
forms the duty with recommendations from the head teacher in 15 per cent of the cases, and without recommendations in 4 per cent of the cases.

The replies agree that in at least 57 per cent of the cases, the head teacher determines the course of study, and that in at least 10 per cent of the cases the board determines the course of study. They disagree in the designation of the performing agent in 33 per cent of the cases. In the designation of the recommending agents, there is practically no agreement.

According to the provisions of the criterion, the county board should establish the course of study with the recommendation of the county superintendent and the final approval of the deputy superintendent. The county superintendent, in turn, should have the advice of the head teachers. This practice should be adopted to improve the administration of the schools concerned.

(9) Allowing or refusing transfers.— According to the county superintendents' replies, as seen in Table 2, the county superintendent allows or refuses transfers with the county board's recommendation in 20 per cent of the cases; the county board performs the duty with the county superintendent's recommendation in 20 per cent of the cases and without recommendations in 10 per cent of the cases; and the local board performs the duty with the county superintendent’s recommendation in 30 per cent of the cases. The head
teachers' replies, as recorded in Table 3, show that the county superintendent allows or refuses transfers without recommendations in 36 per cent of the cases, that the county board performs the duty with recommendations from the county superintendent in 25 per cent of the cases, and that the local board performs it with recommendations from the head teacher in 9 per cent of the cases and with recommendations from no one in 30 per cent of the cases.

The replies agree in showing that the county superintendent allows or refuses transfers in at least 36 per cent of the cases, the county board in at least 25 per cent of the cases, and the local board in at least 30 per cent of the cases. In the designation of recommending agents there is little agreement. The replies of both indicate that there is no uniform practice in discharging this responsibility.

It is recommended that a uniform practice be established in allowing or refusing transfers by placing the ultimate responsibility upon the county board and designating the county superintendent as the recommending agent. The local unit should advise the county superintendent and have the authority to make protests. These recommendations are in accordance with the provisions of the criterion.

(10) Making rules and regulations.-- According to the county superintendents' replies, as seen in Table 2, the head teacher makes rules and regulations with the local
board's recommendation in 10 per cent of the cases and without recommendations in 10 per cent of the cases; the county board performs the duty with the county superintendent's recommendations in 20 per cent of the cases; and the local board makes rules and regulations with the recommendations from the county superintendents in 30 per cent of the cases, with recommendations from the head teacher in 20 per cent of the cases, and without recommendations in 10 per cent of the cases. The head teachers' replies, as recorded in Table 3, show that the head teacher makes rules and regulations without recommendations in 47 per cent of the cases, and that the local board performs the duty with recommendations from the head teacher in 42 per cent of the cases and without recommendations in 11 per cent of the cases.

The replies agree in showing that the performing agent is the head teacher in at least 20 per cent of the cases and the local board in at least 53 per cent of the cases. They also agree that the local board has the recommendations of the county superintendent in at least 30 per cent of the cases, and that it acts without recommendations in at least 10 per cent of the cases. They disagree in designating the responsible agent in 27 per cent of the cases and in designating the recommending agent in 70 per cent of the cases. The replies of both show that there is little uniformity in discharging this responsibility.

According to the provisions of the criterion the deputy
superintendent should formulate a set of general rules and regulations for the district as a whole. The county superintendent should then formulate and the county board approve a set for the county as a whole. These should be in accordance with the general rules and regulations of the district. The head teacher, in turn, should formulate and the local board adopt a set of general rules and regulations in harmony with those of the county system. This practice should be adopted as it would make for more complete uniformity and assure professional leadership in performing this duty.

(11) Purchasing supplies and equipment.—According to the replies of the county superintendents, as recorded in Table 2, the head teacher purchases supplies and equipment with the recommendations of the county superintendent in 20 per cent of the cases and with recommendations from the local board in 10 per cent of the cases; and the local board makes the purchases from the county superintendent's recommendations in 30 per cent of the cases, from the head teacher's recommendations in 20 per cent of the cases, and without recommendations in 20 per cent of the cases. The head teachers' replies, as seen in Table 3, show that the head teacher makes the purchases without recommendations in 16 per cent of the cases, that the local board performs the duty with recommendations from the head teacher in 40 per cent of the cases and with recommendations from no one in
2 per cent of the cases, and that there is no definite practice in 40 per cent of the cases. The replies show that they disagree sharply relative to the designation of the recommending agents. The replies of both indicate that there is no uniform practice in performing the duty.

In keeping with the provisions of the criterion, it is recommended that the county superintendent with the county board's approval purchase the supplies and equipment for all schools, the amount and kind to be determined from lists of needed supplies submitted to the county superintendent by the head teachers and approved by the local boards.

(12) **Making the school budget.** As seen in Table 2, the county superintendent makes the budget with the local board's recommendation in 70 per cent of the cases and without recommendations in 10 per cent of the cases; the county board makes the budget with the county superintendent's recommendation in 10 per cent of the cases; and the local board performs the duty with the county superintendent's recommendation in 10 per cent of the cases; and the local board performs the duty with the county superintendent's recommendation in 10 per cent of the cases. The head teachers' replies, recorded in Table 3, show that the head teacher makes the budget without recommendations in 6 per cent of the cases; and that the county superintendent makes
it with the county board's recommendations in 23 per cent of the cases, with the local board's recommendations in 54 per cent of the cases, and without recommendations in 17 per cent of the cases.

The replies agree in showing that the county superintendent makes the budget in 90 percent of the cases, and that the county superintendent has recommendations from the local board in 54 per cent of the cases and from no one in 10 per cent of the cases. The replies disagree slightly relative to the designation of the responsible agents and with reference to the local board as a recommending agent.

In keeping with the provisions of the criterion, the county superintendent should make the school's budgets with advice and recommendations from the local units. The county board should approve and adopt the budgets. This practice should be adopted in all cases as it makes for greater economy and provides for professional leadership.

(13) **Raising funds.**—The county superintendents' replies, recorded in Table 2, show that the county superintendent with local board's recommendations is responsible for raising funds by taxation in 11 per cent of the cases, and that the local board raises funds with the county superintendent's recommendations in 67 per cent of the cases and without recommendations in 22 per cent of the cases. From the head teachers' replies, given in Table 3, it is seen that the local board exercises the responsibility for raising
funds, with recommendations from the head teacher in 9 per cent of the cases, with recommendations from the county superintendent in 54 per cent of the cases, and without recommendations in 37 per cent of the cases.

The replies agree in showing that the local board is responsible for raising funds in at least 89 per cent of the cases, and that in so doing it acts with recommendations from the county superintendent in at least 54 per cent of the cases and without recommendations in at least 22 per cent of the cases. They disagree slightly relative to the county superintendent as a recommending agent, and in 11 per cent of the cases they disagree in the designation of the performing agent.

In keeping with the provisions of the criterion, the county board should have complete control of raising funds with the advice and recommendation of the county superintendent and the local board. This practice is recommended to provide more uniform financial support of the schools.

(14) Developing a building program.—According to the county superintendents' replies as recorded in Table 2, the local board develops the building program, with recommendations from the county superintendent in 80 per cent of the cases, with recommendations from the head teacher in 10 per cent of the cases, and without recommendations in 10 per cent of the cases. The head teachers' replies, recorded in Table 3, indicate that the local board is responsible
for developing the building program in all cases, with recommendations from the head teacher in 26 per cent of the cases, with recommendations from the county superintendent in 33 per cent of the cases, and without recommendations in 41 per cent of the cases.

The replies agree in showing that the local board develops the building program in all cases; and that it acts with the county superintendent's recommendations in at least 33 per cent of the cases, with the head teacher's recommendations in at least 10 per cent of the cases, and without recommendations in 10 per cent of the cases. The replies disagree sharply relative to the head teacher and the county superintendent as recommending agents.

In keeping with the provisions of the criterion, the local board should initiate the building program with recommendations from both the head teacher and the county superintendent, and the county board should finally approve it. This practice should be adopted throughout the district.

(15) Selecting a site for building.--According to the county superintendents' replies, recorded in Table 2; the local board selects the building site, with recommendations from the county superintendent in 40 per cent of the cases, with recommendations from the county board in 10 per cent of the cases, and without recommendations in 50 per cent of the cases. According to the head teachers' replies, recorded in Table 3, the local board makes the selection of the
site, with the head teacher's recommendation in 17 per cent of the cases, with the county superintendent's recommendations in 19 per cent of the cases, and without recommendations in 64 per cent of the cases.

The replies agree in showing that the local board is the agent responsible for selecting the building site in all cases, that the county superintendent is the recommending agent in 19 per cent of the cases, and that the local board acts without recommendations in at least 50 per cent of the cases. The replies disagree relative to the county superintendent and the head teacher as recommending agents.

According to the provisions of the criterion, the local board should select the building site with the recommendations of the head teacher and the county superintendent and final approval from the county board. This arrangement provides for systematic location of school buildings and also stimulates local initiative.

(16) Planning the school building.—According to the county superintendents' replies, recorded in Table 2, the county superintendent plans the building without recommendations in 11 per cent of the cases; and the local board plans it with recommendations from the county superintendent in 45 per cent of the cases, with recommendations from no one in 22 per cent of the cases, and with the deputy superintendent's recommendation in 22 per cent of the cases. The head teachers' replies, recorded in Table 3 show that the head
teacher plans the building in 2 per cent of the cases; that the local board plans it with the head teacher's recommendation in 32 per cent of the cases, with the county superintendent's recommendations in 39 per cent of the cases, and without recommendations in 27 per cent of the cases.

The replies agree in showing that the local board is responsible for the planning of the building in at least 89 per cent of the cases, with the county superintendent's recommendations in 39 per cent of the cases and without recommendations in 22 per cent of the cases. The replies disagree slightly relative to the designation of the responsible agent and sharply relative to the county superintendent, the head teacher, and the deputy superintendent as recommending agents.

In keeping with the criterion of good practice, the county superintendent should plan the building with advice and information from the head teacher and according to standards submitted by the deputy superintendent. The plans should then be approved by the local board and finally by the county board. This arrangement provides for professional leadership, democratic control, and uniformity of practice.

(17) Supervising the building construction.—According to the county superintendents' replies, recorded in Table 2, the county superintendent supervises the construction
of the building in 11 per cent of the cases; and the local board supervises the construction with recommendations from the county superintendent in 33 per cent of the cases, with the head teacher's recommendations in 11 per cent of the cases, without recommendations in 34 per cent of the cases, and with the deputy superintendent's recommendations in 11 per cent of the cases. From the head teachers' replies, recorded in Table 3, it is seen that the head teacher supervises the construction in 4 per cent of the cases; and that the local board performs the duty with the head teacher's recommendations in 23 per cent of the cases, with the county superintendent's recommendations in 40 per cent of the cases, and without recommendations in 33 per cent of the cases.

The replies agree in showing that the local board supervises building construction in 89 per cent of the cases, with the county superintendent's recommendations in 33 per cent of the cases, with the head teacher's recommendations in 11 per cent of the cases, and without recommendations in 33 per cent of the cases. The replies disagree slightly in the designation of the responsible agent and sharply relative to the county superintendent, the head teacher, and the deputy superintendent as recommending agents. In keeping with the provisions of the criterion, the local board should be ultimately responsible for supervising building construction with the advice and recommendations of the county superintendent and the head teacher.
Supervising school employees.--The county superintendents' replies, recorded in Table 2, show a wide variety of practices in discharging this responsibility. According to the replies the head teacher supervises the employees in 10 per cent of the cases; the county superintendent supervises the employees with recommendation from the county board in 10 per cent of the cases, with recommendations from the local board in 20 per cent of the cases, with recommendations from the head teacher in 10 per cent of the cases, and without recommendations in 10 per cent of the cases; the local board performs the duty with the county superintendent's recommendations in 20 per cent of the cases; the deputy superintendent supervises the employees with recommendations from the county superintendent in 10 per cent of the cases and with recommendations from the local board in 10 per cent of the cases. The head teachers' replies, recorded in Table 3, show that the head teacher exercises full responsibility in supervising employees in 61 per cent of the cases, that the county superintendent supervises employees in 1 per cent of the cases, that the local board supervises employees in 16 per cent of the cases, and that there is no definite practice in 22 per cent of the cases.

These replies show practically no agreement in designating the performing or the recommending agents. This tends to indicate that there is no uniform practice among the counties and that there is no common understanding among
the administrative agents with respect to the division of the responsibility for supervising the work of the employees of the schools.

In keeping with the provision of the criterion, the deputy superintendent should exercise general supervision over the district, but the county board should be ultimately responsible for providing adequate supervision through the county superintendent's office. The county board should either provide for special supervision or provide for sufficient assistance in the county superintendent's office to allow the county superintendent to spend more time in supervising. The head teachers should assist in caring for the more local details. This arrangement would provide for uniform practice, professional leadership, and clarity of relationships.

(19) Assigning duties to employees.—According to the superintendents' replies, recorded in Table 2, the head teacher assigns duties to the employees with the local board's recommendations in 30 per cent of the cases; and the local board makes the assignments with the county superintendent's recommendations in 30 per cent of the cases, with the head teacher's recommendations in 30 per cent of the cases, and without recommendations in 10 per cent of the cases. The head teachers' replies recorded in Table 3 indicate that the head teacher assigns the duties to employees without recommendations in 62 per cent of the cases, and that the local board
makes the assignment without recommendation in 38 per cent of the cases.

The replies agree in showing that the head teacher makes the assignment of duties in at least 30 per cent of the cases, and that the local board performs the duty in at least 38 per cent of the cases. They disagree in designating the performing agent in at least 22 per cent of the cases. There is practically no agreement relative to recommending agents.

According to the provisions of the criterion, the head teacher should assign employees to their duties, since he is the professional executive of the board that employees them and by virtue of that fact should recommend their employment.

(20) Controlling, promoting, and grading pupils.--From the county superintendents' replies recorded in Table 2, it is seen that the head teacher ultimately controls, promotes, and grades pupils in all cases. In 20 per cent of the cases he has the county superintendent's recommendations, in 30 per cent the local board's recommendations, and in 50 per cent he acts without recommendations. The head teachers' replies, recorded in Table 3, show that the head teacher ultimately promotes, grades, and controls pupils in all cases without recommendations.

The replies agree in showing that in controlling, promoting, and grading pupils the head teacher is the perform-
ing agent, and that he acts without recommendation in at least 50 per cent of the cases. They disagree relative to the designation of recommending agents.

In keeping with the provisions of the criterion, the head teacher should be responsible for promoting, grading, and controlling pupils. He should, however, have the advice of the county superintendent in questionable circumstances.

(21) Preparing school programs.-- According to the county superintendents' replies, recorded in Table 2, the school program is prepared by the head teacher with recommendations from the county superintendent in 40 per cent of the cases, with recommendations from the local board in 10 per cent of the cases, and without recommendations in 40 per cent of the cases; and the local board prepares the program with the county superintendent's recommendations in 10 per cent of the cases. The head teachers' replies, recorded in Table 3, show that the head teacher prepares the school program in all cases without recommendations.

The replies agree in showing that in at least 90 per cent of the cases the head teacher prepares the school programs, and that in at least 40 per cent of the cases he acts without recommendations. They disagree slightly in the designation of the performing agent and more sharply relative to the recommending agents.

In keeping with the provisions of the criterion, the
county superintendent should formulate and the county board should adopt a general program for the schools of the county. Then the head teacher should formulate and the local board adopt a specific program for the local school.

(22) Preparing school reports.—According to the county superintendents' replies, recorded in table 2, the head teacher prepares the school reports with recommendations from the county superintendent in 20 per cent of the cases and without recommendations in 70 per cent of the cases; and the county superintendent prepares them with the recommendations of the head teacher in 10 per cent of the cases. From the head teachers' replies, recorded in Table 3, it is seen that the head teacher prepares the school reports in all cases without recommendations.

The replies agree in showing that in at least 90 per cent of the cases the head teacher prepares the school reports, and that in at least 70 per cent of the cases he acts without recommendations. They disagree slightly in the designation of both the performing and the recommending agents.

In keeping with the provisions of the criterion, all school reports should be made by the professional executive of the unit for which the reports are made. The practice in the district at present seems to comply with this provision in at least 90 per cent of the cases.
(23) **Supplying the public with proper information**.-- According to the replies of the county superintendents, recorded in Table 2, the duty of supplying the public with information is performed by the head teacher with recommendations from the county superintendent in 20 per cent of the cases and with recommendations from the local board in 20 per cent of the cases; it is performed by the county superintendent with recommendations from the local board in 20 per cent of the cases and with recommendations from none in 20 per cent of the cases; and is performed by the local board with recommendations from the county superintendent in 10 per cent of the cases and without recommendations in 10 per cent of the cases. The head teachers' replies, recorded in Table 3, show that the head teacher supplies the public with proper information without recommendations in 37 per cent of the cases, that the county superintendent performs the duty without recommendations in 27 per cent of the cases, that the local board performs it in 3 per cent of the cases, and that there is no definite practice in 33 per cent of the cases.

The replies agree in showing that in supplying the public with proper information the head teacher is the performing agent in at least 37 per cent of the cases, the county superintendent in at least 27 per cent of the cases, and the local board in at least 3 per cent of the cases. They disagree in that the head teacher shows that there
is no definite practice in 33 per cent of the cases.
Relative to the designation of recommending agents they
disagree sharply.

In keeping with the provisions of the criterion, the
professional executive in each unit should supply the pub-
lic with information concerning the unit in which he is
employed. This would not bar an executive of a higher unit
from supplying information to the public relative to a lower
unit.

(24) Attending to business details.— From the county
superintendents’ replies, recorded in Table 2, it is seen
that the head teacher attends to the business details of the
school with the county superintendent’s recommendations in
10 per cent of the cases; that the county superintendent
attends to the business details with the local board’s recom-
mendations in 30 per cent of the cases, with the head teach-
er’s recommendations in 10 per cent of the cases, and with-
out recommendations in 30 per cent of the cases; and that
the local board performs the duty with recommendations from
the county superintendent in 10 per cent of the cases and
without recommendations in 10 per cent of the cases. The
head teachers’ replies, recorded in Table 3, show that the
head teacher attends to the business details without recom-
mendations in 25 per cent of the cases, that the local board
performs the duty with the head teacher’s recommendations
in 23 per cent of the cases and without recommendations in
10 per cent, and that there is no definite practice in 42 per cent of the cases.

The replies agree in showing that the head teacher attends to the business details in 10 per cent of the cases, and the local board in 20 per cent of the cases. Otherwise the reports disagree sharply.

In keeping with the provisions of the criterion, all financial affairs should be centered in the county unit. It is evident, however, that neither the county superintendent nor the county board can attend to the minor business details of all the schools. At the same time the nature of the business, the time that would be required in transacting it, the business training and experience of the local board members and the head teacher, and many other conditions should determine the allocation of this responsibility. Nevertheless these general suggestions are made: ordinarily business details should be performed by the professional executive, the expenditure of all funds should be approved by the county superintendent, and a definite agreement relative to the responsibility of each agent in such matters should be provided for in the rules and regulations of both the local and the county board.

(25) Keeping pupil records.—According to the county superintendents' replies, as recorded in Table 2, the county superintendent keeps pupil records with recommendations from the head teacher in 20 per cent of the cases and with-
out recommendations in 60 per cent of the cases; the local board keeps pupil records with the county superintendent's recommendations in 10 per cent of the cases. The head teacher's replies, recorded in Table 3, show that the head teacher keeps pupil records without recommendations in 64 per cent of the cases, that the county superintendent keeps them without recommendations in 35 per cent of the cases, and that the local board keeps them in 1 per cent of the cases.

The replies agree in showing that the county superintendent keeps pupil records without recommendations in at least 35 per cent of the cases. The replies of the county superintendent show that the county superintendent is the performing agent in the majority of cases; and at the same time, the reports of the head teachers show that the head teacher performs the duty. It is evident that each of the two officials are unaware of the action of the other with respect to this duty. It is possible also that the head teacher is keeping one type of record while the county superintendent is keeping another.

In keeping with the provisions of the criterion, the head teacher should keep a detailed pupil record upon uniform forms supplied by the deputy superintendent. The county superintendent should keep a more summarized type of pupil record. It should also be kept upon a uniform form provided by the deputy superintendent.
(26) Keeping financial records.-- From the county superintendents' replies, recorded in Table 2, it is seen that the head teacher keeps financial records with the local board's recommendations in 10 per cent of the cases, and that the county superintendent keeps the records without recommendations in 90 per cent of the cases. The head teachers' replies, recorded in Table 3, show that the head teacher keeps financial records without recommendations in 42 per cent of the cases, and that the county superintendent keeps them with recommendations from the head teacher in 23 per cent of the cases and without recommendations in 35 per cent of the cases.

The replies agree in showing that the county superintendent keeps the financial records in 58 per cent of the cases, and that the head teacher keeps them in 10 per cent of the cases. Otherwise the tables disagree entirely. This disagreement indicates that the officials are not fully aware of each other's actions, or that there is no understanding between them relative to their duties in keeping financial records.

In keeping with the provisions of the criterion, the county superintendent should keep all financial records for the schools with such information and advice from the head teacher as may be needed. It is suggested that the head teacher also keep a more general financial record, where his time permits, as an aid to the local unit in mak-
ing recommendations or supplying information relative to financial matters to the county organization.

(27) **Determining policies.**-- From the county superintendents' replies, recorded in Table 2, it is seen that policies are determined by the head teacher with recommendations from the local board in 10 per cent of the cases, that the county superintendent determines policies with the head teacher's recommendation in 30 per cent of the cases and without recommendations in 20 per cent of the cases, that the county board performs the duty with the county superintendent's recommendation in 10 per cent of the cases, and that the local board determines policies with the head teacher's recommendations in 10 per cent of the cases and without recommendations in 10 per cent of the cases. The head teachers' replies, recorded in Table 3, show that the head teacher fully determines policies in 14 per cent of the cases, that the local board performs the duty with the head teacher's recommendation in 40 per cent of the cases and without recommendations in 16 per cent of the cases, and that there is no definite practice in 30 per cent of the cases.

The replies agree in showing that policies are determined by the head teacher in 10 per cent of the cases and by the local board in 20 per cent of the cases. The reports disagree sharply relative to the designation of both performing and recommending agents. The reports indicate that
there is no uniform practice in performing this duty.

In keeping with the provisions of the criterion, the following practice in determining policies is recommended; The deputy superintendent should determine and formulate general policies for the entire district. The county superintendent should recommend and formulate the policies of the county unit for the county board's approval. The head teacher should recommend and formulate local policies for the approval of the local board. In all cases the policies of the lower unit should harmonize with those of higher units.

(28) Administering the budget.—From the county superintendents' replies, recorded in Table 2, it is seen that the county superintendent administers the budget with recommendations from the local board in 40 per cent of the cases, with the head teacher's recommendations in 10 per cent of the cases, and without recommendations in 10 per cent of the cases; that the county board administers the budget without recommendations in 10 per cent of the cases; and that the local board administers it with the county superintendent's recommendations in 30 per cent of the cases. The head teachers' replies, recorded in Table 3, show that the head teacher administers the budget without recommendations in 15 per cent of the cases; that the county superintendent performs the duty with the local board's recommendation in 43 per cent of the cases, with the head teacher's recommendations
in 25 per cent of the cases, and without recommendations in 19 per cent of the cases.

The replies agree in showing that the county superintendent in 60 per cent of the cases is the agent that administers the budget. They also agree in showing that in 40 per cent of the cases the local board is the recommending agent to the county superintendent, and that in 10 per cent of the cases the head teacher makes recommendations. The replies disagree entirely in designating the other performing agents and in indicating the activity of the local board, the head teacher, and the county superintendent as recommending agents. Again the replies indicate that the practices employed in the different schools and counties vary widely.

In keeping with the provisions of the criterion; the county superintendent as the chief financial official in the "set-up", should administer the budget of every common school in the county. The head teacher should have a duplicate copy of his school's budget and act as a checking agent in its administration. The deputy superintendent should act as the state's agent in setting up safe-guards to insure the proper administration of the budget.

(29) Changing course of study.-- From the county superintendents' replies, recorded in Table 2, it is seen that the head teacher changes the course of study with the county superintendent's recommendations in 20 per cent of the
cases, with the deputy superintendent's recommendations in 10 per cent of the cases, and without recommendations, in 10 per cent; that the county superintendent makes the changes in the course of study in 30 per cent of the cases with the head teacher's recommendations and in 10 per cent of the cases without recommendations; and that in 20 per cent of the cases the deputy superintendent makes the changes with the county superintendent's recommendation. The head teachers' replies, recorded in Table 3, show that the head teacher changes the course of study in 67 per cent of the cases without recommendations, that the county superintendent changes it without recommendation in 19 per cent of the cases, and that the local board performs the function with the head teacher's recommendation in 14 per cent of the cases.

The replies agree that in 40 per cent of the cases the head teacher changes the course of study, and that in 10 per cent of the cases the county superintendent performs this function. Regarding the designation of other performing agents and in indicating the advisory activity the deputy superintendent, the head teacher, and the county superintendent, the tables are at variance.

In keeping with the provisions of the criterion of good practice, the county superintendent, as the most professional authority of the county theoretically, should recommend and the county board determine the changes in the
county course of study with the approval of the deputy state superintendent. The head teacher should advise the county superintendent of local conditions and suggest needed changes. To meet the demands of local conditions departures from the uniform county course of study in so far as they are not inconsistent with the county-wide program should be permitted. The county superintendent should approve all such departures.

(30) Considering requests from the citizenry.—The county superintendents' replies, recorded in Table 2, show that the county superintendent considers the requests from the citizenry with the head teacher's recommendations in 12 per cent of the cases and without recommendations in 51 per cent of the cases, and that the local board considers the requests with the county superintendent's recommendations in 25 per cent of the cases and with the head teacher's recommendations in 12 per cent of the cases. The head teachers' replies, recorded in Table 3, show that the head teacher considers the requests without recommendations in 24 per cent of the cases, that the local board performs the function without recommendations in 23 per cent of the cases, and that there is no definite practice in 53 per cent of the cases.

The replies agree in at least 23 per cent of the cases that the local board considers the requests from the citizenry in 23 per cent of the cases. Otherwise there is no
agreement whatever. This indicates that the practices in discharging this duty very widely, and that among the responsible agents a definite understanding relative to duties involved is almost entirely lacking. It may indicate, likewise, that the two reporting agents are not aware of all practices that are being employed in considering requests from the people of the districts.

It is recommended that the officials cooperate more closely in considering requests of the citizenry. To accomplish this it is suggested that this duty be carefully considered in the general rules and regulations of all boards, both local and county, and in the general policies of both units. These rules, regulations, and policies should have, among others, the following provisions: (1) Requests of a local nature should be considered first by the officials of the local unit; and if the occasion demands, the local unit should pass the request on to the county unit. (2) Requests of a county-wide nature should be considered by the officials of the county unit. These officials may in turn ask for advice from the local officials. (3) Except in unusual circumstances requests should be presented to the professional executive of the unit involved. He in turn should present it to his board if it cannot be disposed of in his office. The suggestions are in keeping with the provision of the criterion.

(31) Controlling use of the school property by the
citizensry.---The county superintendents' replies, recorded in Table 2, show that the local board in all cases is the performing agent in controlling the use made of school property by "outsiders". The recommending agent is shown to be the county superintendent in 10 per cent of the cases, the head teacher in 10 per cent of the cases, the county board in 10 per cent of the cases and no one in 70 per cent of the cases. The head teachers' replies, recorded in Table 3, show that the head teacher without recommendations controls the use of school property by the citizensry in 25 per cent of the cases, that the local board performs the function with the head teacher's recommendations in 51 per cent of the cases and without recommendations in 1 per cent of the cases, and that there is no definite practice in 23 per cent of the cases.

The reports agree in showing that in controlling the use of school property by the citizensry, the local board is the performing agent in 52 per cent of the cases. Otherwise the reports differ sharply in designating both the performing and the recommending agents.

The recommendations in this instance are very similar to those of the preceding one. The use that may be made of school property by the public and by individuals should be clearly stated in the general policies of the two units. A supplementary set of detailed rules and regulations should then be adopted by each local board to guide its professional
representative, the head teacher, in allowing the public and individuals to use school property. These rules should provide that individuals and organizations desiring to use school property must fill out an application blank, in which they should state the nature of the use that is to be made of the property and the time at which it is to be used. Such an arrangement as this would spare school officials from a great deal of criticism and effort, would provide for greater uniformity, insure the proper board-executive relationship, and facilitate the use of the property by acceptable individuals and groups.

A further study of the two tables leads to the following interesting conclusions:

(1) The county superintendents' replies indicate that the county superintendent exerts considerable influence as a performing agent over a wide range of duties, whereas the head teachers' replies indicate that the county superintendent's activity in this respect is more negligible.

The county superintendents' replies show that the county superintendent is sharing in the actual performance of 17 of the 31 listed duties, that for 3 of them he is listed as the performing agent in 75 per cent or more of the cases, that for 8 of them he is listed as the performing agent in 50 per cent or more of the cases, and that for 11 duties he is designated as the performing agent in 30 per cent or more of the cases. The head teachers' replies show
that the county superintendent is designated as sharing in the performance of only 5 of the 31 duties; and that for only 2 of them is he designated as the performing agent in 50 per cent or more of the cases.

For only one duty, making the budget, do the replies agree in showing that the county superintendent is the performing agent in 80 per cent or more of the cases; and for only one other duty do they agree that the county superintendent is the performing agent in more than 35 per cent of the cases.

(2) The replies of the county superintendents indicate that the county superintendent is active as a recommending agent over a wide range of duties; whereas, the head teachers' replies indicate that the county superintendents' advisory activities are negligible.

The county superintendents' replies show that the county superintendent exercises some activity as a recommending agent in the performance of 30 of the 31 duties. However, the replies show that for only one duty, "setting up the type of organization", is the county superintendent designated as the only recommending agent; that for only 3 duties is the county superintendent designated as the recommending agent in 75 per cent or more of the cases, that for 11 duties he is designated as the recommending agent in 50 per cent or more of the cases, and that for 19 duties he is designated as the recommending agent in 30 per cent or more
of the cases. The head teachers' replies show that the county superintendent is a recommending agent in 13 of the 31 duties; but that for only 1 duty, "raising funds", is the county superintendent designated as the recommending agent in more than 50 per cent of the cases; and that for only 6 duties is he designated as the recommending agent in more than 30 per cent of the cases.

(3) The replies of both the head teachers and the coun-
superintendents indicate that the county board's activity as a performing agent is almost negligible.

The county superintendents' replies show that the coun-
ty board is sharing in the actual performance of only 6 of the 31 administrative duties; and that for only one of them, "setting up the type of organization", is it designated as the performing agent in 75 per cent or more of the cases; and that for only 2 duties is it designated as the perform-
ing agent in 50 per cent or more of the cases. The head teachers' replies show that the county board shares in the actual performance of only 6 of the 31 administrative duties; that for only one duty, "setting up the type of organization", is it designated as the performing agent in 50 per cent or more of the cases; and that for the other 5 duties, it is designated as the performing agent in less than 30 per cent of the cases.

The replies agree that for only one duty, "setting up the type of organization", is the county board the per-
forming agent in a high percentage of the cases.

(4) The replies of both the head teachers and the county superintendents indicate that the county board's activity as a recommending agent is almost negligible.

The county superintendents' replies show that the county board makes recommendations to the performing agents in the performance of 6 of the 31 administrative duties, while the head teachers' replies show that the county board makes recommendation to the performing agents in only 4 of the 31 administrative duties. Neither shows that the county board is active as a recommending agent.

(5) The replies disagree relative to the activity of the head teacher as a performing agent. The county superintendents' replies show that the head teacher shares in the performance of 13 of the 31 administrative duties. They show that for one duty, "controlling, promoting, and grading pupils", the head teacher is designated as the only performing agent in 50 per cent or more of the cases; and that for 8 duties he is designated as the performing agent in 30 per cent or more of the cases. The head teachers' replies show that the head teacher shares in performing 19 of the 31 administrative duties; that for 3 duties; "controlling, promoting and grading pupils"; "preparing the school program"; and "preparing school reports"; the head teacher is the only performing agent; that for 3 duties he is designated as the performing agent in 75 per cent of the
cases; and that for 10 duties he is shown as the performing agent in 30 per cent or more of the cases.

The reports agree that for one duty; "controlling, promoting, and grading pupils"; the head teacher is the only performing agent; and that for 3 duties he is the performing agent in 75 per cent or more of the cases; that for 4 duties he is the performing agent in 50 per cent or more of the cases; and that for 7 duties he is the performing agent in 30 per cent or more of the cases.

The county superintendents' replies show that the head teacher shares in making recommendations in the performance of 17 of the 31 administrative duties, but that for only 1 of these duties is he designated as the recommending agent in as many as 50 per cent or more of the cases, and that for only 4 is he designated as the recommending agent in as many as 30 per cent of the cases. The head teachers' replies show that the head teacher shares in making recommendations in the performance of 17 of the 31 duties, and that for 2 duties he is designated as the recommending agent in as many as 50 per cent of the cases, and that for 7 duties he is designated as the recommending agent in as many as 30 per cent of the cases.

The reports agree fairly well relative to the number of duties in which the head teacher has a share in making recommendations and with respect to the designation of the duties in which his influence is felt, but they disagree
rather sharply relative to his activity as a recommending agent.

(7) The replies of the county superintendents and the head teachers both show that the local board is by far the most active performing agent.

The county superintendents' replies show that the local board either performs or shares in performing 27 of the 31 administrative duties, and that for 6 of them (numbers 1, 5, 14, 15, and 31) it is the only performing agent. They also show that for 12 of the duties the local board is designated as the performing agent in 75 per cent or more of the cases, that for 15 duties it is designated as the performing agent in 50 per cent or more of the cases, and that for 19 duties it is indicated as the performing agent in 30 per cent or more of the cases. The head teachers' replies show that the local board performs or shares in performing 24 of the 31 administrative duties; and that in 9 duties it is the only performing agent. They also show that for 11 duties the local board is designated as the performing agent in 75 per cent or more of the cases, that for 11 duties it is designated as the performing agent in 50 per cent or more of the cases; and that for 19 duties the local board is the performing agent in 30 per cent or more of the cases.

The replies agree that for at least 5 duties the local board is the only performing agent, that for 11 duties it is the performing agent in 75 per cent or more of the cases,
that for 13 duties it is the performing agent in 50 per cent or more of the cases, and that for 17 duties it is the performing agent in 30 per cent or more of the cases. The replies disagree very slightly relative to the activity of the local board as a performing agent.

(8) The activity of the local board as a recommending agent is negligible.

The county superintendents' replies show that the local board acts as a recommending agent in the performance of 10 of the 31 administrative duties, but that for only 1 duty it is designated as the recommending agent in more than 40 per cent of the cases, and that for 7 duties it is designated as the recommending agent in 30 per cent or more of the cases. The head teachers' replies show that the local board acts as a recommending agent in the performance of only 3 of the 31 duties. In two of these duties it is designated as the recommending agent in more than 50 per cent of the cases.

(9) The county superintendents' reports show that the deputy superintendent is not active either as a performing or as a recommending agent. The head teachers' replies do not mention the deputy superintendent either as a performing or as a recommending agent.

The foregoing remarks lead to these final conclusions relative to the existing allocation of administrative responsibilities in District Four:
(1) As a performing agent the local board is by far the most active. The head teacher is slightly more active than the county superintendent, and the activity of the county board and the deputy superintendent is almost negligible.

(2) As recommending agents, the county superintendent is probably the most active, the head teacher is slightly less active than the county superintendent, the local board a great deal less active than the head teacher, and the county board and deputy state superintendent scarcely serve in an advisory capacity.

(3) A careful study of Table 2 and Table 3 seems to indicate that there is little uniformity from county to county and from school to school relative to the responsibility that is discharged by each of the agents of administration.

(4) There are indications that in performing many of the administrative functions there is no definite understanding among the agents relative to the responsibilities that each should assume.

(5) A great number of administrative duties, especially those of a financial nature, are not being performed in accordance with sound administrative principles.

(6) In many cases a reallocation of administrative responsibility consistent with the provisions of the criterion for allocating administrative responsibility, is a necessary step in the improvement of the administration of the common schools of District Four under the present "set-up".
CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

At this point it should be stated that in making recommendations and offering remedial suggestions in this thesis no attempt is made to perfect the administrative organization of the common schools of District Four. Neither are the suggestions to be thought of as an ultimate solution to the administrative problems of the common schools, nor are they offered as a substitute for an effective reorganization of the present district system into a system of larger units of control. This work is not in any manner a defense of the present system. The limitations of the small district as the chief unit of administration is thoroughly recognized. On the other hand, the suggestions that are made should be considered as an attempt to make the most of a bad situation, and the system resulting from the changes suggested in this thesis should constitute an intermediate but necessary step toward a more satisfactory organization in the administration of the common schools. The present study is limited to determining improvements that can be made under the present "set-up".

Avenues of Improvements

In keeping with the foregoing statements and in accord-
ance with the suggestions of the preceding chapters, it is
evident that the administration of the common schools of
District Four may be improved under the present "set-up" by:
(1) clarifying the duties of each official, and (2) allo-
cating administrative responsibility according to sound edu-
cational theory in so far as possible.

The study of Tables 2 and 3 of Chapter III; indicated
that from school to school, the administrative officials,
in many cases, do not have a thorough understanding as to
where their duties begin and end. In the performance of
only a few duties does there seem to be any uniformity in
the distribution of responsibility among the agents. In
some schools a given responsibility may be assumed by the lo-
cal board, in other schools the same duty may be performed
by the head teacher, in another by the county superintendent,
and in still other schools some other agent may discharge
the responsibility. Under this system an official can
never be certain whether he is doing his work or the work of
someone else; whether he is to be praised for his industry
or blamed for his meddling.

Such a situation should not be allowed to continue.
It is not only discouraging to the official who is conscien-
tious in the performance of his duty, but it may often lead
to the neglect of important functions and misunderstandings
among school officials. It allows the over aggressive to as-
sume responsibility for work for which he is not fitted, it
provides an escape for the sloven and inefficient, and may lead to the practice which is commonly referred to as "passing the buck". It perhaps has led those who have ultimate responsibility to assume executive functions.

In Chapter II and III, the capacity in which each agent should function, the duties which each one should perform were specifically pointed out, and a definite allocation of responsibility was suggested. The provisions of these chapters relative to the responsibility of each of the administrative duties are summarized in Table 4. This table also suggests relations that should exist between the agents. If the responsibilities and relations suggested in Table 4 were definitely provided for in the rules and regulations of the lay boards, the function of each official would be sufficiently clarified. A system which provides for the adoption of an effective set of rules and regulations will be discussed anon.

In the use and interpretation of the table, it must be remembered that conditions may vary considerably in the local districts to the extent that some provisions of the table may be inoperative. For instance, in the item "attending to the business details of the school", it is shown that the division of responsibility depends upon local conditions. The division here might depend upon such matters as the time devoted by the head teacher to teaching duties, his business
### TABLE 4

**A SUGGESTED ALLOCATION OF ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSIBILITIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative Level</th>
<th>County Board</th>
<th>County Bus.</th>
<th>Local Board</th>
<th>Head Teacher</th>
<th>Support Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Deploy New Teacher</td>
<td>DELEGATE AND PERFORM CONTRACT</td>
<td>EXECUT</td>
<td>REVIEWED</td>
<td>REVIEW</td>
<td>ADVISE OF STATE REQUIREMENTS AND QUALIFICATIONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Deploy Assistant Teachers</td>
<td>SUPPORT</td>
<td>EXECUT</td>
<td>REVIEWED</td>
<td>ADVISE OF STATE REQUIREMENTS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Deploy Janitors, Clerks, Etc.</td>
<td>REVIEW APPEALS</td>
<td>EXECUT</td>
<td>REVIEWED</td>
<td>ADVISE OF STATE REGULATIONS AND PRACTICES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Review Of</td>
<td>DECIDE</td>
<td>EXECUT</td>
<td>REVIEWED</td>
<td>ADVISE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fix Balanced Not Fixed By State.</td>
<td>REVIEWED</td>
<td>EXECUT</td>
<td>REVIEWED</td>
<td>ADVISE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Fix Length of School Term</td>
<td>REVIEWED</td>
<td>EXECUT</td>
<td>REVIEWED</td>
<td>ADVISE LOCAL SCHOOL BOARD AND CO. Supt.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Set Up Type of Organization</td>
<td>REVIEWED</td>
<td>EXECUT</td>
<td>REVIEWED</td>
<td>ADVISE CO. Supt.</td>
<td>FINALLY APPROVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Referral Group Of Group</td>
<td>REVIEWED</td>
<td>EXECUT</td>
<td>REVIEWED</td>
<td>ADVISE CO. Supt.</td>
<td>FINALLY APPROVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Accept or Revoke Transfers</td>
<td>REVIEWED</td>
<td>EXECUT</td>
<td>REVIEWED</td>
<td>ADVISE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Make Rules and Regulations</td>
<td>RECOMMEND FORMULAE FOR LOCAL DIST.</td>
<td>EXECUT</td>
<td>REVIEWED</td>
<td>ADVISE THE DISTRICT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Purchase Supplies and Equipment</td>
<td>APPROVE</td>
<td>EXECUT</td>
<td>REVIEWED</td>
<td>ADVISE LOCAL Supt.</td>
<td>PREPARE LIST OF NEEDS CONSIDERED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Make the School Building</td>
<td>APPROVE</td>
<td>EXECUT</td>
<td>REVIEWED</td>
<td>ADVISE Supt.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Raise Funds (Other Than Tuition)</td>
<td>PERFORM ADVISE AND RECOMMEND</td>
<td>EXECUT</td>
<td>REVIEWED</td>
<td>ADVISE Supt.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Develop a Building Program</td>
<td>FINALLY REVIEWED TO INITIATE ADVISE AND RECOMMEND</td>
<td>EXECUT</td>
<td>REVIEWED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Select a Site For Building</td>
<td>APPROVE</td>
<td>ADVISE AND RECOMMEND</td>
<td>EXECUT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Plan School Buildings</td>
<td>FINALLY APPROVE</td>
<td>ADVISE AND RECOMMEND</td>
<td>EXECUT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Supervise Building Construction</td>
<td>APPROVE</td>
<td>ADVISE AND RECOMMEND</td>
<td>EXECUT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Supervise School Employers</td>
<td>SUPERVISOR CHIEF</td>
<td>EXECUT</td>
<td>REVIEWED</td>
<td>ADVISE AND COUNTY Supt.</td>
<td>PROVIDE GENERAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Design Units for Employes</td>
<td>AUTHORITY RESPONSIBILITY AUTHORITY</td>
<td>EXECUT</td>
<td>REVIEWED</td>
<td>ADVISE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Central Personnel and Grade Personnel</td>
<td>SUPREME AND RESCIND AUTHORITY</td>
<td>EXECUT</td>
<td>REVIEWED</td>
<td>ADVISE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Prepare School Personnel</td>
<td>SUPERVISOR GENERAL FORMULATE GENERAL PROGRAM</td>
<td>EXECUT</td>
<td>REVIEWED</td>
<td>ADVISE LOCAL PROGRAM MANAGER</td>
<td>FORMULATE LOCAL PROGRAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Prepare School Reports</td>
<td>RECOMMEND AUTHORITY</td>
<td>EXECUT</td>
<td>REVIEWED</td>
<td>ADVISE LOCAL DIST.</td>
<td>FORMULATE FOR DISTRICT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Role</td>
<td>County Board</td>
<td>County Unit</td>
<td>Local Board</td>
<td>School System</td>
<td>County Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply public with information</td>
<td>Delegate executive responsibility</td>
<td>Prepare staff; delegate staff</td>
<td>Delegate executive responsibility</td>
<td>Advise local personnel</td>
<td>Prepare statements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend to business details</td>
<td>Delegate authority</td>
<td>Approve all expenditures</td>
<td>Defer on local school's advice</td>
<td>Delegate authority</td>
<td>Prepare statements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep pupil records</td>
<td>Delegate authority</td>
<td>Keep enrollment records</td>
<td>Delegate authority</td>
<td>Delegate authority</td>
<td>Keep records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep financial records</td>
<td>Delegate authority</td>
<td>Perform for all schools</td>
<td>Delegate authority</td>
<td>Perform for locally</td>
<td>Supply uniform forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determine selection</td>
<td>Delegate authority</td>
<td>Recommend for county</td>
<td>Determine authority</td>
<td>Recommend locally</td>
<td>Formulate for district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authorize the budget</td>
<td>Delegate authority</td>
<td>Perform</td>
<td>Delegate authority</td>
<td>Authorize expenditure</td>
<td>Provide safety guards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change source of study</td>
<td>Determine</td>
<td>Recommend</td>
<td>Delegate authority</td>
<td>Authorize expenditure</td>
<td>Finally approve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicate interest from citizenry</td>
<td>Adopt general rules</td>
<td>Formulate rules and execute</td>
<td>Adopt general rules</td>
<td>Formulate local rules and execute</td>
<td>Formulate local rules and execute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control use of school property</td>
<td>Adopt general rules</td>
<td>Formulate general rules</td>
<td>Adopt general rules</td>
<td>Formulate local rules and execute</td>
<td>Formulate local rules and execute</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Training and experience, and the type of business involved. Most of the questions and difficulties of interpreting the table may be clarified by keeping the principle of board-executive relationships well in mind.

Provisions for Making Recommendations Effective

Thus far the major portion of the thesis has been devoted to determining the actual conditions of administration in the common schools of District Four, pointing out the defects in the administration, and suggesting needed improvements. Little attention has been given to the means and
methods by which the recommendations may be put into effect. It is the purpose in this section to suggest some means or system whereby the recommendations that have been made may be put into effective operation. Suggestions as to what should be done are of little value unless some means of executing them is at hand.

Legal changes necessary.—To make at least two of the remedial suggestions effective, certain legal changes will be needed. The law providing for the election of the county superintendent by popular vote should be replaced by one that will empower the county board to select the county superintendent. The office of ex-officio county superintendent should be legally abolished and provision made whereby all counties may have a professionally trained superintendent. Suggestions as to the provisions that might be made have been given elsewhere. A legal change will be necessary also to allow the county to become the taxing unit to the extent that has been specified elsewhere.

It should be pointed out that special legal provisions pertaining to the selection of the county superintendent and the collection of a county wide school tax have been made for various counties in the state, but that these provisions are restricted as to be inoperative throughout District Four. However, it should be possible to secure the needed special legislation for the counties of District Four
in a manner similar to that by which it has been provided for in other counties.

**District-wide adoption of rules and regulations.**

Other remedial suggestions that are not vitally linked with legal provisions have been made throughout the thesis. These suggestions are centered around the proper allocation of administrative responsibilities. The problem is to get those agents who exercise ultimate control of the schools to properly delegate authority according to sound administrative principles. This can be accomplished by getting each county and local board in District Four to adopt a uniform set of rules and regulations that provide for the proper division of administrative functions.

Primarily, rules and regulations are adopted by boards of education so that each agent who is directly connected with the administration may be fully aware of his respective duties. Rules and regulations serve to clarify the relations that should exist between all employees of the school system. Reader points out the value of rules and regulations as follows:

Each employee would know his function, and responsibility could, therefore, be definitely placed. The result would be less muddling, less meddling, and less characterized by that administrative pastime which is commonly known as "passing the buck." Much of the friction which now exists between educational and business employees—in brief, between all employees—would be obviated.

Such rules and regulations would especially aid
new employees, and particularly would they aid employees who have recently entered the organization from another community. Without a guide such as rules and regulations afford, new employees often grope in the dark. Rules and regulations would immediately inform such employees of their powers and duties. Still more, they would facilitate the training of inexperienced employees.  

Concerning the need of rules and regulations, Reeder says:

If . . . rules and regulations exist so infrequently in the larger cities—the communities in which the more progressive schools are found—they are probably as scarce as dodos in the small-city, town, village, and rural-school systems. A good set of rules and regulations should be adopted by every school system, whether large or small, for the conduct of its business. Our state departments of education could make a contribution to local school administration by formulating a set of suggestive rules and regulations which local school officials might adapt to the needs of their schools; . . .

The suggestion that is offered in this quotation relative to state departments formulating a set of rules and regulations which might be adopted by local boards is especially pertinent to this discussion. It should be fully capitalized in securing the adoption of a uniform set of rules and regulations throughout the district.

In developing the suggestion of Reeder to a fuller extent, it is recommended that the deputy state superintendent prepare, or have prepared, a comprehensive set of rules and regulations which each county and local board may either adopt or use as a guide in drawing up its own set. These

---

1 Reeder, op. cit., p. 17.

2 Ibid p. 16.
rules and regulations should clearly define the functions of each administrative agent in both the county and the local unit. They should state a number of the most important administrative duties and point out the corresponding responsibility of each administrative agent. These rules and regulations should be in keeping with the principles that have been given in this thesis with respect to the capacity in which each agent functions and they should be in accord with the allocation of responsibility that has been suggested. Indeed, it is hoped that the recommendations that have been made in these respects may be used as basic material in the preparation of an efficient set of rules and regulations for each board in the district.

General Conclusions

This study has served the following purposes relative to the administration of the common schools in District Four.

1. It has set up definite underlying principles to use as a criterion for properly allocating administrative responsibility among the administrative agents.

2. It has defined the capacity in which each administrative agent should function and has pointed out the relations that should exist between the agents.

3. It has pointed out the most important duties that should be performed in each of the units of administration and has designated the responsibility that should be exer-
cised by each agent in performing each of the duties.

4. It has shown the present legal status and legal provisions for each of the administrative agents.

5. It has shown the part that is at present being played by each administrative agent in performing the most important administrative duties. At the same time it has suggested the role that each administrative agent should play in performing the same duties.

6. It has pointed out the general lines along which improvements may be made under the present "set-up".

7. Finally, it has suggested the means through which the chief recommendations of the thesis may be put into operation.
APPENDIX

QUESTIONNAIRE TO THE HEAD TEACHERS OF THE
COMMON SCHOOLS OF DISTRICT FOUR

Dear fellow teacher,

I am collecting data relative to the allocation of administrative duties among the administrative agents of the common schools of District Four. This data is to be used in a thesis which I am now writing in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Master's degree. The accuracy and success of my study largely depends upon the responses which I receive to the questionnaire following. Therefore, I sincerely trust that you will give your careful attention to the questionnaire, execute it according to the directions that follow, and return it to me at your earliest convenience.

Part I of the questionnaire is for registration purposes only. I assure you that it will be detached from the body of the questionnaire and that neither your name, nor the name of your school will appear in my study. Part I may be executed by filling the blanks as indicated.

Part II is designed to determine the allocation of administrative duties in the school. It may be executed by underlining responses according to the directions in the heading of Part II.

I will sincerely appreciate your consideration of the questionnaire.

Yours truly,

Carrol M. Jones

Part I

Registration sheet (to be detached from answers and used to determine the schools that have responded).

1. (Name of school) ____________________ (County) __________

2. (District No.) __________

3. (Name of head teacher) ____________________
Part II

Following is a list of administrative duties. After each you will find several responses. Will you please underline the response that best describes the practice by which each particular duty is discharged. The duties are numbered and the responses are lettered.

1. Employing the head teacher
   a. Board elects from county superintendent’s recommendations
   b. Board exercises full responsibility

2. Employing assistant teachers
   a. Board elects from head teacher’s recommendations
   b. Board elects from county superintendent’s recommendations
   c. Board exercises full responsibility

3. Employing janitors, clerks, etc.
   a. Board elects from head teacher’s recommendation
   b. Board elects from county superintendent’s recommendations
   c. Board exercises full responsibility

4. Dismissing school employees
   a. Board acts on head teacher’s recommendation
   b. Board acts on county superintendent’s recommendation
   c. Board exercises full responsibility

5. Fixing employee’s salary that is not fixed by state
   a. Board acts on head teacher’s recommendation
   b. Board acts on county superintendent’s recommendation
   c. Board exercises full responsibility

6. Fixing length of school term
   a. Board acts on head teacher’s recommendation
   b. Board acts on county superintendent’s recommendation
   c. Board exercises full responsibility

7. Setting up type of organization (number of grades, etc.)
   a. Board acts on head teacher’s recommendation
   b. Board acts on county superintendent’s recommendation
   c. Board exercises full responsibility

8. Establishing curricula and course of study
   a. Full responsibility delegated to head teacher
b. Full responsibility exercised by board

c. Full responsibility delegated to county superintendent

d. Board acts on head teacher's recommendation

9. Allowing or refusing transfers
   a. County board acts on county superintendent's recommendation
   b. Full responsibility exercised by board
   c. Full responsibility delegated to county superintendent
   d. Board acts on recommendation of head teacher

10. Making rules and regulations (not disciplining)
    a. Full responsibility delegated to head teacher
    b. Full responsibility exercised by board
    c. Full responsibility delegated to county superintendent
    d. Board acts on head teacher's recommendation

11. Purchasing supplies, equipment, etc.
    a. Full responsibility delegated to head teacher
    b. Full responsibility exercised by board
    c. Board acts on head teacher's recommendation
    d. No definite practice

12. Making the budget
    a. Full responsibility delegated to head teacher
    b. Full responsibility delegated to county superintendent
    c. County superintendent acts with advice from local board
    d. County superintendent acts with advice from head teacher

13. Raising funds (levying taxes)
    a. Board acts on head teacher's recommendation
    b. Board acts on county superintendent's recommendation
    c. Board exercises full responsibility

14. Developing a building program
    a. Board acts on head teacher's recommendation
    b. Board acts on county superintendent's recommendation
    c. Board exercises full responsibility

15. Selecting a site for school building
    a. Board acts on head teacher's recommendation
    b. Board acts on county superintendent's recommendation.
c. Board exercises full responsibility
d. Full responsibility delegated to head teacher

16. Planning the school building
a. Board acts on head teacher's recommendation
b. Board acts on county superintendent's recommendation
c. Board exercises full responsibility
d. Full responsibility delegated to head teacher

17. Supervise building construction
a. Board acts on head teacher's recommendation
b. Board acts on county superintendent's recommendation
c. Board exercises full responsibility
d. Full responsibility delegated to head teacher

18. Supervising school employees
a. Full responsibility delegated to head teacher
b. Full responsibility delegated to county superintendent
c. Full responsibility exercised by board
d. No definite practice

19. Assigning duties to employees
a. Full responsibility delegated to head teacher
b. Full responsibility delegated to county superintendent
c. Full responsibility exercised by board

20. Controlling, promoting, and grading pupils
a. Full responsibility delegated to head teacher
b. Full responsibility delegated to county superintendent
c. Full responsibility exercised by board
d. No definite practice

21. Preparing school programs
a. Full responsibility delegated to head teacher
b. Full responsibility delegated to county superintendent
c. Full responsibility exercised by board

22. Preparing school reports
a. Full responsibility delegated to head teacher
b. Full responsibility delegated to county superintendent
c. Full responsibility exercised by board

23. Supplying the public with information
a. Full responsibility delegated to head teacher
b. Full responsibility delegated to county superintendent
c. Full responsibility exercised by board
d. No definite practice

24. Attending to the business details of the school
   a. Full responsibility delegated to head teacher
   b. Full responsibility delegated to county superintendent
   c. Board acts on head teacher's recommendation
   d. Full responsibility exercised by board
   e. No definite practice

25. Keeping pupil records
   a. Full responsibility exercised by head teacher
   b. Full responsibility exercised by county superintendent
   c. Full responsibility exercised by board
   d. County superintendent acts on head teacher's recommendation

26. Keeping financial records
   a. Full responsibility exercised by head teacher
   b. Full responsibility exercised by board
   c. Full responsibility exercised by county superintendent
   d. County superintendent acts on head teacher's recommendation

27. Determining policies
   a. Full responsibility delegated to head teacher
   b. Full responsibility exercised by board
   c. Board acts on head teacher's recommendation
   d. No definite practice

28. Administering the budget
   a. Full responsibility delegated to head teacher
   b. Full responsibility delegated to county superintendent
   c. County superintendent performs the duty with recommendations of the board
   d. County superintendent performs the duty with recommendations of the head teacher

29. Changing courses of study or subjects offered
   a. Full responsibility delegated to head teacher
   b. Full responsibility delegated to county superintendent
   c. Board acts on county superintendent's recommendation
   d. Board acts on head teacher's recommendation

30. Considering requests from citizenry
   a. Full responsibility delegated to head teacher
b. Full responsibility delegated to county superintendent

c. Full responsibility exercised by the board

d. No definite practice

31. Controlling the use of school property

a. Full responsibility delegated to head teacher

b. Full responsibility delegated to county superintendent

c. Board acts on head teacher's recommendation

d. Board exercises full responsibility

e. No definite practice
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