
Student Work

1-1-1953

A Study of the Character of the Administrative Practices and Standards of Ten Small School Systems

Bruce Cowgill
University of Omaha

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/studentwork>
Please take our feedback survey at: https://unomaha.az1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_8cchtFmpDyGfBLE

Recommended Citation

Cowgill, Bruce, "A Study of the Character of the Administrative Practices and Standards of Ten Small School Systems" (1953). *Student Work*. 2566.
<https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/studentwork/2566>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by DigitalCommons@UNO. It has been accepted for inclusion in Student Work by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@UNO. For more information, please contact unodigitalcommons@unomaha.edu.

A STUDY OF THE CHARACTER OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE PRACTICES
AND STANDARDS OF TEN SMALL SCHOOL SYSTEMS.

by

Bruce Cowgill

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of the University of
Omaha in partial fulfillment of the requirements for
the Degree

Master of Arts

Department of Education

1953

UMI Number: EP74109

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



UMI EP74109

Published by ProQuest LLC (2015). Copyright in the Dissertation held by the Author.

Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

All rights reserved. This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code



ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 - 1346

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

THE AUTHOR WISHES TO EXPRESS HIS APPRECIATION FOR THE VALUABLE ASSISTANCE RENDERED BY THE MANY PERSONS COOPERATING IN THIS STUDY. HE IS GRATEFUL TO THE SUPERINTENDENTS OF THE TEN SCHOOLS SURVEYED FOR THE FINE MANNER IN WHICH THEY COOPERATED IN THE PROJECT. HE IS PARTICULARLY INDEBTED TO DR. FRANK H. GORMAN, FOR ACTING AS ADVISOR AND FOR READING THE MANUSCRIPT. TO GEORGE S. PRITCHARD THE AUTHOR IS DEEPLY INDEBTED FOR HIS SUPERVISION OF THE SURVEY.

B. E. C.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. THE PROBLEM AND ITS SCOPE.	1
The Problem.	1
Hypotheses	1
Definitions.	1
Delimitations.	2
II. PREVIOUS RESEARCH.	4
III. HISTORY AND METHOD OF INVESTIGATION.	11
IV. EXISTING PRACTICES IN ASSUMPTION OF ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSIBILITIES IN TEN SMALL SCHOOL SYSTEMS . .	13
Personnel.	13
Finance.	15
Building Use	16
School Policies.	16
Superintendents Division of Time	18
V. STATISTICS RELATING TO SUPERINTENDENTS AND THE STANDARD OF ADMINISTRATIVE PRACTICES AS VIEWED BY THEM IN TEN SMALL SCHOOL SYSTEMS	20
Tenure	20
Superintendents Ideas On Schools	21
VI. SCHOOL BOARDS AND THE STANDARDS OF ADMINISTRATIVE PRACTICES AS VIEWED BY THEM.	24
Board Turnover	24
Membership	24
Boards Ideas On Schools.	24
VII. CLASSROOM TEACHERS AND THEIR RELATIONSHIP TO THE SUPERINTENDENT AND THE BOARD	27
Teachers Ideas On School	27
VIII. GENERALIZATIONS, SUMMARY, AND CONCLUSIONS.	29
Generalizations.	29
Summary.	29
Conclusions.	30
BIBLIOGRAPHY.	31
APPENDIX.	32

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
I. Administrative Responsibilities in Ten Small School Systems as They Now Exist . .	14
II. Duties of the School Administrator and the Percent of Time Spent on Each in Ten Small School Systems	18
III. Tenure of Superintendents and Principals .	20
IV. Administrative Responsibilities in Ten Small School Systems as the Superintendent Thought That They Should Be.	21
V. Administrative Responsibilities in Ten Small School Systems as Board Members Thought That They Should Be.	25
VI. How Twenty Teachers Thought Administration of Schools Could Be Best Improved.	28

\ CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM AND ITS SCOPE

The Problem

The main purpose of this survey was to determine the character of the administrative relationships which exist in small school systems. This involved the study of five factors, namely, (1) The responsibilities of the superintendent as delegated by the board, (2) The responsibilities assumed by the board of education, (3) The relationship of the board of education to the public, (4) The relationship of the board of education to the staff, and (5) The relationship of the superintendent to the public.

Hypotheses

This study was undertaken because of the belief that, (1) Considerable confusion exists in respect to administrative practices and relationships, and (2) No definite standards of administrative relationships are recognized.

Definitions

"Small school," as used in this survey, means a school with grades 1 through 12 inclusive, having an enrollment of from 50 to 250 students.

"Superintendent," in this study, refers to the chief administrator of the school.

"Board of Education," as used in this work, refers to a six member group elected by the citizens of the community at an annual election to act as a governing

body for the school. Terms are for three years with two members being elected each year.

"Staff" as used in this survey refers to both teaching and non-teaching personnel.

"Budget" as used here, means the list of proposed expenditures it will take to run the school system for the next year. It is submitted by the board of education to the public for their adoption, at an annual meeting.

Delimitations

This problem was limited to small Class II¹ public schools and did not include districts of any other classifications.

It was limited to the reports as given by one board member, the superintendent and two teachers. Pupils were not contacted nor were the patrons in the community.

The problem was further limited by the fact that only ten schools were contacted in the survey and these in a related area within a radius of some fifty miles.

No attempt was made to evaluate the effectiveness of the school program other than through the interview with the board members and the superintendent. The interview method was the only method used to obtain the data.

1. A class II district as specified by the state school law is a district in a territory embracing 1000 inhabitants or less, that maintains both elementary and high school grades under the direction of a single board.

Only schools in the following counties were used in the survey: Platte, Polk, York, Butler, Saunders, Washington, and Merrick.

CHAPTER II

PREVIOUS RESEARCH

Cyr¹ in 1933 made both a questionnaire and an interview study of administrative duties generally assigned to officials in small school systems. Although the study was made some time ago and much of the work deals with the office of the County Superintendent, it is still applicable to existing practices.

- Four conclusions were drawn by Cyr. (1) The small local district still retains the major responsibility for educational administration. There was little agreement on the allocation of duties. (2) In Pennsylvania, Nebraska, Idaho, and Indiana the local district assumes the major responsibility for the administration of schools. (3) Where the local district is the basic unit there is a great variation in the practice reported. (4) At this time it was the practice in Nebraska for the voters to assume some of the responsibility in the Annual Meeting. The report was summed up with the quotation that "The small school district retains the major responsibility for educational administration even for the little agreement that exists."

1. Frank W. Cyr "Responsibility for Rural School Administration" Teachers College, Columbia University contributions to education.--No. 479 Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, New York City, 1933.

Archerd¹ used the questionnaire and the interview method and dealt primarily with tenure. He tried to determine the relationship between tenure of the superintendent and the efficiency of the school system. He found a great turnover of administrations particularly in the smaller districts. He stated that longer tenure was beneficial to a community and recommended a term contract for administrators rather than one drawn up annually, since proper organization takes time.

Hazelbarker² used the questionnaire method to contact board members and professors in institutions of higher learning. He stated that agreement was found and recommendation made by the local boards of education in Arkansas for:

1. Holding closed board meetings occasionally
2. Holding special meetings, or meetings other than those regularly scheduled
3. Following an order of business in conducting school board meetings
4. Having current publications dealing with the practice of school administration available for school board members.
5. Attending some professional meetings during the year
6. Making school board minutes accessible to the public.

-
1. Frederic Archerd "Comparison of the efficiency of School Systems in relation to the tenure of superintendents" unpublished masters dissertation, University of Nebraska, 1931.
 2. Norval Denver Hazelbarker-N. Ed. University of Missouri, 1943 "An Analysis of Certain Methods and Procedures used by local boards of education in Arkansas, used for doctors dissertation, University of Arkansas, 1953

7. The following functions were delegated to the superintendent:
1. interviewing applicants for both teaching and non-teaching personnel
 2. planning courses of study
 3. selecting textbooks
 4. assigning teachers to classes and rooms
 5. informing teachers termination of contracts
 6. determining the general method of instruction to be used.
 7. preparation of the school budget
 8. taking and maintaining the school census
 9. keeping financial account records
 10. accounting for extra curricular money
 11. preparing annual financial statements
 12. suspending pupils from school
 13. supervising the operation and maintenance of school plant
 14. interviewing salesmen
 15. purchasing supplies
 16. preparing an agenda for board of education meetings
 17. preparation of bills for presentation at board meetings
 18. determining the duties of custodians
 19. determining school bus time schedule
 20. establishing rules of conduct while riding school buses.

Hazelbarker's survey recommended that the following duties be performed jointly by the superintendent and the board.

1. deciding on promotion for employees
2. evaluating the total educational program
3. selecting and employing school architects
4. selecting and negotiating for school sites
5. determining salary schedule
6. establishing the age for admission to school
7. determining the opening and closing date for school
8. determining the need for additional facilities
9. determining the policy for community use of school facilities
10. planning new school buildings
11. establishing school bus routes
12. writing and revising board of education rules and regulations

Luckman¹ and Gertsbacker state that the most significant need which is evidenced by the response to the questionnaires they sent out was for more training in the areas of housing and plant management.

They also surveyed school board membership in California with the following results 87.8% were male members and 12.2% female. Farmers comprised the largest one group area with a total of 87 out of the 504 members questioned. They concluded that there were two keys to good personnel administrations; an intelligent pattern and a qualified executive to apply it.

1. Lloyd D. Luckman and Charles A. Gertsbacker, Jr.; "Areas of Conflict in California School Administration." Research in Education Bulletin No. 4--July 1951, Doctors dissertation, Stanford University.

Haisley¹, Ballou, and others used the interview method to check administrative practices in twenty-six schools. Twenty-five of the twenty-six superintendents interviewed stated that they were recognized by the board of education.

In their study, "single executive" referred to superintendent control. "Dual executive" referred to joint superintendent-board control. One hundred four superintendents were interviewed in this area. Eighty-nine thought the single executive plan desirable; fourteen thought the dual executive plan desirable and one was undecided.

Thirty-eight classroom teachers responded as follows in the same area: thirty favored the single executive plan; eight the dual executive plan.

It was stated in this study that the superintendent should nominate all employees and the board should elect only on his nomination. The superintendent should submit an annual budget for the consideration of the board and he should expect to be held accountable to the board of education for formulating for its consideration an educational program based upon community needs, sound professional theory and available financial resources.

A report "Some Reasons Why School Administrators Succeed or Fail"² was made in which the questionnaire method was

-
1. Haisley, Ballou, and others "The Superintendent of Schools and his Work" American Assoc. of School Admin. C. Feb. 1940, page 10-12.
 2. Report from the Nat'l. Inst. Teachers Placement Assoc. to the Nat'l. Conf. of Prof. of Ed. Admin. Delivered to the N.C.P.E.A. Committee of Preparatory Programs for school admin. at the A.A.S.A. Reg. Conf. St. Louis, Mo. Feb. 1952.

used. Fifty-two institutions in twenty-one states replied. Reasons given for failure of school administrators were: Ineffective Human Relations 34%, Inadequate Preparation 32%, Undesirable Personal Traits 31%, Others 3%. Under ineffective human relations most frequently mentioned were, lack of skill in dealing with people and autocratic administration. Under inadequate preparation, most frequently mentioned were inability to understand the job and inability to handle big and complex jobs. Most commonly listed under undesirable personal traits were poor judgement and lack of organizational ability.

Monroe¹ in a survey of small school systems in communities of not more than 3500 population found that such communities constituted 80% of all incorporated places in the United States. He found in the 17th yearbook, 1939, of the American Association of School Administrators the following facts.

1. In nearly all cases the superintendents of small school systems are selected by the local school board.

2. In towns of less than 500 population 19.86% of the superintendents are under 30 years of age.

3. The average number of years spent in schoolwork by the administrator increases as the size of the school increases.

4. About 30% of the administrators in the smallest school systems have been in their present position from

1. Walter S. Monroe, Encyclopedia of Educational Research Rev. Ed. Macmillan Co., New York, 1950, page 1048

10 to 14 years, while in larger systems the percent with this length of tenure is from 2 to over 3 times as great.

Lacer¹ lists the following reasons for the short tenure of teachers: 1. Lack of adequate pay, 2. marriage, 3. To be nearer home, 4. dismissal, 5. desire for advancement. He proposes that tenure might be lengthened by tactful introduction of the teacher to the community cultural and social life, hospitable and planned welcomes to the teacher by the community and insight into the chief administrators philosophy and aims of education.

Derby² surveyed extra curricular activities in north west Iowa and concluded that School Administrators have been lax in the administration of the financial aspects of extra curricular activities. He recommended that:

(1) Every school set up a financial committee made up of faculty and students.

(2) Clear evaluation of methods of fund raising be made from the standpoint of educational values time and labor required and public approval.

(3) Accounting system be simple, adequate and accessible

(4) Reports on the handling of these funds be made at regular intervals.

(5) Accounts be audited at least once each year.

(6) Treasurer be bonded.

-
1. C.H. Lacer-"Study of Turnover and Teacher Adjustment in the small school." Master Thesis-Univ. of Wash. 1940.
 2. C. N. Derby "Financing Extra Curricular Activities in 168 High Schools in North Western Iowa" Masters Thesis, Univ. of South Dakota, 1939.

There were many other works pertaining to the study being made. Only a few of the most pertinent have been presented here.

CHAPTER III

HISTORY AND METHOD OF INVESTIGATION

To obtain data for this particular problem, six interviewers were chosen to do a survey of sixty schools. These schools were divided into three areas consisting of western Iowa, eastern Nebraska and east-central Nebraska. Two interviewers were assigned to each area with a total of ten schools each from which to secure the information.

The two interviewers together chose the schools they would like to interview in their area. The State School Boards Associations of both Iowa and Nebraska approved of the survey and sent out letters to the superintendents of the schools chosen in their respective states, asking for permission to make these interviews. Permission was granted in every case and each school cooperated to the fullest extent in the survey.

The same interview schedule was used in all of the schools. It was prepared by George S. Pritchard of the University of Omaha, who acted as advisor for the project. Questions were asked about hiring of personnel, curriculum, buying, budget preparation, interpretation of the school, etc. The interview schedule was set up to find out what was being done in the respective areas and also how the person being interviewed thought that it should be done. A copy of the interview schedule may be found in the Appendix.

Four persons in each school system were interviewed. They included the superintendent, one board member, preferably one who had been on the board for sometime, and two teachers. The same questions were asked of the superintendent and the board member. The teachers were asked only one question, the question being: "From your experience as a teacher, what do you consider some of the ways in which administration of schools could be improved?" The personal interview method was used exclusively and the results were written up after the person had been interviewed. Only brief notations were jotted down during the interview itself.

CHAPTER IV

EXISTING PRACTICES IN ASSUMPTION OF ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSIBILITIES IN TEN SMALL SCHOOL SYSTEMS.

The interview schedule listed fourteen areas to be checked to see how administrative duties were handled in each school. Table I was the result of compiling of data in these areas.

In the selection of teachers superintendents in two of the schools did all of the interviewing, screening and hiring. Five other schools allowed the superintendent a part in the selection. He would screen and submit several applications to the board in these schools and would have the final voice in selection. The three remaining schools allowed the superintendent no voice in selection of teachers. The board of education assumed sole responsibility.

Non-teaching personnel consisted of custodians in all schools; cooks in one, and bus drivers in two. Results in the area were exactly the same as they were for selection of teaching personnel. The same two schools that allowed the superintendent to hire the teachers also allowed him to hire non-teaching personnel. The same five schools that worked out teacher hiring on a cooperative basis did the same with non-teaching personnel. School boards in the three schools that had the board do all of the hiring of teachers handled their non-teaching personnel the same way.

TABLE I

ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSIBILITIES IN TEN SMALL SCHOOL
SYSTEMS--AS THEY NOW EXIST

Schools		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Total
Selection of Teachers	Superintendent	x		x								2
	Board		x				x			x		3
	Cooperative Plan				x	x		x	x		x	5
Selection of non-teaching personnel	Superintendent	x		x								2
	Board		x				x			x		3
	Cooperative Plan				x	x		x	x		x	5
Preparation of salary schedule	Superintendent			x								1
	Board		x			x	x	x	x		x	6
	Cooperative Plan	x			x					x		3
Personnel	Superintendent	x		x	x						x	4
	Board						x		x	x		3
	Cooperative Plan		x			x		x				3
Policies Evaluation of teaching skills	Superintendent	x		x	x	x						4
	Board		x				x			x		3
	Cooperative Plan							x	x		x	3
Budget	Superintendent			x	x	x				x		4
	Board		x				x	x	x			4
	Cooperative Plan	x									x	2
Preparation of Supplies	Superintendent	x		x	x							3
	Board		x									1
	Cooperative Plan					x	x	x	x	x	x	6
Arrangements for use of Building	Superintendent			x				x	x			3
	Board	x	x			x	x			x		5
	Cooperative Plan				x						x	2
Interpretation of School	Superintendent	x		x	x	x		x	x	x		7
	Board		x									1
	Cooperative Plan						x				x	2
School policies graduation, entrance, etc.	Superintendent	x		x		x	x	x			x	6
	Board											0
	Cooperative Plan		x		x				x	x		4
Rules of Conduct	Superintendent	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	9
	Board											0
	Cooperative Plan							x				1
Planning	Superintendent	x		x		x	x			x	x	6
	Board											0
	Cooperative Plan		x		x			x	x			4
Extra Curricular	Superintendent	x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	9
	Board											0
	Cooperative Plan		x									1
Evaluation of total school program	Superintendent			x		x						2
	Board											0
	Cooperative Plan	x	x		x		x	x	x	x	x	8
TOTAL	Superintendent	10	1	11	7	8	11	11	5	5		
	Board	1	8	0	0	2	7	2	3	5	1	
	Cooperative Plan	3	5	0	7	4	3	8	7	4	8	

One superintendent had full responsibility for the preparation of the salary schedule. Three others helped by checking surrounding schools and submitting their recommendations. Superintendents in the six remaining schools had no voice in the preparation of a salary schedule. They and the teachers were offered contracts by the board on a "take it or leave it" basis.

Personnel policies included such things as working hours for the staff, sick leave, etc. Four superintendents prepared policies for their schools. Three others did so with the help of the board, and superintendents in three had nothing to do with their formulation.

Evaluation of teaching skills included basis for judgment on promotion, retention, or discharge of members of the teaching staff. Superintendents in four schools had the final voice in their schools. Three others did so with the help of the board and three schools turned this area over entirely to the board of education.

Preparation of the budget was the duty of the superintendent in four of the schools. Two superintendents worked with the board in preparing the budget and the board prepared it without the superintendent's help in the four remaining schools.

Three schools allowed the superintendent to purchase all supplies. Six others used a cooperative plan, whereby the superintendent bought general supplies and the board maintenance supplies. One school board did all

of the purchasing. The superintendent in this school submitted a list of supplies that were needed to the board and they did the buying.

In three schools arrangements for using the building were made with the superintendent. Two other schools made all arrangements at board meetings with the superintendent and the board participating. Five schools left all arrangements for building use in the hands of the board.

Seven superintendents were responsible for interpretation of the school to the general public. Two others worked it out cooperatively and one school board handled all interpretation.

Formulation of school policies was left up to the superintendent in six schools. The four remaining schools worked it out on a cooperative basis. These policies consisted of such things as graduation requirements, entrance requirements, etc.

Establishing and enforcing rules of conduct was the duty of the superintendent in nine schools. The one remaining school worked it out on a cooperative basis. This consisted of suggestion on the part of board members generally at the regular board meeting.

Six schools allowed the superintendent to plan the curriculum with no help from the board. The four other schools had the superintendent plan the curriculum and submit it to the board for approval.

Superintendents in nine of the schools had absolute

control over all extra curricular activities. The one remaining school had the superintendent submit such decision to the board for approval.

Two schools had the superintendent evaluate the total school program and relied on his judgment entirely. Eight schools worked it out on a cooperative basis.

A wide variation occurred among the ten schools in how the fourteen areas were administered.

School No. 1 in the survey gave the superintendent control of ten areas, the board controlled one and three were worked out cooperatively.

In School No. 2 the board assumed more responsibility. The superintendent had control of only one area. The board controlled eight and five were worked out on a cooperative basis.

Complete control in all fourteen of the areas was assumed by the superintendent in School No. 3.

School No. 4 allowed the superintendent to control seven areas and worked with him in the seven remaining areas on a cooperative basis.

The superintendent in School No. 5 assumed complete responsibility in eight of the areas. The board controlled two, and four were worked out on a cooperative basis.

School No. 6 allowed the superintendent to administer four areas; the board assumed control of seven and the remaining three areas were worked out on a cooperative basis.

The cooperative plan was used in eight areas in the seventh school that was surveyed. The superintendent had control of four areas and the board of education three.

School No. 8 used the cooperative plan in seven areas. The superintendent controlled four areas and the board of education three.

School No. 9 divided the responsibility almost equally. The superintendent and the board assumed responsibility in five areas each and the cooperative plan was used in the remaining areas.

School No. 10 used the cooperative plan in eight areas. The superintendent assumed control of five and the board handled the remaining one area.

Another area checked under existing practice was how the superintendent divided his time. Table II was compiled to illustrate this.

TABLE II Duties of the School Administrator and the Percent of Time Spent on Each in Ten Small School Systems										
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Teaching Classes	30	50	35	50	50	60	50	60	40	60
Coaching	0	0	10	0	0	20	0	0	0	0
Supervision of Teaching	15	10	15	20	15	5	15	10	10	10
Clerical Work	15	15	20	15	15	5	10	15	20	20
Purchasing, Personnel, Misc. Financial Prob.	40	25	20	15	20	10	5	15	30	10

In all but one school the superintendent spent more time teaching classes than in any other area. Superintendents in seven of the schools spent at least one half

of their time teaching classes.

Superintendents in three of the schools also had to do the coaching.

Four superintendents spent ten percent of their time in supervision of classes and four superintendents spent fifteen percent. In the two remaining schools one superintendent spent five percent and the other twenty percent of their time in supervision.

Clerical work occupied fifteen percent of the time of five administrators. Twenty percent of the time of three; five percent for one and ten percent for one.

None of the superintendents interviewed could break the percentage of time down further so the many smaller duties such as purchasing, interviewing salesmen, personnel problems, guidance, financial problems, etc. were all grouped under the miscellaneous heading. One superintendent spent five percent of his time in this area, two ten percent, two fifteen percent, two twenty percent, one twenty-five percent, one thirty percent and one forty percent.

CHAPTER V

STATISTICS RELATING TO SUPERINTENDENTS AND THE STANDARD OF ADMINISTRATIVE PRACTICES AS VIEWED BY THEM IN TEN SMALL SCHOOL SYSTEMS

The ten schools interviewed had a total of 32 superintendents over a period of ten years.

Two superintendents had been in their present position for eleven years, one superintendent six years, one for three years, five for two years, and one superintendent was serving his first year in his present position. Average tenure was 4.2 years.

Superintendents in 8 schools attended all school meetings. Superintendents in the two remaining schools attended all meetings if they were in town, but missed several meetings during the summer months.

Superintendents in 6 schools planned the board meetings with a written monthly program. Four superintendents did not plan the meetings.

TABLE III

TENURE OF SUPERINTENDENTS AND PRINCIPALS

School	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Number of superintendents over a ten year period	4	2	1	5	1	5	3	5	3	3
Number of principals over a ten year period	4	1	2	4	3	4	3	6	3	5
Number of years superintendent in present position	2	6	11	1	11	2	2	3	2	2

Six of the areas in the interview schedule in addition to present practices also wanted to know how the superintendent thought that they should exist.

Table IV was a result of the compiling of data on these areas.

TABLE IV

Administrative Responsibilities in Ten Small School Systems as the Superintendents Thought That They Should Be

	School	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Total
Selection of Teachers	Superintendent	x	x	x				x			x	5
	Board											0
	Cooperative Plan				x	x	x		x	x		5
Selection of Non-teaching Personnel	Superintendent	x	x	x				x			x	5
	Board						x					1
	Cooperative Plan				x	x			x	x	x	4
Preparation of Budget	Superintendent	x	x	x	x		x		x			5
	Board											0
	Cooperative Plan	x				x	x		x		x	5
Purchase of Supplies	Superintendent	x	x	x	x			x	x	x		7
	Board											0
	Cooperative Plan					x	x				x	3
Interpretation of Schools	Superintendent		x	x	x	x		x	x			6
	Board											0
	Cooperative Plan	x					x			x	x	4
Control of Extra Curricular Act.	Superintendent	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x	9
	Board											0
	Cooperative Plan						x					1
TOTAL	Superintendent	4	6	6	4	2	0	6	3	3	3	
	Board	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	
	Cooperative Plan	2	0	0	2	4	5	0	3	3	3	

In selection of teachers five superintendents thought that it was the duty of the administrator and five thought that a cooperative plan should be used whereby the superintendent would screen all applications and submit his choice to the board for approval.

Five administrators thought that it was the duty of the superintendent to select non-teaching personnel. Four thought that the same type of cooperative plan should be used as they suggested for teaching personnel and one thought that it was the responsibility of the board.

Five superintendents thought that they should prepare the budget and the other five thought that they should do so with the help of the board on a cooperative basis.

In purchase of supplies seven administrators thought that they should have full authority within the confines of the budget and the remaining three thought that a cooperative plan should be used.

Six superintendents thought that interpretation of the school was the duty of the superintendent and the four other superintendents thought a cooperative plan should be used.

Greatest agreement among the administrators came in the control of extra curricular activities. Nine thought that it was the responsibility of themselves and one thought that a cooperative plan should be used.

In three of the schools visited the superintendents thought that they should have control of all six areas. Two thought that the superintendent should assume control of four areas and use a cooperative plan on two. Three administrators would like control of three areas with a cooperative plan used on the other three. One superintendent thought he should control two areas and use a cooperative plan on four and one superintendent thought the board should control one area and use the cooperative plan on the other five.

Superintendents would, if they had more time, use it for supervision, guidance and testing.

Five superintendents would use additional time helping teachers more and supervising classes, four would improve their guidance and testing programs and one would devote more time to declamatory and music.

CHAPTER VI

School Boards and the Standards of Administrative practices as viewed by them.

School board membership was checked for board turnover and for occupational status as well as for the opinion in the six areas shown in Table V.

Of the ten schools surveyed turnover in school board membership for the most part had been very gradual. Seven of the schools had at least two members that had served ten years or longer. Two schools had a mild turnover with no members serving ten years and one school had a completely new school board, the result of a consolidation program the past year.

Eight of the ten schools had six member boards. Two schools had five member boards, the result of existing vacancies that had not been filled. This totaled fifty-eight board members and they came from the following occupational groups; farmers--twenty-seven; businessmen--fourteen; tradesmen--seven; bankers--four; doctors, mail carriers and housewives--two each. Farmers were represented on all boards except one.

Two school boards thought that it was the duty of the superintendent to select teachers. Three thought it was the duty of the school board and five thought that a cooperative plan should be used.

The same board members answered the same way in regard to the hiring of non-teaching personnel as they did for teaching personnel.

TABLE V

Administrative Responsibilities
in Ten Small School Systems
as Board Members Thought That They Should be.

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Total
Selection of Teachers	Superintendent Board	x		x								2
	Cooperative Plan		x				x			x		3
Selection of non-teaching personnel	Superintendent Board	x		x				x	x		x	5
	Cooperative Plan		x				x			x		3
Preparation of Budget	Superintendent Board			x	x	x		x	x		x	5
	Cooperative Plan		x				x	x	x		x	5
Purchase of Supplies	Superintendent Board	x		x	x							3
	Cooperative Plan		x									1
Interpretation of School	Superintendent Board			x	x	x		x	x	x		6
	Cooperative Plan	x					x				x	3
Control of Extra Curric. Act.	Superintendent Board	x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	9
	Cooperative Plan		x									1
TOTAL	Superintendent Board	4	0	6	4	3	1	2	2	3	1	
	Cooperative Plan	0	5	0	0	0	3	1	1	2	1	
		2	1	0	2	3	2	3	3	1	4	

There were four school boards that thought that the superintendent should prepare the budget. Five thought that it was the duty of the school board and one thought that a cooperative plan should be used.

Three school boards would turn the purchasing of supplies over to the superintendent. One would have the school board do it and six would use a cooperative plan.

Nine school boards thought that the superintendent should control all extra curricular activities and the one remaining school thought that a cooperative plan should be used.

Board members were also asked in what areas they thought superintendents they had known were the weakest. Their response was as follows:

Four School boards thought superintendents were weakest in public relations. They did a good job in school but could not get along with the public. Three boards thought that superintendents were weakest in finance. They wanted to spend too much. Two boards thought the lack of discipline was the downfall of superintendents that they had known. One board said that they were weakest in detail work, reports were inadequate, etc.

Five school boards were operating under a written set of school board policies. The other five schools were all working on policies.

CHAPTER VII

Classroom Teachers and Their Relationship to
the Superintendent and the Board

The survey did not deal with the classroom teacher to any great extent. Two questions in the survey asked about them and they were asked the one question, "From your experience as a teacher what do you consider some ways in which administration of schools could be improved."

The first inquiry in regard to teachers asked to what extent they had a voice in preparation of a salary schedule. Four schools allowed the teachers a voice in preparing such a schedule. Six school boards set the salary and offered it to the teachers on a take it or leave it basis. Teachers were not consulted before hand to find their wishes or ideas.

The other question dealing with teachers was to what extent they had a voice in curriculum construction. Five schools allowed the teachers to partake in the planning of the curriculum. The remaining five schools gave the teachers no voice in curriculum planning.

Three teachers thought that superintendents did not screen personnel closely enough when new teachers were hired. Five teachers thought that superintendents did not give the teachers proper backing when discipline problems arose. Three teachers thought superintendents should explain the policies and standards better than they were doing. Five teachers thought superintendents were not assuming full responsibility and did not carry their fair share of the load. Six teachers listed lack

of cooperation with the staff as a grievance. They felt they were not consulted or informed on policies affecting themselves.

TABLE VI

How 20 teachers thought administration of schools could be best improved

Teachers	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	
Selection of Personnel	x								x				x							3	
Back-up Teachers in Discipline Prob.			x			x							x				x		x	5	
Better explanation of policies and Stan.					x				x									x		3	
Failure to assume responsibility						x				x					x	x				x	5
Lack of Cooperation with Staff	x	x					x	x				x				x				6	
Public Relations	x			x							x		x						x	5	
Getting Supplies							x					x								2	

Five teachers thought that superintendents fell down in selling themselves to the public. They could not get along with people. Two teachers thought that they did not get all of the supplies that they should have received. Several teachers listed several items so the grand total would exceed 20.

CHAPTER VIII

GENERALIZATIONS SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

In general, the facts in the survey indicate that:

1. Schools are run primarily as the board wishes them to be run. The board's ideas on how they should be run were closer to existing conditions than were ideas expressed by superintendents.
2. School board members assume more control in areas involving personnel and expenditure of funds than they do in areas of curriculum and extra curricular activities.
3. Farmers are represented on most school boards. All of the schools except one had farmers on the board and nearly half of the overall membership on all of the boards were farmers.
4. Superintendents in the ten schools surveyed spend most of their time teaching classes. Seven of the superintendents spent half or more of their time in the classroom.

SUMMARY

In view of all of the facts gathered, it is safe to assume that:

1. Schools are run as the boards of education wish.
2. Schools could be classified into one of 3 classes; Superintendent controlled, board controlled, or run co-operatively on the basis of who controlled the major portion of the fourteen areas listed in the survey. Four schools could be classified as superintendent controlled, two could be called board controlled and the four remain-

ing schools would be classified as run on a cooperative basis.

3. The average tenure for superintendents in the ten schools surveyed was 4.2 years.

4. All of the boards apparently desire a written set of policies. Five schools already have them and the remaining five schools are working on them.

CONCLUSIONS:

This survey tends to confirm the belief that considerable confusion does exist in the assumption of administrative duties. In no two schools was the pattern the same in the assumption of these duties. In most of the schools the variation was great.

No definite standards for administrative relationships are recognized. An administrator going into a new system would have to have an understanding with the board on how the various areas were to be handled because of the lack of standards.

The author feels that the absence of such standards militates against a good school system. He would like to suggest it as a field in which further study should be made.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books and Thesis

ARCHERD, Frederic, "Comparison of the efficiency of school systems in relation to the tenure of superintendents," Unpublished Masters Dissertation, University of Nebraska, 1931.

CYR, Frank W. Responsibility for Rural School Administration, No. 579, Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City, 1933.

DERBY, C. N. "Financing extra curricular activities in 168 High Schools in Northwestern Iowa," Masters Thesis, University of South Dakota, 1939.

HAISLEY, BALLOU, et al., The Superintendent of Schools and His Work, American Association of School Administrators, C., February, 1940.

HAZELBARKER, Norval Denver, "An Analysis of Certain Methods and Procedures Used by Local Boards of Education in Arkansas," Doctors Dissertation, University of Arkansas, 1953.

LACER, "Study of turnover and teacher adjustment in the small school," Masters Thesis, University of Washington, 1940.

LUCKMAN, Lloyd D. and GERTSBACKER, Charles A. "Area's of Conflict in California School Administration" Research in Education Bulletin No. 4, July, 1951, Doctors Dissertation, Stanford University.

MONROE, Walter S., Encyclopedia of Educational Research, Rev. Ed. Macmillan Co., New York, 1950.

_____, Report from National Inst., Teachers Placement Assoc., to the National Conference of Prof. and Ed. Adm., delivered at A.A.S.A., Regional Conference, St. Louis, Missouri, February, 1952.

APPENDIX

INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR OMAHA UNIVERSITY PROJECT

(Used in interviews of superintendents and board members)

PERSONNEL

1. In the selection of teachers (interviewing and hiring).
 - a. What are the duties of the superintendent at present?
 - b. What should the duties of the superintendent be in an ideal situation?
 - c. What are the duties of the members of the board of education?
 - d. What should be the duties of the board members in an ideal situation?
2. In the selection of non-teaching personnel (interviewing and hiring).
 - a. What are the duties of the superintendent at present?
 - b. What should the duties of the superintendent be in an ideal situation?
 - c. What are the duties of the members of the board of education?
 - d. What should be the duties of the board members in an ideal situation?
3. In preparing a salary schedule, or determining salaries for the coming year:
 - a. To what extent do the teachers have a voice?
 - b. What is the superintendent's responsibility?
 - c. What is the board's responsibility?
 - d. What difficulties arise with this problem of salaries, etc.?
4.
 - A. Who makes the decisions in regard to personnel policies such as sick leave, arrangements for securing substitute teachers, and the fixing of working hours for the staff?
 - B. What misunderstandings, if any, exist as to the proper responsibilities of board and superintendent in these matters?
5. With respect to the evaluation of teaching skill, especially in relation to promotion, retention, and discharge:

- A. How are judgments reached? Who participates and what methods are used?
- B. Have you encountered any difficulties which may be attributed to the methods used?

FINANCE

- 6. In the preparation of the budget?
 - A. What are the duties of the superintendent at present?
 - B. What should the duties of the superintendent be in an ideal situation?
 - C. What are the duties of the members of the Board of Education?
 - D. What should be the duties of the Board members in an ideal situation?
- 7. In the purchase of supplies and equipment:
 - A. What are the duties of the superintendent at present?
 - B. What should the duties of the superintendent be in an ideal situation?
 - C. What are the duties of the members of the Board of Education?
 - D. What should be the duties of the board members in an ideal situation?
- 8. In permitting the use of building and school facilities for public gatherings:
 - a. Does the board have an established policy or does it decide each request on the basis of merit?
 - b. Are the arrangements for using facilities made with the superintendent or the board?
 - c. What problems have arisen over the use of buildings or facilities?
- 9. In the interpretation of the school to the general public:
 - a. What are the duties of the superintendent at present?
 - b. What should the duties of the superintendent be in an ideal situation?
 - c. What are the duties at present of board members in this area?

- d. What should be the duties of the board members in an ideal situation?
- 10. In case of an attack against the school system from the community:
 - a. What would be the responsibility of the superintendent ?
 - B. What would be the responsibility of the board members?
- 11. A. In case an irate parent approaches a board member:
 - a. What does the board member usually do?
 - b. In your opinion, what should he do?
- B. In case a patron demanding a special favor approaches a member of the board?

PUPILS

- 12. A. What part does the board play in determining policies governing the school entrance age, graduation requirements, etc.
- B. What is the superintendent's role in determining such policies?
- C. Are these arrangements satisfactory?
- 13. A. Who establishes rules of conduct?
- B. Who enforces these rules?
- C. If unfavorable community action develops, who accepts the responsibility for the policies in force?

CURRICULUM and SUPERVISION

- 14. A. What is the board's role in determining what shall be included in the curriculum?
- B. What is the superintendent's role?
- C. To what extent do teachers have a voice in curriculum construction?
- 15. In the control of extra-curricular activities:
 - a. What are the duties of the superintendent at present?
 - b. What should the duties of the superintendent be in an ideal situation?

- c. What are the duties at present of board members in this area?
 - d. What should be the duties of board members in an ideal situation?
16. In evaluating the total school program:
- a. To what extent are pupils, teachers, and patrons asked to consider the effectiveness of the school program?
 - b. How much does the board rely upon the superintendent to judge the quality of the school work?
 - c. To what extent do boards base their judgment upon school visitations?
 - d. To what extent do board members control the school program by making suggestions to teachers, janitors, etc.?
17. Among the superintendents you have known, what seems to be the area or areas in which they were the weakest (board only)
18. If you had additional time, in what areas would you do more work? (Supt. only).
19. What determines the selection of a new superintendent of schools?
20. In what respects are colleges failing to train school administrators well?

Vital Statistics Concerning School System

- 1. How many superintendents of schools has this school system had in the past ten years?
- 2. How many principals of the high school has this system had in the past ten years?
- 3. How long have you been in your present position?
- 4. What has been the turn-over in school board membership in the past ten years?
- 5. As a superintendent, how do you divide your time during the year as far as percentage is concerned:
 - Personnel problems
 - Financial problems
 - Building and repair problems
 - Supervision of teaching
 - Working with the curriculum
 - Clerical work (letters, etc.)

Purchasing (interviewing salesmen, etc.)
Working with community groups
Other Activities

6. What methods are used by the community to assure the selection of good school board members?
7. School board members are from what trade or occupational group?
8. Is there a record of policies determined by the board which is available to teachers and the general public?
9. To what extent does the superintendent attend board meetings?

Does he plan the program for the board meetings?

Interview Guide for High School Principals, High
School Teachers, Elementary Principal,
and Elementary Teachers

1. From your experience as a teacher what do you consider some of the ways in which administration of schools could be improved?

(Provide a list of areas which is to be used only when the teacher has difficulty in responding).

1. Curriculum
2. Public relations
3. Working hours for staff
4. Passing on information
5. Getting supplies