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Introductory.

1. Introduction.

At the very outset let it be understood that the writer lays no claim to an exhaustive treatment of his subject. The problem is a too intricate one, the field too extensive, to be covered within the scope of a treatise such as this. It comprises a task worthy the effort of years, to be contained in several volumes. All that dare be hoped as a result of this effort is to indicate the tendency toward centralization in educational administration.

2. Definition.

"Centralization in educational administration means roughly the removal of authority and responsibility from local and popular sources to those more centralized and remote". (Dutton, S. T. and Snedden, D. S. in their Administration of Public Education in the United States". p.97.)

Centralization is the term used "to designate the tendency in school administration to concentrate authority and to reduce management by layman". (Snedden, D. S., in Cyclopedia of Education, edited by Paul Monroe, Vol.1,p.557.

Centralization is the tendency to make the state the unit of authorization and control in educational administration.

3. The problem.

Though the tenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States indirectly "reserved to the states respectively or to the people" the care of public education, the Federal Constitution made no mention of it. Nor did it fare much better with the
states. Of the sixteen states making up the Union in 1880, the original thirteen and Vermont, Kentucky and Tennessee, eight made no mention whatever of education; the other eight, Vermont, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Pennsylvania, Delaware, North Carolina, Georgia, and Tennessee, only briefly.

As a result decentralization reigned supreme. "Each district was a law unto itself; of uniformity and system there was none". Local initiative and local public sentiment were the controlling factors in all matters educational.

Today there is not one of the forty-eight states of the Union but what has a state system of public education, exercising powers of authorization and control to a larger or less degree.

The evolution of educational administration from the original stage of decentralization to the present stage of centralization implied the problem suggesting this treatise. To trace that evolution, its purpose.


The general method of the investigation has been to trace historically each separate phase of the movement. Wherever possible, comparisons have been made between the present and some former periods. Tables and charts are employed wherever sufficient data was available to make such tables and charts practical.

Nineteen phases of the tendency toward centralization in educational administration have been so treated. These, in alphabetical order, are:

(1) Certification of teachers.

(2) Compulsory attendance.
(3) Consolidation of Schools.
(4) Course of Study.
(5) Fraternities.
(6) Kindergartens.
(7) Length of school year.
(8) Libraries.
(9) Medical inspection.
(10) Military drill.
(11) Minimum salaries for teachers.
(12) Pensions, Teachers'.
(13) Schoolhouse construction and sanitation.
(14) State aid.
(15) State boards of education.
(16) State Superintendent of public instruction.
(17) Textbooks.
(18) Units or organization.
(19) Vocational education.

5. Acknowledgement.

The problem of this thesis, and the method of treatment, were suggested by Professor Freeman Daughters. To his guidance, his readiness to suggest references, and his help in every difficulty, I gratefully acknowledge my indebtedness.
Certification of Teachers.

The development of thirty-five years as indicated by three statements of 1881, 1894 and 1916:

"Teachers' certificates are too plenty and too cheap; such a standard should be required as will give them real professional value". (Report of the Commissioner, United States Bureau of Education, 1881, p.227).

"The local authority has absolute control over the appointment and payment of teachers. The city boards issue their own certificates, while the rural boards are only allowed to employ teachers who are certificated by the county board; but this important task is very inefficiently performed by the county board, and the whole method of certifying and employing teachers is admitted to be unsatisfactory. The state board can issue certificates, but the majority of teachers never trouble to apply for them". (Report of the Royal Commission, United States Bureau of Education, Report of the Commissioner, 1894, Vol.1,p.644.)

"The tendency constantly to demand higher qualifications of those who aspire to teach shows no abatement. About one half of the states whose legislatures met in 1916 amended their laws relating to teachers' certificates". (United States Bureau of Education, Report of the Commissioner, Vol.1,p.25.)

In the early New England settlements, the earliest method of examination and certification was to vest full authority in the minister. He examined the applicant, and passed on his qualifications. Later this duty devolved upon the selectmen,
and in the course of time upon the county superintendent or other local officer. "But the results were not satisfactory. The certificates were not of equal value, and the credentials of one county could not be utilized by another. An attempt was made to remedy the evil by causing the questions of all examinations to be prepared by a central agency, generally in the office of the state superintendent, but it was still not sufficient, for the grading of the papers was done according to varying ideals of perfection. The plan now generally accepted as the most efficient, is to place the entire matter in the control of state officers. Substantially this plan is followed in many of the states". (United States Bureau of education, Report of the Commissioner, 1911, Vol.1,p.92.)

Forty-seven states at present have some legislation bearing more or less directly upon state control of the certification of teachers. This legislation may be divided into five types. In order to indicate the progress toward centralization, I have compared the existent status of this legislation with that of thirteen years ago, 1903. The different types are not described as they are self-explanatory.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State System</th>
<th>Number of states having in 1903</th>
<th>Number of states having in 1916</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 states</td>
<td>17 states</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama, Connecticut, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, North Dakota, West Virginia.</td>
<td>Vermont Rhode Island, New Jersey, Virginia, West Virginia, Iowa, North Dakota, Minnesota, Nebraska, South Dakota, Wyoming, Arizona,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>System</th>
<th>31 states</th>
<th>16 states</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>System</td>
<td>2 states</td>
<td>8 states</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Texas, Ohio, Michigan, Wisconsin, Kansas, Colorado.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>System</td>
<td>2 states</td>
<td>6 states</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>System</td>
<td></td>
<td>North Carolina, Delaware.</td>
<td>1 state</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The greatest decentralization prevails in the North East, five of the eight state-county-local systems, being found there. In the West is to be found the greatest centralization, twelve of the sixteen state systems being west of the Mississippi River. All of the state-local systems are east of the Mississippi River.

Inter-state recognition of diplomas and certificates.

Twenty-eight states recognize both diplomas and certificates. These states are, Arizona, California, Idaho, Nevada, Oregon, Washington, Utah, Wyoming, South Dakota, Kansas, Nebraska, Oklahoma, Missouri, Wisconsin, Michigan, Indiana, Illinois, Ohio, South Carolina, West Virginia, Virginia, Pennsylvania, New York, New Jersey, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and New Mexico.

Nine states, Montana, North Dakota, Minnesota, Colorado, Maryland, New Hampshire, Maine, Delaware, Texas, recognize diplomas but not certificates.

One state, Iowa, recognizes certificates, but not diplomas.

The remaining ten states recognize neither diplomas nor certificates. These states are, North Carolina, Florida, Kentucky, Tennessee, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Georgia, Arkansas.

Hence twenty-nine states recognize certificates, thirty-seven recognize diplomas.

Examples of centralization.

New Jersey, in 1916, added to the state board of examiners one assistant state commissioner of education. The board is
authorized to examine teachers, grant state certificates, and revoke the same under rules prescribed by the state board of education.

Mississippi, in 1916, established among other provisions, the following, "that the state board of examiners may accept a teacher's credentials issued in another state, and issue thereon a first-grade license if the qualifications are shown to be at least equal to those required for a first-grade license in Mississippi.

Maryland in an entirely new school code adopted in 1916, provides for eleven definite certificates, and fixes the qualifications of their holder.

In the matter of legislative progress, Indiana affords an interesting example. The following is a digest of The Licensing of Teachers, by W. R. Rawles, in Centralizing Tendencies in Administration in Indiana, pp. 85-92.

1824, law enacted giving sub-trustees of school districts authority to employ a teacher who was required "to produce the certificate of the township trustees that they had examined him touching his qualifications, and particularly as respects his knowledge of the English language, writing and arithmetic".

1833, law enacted providing for the examination of an applicant "touching his ability to teach reading, writing, and arithmetic."

1834, law passed providing for the appointment by the circuit court of three examiners of each county, "to certify the branches of learning each applicant was qualified
to teach".

1847, law passed raising qualifications to teach to orthography reading, writing, arithmetic, English grammar, and geography.

1852, State Superintendent given power to examine all applicants for license, and to grant certificates for one and two years.

1865, State Board of Education given power to grant "state certificates of qualification to such teachers as may upon a critical and thorough examination be found to possess eminent scholarship, and professional ability, and shall furnish satisfactory evidence of good moral character".

1899, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, and State Board of Education, made exclusive agencies for issuing licenses.

A comparison of the scholarship requirements of Pennsylvania, in 1903, and in 1916;

1903 -

For state certificate: Graduate from a four years' collegiate course. Must be twenty-one years of age, a successful teacher, and a person of good moral character.

For permanent certificate: Must hold a professional certificate. (Three years holder of professional certificate)

For professional certificate: Examination same as provisional certificate, and the applicant must have had success in teaching.

For provisional certificate: Examination in orthography,
reading, writing, geography, English grammar, written
and mental arithmetic, United States history, theory
and art of teaching, civil government, including
state and local government, elementary geography.

1916 -

For permanent state certificate: Holder of a professional
certificate for two or more years, and certificate of
successful teaching for two school terms, from proper
superintendents and boards of school directors; proof
of careful reading of at least four books on pedagogy
approved by the State Superintendent, and examining
in all the branches enumerated under the requirements
for professional and provisional certificates.

For permanent College certificates: Graduation from a college
or university approved by the College and University
Council of Pennsylvania, and of approved apartments there
in. (Three years experience with provisional college
certificate.

For provisional college certificate: Same as for permanent
college certificate, on evidence of having completed
during his college or university course not less than
200 hours'work in pedagogical studies, such as psychol-
ogy, ethics, logic, history of education, school manage-
ment, and methods of teaching.

For state normal school diploma: Diploma issued by a state
normal school of Pennsylvania.

For state normal school certificate: Certificate issued by
a state normal school of Pennsylvania.

For special certificate: Graduate of an approved special school of such subjects, under such conditions as the state superintendent may impose.

For professional certificate: Examination in all branches required for a provisional certificate, and in addition any two of the following: Vocal music, drawing, English literature, plane geometry, general history, physical geography, elementary botany, elementary zoology, or elementary physics. Must satisfy said superintendent of intelligent reading of two books on pedagogy approved for such purposes by the state superintendent.

For provisional certificate: Examination in spelling, reading, writing, physiology and hygiene, geography, grammar, arithmetic, elementary algebra, history of United States and of Pennsylvania, civil government, including state and local government, school management and methods of teaching.
T INDICATING THE DEVELOPMENT
HE CERTIFICATION OF TEACHERS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>States</th>
<th>County System</th>
<th>State-Local System</th>
<th>State-County-Local System</th>
<th>State-County System</th>
<th>State System</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1903 1916 1903 1916 1903 1916 1903 1916 1903 1916
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Compulsory attendance.

Compulsory attendance in the form of state legislation came as a result of the development of the factory system. Childhood came to have a new and larger commercial value, it became an asset. As a result of its earning power in the factories of Massachusetts, the children were sent to the mills instead of to the schools. So great had the evil become, and so urgent some remedy, that the Massachusetts legislature, through the efforts of Horace Mann, passed in 1852 the first state compulsory attendance law. That law, as amended in 1859, provided for an attendance annually of at least twelve weeks, six weeks of which must be consecutive, for every child between the ages of eight and fourteen years. For every neglect of such duty a fine not to exceed $20.00 should be forfeited to the use of the city or town.

This was not the first attempt to compel parents and guardians to provide for the education of children under their control. Two hundred and ten years before Massachusetts passed the first state compulsory education law, the following order was issued by the general court of the Massachusetts Colony: "This court, taking into consideration the great neglect of many parents and masters in training up their children in learning and labor, and other employments which may be profitable to the commonwealth, do hereupon order and decree that in every town the chosen men appointed for managing the prudential affairs of the same shall henceforth stand charged with the care of the redress of this evil, so as they shall be sufficiently punished by fines for the neglect thereof, upon presentation of the grand jury, or other information.
or complaint in any court within this jurisdiction; and for this end they, or the greater number of them shall have power to take account from time to time of all parents and masters, and of their children, concerning their calling and employment of their children, especially of their ability to read and understand the principles of religion and the capital laws of their country, and to impose fines upon such as shall refuse to render such account to them when they shall be required". (Records Massachusetts Colony, Vol.II, #6).

Five years later, 1647, the following order was added to the above: "It being one chief project of that old deluder, Satan, to keep men from the knowledge of the Scriptures, as in former times, keeping them in an unknown tongue, so in these latter times by persuading them from the use of tongues, so that at least, the true sense and meaning of the original might be clouded with glosses of saint seeming deceivers; and that learning may not be buried in the graves of our forefathers in church and commonwealth the Lord assisting our endeavors; it is therefore ordered by this courte, and authority thereof, That every township within this jurisdiction, after that the Lord hath increased them to the number of fifty householders, shall then forthwith appointe one within their towne to teach all such children as shall resort to him, to write and read; whose wages shall be paid either by the parents or masters of such children, or by the inhabitants in general, by way of supplye as the major part of those who order the prudentials of the towne shall appointe; provided that those who send their children, bee not oppresses by paying much more than they can have them taught for in other townes. And it is further
ordered, that where any towne shall increase to the number of one hundred families or howsholders, they shall sett up a grammar schoole, the master thereof being able to instruct youths so far as they may bee fitted for the university; and in any towne neglect the performance hereof above one yeare, then every such towne shall pay five puonds per annum to the next such school till they shall perform this order". (Records Massachusetts Colony Vol.II, p.203.)

During the sixty-five years since the adoption of compulsory school attendance legislation by Massachusetts, similar laws have been passed in every state with the one exception of Mississippi. The order of the adoption of such legislation follows:

1852, Massachusetts.
1864, District of Columbia.
1867, Vermont.
1872, Connecticut, New Mexico.
1873, Nevada.
1874, New York, Kansas, California.
1875, Maine, New Jersey.
1876, Wyoming.
1877, Ohio.
1879, Wisconsin.
1883, Rhode Island, Illinois, Dakota, Montana.
1885, Minnesota.
1887, Nebraska, Idaho,
1889, South Dakota, Colorado, Oregon.
1890, Utah.
1895, Pennsylvania.
1896, Kentucky.
1897, West Virginia, Indiana,
1899, Arizona.
1902, Iowa, Maryland.
1905, Missouri, Tennessee.
1907, Delaware, North Carolina, Oklahoma.
1908, Virginia.
1909, Arkansas,
1910, Louisiana.
1915, South Carolina, Florida, Alabama, Texas.
1916, Georgia.

It is not to be assumed that at first these represented all that was to be desired. Though prior to 1900, thirty-two states had laws relating to compulsory attendance, many of these were ineffective, and most of them were not sufficiently thoroughgoing in their requirements to meet the demands satisfactorily. But since 1900 progress has been rapid, weaknesses have been eliminated and amendments have been made until most of the state compulsory attendance laws are now worthy of the name.

Annual period of required attendance.

In every state but five the law prescribes the full school term as the annual period. The five which have other requirements are:

Arkansas - specifies not less than one half the time the public school is in session.

Maryland - prescribes full time in Baltimore, not less than
four months elsewhere.

Nebraska - specifies not less than two thirds of entire
time school is in session.

Oklahoma - at least two thirds of time school is in session.

Missouri - specifies three fourths of the school year.

It hardly seems necessary to commend the full time require­
ment as the only logical one. Legislative enactment prescribing
a partial school year, would seem to sanction irregular and fit­
full attendance. And yet discretionary power is essential to the
just enforcement of the law. To this end, in almost every state
 provision is made for exemption under certain condition.

Compulsory age.

Of the forty-seven states now having compulsory laws, seventeen make seven years of age the lower limit, twenty-nine make eight years of age the lower limit, and one makes nine years of age the lower limit; while the age at which a child may withdraw from school provided he has certain educational attainments,
is twelve in three states, fourteen in seventeen states, fifteen in ten states, sixteen in sixteen states, and eighteen in one state.

The full period for compulsory attendance ranges from four years in Virginia and North Carolina, to ten years in Idaho. In two states the full period for compulsory attendance is four years, in one it is five years, in ten it is six years, in three it is seven years, in fifteen it is eight years, in four it is nine years, and in one it is ten years.

Penalties.

Penalties upon parents for failure to live up to the
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law are provided by forty-two states. These vary from $1.00, minimum in Indiana, to $300.00, maximum in Idaho, and imprisonment of from two days, minimum in Indiana and Michigan, to six months, maximum in Idaho. Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Mississippi, South Carolina, and Texas are the six states prescribing no penalties.

Only nine states, Iowa, Maine, Minnesota, North Carolina, Oregon, South Carolina, Vermont, Virginia, and Wisconsin, provide for penalties upon other than parents. Fines of from $5.00 minimum in North Carolina, Oregon, Virginia, and Wisconsin, to $100.00, maximum in Vermont are specified. Minnesota also provides for an imprisonment of not more than ten days. Maine extends these penalties to cover any city or town neglecting to elect a truant officer.

Table showing the progress of the adoption of compulsory school attendance legislation by five year periods. The table includes the District of Columbia.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years (inclusive)</th>
<th>Number of states adopting</th>
<th>Total number having adopted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>From 1852 to 1860</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From 1861 to 1865</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From 1866 to 1870</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From 1871 to 1875</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From 1876 to 1880</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From 1881 to 1885</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From 1886 to 1890</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From 1891 to 1895</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From 1896 to 1900</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From 1901 to 1905</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From 1906 to 1910</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From 1911 to 1915</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During 1916</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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CHART INDICATING THE PROGRESS OF THE ADOPTION OF
COMPULSORY SCHOOL ATTENDANCE LEGISLATION.
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Digest of State Laws Relating to Public Education.
Consolidation of Schools.

Then two or more school districts are made into a single district, and as a result one school in one building replaces two or more small schools in several buildings, we have what is known as consolidation of schools.

The first law permitting such consolidation of schools was passed by New York in 1853. Sixteen years later in 1869, Massachusetts passed a law permitting both the consolidation of schools, and the expenditure of funds for the transportation of children. This law was put into operation five years later, in 1874, by the town of Quincy; in the following year by Montagne; and four years later, in 1879, in Concord.

Connecticut was the next state to pass such a law, when the legislature in 1889 authorized the consolidation of districts. Four years later, in 1893, it made provision for the expenditure of funds for the transportation of children.

By 1900 eight other states had followed with similar legislation. These states were, Maine, 1893; Ohio, 1894; Iowa, 1895; Nebraska, 1897; Rhode Island and New Hampshire, 1898; Kansas, 1896; and Indiana, 1899.

Since 1900 the movement has made rapid progress, every state in the Union, with the one exception of Alabama, making some provision for the consolidation of schools. But though Alabama has not directly provided for the consolidation of schools by legislative enactment, the county boards of education have the power of fixing school districts after holding a public hearing advertised three weeks in the local papers, and by posters.
in the districts affected. Hence consolidation is possible. In 1914, however, consolidation of schools, with transportation of pupils, was found in only a few instances.

Persuasive legislation.

At least six states have resorted to this type of legislation in order to encourage the consolidation of schools.

Minnesota in 1911, passed the Holmberg act, under which schools are aided from school funds.

North Dakota and Wisconsin, in 1913, both passed laws quite similar to the Holmberg law of Minnesota.

The Missouri legislature passed a law in 1913, which provides that the state will pay one fourth of the cost of a building for this purpose, up to $2,000.00, and will also pay annually for the maintenance of the school $25.00 for each square mile in the consolidated districted.

The Iowa legislature in the same year voted to give $250.00 for equipment, and $200.00 annually for each consolidated school of two school rooms teaching agriculture, home economics, and other industrial or vocational subjects; $350.00 for equipment and $500.00 annually for schools of three rooms; and $500.00 for equipment and $500.00 annually for each school or four or more rooms.

Washington pays to the consolidated schools, from the state school funds, an annual bonus of $170.00 for each school abandoned, less one.

Examples of the progress of the movement within states:

Indiana passed its law permitting the consolidation of
schools in 1899. By 1909, during a period of ten years, more
or less complete consolidation had been effected in 486 of the
1017 townships in the state; and the number of schools of less
than twenty children was reduced from 4180 to 1755. About
25,000 children were being transported to and from school each
day, at public expense, and about 2,500 privately.

Ohio passed its law in 1904. By 1910 there were 178 con­
solidated in the state.

An idea of the progress of the movement in Massachusetts
may be gained by a study of the expenditure of the state for
transportation each year since the state board of education
began collecting such information. This table, up to 1913,
is from the United States Bureau of Education Bulletin # 30,
1914, follows :

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1888-89</td>
<td>$22,118.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1889-90</td>
<td>24,145.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890-91</td>
<td>30,648.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891-92</td>
<td>38,726.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1892-93</td>
<td>50,590.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1893-94</td>
<td>63,617.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1894-95</td>
<td>76,608.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1895-96</td>
<td>91,136.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1896-97</td>
<td>105,317.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1897-98</td>
<td>123,032.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1898-99</td>
<td>127,409.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1899-00</td>
<td>141,753.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900-01</td>
<td>151,773.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1901-02</td>
<td>165,596.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Number of states adopting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1853</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1869</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1889</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1893</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1894</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1895</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1896</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1897</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1898</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1899</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1901</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1902</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1903</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1904</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1912</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1913</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>????</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table showing the progress of the movement,
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The adoption of a series of uniform textbooks for use in the schools, whether in the district, township, county, or state unit, by no means determines the course of study. That is a much more comprehensive term and implies not only the text books to be used, but an outline of the work to be followed by the teacher, designating the amount of work to be covered in any period of time, methods to be employed, tools, collaterals, etc. The very fact that such a course of study can be made out, and that it be followed is required by mandatory legislation, is evidence of powerful centralization in administration. And yet such courses of study have been outlined more or less completely, and are being used in at least twenty-four states, while in at least fifteen others special subjects are required taught. These thirty-nine states are: Idaho, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Mississippi, Montana, Nevada, North Dakota, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Utah, Washington, West Virginia, Arizona, Texas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Indiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Tennessee, Virginia, Wisconsin, New York, North Carolina, Iowa, New Hampshire, Minnesota, Vermont, Michigan, Nebraska, Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Missouri, Ohio, and Oklahoma.

Except in New England where the town is the unit, everywhere the district and township have given way to either county or state uniformity. The evolution has been from the individual local school, to a uniformity in district or township; from the district or township to a uniformity in county (town in New England); from the county to a uniformity in the state; from
a uniformity within the state to a uniformity throughout all the states. The first four stages of this evolution has been aided largely by legislation, the fifth stage has come largely as a result or requirements to be met in institutions of higher learning.

In Centralizing Tendencies in the Administration of Indiana, pp. 92-99, Dr. W. A. Rawles has given a very detailed history of the evolution of the course of study in that state, which may be taken as typical of the development of the course of study legislation generally. An outline of Dr. Rawles' statement follows:

1819, First legal utterance bearing on the subject of the course of study, authorizing trustees to distribute certain school funds "in proportion to the number of schools (scholars) learning the English language", which would seem to indicate that English was required.

1824, Legal provision made to require a certificate as to the teacher's qualifications "in the English language, writing and arithmetic", which would seem to indicate an addition of two subjects to the curriculum of 1819.

1855, Permissive legislation provided "other languages" might be taught "as a branch of education".

1865, Law provided "that the common schools of the state shall be taught in the English language, and the trustees shall provide to have orthography, reading, writing, geography, arithmetic, English grammar, and good behavior, and such other branches of learning and other languages as the advancement of the pupils may require and the trustees from time to time direct."
1861, Provision made for a central school for advanced pupils promoted from primary schools.

1873, Authority given to combine and establish graded schools.

1884, Convention of county superintendents adopted a standard course of study covering a period of eight years, of six or seven months each.

1890, A course of study prepared for district graded and non-commissioned high schools of the state by county and city superintendents, and state board of education.

1894, First manual on course of study prepared for the teachers of the state by a commission appointed by the association of county superintendents.

The following fourteen states have a uniform course of study for the state: Idaho, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Mississippi, Montana, Nevada, North Dakota, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Vermont, Washington, West Virginia and Arizona.

In the following ten states a minimum course of course of study is compulsory in the state: California, Colorado, Connecticut, Indiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Tennessee, Virginia, Wisconsin and Texas.

The following eight have made compulsory instruction in physiology and hygiene: New York, North Carolina, Iowa, New Hampshire, Minnesota, Vermont, Michigan, and Nebraska.

In the following seventeen states elementary instruction in agriculture is now required: Alabama, Arkansas, California, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Maine, Mississippi, Missouri, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Texas, West Virginia, and Wisconsin.
In many of the states the Commissioner of Education (Superintendent of Public Instruction) has power or is required to make out the course of study. Arkansas and New Jersey are examples of this. In some states a special commission is appointed to do this work, as in Utah.
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Fraternities.

Before state-wide legislation came to be enacted to solve the problem of fraternities in public schools, it had been taken up by many of the important cities throughout the country.

Camden, New Jersey, had by municipal legislation forbidden high school students to organize any kind of society without permission from the board of education.

The board of education of Reading, Pennsylvania, had adopted rules denying public recognition to any secret society not having a charter from the faculty of the school. To be eligible to student offices, students must testify that they were not members of any secret society.

The debarrment of fraternity members from participation in honors or offices had been the method chosen by several cities; for example, Omaha, Nebraska; Columbus, Ohio; and Sedalia, Missouri.

At Pueblo and Boulder, Colorado, the school authorities appealed to the parents for their support in abolishing the fraternities.

The following cities in which the school authorities were endeavoring to solve the problem, will indicate how wide-spread the agitation was: Des Moines, Iowa; Los Angeles, California; Madison, Wisconsin; Springfield, Illinois; Wichita, Kansas; Bloomington, Indiana; Salt Lake, Utah; East Orange, New Jersey; Kokomo, Indiana; Marshalltown, Iowa.

Also it may not be amiss to note that the well known Seattle
case of "Vayland v Board of School Directors of District No.1 of Seattle et al, tried in the Superior court, and carried to the Supreme court, was decided in 1906, a year before any state legislation had been enacted in the United States, and four years before Washington took any such state action.

The Supreme court in affirming the judgment of the Superior court, declared "under our statutes the respondent school board had undoubted authority to take the action of which appellant complains, and the courts should not interfere with said board in the enforcement of rules and regulations which it has adopted". (State School Systems, United States Bureau of Education, Bulletin # 3, 1906, pp. 141.)

The first legislation to be passed with a view to control or abolish the secret society in the public school, was in 1907. In that year Indiana, Kansas, and Minnesota passed laws of this nature.


Thus it appears that though the movement is only nine years old, eighteen states have direct legislation prohibiting or declaring unlawful secret societies in public schools, while one other, Pennsylvania, indirectly prohibits by giving school directors power to make rules regulating all student activities.

All of these states direct legislation against elementary
and high school secret societies; two of them, Mississippi and South Carolina, prohibit such secret societies in all educational institutions, including the universities, supported in whole or in part by the state.

Iowa, Montana, Nebraska, Ohio, Oklahoma and Vermont, provide definite penalties. Offenders may be dismissed, suspended, expelled and debarred from graduation.

In all of the states in which mention is made of those who are charged with the enforcement of these laws, the authority and responsibility is placed upon the school officers, committees, trustees, or boards of directors.

Michigan established a precedent in fraternity legislation when in 1911 she added as a part of the law a penalty for officers who failed or refused to perform duties imposed, of a fine of not less than $10.00, nor more than $25.00.

The progress of the movement may be noted from the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of states enacting legislation</th>
<th>Total number of states having legislation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1907</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1908</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1909</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1912</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1913</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1914</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The Kindergarten.

After thirty-five years, a comparison.

In 1881 the Commissioner of the United States Bureau of Education wrote, (Vol.1. 1881, p.CXXXVII) "Probably the day will come when school boards will realize that the Kindergarten, which brings under proper influences the rough little wanderers on the city streets, is a school which cannot be too carefully tended and heartily encouraged".

In 1915 Luella A. Palmer wrote (United States Bureau of Education, Bulletin # 24, 1915, p.5) "After years of trial and thorough alternate opposition and encouragement, the kindergarten has arrived at a point where it is considered an integral part of a complete educational system".

The kindergarten had its beginning in America as a private institution. The first kindergarten to be opened in the United States was in Watertown, Wisconsin. It was opened in 1855 by Mrs. Carl Shurz, and was a German school.

The first kindergarten for English speaking children was opened in Boston in 1860 by Elizabeth P. Peabody.

In 1868 Madame Matilde Kriege and her daughter came from Germany to organize kindergarten training in Boston.

The first kindergarten to be organized in New York was in 1870. This was a private school opened by Miss Marie Boelte.

The next stage in the development of the movement was that of permissive legislation. Vermont, Indiana, and Connecticut all seem to have enacted such legislation in 1888, The
following year Michigan, in 1893 Ohio, and in 1895 Illinois passed similar laws.

During the next five years thirteen states gave legal recognition to the kindergarten. These states were: Washington, New York, Pennsylvania, Iowa, Wisconsin, California, Oregon, Colorado, Louisiana, Minnesota, Montana, New Jersey, Arizona.

Since 1900 fifteen more states have fallen into line. These are: Oklahoma, Florida, Texas, Utah, Idaho, West Virginia, Wyoming, Nevada, Delaware, South Carolina, Kentucky, Missouri, North Dakota, New Mexico, Mississippi.

In Maine, New Hampshire, Kansas, Nebraska, and South Dakota the provisions of the constitutions are considered adequate so that special legislation is not necessary for the establishment of kindergartens.

In Massachusetts and Rhode Island legislation is not necessary because schools are supported almost wholly by local taxation, and because there is no age limit for entering school.

Thus the only seven states in which the kindergarten has no legal foothold in the United States are North Carolina, Georgia, Tennessee, Alabama, Arkansas, Virginia, and Maryland.

A novel characteristic of the evolution of the kindergarten movement is the so-called "petitioning form of legislation". It differs from the permissive form of legislation in that in the latter it is left to the school boards to decide whether or not new kindergartens shall be established; while in the former the new kindergarten must be established upon the petition of a certain number in the community. California, Yavada and North
Dakota have this type of legislation.

Concerning the effectiveness of this plan, a mimeographed letter issued recently (February 15, 1917) Bureau of Education, Department of the Interior, has this to say: "Many of the kindergartens opened for the first time in 1916 were secured as a result of petitions by parents. It is estimated that at least $100,000.00 was spent by school boards last year, (In California.) for classes started in this way. This has proved such a successful method of extending the movement, that in a number of states including Kansas, Maine, New York, Oregon, Utah, Texas, bills will be introduced in the state legislatures providing for the establishment of kindergartens on petition of parents".

Though at present the establishment of kindergartens as a part of the school system is not mandatory in any of the states, it is safe to say such a provision is not far distant. It is the logical conclusion of the evolution of the movement. It is the only manner in which the schools can extend downward as well as upward its privileges.

The effect of state legislation upon the progress of the kindergarten movement may be seen in the table given below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Private or charitable kindergartens.</th>
<th>Public kindergartens.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1888</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1892</td>
<td>852</td>
<td>459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1897</td>
<td></td>
<td>1157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1898</td>
<td>1519</td>
<td>1365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1903</td>
<td>1500 (approximately)</td>
<td>2500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1912</td>
<td>994</td>
<td>3583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1913</td>
<td>1387 (approximately)</td>
<td>7500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1914</td>
<td>1571</td>
<td>5525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915</td>
<td>1612</td>
<td>9486</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Minimum School Term.

Forty five states have enacted legislation specifying the minimum school term for any school of the state. These states, together with the year of enactment of their present laws are:

1891, New Hampshire.
1910, Arkansas.
1911, California, Indiana, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, New Jersey, North Dakota, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Tennessee, Virginia, West Virginia, Wisconsin.
1912, Arizona, Indiana, Illinois, Iowa, Kentucky, Maryland, Mississippi, Ohio, South Carolina, Vermont.
1913, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, Oregon, Utah, Wyoming.
1915, Maine.

Colorado, Connecticut, Massachusetts, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, and Texas. For these last six I was not able to secure dates.

The three states having no such legislation are Alabama, Louisiana, and Georgia. All three of these states have a compulsory school attendance law, however. Alabama requires at least eighty days attendance of each child, and the average length of the school term for the year of 1911-12 was 132 days. Louisiana full time attendance, and its average length of school term (for white children) for 1911-12 was 157.2 days.

The most distinct characteristic of state legislation pertaining to minimum school term, has been the tendency to pre-
scribe a longer school term. This can best be indicated by comparing the provisions of the present minimum school term laws with those of 1904. This is done in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minimum school term of</th>
<th>In 1904</th>
<th>In 1916</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60 days</td>
<td>Arkansas, Montana, Nebraska, Oklahoma, South Carolina</td>
<td>Arkansas, Oklahoma.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 days</td>
<td>Kentucky, Minnesota.</td>
<td>Michigan, Minnesota, New Hampshire, New Mexico, Tennessee, Utah, Virginia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110 days</td>
<td>Illinois.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140 days</td>
<td>Vermont.</td>
<td>Delaware, North Dakota, Kansas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150 days</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vermont.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Days</td>
<td>States in 160 days</td>
<td>States in 180 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160 days</td>
<td>Massachusetts, New York</td>
<td>Arizona, Massachusetts, Missouri, Wisconsin, Ohio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180 days</td>
<td>Connecticut Michigan</td>
<td>Connecticut, Idaho, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200 days</td>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>Maryland</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

States having no legislation:
- Alabama, Delaware, Georgia, Louisiana, Indiana, Nevada, New Jersey, Oregon, Tennessee, Virginia, West Virginia, Wisconsin.

Total, 42 states. Total, 48 states.

Progress during twelve years, 1904-1916, indicated in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of states having no minimum school term requirement</th>
<th>In 1904</th>
<th>In 1913</th>
<th>In 1916</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of states having a minimum term requirement of 60 days</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80 days</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 days</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110 days</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120 days</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140 days</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150 days</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160 days</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180 days</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200 days</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Median - 90 days, 110 days, 127.65 days
SHOWING THE LENGTHENING
MINIMUM SCHOOL TERM
AS A RESULT OF STATE LEGISLATION

Number of states.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>200 days</th>
<th>180 days</th>
<th>160 days</th>
<th>150 days</th>
<th>140 days</th>
<th>130 days</th>
<th>120 days</th>
<th>110 days</th>
<th>100 days</th>
<th>90 days</th>
<th>60 days</th>
<th>50 days</th>
<th>40 days</th>
<th>30 days</th>
<th>20 days</th>
<th>10 days</th>
<th>0 days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1904</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1913</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
The data for the preceding table, for 1904, was compiled from a digest of school laws, United States Bureau of Education, Report of the Commissioner, (1904, Vol.1, pp. 249-518); for 1913 from E. P. Cubberley (Cyclopedia of Education, ed. by P. Monroe, Vol.5, p. 567); that for 1916 from A Digest of State Laws, by J. C. Muerman, (Minimum School Term Regulations, United States Bureau of Education, Bulletin # 42, 1916, pp. 14-13). Mr. Muerman gives four states as having no minimum school term regulations at present, including Rhode Island as one. That seems to be an error, however, as Rhode Island does have a minimum school term law of six months, 120 days.
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School Libraries.

In the movement toward centralization in the administration of public school libraries, four well marked stages are evident.

First came the local school libraries, made possible by gifts, etc.

Then came permissive state legislation, by which the district was authorized to tax itself for the creation and maintenance of a school library. Nineteen states have this form of legislation today. They are Colorado, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, Kentucky, Missouri, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Washington, West Virginia, Wyoming, Georgia, Idaho, Maine, Nebraska, New Hampshire, Oklahoma, Utah, and Mississippi.

Next followed persuasive legislation, by which the state granted aid to a district, usually duplicating the amount raised by the district. Eighteen states have such legislation today; Alabama, Arizona, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Rhode Island, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Montana, Virginia, Vermont, Tennessee, and South Carolina.

And finally mandatory legislation, by which the establishment of school libraries is required of the local communities. Seven states provide such legislation, Iowa, Michigan, Nevada, Oregon, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wisconsin.

New York seems to have led off first with permissive legislation, passing such a law in 1833 authorizing local districts to raise by tax the sum of $20.00 for the purpose of creating
a library, not over $10.00 annually thereafter for its main-

Then followed Massachusetts in 1837, Connecticut in 1838,
Rhode Island and Iowa in 1840, Indiana in 1841, Maine in 1844,
Oregon in 1847, and Wisconsin in 1848, and New Hampshire in 1849.

Thus by 1850 ten states had adopted such legislation, by
1900 this number had increased to twenty-two. Today the public
school library has some legal foothold in forty-four states.

I found a conflict in regard to the dates for New York,
Massachusetts and Connecticut. Since I did not have access to
original sources, I have used those of E. D. Greenman, of the
United States bureau of Education Library (The Library Journal,
Vol.37, pp. 310-315) instead of those of Josephine Rathbone, as
given in the Cyclopedia of Education, ed. by P. Monroe, Vol.3,
pp. 14-18. Miss Rathbones are: New York, 1835, Massachusetts, 1835,
and Connecticut 1837.

Wisconsin affords a good example of the evolution and pro-
gress of the movement. Permissive legislation - the constitu-
tion of 1848 authorized a district tax of not exceeding $30.00,
annually. (In 1867 this was increased to $100.00) Persuasive
legislation - the law of 1887 granted an amount equal to ten
cents for each person of school age in the district. The use of
this money by the district for library purposes was made option-
al with the local community. Mandatory legislation - the law of
1895 requires the establishment of public school libraries.

The Oregon law is commended as the best of state school laws
pertaining to public school libraries. It provides:

(1) A mandatory minimum annual tax levy by the county of not
less than ten cents for each person between four and twenty years of age in the county.

(2) Compulsory selection from a well chosen list made by the Oregon Library Committee.

(3) A central purchasing agency, the Library Committee, and a state contract price.

(4) A definite and fixed time for annual purchase.

(5) Suitable rules and regulations to prevent scattering of books.

The progress toward centralization in this movement is peculiar in that there does not follow a centralization of distribution. California affords a good example of this. The state system was found to be far too large and unwieldy to serve the most adequately and economically as a unit of distribution. Hence there has arisen the plan of county distribution. In its organization it follows closely that of a large city, with its branches in different sections of the town. Already twenty-one of the fifty-eight counties of California have this arrangement.

Due to the fact that the two so largely either coordinate or supplement each other, I have collected the dates of legislative enactment for both public school libraries and state library commissions. Prior to the establishment of the state library commissions, the state district libraries did not prove a decided success. Since 1860, the date of the establishment of the Massachusetts Library Commission, the movement has had a rapid growth and phenomenal success. The period of direct appropriation and legislation, may be said to date from 1890.
The forty-four states having some form of public school library legislation in 1915:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Year of enactment</th>
<th>Year of creation state library commission</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>1907</td>
<td>1907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>1913</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>1854</td>
<td>1909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>1876</td>
<td>1899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>1818</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>1903</td>
<td>1901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>1911</td>
<td>1897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>1901</td>
<td>1897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>1855</td>
<td>1909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>1841</td>
<td>1899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>1840</td>
<td>1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>1870</td>
<td>1899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>1873</td>
<td>1910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>1844</td>
<td>1911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>1902</td>
<td>1902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>1837</td>
<td>1890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>1913</td>
<td>1907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>1873</td>
<td>1899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>1892</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>1853</td>
<td>1907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>1813</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>1913</td>
<td>1901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>1913</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>1849</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>1871</td>
<td>1907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>1833</td>
<td>1892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>1911</td>
<td>1909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>1908</td>
<td>1907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>1847</td>
<td>1896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>1854</td>
<td>1905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>1811</td>
<td>1899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>1840</td>
<td>1870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>1913</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>1913</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>1913</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>1913</td>
<td>1909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>1909</td>
<td>1909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>1908</td>
<td>1908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>1870</td>
<td>1896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>1903</td>
<td>1903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;West Virginia&quot;</td>
<td>1913</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>1848</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>1887</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the four states having no such legislation, three at least are making some provision for the existing need.
When in 1913 an effort to have a library commission established in Arizona failed, the governor appointed an honorary board of library commission.

Texas in 1913 passed an act creating farmer's county public libraries. The state already maintained an extensive system of school libraries by means of local taxation.

Florida, here the state constitution grants an annual tax of three mills on the dollar, which may be expended for school purposes, including school libraries.

Table indicating the progress of the movement:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of states adopting legislation</th>
<th>Total number of states having legislation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1833</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1837</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1838</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1840</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1841</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1844</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1847</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1848</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1849</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1853</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1854</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1855</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1873</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1887</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1892</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1901</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1902</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1903</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1907</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1908</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1909</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1913</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1914</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>???</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Bibliography.

Ahern, Miss. M. E.; Library activities during 1912-1913.

Fargo, Lucile F.: The place of the library in High School education.

Fagge, Ethelwyn H.: High school libraries.


Hall, Mary E.: Report of the committee on high school libraries.
Proc. N. E. A. 1915, pp. 1064-1071

Hargraves, R. T.: The possibilities of the high school library.


Hood, W. R.: Public School libraries.
Digest of state laws relating to public education.
pp. 770-784.

Johnston, W. D.: High school libraries.


McAndrew, Wm.: The high school library.
Morgan, Ella S.: High school libraries of California.


Public, Society and School Libraries.

Rice, O. S.: Rural school libraries.

Rathbone, Josephine: School libraries.

Sabin, Henry: Rural school libraries.

Wilson, Martha: Report of the committee on Rural school libraries.

Wright, Purd B.: High school branches of public libraries.

Wolcott, J. D.: Library extension in the United States.
: Recent aspects of Library development.
: Library activities.
United States Bureau of Education, Report of the Commissioner:  
Library laws in the United States. 1894-95, Vol.1,  
pp. 523-599.  
Medical Inspection.

In its origin, development, spread, and organization, medical inspection of school children affords a perfect example of the tendency toward centralization in educational administration. At first there was no recognition on the part of the state of any such need. Then came permissive laws, and finally mandatory legislation.

Medical inspection in the United States was first established in the cities. Boston in the year 1894, established a regular system of medical inspection as the result of a series of epidemics among the school children. In 1895 Chicago, in 1897 New York City, and in 1898 Philadelphia followed the example of Boston. By 1900 eight cities in the United States were providing for health work in the schools; by 1902 twenty-three cities; and by 1905 fifth-five cities. During the next six years this number increased to 443. In 1914, 704 cities of over 5,000 population had medical inspection, 402 had school nurses, 141 had school clinics, and 64 had psychological clinics. The figures for 1911, and 1914, are due almost entirely to state legislation.

It was not until five years after the first city system of medical inspection had been established, that any state legislative action was taken. In that year, 1899, when six cities in the United States already had such systems, Connecticut passed the first state law providing for the medical inspection of school children. Four years later, in 1903, New Jersey enacted a permissive law. And in 1906, twelve years after Boston had established
its system of medical inspection, Massachusetts passed the first mandatory law in the United States. In 1911 seven states had mandatory laws, ten had permissive laws, and in two states and the District of Columbia medical inspection was carried on under regulations promulgated by the boards of health and having the force of law.

The states having some such legislation, together with the year of adoption follow: Connecticut, 1899; New Jersey, 1903; Massachusetts, 1906; District of Columbia, 1907; Washington, 1909; California, 1909; Colorado, 1909; Maine, 1909; Minnesota, 1910; New York, 1910; Ohio, 1910; Vermont, 1910; Virginia, 1910; Indiana, 1911; Louisiana, 1911; North Dakota, 1911; Pennsylvania, 1911; Rhode Island, 1911; Utah, 1911; West Virginia, 1911; New Hampshire, 1913; Nebraska, 1913; Wisconsin, 1913.

At first the administration of practically all of the systems was left to local health boards. By 1911 the tide had turned. In that year, of the 443 cities having medical inspection, in only 106 were they under the boards of health, while in the remaining 337 the board of education was the controlling body.

At first provision was made only for defective vision and hearing. Connecticut's first law, for example, provided only for the testing of eyesight by the teachers every three years. Later the effort was made to provide by legislation for the prevention and control of contagious diseases. Today medical inspection includes almost all matters pertaining to the physical welfare of child life while in school, and in many places it has been extended so as to take cognizance of home conditions as they
affect the health of the children. The school nurse, dental hygiene, general physical examination of teachers and pupils, and all that pertains to the hygiene of instruction and the care of school premises are more and more being provided for by legislative action of the state.

In its recent origin and rapid progress the movement of the school nurse as an indispensable adjunct of the best systems of medical inspection, is as remarkable as that of which it forms a part. In 1911 Dr. Ayres said "No school (in 1900) had ever heard of a school nurse, for no city in the world employed one; but today seventy-six American cities have corps of school nurses as permanent parts of their educational forces".

The first regular employment of trained nurses in connection with the work of medical examination was begun in New York City in December, 1902. By the beginning of the year 1911, the total number employed in American cities was 415.

Progress of the movement as indicated by the adoption of legislation affecting medical inspection is shown by the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of states adopting</th>
<th>Total number of states having adopted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1899</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1903</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1907</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1909</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1913</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHART INDICATING THE PROGRESS
OF STATE LEGISLATION
AFFECTING MEDICAL INSPECTION.

States.

Year - 1899 1903 1906 1907 1909 1910 1911 1913
Bibliograph.

Ayres, L. P.: Medical Inspection.


Cornell, W. S.: Health and Medical Inspection of School Children.

Dresslar, F. B.: Duties of the States in the Medical Inspection of Schools.


Gulick, L. H. and Ayres, L. P.: Medical Inspection of Schools.


Russell Sage Foundation: Medical Inspection of School Legislation.

A Comparative Study of Public School Systems of the Forty-eight states. pp. 30-31


United States Bureau of Education, Report of the Commissioner:


1907, Medical inspection of school children. Vol. 1, pp. 432-5


1912, Medical inspection of schools. Vol. 1, p. 162.

1913, Medical inspection of schools, legislation.

Vol. 1, pp. 429-431; 910-911.
1914, Medical inspection. Vol. 1, pp. 94-95.

Military Training.

Here an entirely new situation is encountered. In each of the movements dealt with heretofore the problem has been to show the tendency toward centralization by tracing the history or evolution of the movement. But in the case of military training no such method is possible. The movement can hardly be said to have a history; "three years ago the mere mention of a plan so revolutionary would have evoked general ridicule". (Report of the Commissioner, United States Bureau of Education, 1916, p.47)

As recently as two years ago (1915) one of the foremost educational associations in the United States (the National Education Association), one of the most important educational magazines in America (School and Society), and two of the most prominent educators of our country (N. C. Schaeffer, Superintendent of Public Instruction of Pennsylvania, and Dr. John Finley, New York Commissioner of Education), in the form of resolutions, editorials, lectures and written articles setting forth the evils and dangers of any such scheme, sought to stem the tide. And yet today it forms part of the program of preparedness of practically all educators and men in public life. The proposal to introduce military training into the public schools of America is by far the most startling of the effects of the European war on American educational problems.

How absolutely revolutionary this new movement is may be more fully realized when compared with the almost complete absence of any military element a few years ago. The incident
is related (Proc. N. E. A. 1915, p. 219) of several Italian students who were sitting in a Cafe in Washington, when suddenly one of them sprang up excitedly and pointed out of the window. "At last I see an American soldier", he said. "I had often heard in Italy that you are a non-military nation, but I never dreamed that I could travel through five of your largest cities (Ithaca, Buffalo, Philadelphia, New York, and Baltimore) before meeting a soldier".

And yet, though of such a brief period of agitation, the movement may be divided into four stages of evolution.

1. The military training that existed prior to the recent cataclysmic agitation. Here may be mentioned the Federal military schools at West Point and Annapolis; the military training required in some of our land-grant colleges, and the private military academies including military training as a part of the curriculum. This stage extended up to 1915.

2. The period of agitation, coming as a result of the sudden realization of amazing unpreparedness revealed by the World War. This period may be said to cover approximately a year, 1915. It marked the tremendous conflict between Pacifist and Militarist. Two of the most powerful appeals of the Pacifists are to be found in the Proc. N. E. A. (1915, pp. 217-222) and School and Society (Vol. 1, pp. 289-295). As the danger to American Democracy became more real, however, be it said to the credit of the Pacifist of the educational school that he not only ceased his opposition to the introduction of military training into the public school system, but has even extended to the
movement his support. Especially significant in this respect is the attitude of the National Education Society, which replaced its previous resolution on the evils of military training, with a resolution that clearly recognizes "that the community or the state may introduce such elements of military training into the school as may seem wise and prudent".

3. Even before the period of debate and argument had passed, the third stage was being ushered in. This is the voluntary introduction of military training into local school systems. Even here the plan was not without precedent. As early as 1901, in a rudimentary way, at the petition of nineteen boys, military training had been begun in the schools of Sumter, S. C. This, however, had never received much more than local recognition. Now it was to come into its own. The Superintendent of Schools, Professor S. H. Edmonds, received hundreds of queries, and the plan of Sumter quickly came to be copied by many school systems.

As an illustration of the extensive progress of this phase of the movement, consider the following quotations from different issues of School and Society for the year 1916.

"In Washington, D. C.; in Portland, Me.; in Omaha, Neb. military drill is established in the schools. -- Waukegan has just adopted the system. -- Day by day there is fresh report of the formation of voluntary corps in grammar and high schools and colleges in all parts of the land". (Vol.3, p.279)

"The Connecticut State Reformatory at Cheshire has installed a system of military training and instruction, and there is a
movement in Hartford to have the Hartford High School establish a course in military training".

"The establishment of military training in the high schools of Indiana is being vigorously pressed. Cadet corps have been organized in the high schools of Indianapolis".

"The Board of Education at Springfield, Ohio, has adopted military training as a part of the high school course".

"Military training has been adopted for the public schools of Hammond, Indiana.".

"A school for officers has been started in the high-school cadet regiments of Chicago".

"A cadet corps has been organized in the Wichita, Kansas, High School.".

"The school committee of Pawtucket, R. I., has adopted military training for the public schools".

"The school board of Seattle, Washington, has the question of military training in the public schools under consideration, with favorable recommendations". (Vol.3, pp.751-752)

4. The fourth phase of the movement, and that in which it culminates in centralization, is the enactment of such laws by the state legislatures as to make military training in the public schools compulsory.

New York was the first state to respond to the "wave of enthusiasm for military training", by the enactment in 1916 of military physical-training legislation. The law, originally proposed as one bill but later modified into two, provides for:

(a) A military training commission to consist of three mem-
bers, "the major general commanding the National Guard, ex officio, who shall be chairman of the commission; a member to be appointed by the board of regents of the university of the State, and a member to be appointed by the governor".

(b) Compulsory military training. "All boys above the age of sixteen years and not over nineteen years, except boys exempted by the commission, shall be given such military training as the commission may prescribe for periods aggregating not more than three hours in each week during the school or college year, in the case of boys who are pupils in public or private colleges, and for periods not exceeding those above stated between September first of each year and the fifteenth day of June next ensuing in the case of boys who are not pupils".

(c) "Compulsory physical training and discipline for all children of eight years and over in all schools of the state, public and private." (Report of the Commissioner, United States Bureau of Education, 1916, Vol. 1, p. 323)

A law was enacted by the legislature of Louisiana the same year, providing for instruction in military science for boys in high school for at least one hour a week.

New Jersey appropriated $159,000.00 for military training in the public schools, and provided for two hours' training each week.

A committee of the Massachusetts' legislature was appointed to consider the subject of military instruction in all secondary public schools of the state.

A plan was worked out by Lieutenant E. Z. Steever, U.S.A.,
for the high schools of Wyoming, and was generally adopted.

Thus it appears that in three states, New York, New Jersey, and Louisiana, military training has been provided for by state legislative action; in one other, Wyoming, it has been generally adopted by the high schools without such legislation; while in at least one other, Massachusetts, it is under consideration.

Assuming that the New York law is a fair example of what may be expected from other states, including as it does all schools of the state, both public and private, the tendency is toward complete centralization of administration by legislative enactment.
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Where Education Fails.
Minimum Salary.

The first legislation providing for a minimum salary for teachers seems to have been passed by the West Virginia legislature in 1882. This law provided that "in determining the salaries, they (the board of education) shall have regard to the grade of teachers' certificates, fixing to each grade the salary that shall be paid to teachers of said grades in the several sub-districts as follows: Teachers having certificates of the grade of number one shall be paid not less than $25.00 per month; those holding certificates of the grade of number two, not less than $22.00 per month; and those holding certificates of the grade of number three, not less than $18.00 per month." (West Virginia School Law, 1883, section #6)

This law as amended several times, now provides for salaries of $40.00, $35.00, $30.00 per month for holders of first, second, and third grades of certificates, respectively.

The only other state to enact such legislation before the close of the nineteenth century was New York. In the Report of the Commissioner, United States Bureau of Education 1896-1897, Vol.2, p. 1538, attention was called to the fact that "the policy of an assured minimum salary is advocated to some extent in the United States; in New York a bill to this effect has been carried through the legislature, and awaits the governor's signature." This law applied only to New York City. It was signed and went into effect in 1899.

Since the beginning of the twentieth century, fourteen states
have enacted such legislation. They are: New Jersey, 1900; Indiana, 1901; Pennsylvania, 1903; Maryland, 1904; North Dakota, 1905; Ohio, 1906; North Carolina, 1907; Rhode Island, 1909; Kentucky, 1912; California, 1907; Oregon, 1907; Utah, 1907; Iowa, and Colorado.

The provisions of these laws vary extensively.

In New Jersey the teachers of the primary and grammar grades of less than two years experience are to receive not less than $408.00 annually, above twelve years experience, not less than $936.00.

In Iowa beginners are to receive a minimum daily wage equal to three cents multiplied by the general average grade shown on the certificate, for holders of first grade certificate; two and three-fourths cents for holders of second grade certificate; and two and one half cents for holders of third grade certificate.

In Maryland, the minimum annual salary for white teachers is $300.00.

In Indiana the minimum daily wage for a beginner is to equal two and one half cents multiplied by the general average on the certificate.

The provisions of the West Virginia law were given above.

In Pennsylvania, for holders of a professional certificate the minimum salary is $55.00; for all others, $45.00.

In North Carolina, for elementary teachers, $35.00; for high school teachers, $40.00

In North Dakota, $45.00.
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The minimum salary for Ohio is $40.00; for Rhode Island, $400.00, annually; Kentucky, $35.00; and for Colorado, $50.00.

The laws of California, Oregon and Utah are only indirectly minimum salary laws. Through legislative provision, a specified proportion of tax levies and state apportionment must be devoted to teachers' salaries. This results in an average monthly salary of $67.28 for Oregon; $80.68 for Utah; and $100.12 for California.

Four states, West Virginia, Ohio, Rhode Island, and California grant state aid on a basis of minimum salaries for teachers.

Though the movement has not yet become general, the fact that sixteen states should enact such legislation as to prescribe a minimum salary indicates the tendency toward centralization in that field of administration.
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Teachers' Pensions.

As in the case of the other movements thus far considered, the movement for teachers' pensions had its beginning outside of state legislation. By the time state legislatures came to recognize the need for legislation providing for such pensions, Voluntary Mutual Benefit Associations among teachers existed in many of our large cities.

For temporary aid only, such associations existed in Baltimore, St. Louis, Cincinnati, Cleveland, Detroit, Chicago, Buffalo, and St. Paul.

Associations for annuity, or retirement funds only, existed in New York, Boston and Baltimore.

Associations for both temporary aid and annuity had been organized in Hamilton County, Ohio; Philadelphia, Brooklyn, and the District of Columbia.

The first effort to secure state legislation providing for retirement funds seems to have been made by the Brooklyn Teachers' Association. In 1878 they succeeded in having such a bill introduced in the New York State legislature. This bill and another one introduced the following year were both defeated. It was not until 1895, after seven years of careful and persistent agitation that they succeeded in getting a bill passed authorizing the creation of a retirement fund for the Brooklyn teachers. Thus the second step in the process of the evolution of the movement was that of permissive legislation.

Today thirty-three states provide for some kind of pensions.
or retirement fund for teachers. These states, in the order of their adoption of such legislation are:

1896 - New Jersey.
1897 - Ohio.
1902 - Maryland.
1907 - Pennsylvania, Rhode Island.
1908 - Virginia.
1909 - Colorado, Nebraska.
1910 - Louisiana.
1911 - Connecticut, Delaware, New York, Oregon, Wisconsin.
1912 - Arizona, Kentucky.
1913 - California, Maine, Utah, Vermont.
1914 - Massachusetts, North Dakota.
?

New York is listed above as 1911; the 1895 law applied to Brooklyn only.

In twenty-one of the thirty-three states listed above the laws are state-wide in application. These states are: Arizona, California, Illinois, Indiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Montana, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, Rhode Island, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Wisconsin.

In five states the law effects two of more cities; Colorado, applying to Denver, Pueblo, and Colorado Springs; Connecticut, applying to New Hampshire and New London; Pennsylvania,
applying to eleven cities; Kansas, applying to Topeka, Wichita, and Kansas City; and Kentucky, applying to Louisville, Lexington, Covington, Newport and Paducah.

In seven states the law applies to a single city or county; Alabama, Mobile County; Delaware, Wilmington; Louisiana, New Orleans; Nebraska, Omaha; Oregon, Portland; Tennessee, Chattanooga; and West Virginia, Wheeling.

Types of pension plans.

There are three different types of pension plans, the contributory, the non-contributory, and the insurance plan.

Under the contributory plan the pensions are provided partly by public funds and partly by contributions from the teachers. Twenty-one states have this plan. California, Connecticut, Delaware, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, Kentucky, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Vermont, Virginia, West Virginia, and Wisconsin.

Under the non-contributory plan the pensions are financed by the state without the aid of contributions from the teachers. Nine states have this plan; Alabama, Colorado, Maryland, Rhode Island, Arizona, Maine, New Hampshire, Tennessee, and New Jersey.

It seems to be the opinion of experts that the non-contributory state financed plan is the only logical one; and that ultimately the same authority that pays the salaries will pay the pensions. In keeping with this New Jersey set a right example by amending her earlier law in 1907, and making it non-contributory.
The law of Arizona affords the most perfect example of centralization. Of this law the United States Bureau of Education, Report of the Commissioner (1912, Vol.1, pp.65-66) has the following to say: "To the new state of Arizona must be accorded the distinction of having a retirement law that is by far the best in the United States. It is best, first, because it provides a reasonably adequate annuity, namely six hundred dollars a year; second, because it does not reduce salaries under the fiction of "assessments", but provides that all annuities shall be paid direct from state funds; third, because it is state wide in operation, and avoids all controversies concerning the place of service and the proportion of individual pensions which certain districts should pay; fourth, because there is no complicated administrative machinery, the control of the entire matter being in the hands of the State Board of Education and the Superintendent of Public Instruction; and fifth because its simplicity and the absence of restrictions permit its application to any deserving case. --- No other law possesses all these good points in combination".

The progress of the non-contributory system has been as follows:

1902 - Maryland.
1907 - New Jersey, Rhode Island
1909 - Colorado.
1912 - Arizona.
1913 - Maine.
The insurance plan, financed entirely by the teachers without the help of public funds, prevails in four states; Louisiana, Michigan, Utah, and in cities of the first class in Kentucky.

Provision for refund.

Where the insurance factor enters into the pension system, the only just provision is that which provides for refund of money, in whole or in part, paid in by the teachers, in case of death or resignation.

Thirteen of the twenty-one states having the contributory plan, provide for this, in whole or in part. These states are: Massachusetts, Indiana, Kansas, Kentucky, Minnesota, North Dakota, Ohio, Wisconsin, Illinois, Connecticut, Virginia, Delaware, and West Virginia.

In all four of the states where the insurance plan prevails a refund is provided for; in Utah all that has been paid in, in Kentucky, three fourths, and in Louisiana and Michigan one half.

Chart indicating the progress of the movement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of states adopting.</th>
<th>Total number of states having adopted.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1896</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1897</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1902</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1907</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1908</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1909</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1912</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1913</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1914</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Schoolhouse Legislation.

Construction and Sanitation of new buildings.

In 1913, only twenty-eight states had some laws or regulations in regard to schoolhouse construction or sanitation. These were Washington, California, Arizona, Montana, Colorado, Utah, North Dakota, South Dakota, Kansas, Minnesota, Iowa, Louisiana, Indiana, Alabama, Ohio, Maine, Vermont, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Rhode Island, New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, and South Carolina.

In 1915 forty-five states had some legislation in regard to school houses. In forty of these the laws had to do with general oversight; Alabama, Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Idaho, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Montana, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and Wyoming. In five other states, Nebraska, Tennessee, Colorado, Illinois, Missouri, some regulation or legislation existed in regard to site, protection against fire or panic.

In 1913 twenty states had no such legislation; Oregon, Nevada, Idaho, Wyoming, New Mexico, Nebraska, Oklahoma, Texas, Missouri, Arkansas, Wisconsin, Illinois, Michigan, Kentucky, Tennessee, Georgia, Florida, Mississippi, Maryland, and Arizona.

In 1915 the three states having no such legislation were:
Arizona, Georgia and New Mexico.

In a map in a "Comparative study of public school systems in the forty-eight states", p. 26, (Published by the Russell Sage Foundation) Arizona is indicated as having such regulation or legislation in 1913. This must have been an error, as I can find no trace of any such regulation or legislation. The law does state School Trustees may improve property, streets, etc., adjoining school property, but this hardly seems sufficient to justify classifying it with such legislation, hence I am classifying Arizona as having no such schoolhouse legislation.

Nine of the forty states enumerated above empowered officials outside of the district to give advice concerning plans for the construction of new buildings. These are New Jersey, North Dakota, Pennsylvania, Texas, Vermont, West Virginia, and Wisconsin. In seven of these, Maine and West Virginia excepted, this is mandatory. In Montana it is confined to rural districts only, in the others it is state-wide.

By twenty-nine states the power of approval has been taken from the lay authorities and placed under state control; Delaware, Idaho, Indiana, Iowa, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Kansas, Maine, Maryland, Minnesota, Montana, Nevada, New York, New Jersey, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, and Wisconsin. In all but three of these, Delaware, Indiana, and South Carolina, this is mandatory. In two, Delaware and Indiana, it is permissive, in South Carolina it is persuasive, encouraged by state aid. In
every instance, this is state-wide, though six states, Maryland, New York, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Utah and Washington, provide for some freedom in the case of cities of a certain class.

In eleven states the state department of education acts alone; Idaho, Kansas, Minnesota, New Hampshire, Nevada, New Jersey, New York, North Dakota, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, and Rhode Island. In four states, Louisiana, Maine, Montana, and Utah, the state department of education acts in cooperation with the state health department. In two, North Carolina and South Carolina, the state educational department works in cooperation with the county educational department. In seven states, Maryland, Oregon, Texas, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, and Wisconsin, the county of district officers are in charge. In two states, Delaware and Indiana, the state health department acts alone. In one state, Iowa, the local health department acts alone. In Massachusetts the state fire department has charge. In Ohio the responsibility rests upon the state, county and local health officers, and state and local fire officers.

In two states, Maryland and Washington, this power extends over equipment.

Old Buildings.

Twenty-three states by legislative enactment, and three through rules of the state department of education, provide for the inspection of old buildings, including the power to frame and enforce sanitary codes. The twenty-three states are: Alabama, Arkansas, Delaware, Florida, Iowa, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Montana, New Hampshire, New York, North
Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Utah, Virginia, Wisconsin, Vermont, and Wyoming. The three states are: Indiana, Idaho, and Kentucky.

In fifteen states the authority is vested in state officials. In ten of these, Arkansas, Florida, Indiana, Idaho, Massachusetts, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Vermont, and Utah, in the state health department; in three, Minnesota, North Dakota, and Wisconsin, in the state educational department; in one, Ohio, in the state inspectors of plumbing; and in the other, Massachusetts in the state fire of factory inspectors.

In ten states the authority is left with county officials; California, Delaware, New York, Carolina, South Dakota, Virginia, Iowa, Kentucky, Montana, and New Hampshire.

Wyoming provides that managers of all public places shall remedy sanitary defects called to their attention.

School sites.

Thirty-eight states have made some legal provision regarding school sites. These states are: Alabama, Arkansas, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Indiana, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, and Wisconsin.

Nineteen states have laws prohibiting the location of school buildings within a specified distance from places where liquor is sold, from gambling houses, houses of prostitution, and
noisy or smoky factories. These states are: Arkansas, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Indiana, Iowa, Kentucky, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Nevada, New Hampshire, New York, Oregon, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Tennessee, Vermont, and Wisconsin.

Twenty-six states have laws regulating the size of the school grounds, the minimum ranging from not less than half an average city block (in Montana, not less than one acre for rural schools) to two acres (in South Dakota). These states are: Alabama, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Vermont, Virginia, Washington and Wisconsin.

All of these laws are state-wide in application, and are mandatory.

Protection against fire and panic.

Thirty-six states provide for some form of protection against fire or panic. These are: California, Colorado, Connecticut, Florida, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, and Wisconsin.

Blanket regulations, by legislative enactment, are found in eleven states: Connecticut, Florida, Maine, Massachusetts, Minnesota, New Jersey, New York, North Dakota, Texas, Utah, and
Virginia. Indiana has such regulation as a rule of the state department of education.

Ten states, by state legislative enactment, provide for abundant facilities for exodus; three states make such provisions by rule of the state department of education. The ten states are: Colorado, Connecticut, Massachusetts, Mississippi, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, Rhode Island, Texas, and Virginia. The three states are, Indiana, New Jersey, Vermont.

Thirty-one states have regulations as to exits, or exterior escapes, of both. In thirty states this is by legislative enactment: California, Colorado, Connecticut, Florida, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Virginia, and Wisconsin. In Vermont there are regulations applying to both, prescribed by the state board of education.

Sixteen states have legislation regulation regulating alarms, fire-fighting apparatus, or drills: Connecticut, Florida, Iowa, Kansas, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Montana, New York, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Virginia, and Wisconsin. In Vermont there are regulations applying to both, prescribed by the state board of education.

Lighting.

Thirteen states, either by legislative enactment, or by direction of the state board of education, provide for some regulation of lighting. These are: Indiana, Montana, North Dakota, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Texas and Virginia, by legislative
The shaded portion indicates the number of states making provision for such control, the unshaded portion indicating the number of states with no such provision.
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The shaded portion indicates the number of states exercising such control, the unshaded portion indicating the number of states in which no such control is exercised.
enactment, Delaware, Louisiana, Minnesota, New Jersey, South Dakota, Vermont by direction of the state board of education.

Ventilation.

Nine states, by legislative enactment, make some provision for ventilation: Indiana, Montana, North Dakota, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Texas, Utah and Virginia.

All of these have something to say in regard to air space; all but Montana in regard to rate of change of air. Seven of them, Montana, North Dakota, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Utah, and Virginia, have something to say in regard to floor space, per square feet per pupil. Indiana, Ohio, Texas, have something to say in regard to size and location of inlets and outlets of air.
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To trace the history and follow the development of school finances, and of state legislation pertaining to state aid, was discovered to be a task far beyond the limits of this thesis. All that dared be undertaken was such a consideration of existent legislation as to indicate the tendency toward and degree of centralization. This will be done under the six following divisions:

1. The granting of state aid.
2. The distribution of state school money.
3. The expenditure of state school money.
4. The authority to borrow money and to issue bonds.
5. Taxing duties and powers.

1. State aid.

"State aid", the appropriation conditionally of state moneys, is to be distinguished from the regular distribution of state school funds and the study of restrictions attached to their expenditure. Every state in the union excepting Pennsylvania and Georgia has one or more permanent school funds for common schools, or an account which is a recognition of the state's permanent indebtedness to such a fund. Pennsylvania and Georgia formerly had such funds, but have none today.

In granting state aid, centralization of control and administration is secured only indirectly. Localities are in no instance compelled to accept state aid, and so to assume
responsibility for conditions involved. As soon as the state aid is accepted however the conditions attached become operative. Hence centralization is secured by the voluntary participation on the part of the localities.

At present state aid is granted in the following thirty-four states: Alabama, Colorado, Connecticut, Florida, Indiana, Idaho, Iowa, Kansas, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Tennessee, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, West Virginia, Wisconsin.

The purposes for which all state aid is granted may be summarized as follows:

Seventeen states grant aid for the maintenance of public schools, including equalization of educational advantages. These are: Colorado, Idaho, Indiana, Kansas, Maine, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, New Mexico, North Carolina, Rhode Island, Tennessee, West Virginia, Connecticut, Vermont, Nevada.

Fifteen states aid in the enlargement of the sphere of public elementary education, as follows: Connecticut, Kansas, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Rhode Island, Vermont, Wisconsin.

Nine states grant aid for local supervision; Connecticut, Maine, New Jersey, New York, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Vermont, Massachusetts, New Hampshire.

Eight states grant aid for the employment of qualified teachers.
and the payment of a minimum salary: Minnesota, New Hampshire, Wisconsin, Colorado, Ohio, Rhode Island, Utah, West Virginia.

Eleven states grant aid for the establishment and maintenance of elementary school libraries, as follows: Alabama, Connecticut, Maryland, Minnesota, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia.

One state, New Mexico, aids in the construction of school houses, when the regular income of a school district is insufficient.

One state, South Carolina, grants aid for the purpose of increasing the average length of the school term to at least one hundred days when regular school funds are insufficient.

2. The distribution of state school money.

The bases upon which moneys are distributed among localities may be classified into three types:

(1) The distribution of state money on the bases of school population and valuation of taxable property. Thirty-three states have this system, as follows: Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado, Connecticut, Georgia, Indiana, Illinois, Idaho, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Michigan, Mississippi, Montana, Nebraska, New Mexico, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Virginia, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming, Maine.

(2) The distribution of state money upon bases of attendance of pupils, number of teachers, inverse property valuation, and ratio of local school tax to total local tax. Eleven states
have this system, as follows: California, Delaware, Florida, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Missouri, New Hampshire, New York, South Carolina, Vermont, Washington.

(3) The distribution of state money on the bases listed under both (1) and (2). Four states come in this group, Nevada, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island.

At present it may be said that the methods of distribution in vogue do not secure satisfactorily efficient central control. But in proportion to the endeavor to equalize educational opportunity and to encourage local effort and local initiative, to that extent will centralized control become increasingly effective.

3. The expenditure of state school money.

The restrictions attached to the local expenditure of state school moneys are of three types:

(1) Complete restriction; school moneys to be expended for a specific purpose, or for specific purposes, and for none other. Twenty-three states have legislation of this kind: California, Connecticut, Kentucky, Minnesota, Missouri, Nevada, New York, North Dakota, Rhode Island, Virginia, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Arizona, Colorado, Delaware, Wyoming, Maine, Maryland, Michigan, New Jersey, Ohio, Utah, Nebraska.

(2) Partial restriction; the distribution of only a part of the state school money under certain restrictions of expenditure, and the remainder unrestrictedly. Seven states have legislation of this kind: Alabama, Arkansas, Massachusetts, New Hampshire,
Oregon, Texas, Washington.

(3) Unrestricted; the distribution of state school money without any restrictions as to expenditure by the local unit. Eighteen states come in this group: Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Montana, New Mexico, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Vermont.

4. The authority to borrow money and to issue bonds.

In all but four states (Alabama, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts) legislation has been enacted authorizing local communities to borrow money and to issue bonds. Apparently this is legislation toward decentralization. And yet by means of restrictions attached by the same central power authorizing the local communities to incur such indebtedness, a very high degree of centralization has been attained. These restrictions, covering every phase of this function, are as follows:

(1) The designation by central authority of the persons responsible for authorizing the borrowing of money and the issuing of bonds. New Hampshire, North Carolina, and Vermont are the only three states in which this policy does not prevail.

(2) In all but eleven of the forty-four states mentioned above (Arkansas, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Minnesota, Nevada, New Hampshire, North Carolina, Ohio, Vermont) a restriction is placed upon the amount of indebtedness that may be so incurred.

(3) Thirty-five states limit the periods for which money
may be borrowed, or bonds issued. The nine states having no such restrictions are: Arkansas, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Mississippi, New Hampshire, North Carolina, Rhode Island, Vermont.

(4) Every state but five (Arkansas, Connecticut, North Carolina, Rhode Island, Vermont) designates the maximum amount of interest which may be allowed upon money so secured.

(5) Twenty states designate the denominations in which bonds may be issued. These are Colorado, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Michigan, Missouri, Montana, New Mexico, New York, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Dakota, Tennessee, Utah, Wyoming, Washington.

(6) Thirty-two states make some restrictions in regard to selling price of bonds, care of sinking fund, state loans, etc. These are: Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Virginia, Washington, Wyoming, Wisconsin, Minnesota, North Carolina.

(7) Every one of the forty-four states designates the purpose for which money thus raised may be expended.

5. Taxing duties and powers.

In forty states the levying of taxes for general or specific educational purposes by the localities is mandatory. These are: Arizona, Colorado, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Idaho, Iowa, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland,

In eighteen states the rate or amount of tax to be raised by local authorities is left indefinite. These are: Connecticut, Kentucky, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Utah, Washington, Wisconsin.

Fifteen states prescribe a fixed or minimum amount of local tax which must be raised. These states are: Colorado, Delaware, Florida, Idaho, Iowa, Louisiana, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nevada, North Dakota, Oregon, South Carolina, Vermont, Virginia.

Nine states, California, Oregon, Utah, Washington, Wyoming, Maine, Arizona, New Hampshire, Wisconsin, fix the minimum amount which must be raised per child of school age, per teacher, per inhabitant, or proportionate to the amount of money received from the regular state apportionment.

In six states, Florida, North Dakota, South Dakota, New Mexico, Pennsylvania, Wyoming, a local fixed poll or minimum occupation tax is mandatory.

In eighteen states, Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Montana, Nevada, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Oklahoma,
North Carolina, North Dakota, South Dakota, Tennessee, Utah, Vermont, Washington and Wisconsin, the levying of additional or special taxes is mandatory if the state or local funds, or both are insufficient to meet current school expenses.

Maximum tax legislation has been prescribed by forty-two states. These states are: Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana, Kentucky, Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, West Virginia, Washington, Wisconsin, Wyoming.


All of the forty-eight states have adopted legislation providing for intervention when localities fail to comply with one or more of the educational laws. This legislation may said to have taken three forms.

(1) The transferring of authority from one officer to another. Thirteen states, California, Connecticut, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana, Maine, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, and Virginia, have enacted such legislation providing for a transfer of authority because of non-performance of duty involving matters of finance; and in the case of five of these, California, Kansas, Louisiana, Nevada and Oklahoma, this is to a state officer.

(2) By making localities or local officers liable to the
state. Eleven states have legislation of this kind, Connecticut, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Mexico, North Dakota, Ohio, Oregon, Washington.
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Four quotations, covering a period of twenty-one years indicating the progress of the movement of state boards of education.

"It is generally admitted by thoughtful teachers in America that the state board of education is the weakest part of the educational system. The jealousy with which the township and the city protects its independence has hitherto prevented those functions which need to be administered centrally from developing proper activity; and indeed no clear conception seems yet to have been formed as to the precise duties which need to be administered from the center of the state, nor are serious proposals yet made to constitute an authority adequate to their performance". (Report of the Royal Commission on secondary education, United States Bureau of Education, Report of the commissioner, 1894-95, Vol.1, p. 639.)

"It is evident that these (state boards of education) yet form no integral part in American education. In size, manner of composition, function, and influence, they vary indefinitely and widely. There is much uncertainty regarding their future". (Administration of public education in the United States, by Dutton and Snedden, p. 67. 1912)

"The tendency to centralize control in public education in state office, under the direction of state boards of education, is one of the most significant measures of progress in modern school administration". (United States Bureau of Education, Report of the commissioner, 1914, Vol.1, p.29.)
"The trend of educational development is toward the state board of education as the administrative head of the educational system. In thirty-seven of the forty-eight states in the United States, there are state boards of education with functions relative to the public schools; in one other, Minnesota, there is a state board with functions relative to the public high schools only. Two, Nebraska and Iowa, have state boards known as boards of education". (United States Bureau of Education, Bulletin #5, 1915, p.7.)

The first state board of education in the United States was established in 1784, when New York established the board of Regents. Forty-one years later, in 1825, North Carolina created a board known as President and Directors of the Literary Fund, an ex officio state board of education.

During the next twenty-five years six more states followed the example set by New York and North Carolina; Missouri establishing the first board officially called state board of education in 1835, Massachusetts establishing such a board in 1837, and Kentucky in 1838, Connecticut 1839, Arkansas in 1843, and Ohio in 1850 each forming some kind of state board.

By 1875 this number had increased to twenty-six, the new state to adopt such boards being, California, Florida, Georgia, Indiana, Illinois, Kansas, Louisiana, Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, Nebraska, Nevada, New Jersey, Oregon, Rhode Island, South Carolina, and Tennessee.

During the next ten years four more states were added to the list, these states being, Colorado, Delaware, Iowa, and Texas.
By 1695 the number of states having such boards had increased to thirty-five, the five new states to be added to the list being, Idaho, Montana, Mississippi, Washington, and West Virginia.

During the next twenty years seven other states came into line, making a total of forty-two. These seven additional states were: Arizona, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Utah, Vermont, New Mexico, North Dakota.

The six states in which no state boards of any kind have yet been established are: Alabama, Maine, New Hampshire, South Dakota, Wisconsin, Wyoming.

Composition of state boards of education.

I. The board known as President and Directors of the Literary Fund, established by North Carolina in 1825, in the matter of its composition, may be considered as typical of the earlier types of state boards. It consisted of the state treasurer, the chief justice, and the speakers of the two houses of the legislature. At present only eight states still hold to such boards: these states are, Colorado, Florida, Kentucky, Mississippi, Missouri, North Carolina, Oregon, and Texas. The ex officio members who compose the present boards are usually the governor, superintendent of public instruction, and one or more other state officers such as secretary of state, attorney general, treasurer, auditor, lieutenant governor, or comptroller of the treasury.

II. A modification of the above type is that made up of ex officio officers and either other educational officials or appointed members or both. This condition prevails in Indiana, Nevada, Utah, Arizona, and Kansas.

III. Another type is the appointed or elected board. Here the superintendent of public instruction is usually, the governor
frequently, are ex officio members. Boards of this type are found in Michigan, Rhode Island, Connecticut, Maryland, West Virginia, Virginia, South Carolina, Tennessee, New Mexico, Louisiana, Montana, and Washington.

III. The most efficient type, and that toward which the present tendency prevails, is that of a small board of expert members composed of citizens of the state, with the superintendent of public instruction chosen by and serving in the capacity of specialist and executive official of the board. New York in 1904, Massachusetts in 1909, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Arkansas and Oklahoma in 1911, and California and Idaho in 1913 established such boards.

Comparison of duties and powers in 1894 and 1911.

"The state board of education generally establishes its own normal colleges, schools for special classes, --- but beyond this range its authority in the erection and maintenance of school buildings is very slight". (Report of the Royal Commission, United States Bureau of Education, Report of the commissioner, Vol.1,p.64).

Compare with the above the following from the 1911 report of the Illinois educational commission. Speaking of the powers of the New York State Board of Education, it says:

"The State Library and the State Museum are departments of the university (state board of education) and the board may establish other departments if they are deemed necessary to the discharge of its duties. It has power to exclude from membership any institution failing to comply with the laws of the State, or the rules of the board. It has charge of private academies, and in some measure of the public secondary schools, as well as of all the
higher institutions. All the powers and duties of the board in relation to the supervision of the elementary and secondary school technical and professional schools, are devolved upon the commissioner of education who is elected by the board. The board of New York has power to establish such rules and regulations as are necessary to carry into effect the statutes of the state relating to education. It cooperates with other agencies in bringing within the reach of the people of the state, young and old, the largest educational opportunities by stimulating interest, recommending methods, designating suitable teachers and lecturers, and by lending books and apparatus. It establishes in the Academies of the universities examinations in studies, furnishes a suitable standard for graduation from Academies, and of admission to colleges, and grants certificates and diplomas to those who pass such examinations. It controls the whole matter of granting honorary degrees and diplomas. The board has power to incorporate any university, college, academy, museum, or other institution, for the promotion of science, literature, art, history, or other departments of knowledge". (United States Bureau of Education, Bulletin # 5, 1915, pp. 10-11.)

New York may represent the extreme in the movement at the present time, but it is an indication of the direction in which this tendency is leading.
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Superintendent of Public Instruction.

The office of State Superintendent of Public Instruction came as a result of the growing complexity of the state organization. At first as the duties of school supervision increased, and forced themselves upon the attention of the state, they seem to have been treated as subordinate and committed to some one of the then incumbent state officers, as for example the secretary of state. These experiments and arrangements invariably proved unsatisfactory, and even detrimental to education.

New York, Vermont and Maryland each seem to have established the office before 1830.

New York was the first to do so, when in 1812, in enacting legislation contemplating a permanent system of common schools, the office of State Superintendent of Common Schools was established. The following year, in 1813, the first superintendent to serve under the new law was appointed.

It was not until fourteen years after the action taken by New York, that Maryland established a similar office. Vermont followed in 1827.

In the case of each of these three states the office was abolished after a few years; in New York after nine years, in Maryland after after nine years; and in Vermont after six years, only to be reestablished later on a more permanent basis. In New York in 1854, in Maryland in 1868, and in Vermont in 1845.

Michigan was the first state to maintain continuously such a state office, establishing the office of State Superintendent of common schools in 1829.
The following table from State and County School Administration, by Cubberley and Elliott, shows the evolution of the office in each of the forty-eight states:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Office Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State Comptroller, ex officio, 1867-68.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Superintendent of Education, since 1868.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>Governor, ex officio Superintendent, 1871-79.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Territorial Superintendent, Appointed, 1879-1912.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Superintendent of Public Instruction, since 1912.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Superintendent of Public Instruction, since, 1849.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>Territorial Superintendent of Common Schools, 1861-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Territorial Treasurer, ex officio, 1865-70.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Superintendent of Public Instruction, since 1870.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>State Superintendent of Schools, 1875-87.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State auditor, ex officio Secretary of State, 1898-1912.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State Commissioner of Education, since 1913.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Registrar of Land Office to look after school lands 1835-1839.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secretary of State, ex officio. 1845-1849.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Registrar of Public Lands, ex officio. 1950-1861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State Superintendent of Public Instruction, since 1869.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>State School Commissioner, 1870-1911.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State Superintendent of Schools. Since 1911.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>Territorial Controller, ex officio. 1875-1887.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Superintendent of Public Instruction. Since 1887.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commissioner of Education. Since 1913.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Secretary of State, ex officio. 1825-1845.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Secretary of State, ex officio Superintendent of Common Schools. 1845-1854.

State Superintendent of Public Instruction. Since 1854

Indiana, State Treasurer, ex officio. 1843-1851.

Superintendent of Public Instruction. Since 1851.

Iowa, Territorial Superintendent of Public Instruction. 1841-1842.

Superintendent of Public Instruction. 1847-1857.

Secretary State Board of Education. 1857-1864.

Superintendent of Public Instruction. Since 1864.

Kansas, Territorial Superintendent of Schools. 1857-1859.

State Superintendent of Public Instruction. Since 1859.

Kentucky, State Superintendent of Common Schools. 1837-1850.

State Superintendent of Public Instruction. Since 1850.

Louisiana, Secretary of State, ex officio. 1833-1847.

Superintendent of Public Instruction. Since 1847.

Maine, Secretary State Board of Education. 1846-1852.

Superintendent of Public Instruction. Since 1854.

Maryland, Superintendent of Public Instruction. 1826-1828.

Superintendent of Public Instruction. 1864-1868.

Principal Normal School, ex officio. 1868-1902.

Superintendent of Public Instruction. Since 1902.

Massachusetts, Secretary State Board of Education. 1837-1909.

Commissioner of Education. Since 1909.

Michigan, Superintendent of Public Instruction. Since 1836.
Minnesota
Territorial Superintendent of Public Instruction. 1849-1855.
Chancellor State University, ex officio. 1860-62.
Secretary of State, ex officio. 1862-1867.
Superintendent of Public Instruction. Since 1967.

Mississippi
Secretary of State, ex officio. 1846-1951.
Superintendent of Public Instruction. Since 1970.

Missouri
State Superintendent of Common Schools. 1839-1841.
Secretary of State ex officio. 1840-1853.
State Superintendent of Schools. 1853-1861.
Secretary of State, ex officio. 1861-1865.
Superintendent of Public Instruction. Since 1865.

Montana
Superintendent of Public Instruction. Since 1889.

Nebraska
State Librarian, ex officio. 1855-1861.
Territorial Auditor, ex officio. 1861-1869.
Superintendent of Public Instruction. Since 1869.

Nevada
Superintendent of Public Instruction. Since 1862.

New Hampshire
State School Commissioner. 1846-1850.
Superintendent of Public Instruction. Since 1867.

New Jersey
State Superintendent of Public Schools. 1845-1846.
Superintendent of Public Schools. 1846-1911.
Commissioner of Education. Since 1911.

New Mexico
Territorial Superintendent of Public Schools. 1863-1911.
Superintendent of Public Instruction. Since 1912.

New York
Superintendent of Common Schools. 1812-1821.
Secretary of State, ex officio. 1821-1854.
Superintendent of Public Instruction. 1854-1904.
Commissioner of Education. Since 1904.
North Carolina Superintendent of Common Schools. 1852-1866.
    Superintendent of Public Instruction. Since 1868.

North Dakota, Territorial Superintendent of Public Instruction.
    1864-1889.
    State Superintendent of Public Instruction. Since 1890.

Ohio Superintendent of Common Schools. 1837-1840.
    Secretary of State, ex officio. 184-1853.
    Commissioner of Common Schools. 1853-1914.
    Superintendent of Public Instruction. Since 1914.

Oklahoma Territorial Auditor and Superintendent of Schools.
    1891-1907.
    Superintendent of Public Instruction. Since 1907.

Oregon Territorial Superintendent of Common Schools. 1849-1851.
    Governor, ex officio. 1857-1872.
    Superintendent of Public Instruction. Since 1872.

Pennsylvania Secretary of State, ex officio. 1834-1857.
    Superintendent of Common Schools. 1857-1873.
    Superintendent of Public Instruction. Since 1873.

Rhode Island Secretary of State, ex officio. 1838-1843.
    State School Agent. 1843-1845.
    Commissioner of Public Schools. Since 1845.

South Carolina Comptroller of State, for returns. 1812-1868.
    State Superintendent of Education. Since 1868.

South Dakota Territorial Superintendent of Public Instruction.
    1964-1889.
    Superintendent of Public Instruction. Since 1889.

Tennessee Secretary of State, ex officio. 1835-1844.
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Texas

State Treasurer, ex officio. 1844-1861.
Superintendent of Common Schools. 1867-1870.
State Treasurer, ex officio. 1871-1873.
Superintendent of Public Instruction. Since 1873.

Utah

State Treasurer, ex officio. 1854-1861.
Superintendent of Public Instruction. 1869-1876.
Secretary State Board of Education. 1876-1893.
Superintendent of Public Instruction. Since 1883.

Territorial Superintendent of Common Schools. 1855-1876.
Territorial Superintendent of District Schools. 1876-1897.
Territorial Commissioner of Schools. 1887-1896.
Superintendent of Public Instruction. Since 1896.

Vermont

Secretary of State, for returns. 1827-1833.
Superintendent of Schools. 1845-1851.
Secretary State Board of Education. 1856-1874.
Superintendent of Education. Since 1874.

Washington

Territorial Superintendent of Schools. 1871-1889.
Superintendent of Public Instruction. Since 1889.

West Virginia

State Superintendent of Free Schools. Since 1864.

Wisconsin

Superintendent of Public Instruction. Since 1849.

Wyoming

Territorial Auditor, ex officio. 1869-1871.
State Librarian, ex officio. 1873-1880.
Territorial Superintendent of Public Instruction. 1880-1890.
Superintendent of Public Instruction. Since 1890.
Method of appointment.

In thirty-three states the State Superintendent of Public Instruction is elected by the qualified voters. These states are: Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Michigan, Massachusetts, Missouri, Montana, Nevada, Nebraska, New Mexico, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Carolina, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and Wyoming.

In five states the Superintendent is appointed by the State Board of Education. These states are: Connecticut, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Newmont and New York.

In the remaining ten they are appointed by the Governor. These states are: Delaware, Iowa, Maine, Maryland, Minnesota, New Hampshire, New Jersey, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Tennessee.

Powers of State Superintendent.

Perhaps the power of most significance vested in the State Superintendent as indicating the trend toward centralization, is that of appellate judicial authority co-ordinate with that of the court of appeals in some respects. This appellate jurisdiction has been conferred upon the State Superintendent in at least twenty-eight states, California, Colorado, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New York, New Jersey, North Dakota, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, Virginia, Washington, and Wisconsin.

The following from the New York School Law (Title XIV, Section I) illustrates the above. In the case of any appeal to the State
Superintendent in connection with any matter pertaining to common schools "his decision shall be final and conclusive, and not subject to question or review in any place or court whatever".

A comparison of duties and powers of the State Superintendent of Illinois in 1887 and 1914.

1887.

"Although the State Superintendent is placed at the head of the public school system the law has invested him with very little power. He can require reports to be made to him by the county superintendents and other school officers, and can withhold from any section which has not complied with the school laws, its proportion of the state school fund. Beyond this he must rely upon his own efforts and personal influence for accomplishing any purpose". (United States Bureau of Education, Report of the Commissioner, 1887-88, p.1098).

1914.

"Duties: To have an office and keep records at the state capitol, preserve all documents coming into his hands as superintendent; supervise public schools; confer with experienced teachers as to the best manner of conducting schools; advise and assist county superintendents; act as ex officio member of board of trustees of the Southern Normal University; make rules necessary to carry out the school laws; give advice to school officers regarding the school law; hear and determine all controversies coming to him by appeal from county superintendents, grant certificates to qualified teachers, and suspend state certificates for cause; visit and inspect such charitable institutions are educational
in their character; report biennially to the governor as to the conditions of the schools.

Powers of Superintendent: To designate statistics required to be reported by school officers to county superintendents; authorize county superintendents to procure necessary assistance in conducting teachers' examinations; require county superintendent to furnish information for his biennial report; require reports from townships, cities, and districts; remit, for good reason, the school fund forfeited by any township which may have failed to make reports required by law; require the auditor of public accounts to withhold from the county superintendent the amount due his county from the state school fund, or the said superintendent for his compensation, until the said superintendent makes the required annual report to State Superintendent; request report from every university, college, or other educational institution; require that common-school township or other school fund be withheld from any township, district, officer, or teacher, until required reports are made".(Digest of State Laws Relating to Public Instruction, United States Bureau of Education, Bulletin # 47, 1915, p.47.)
CHART INDICATING THE PROGRESS OF STATE LEGISLATION IN THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE OFFICE OF SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION.

The purple graph indicates the progress as the office was first established; the blue the legislation in effect at the present time.
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By 1884, the year the first state-wide mandatory law was passed in the United States, providing for free text books in public schools, nineteen cities were already pursuing that policy. These cities, in chronological order, were: Philadelphia, 1818; Jersey City, 1830; Newark, New Jersey, 1838; Elizabeth, New Jersey, 1850; Hoboken, 1855; Charleston, South Carolina, 1856; Paterson, New Jersey, 1860; Chester, Pennsylvania, 1864; Passaic, New Jersey, 1870; Fall River, Massachusetts, 1874; Wilmington, Delaware, 1875; Johnstown, Pennsylvania, 1875; Moonsocket, Rhode Island, 1877; New York City, 1878; Lowell, Massachusetts, 1881; Yonkers, New York 1882; La Crosse, Wisconsin, 1882; Holyoke, Massachusetts, 1883; and Camden, New Jersey, 1883.

Of the states represented above, Massachusetts adopted a state-wide mandatory law in 1884, Pennsylvania and Rhode Island in 1893, New Jersey in 1894, Delaware in 1899; Wisconsin has a permissive law, while South Carolina is still included among the states making no provision for free text books.

The date of adoption of a state-wide mandatory free textbook law in each of the fifteen states having such legislation at present was as follows: 1884, Massachusetts; 1889, Maine; 1891, Nebraska; 1893, Pennsylvania and Rhode Island; 1894, New Jersey; 1895, Vermont; 1896, Maryland; 1898, Delaware; 1899, Wyoming, and New Hampshire; 1904, Utah; 1912, Arizona; 1913, Nevada and California.

Seven of these states leave the selection of the textbooks
to be used with the city or township. These states are: New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, and Rhode Island.

In two states, Nebraska and Wyoming, the selection is left to local district boards.

One state, Maryland, allows the county boards to select the textbooks.

Five states, Arizona, California, Delaware, Nevada, and Utah, require the use of books adopted by state authorities.

In eleven states free textbooks for public secondary schools as well as for elementary schools is required. These states are: Delaware, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, and Wyoming.

In twenty states permissive laws provide that school districts may supply free textbooks if they desire to do so. These states are Colorado, Connecticut, Idaho, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, South Dakota, Texas, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Virginia, and Georgia.

State uniformity.

In 1897 sixteen states had state uniformity compulsory laws applying to textbooks. These were: Arizona, California, Delaware, Idaho, Indiana, Louisiana, Missouri, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, South Carolina, Utah, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, and Wyoming.

Today that number has been increased to twenty-four, as follows Alabama, Arizona, California, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Idaho,
Indiana, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Virginia, and West Virginia.

In all of these a state board selects the textbooks to be used. The present tendency is to merge the state textbook commission with the state board of education.

In eleven of the twenty-four states with state uniformity of textbooks, the boards of education constitute the state textbook commission. These states are: Arizona, California, Delaware, Georgia, Idaho, Indiana, Louisiana, New Mexico, Oklahoma, South Carolina, and Virginia.

In three states, Nevada, North Carolina, and Tennessee, the state textbook commission is composed of the state board of education, and additional appointed members.

In ten states, Alabama, Florida, Kansas, Kentucky, Mississippi, Montana, Oregon, Texas, Utah, and West Virginia, the state textbook commission is made up of specially appointed members.

As a perfect example of centralization, the law of Arizona affords a goal toward which all states may well strive. "The state board of education adopts a series of books for the entire state, and buys them; the county superintendent orders from the board what his estimates show that his county will need, and he supplies the district trustees, who in turn supply the pupils." (United States Bureau of Education, Report of the Commissioner, 1912, Vol.1,p.73.)

Two states, California and Kansas, have extended their legislation pertaining to textbooks to their publication. California enacted such legislation in 1885, Kansas in 1913.
CHART INDICATING THE PROGRESS OF THE ADOPTION OF STATE-WIDE MANDATORY FREE TEXTBOOK LEGISLATION.
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Units of Organization.

To show that the state is the ultimate unit of organization for educational administration, is the burden of this study of centralizing tendencies. But the evolution toward the state unit the district, town or township, and county have played an important part. They are still vital factors in educational administration. Hence this consideration of them.

In the order of legislative provision, the district is the oldest of these three units. It dates back to 1789, when the following law was enacted by the general court of Massachusetts: "And whereas by means of the dispersed situation of the inhabitants in this commonwealth, the children and youth cannot be collected in any one place for their instruction, and it has become expedient that the towns and districts in the circumstances aforesaid, should be divided into separate districts for the purpose aforesaid."

In 1800 the power to tax was conferred upon the people of the district; in 1817 they were made corporations with full power to sue and be sued; and in 1827 they were empowered to elect prudential committees. Thus in thirty-eight years the school district had become a "full fledged political institution".

Other states rapidly followed Massachusetts in adopting this extreme of local self-government. Vermont in 1782 empowered the towns to form districts and to elect officers. New York took similar action in 1795. In 1820 Maine adopted the district system. By 1827 the district system was firmly established.
throughout New England.

And in their march westward, the pioneers carried the district system with them, and made it part of the civilization of the New West. Ohio adopted it as a system in 1821, Illinois in 1825, Indiana in 1833, and Michigan in 1837. Every state west of the Mississippi River adopted it, and are organized under it today.

It does not come within the scope of this paper to discuss the advantages and disadvantages of the several phases of the present centralizing tendency. But in view of the fact that the district system crowded out the town system, and is now itself being crowded out by the county system, it may not be out of place to enumerate its evils, as they are given by C. T. Webster. (Recent centralizing tendencies in state educational administration)

(1) It fosters a very narrow provincialism.
(2) It is much more expensive.
(3) It enormously increases the number of officials.
(4) It increases number of school elections.
(5) It occasions glaring and unjust inequalities in school taxation and school privileges.
(6) It does not admit of any continuous and steady school policy.
(7) It does not admit of any effective system of grading.
(8) It bars out all really effective supervision.
(9) It fosters boundary quarrels.

The states at present organized with the district system are:
Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado, Idaho, Illinois, Kansas, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, New York, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Dakota and Wyoming. In Iowa, Michigan, North Dakota and Utah the district predominates. In California, Delaware, Mississippi, South Carolina, Texas and Washington the balance of power rests with the district rather than with the county.

Though the town or township system may be said to have been the one existing in New England prior to the creation of the district system, and so to precede it, in the order of legislative enactment it does not come until sixty-three years later, when in 1852 it was adopted by Indiana. Its adoption by Massachusetts in 1882 came as a result of thirty years struggle to overthrow the district system. In short it may be said that its progress in New England was everywhere marked by the overthrow of the district system. New Hampshire three off the district system and adopted the township unit in 1885; Maine followed in 1892. That same year the conflict became evident in the west, Ohio changing from the district to the town unit. Michigan had adopted the district system in 1837, in 1891 it adopted the township system.

The states at present having the town or township system are: Maine, Vermont, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Indiana, North Dakota (semi), Michigan (semi), Iowa (semi), and West Virginia.

The town of New England, and the township of the western states are not the same. The town of New England is a geographi-
cal unit, the township of the central west is the Congressional unit. Though the town is admirably adapted to Massachusetts, because of the density on population and its geographical character, the township is extremely undesirable for the reason that it does not provide for geographical barriers.

The county system dates back to 1865. In that year Maryland enacted the first law adopting the county system of supervision.

South Carolina followed in 1862, but while making provision for county supervision, permitted district organization. In 1870 Louisiana, in 1885 Florida, in 1887 Georgia adopted the county unit of organization. Delaware in 1898 passed a law providing for county supervision, but allowed the district organization to remain. In 1900 North Carolina passed a county unit law. Since that date the county system has been adopted by ten states, so that today it is found in eighteen states in either a county or semi county system.

Ohio affords a good example of the evolution of the county unit. In 1821 Ohio adopted the district system. In 1892 it cast off the district system and adopted the township unit. In 1914 it cast off the township unit and adopted the county.

The eighteen states in which the county unit of organization is found today are: Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, North Carolina, Tennessee, Utah (semi), California (semi), Delaware (semi), Mississippi (semi), Ohio, South Carolina, Texas, Virginia, Washington, and Wisconsin.
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Vocational Education.

Industrial training has been introduced into the American school system in an effort to meet the new social and industrial conditions arising from tremendous industrial expansion. Coincident with the expansion there has been a development which has left but a few industries untouched, and has changed the industrial organization from comparative homogeneity to a situation in which a minority of workers requires even greater skill and intelligence than formerly, and a majority which need skill only in a narrow range of operations. To meet this new situation became the task confronting the schools.

1. The first effort to meet the new conditions was made about the middle of the nineteenth century. This took the twofold form of evening classes for adults under private auspices, and the introduction of rudimentary industrial training into charitable institutions for destitute children.

Some of the former were: Cooper Union (1859) and Mechanics Institute, of New York; Franklin Union (1824) and Spring Garden Institute, of Philadelphia; Ohio Mechanics Union of Cincinnati; and the Richmond Mechanics Union of Virginia.

Some of the latter were:
1848, House of Industry Colored School, Philadelphia.
1849, Industrial School of the American Female Guardian Society, New York.
1854, Industrial School for Girls, Boston.
Brooklyn Industrial School Association and Home for Destitute Children, Brooklyn.
   Eastern District Industrial School, Brooklyn.
1856, St. Vincent's Industrial School, New York.
1857, The Industrial School of Rochester, Rochester.
   Industrial School, St. Joseph's Convent of Mercy, St. Louis.
1858, Girls' Industrial School, St. Louis.
   St. Joseph's Industrial School, New York.
1859, Detroit Industrial School
   Industrial School for Girls, Philadelphia.
1855, Children's Aid Society Industrial School, New York.

Thus there were by 1860, fifteen such schools. Within the next twelve years this number increased to fifty-six.

It must not be assumed that any of these offered the differentiated course of the modern vocational school. As a matter of fact the curriculum of the Unions and the Institutes was limited almost entirely to language, arithmetic, and the other general studies; while that of the charitable schools was extended to cover sewing for the girls, and simple manual training for the boys.

2. The next important date in the development of the industrial movement is 1862, the passage of the Morrill Act, by which large land grants were made to the states for the support of instruction of agriculture and mechanics. As a result engineering departments were soon added in most of the western state colleges and universities. But though the development of these institutions has been widespread, they are not directly to be classed as vocational institutions. Their function is to produce
engineering and technical experts, not to train workmen, or even to develop men of the foreman type.

3. The next step in the process of evolution is that of permissive legislation. This dates from 1872, when the Massachusetts' legislature passed an act providing that the city-council of any city or town might establish and maintain one or more industrial schools, and raise and appropriate the money necessary to render them efficient. These schools were to be under the superintendence of the "board of school-committee" of the city or town. They employed the teachers, and prescribed the arts, trades, and occupations to be taught.

Boston and Lowell seem to have taken advantage of this privilege, and established such schools the same year. Two years later (1874) New Bedford and Springfield established similar schools; Lynn and Waltham four years later (1878). Some of the other cities to follow were: Haverhill, 1887; Winchester, 1888; Fall River, 1889; Malden, 1889; Newburyport, 1892. Thus in twenty years eleven cities had established such schools in Massachusetts.

Mention ought be made of the exhibit at the Centennial Exposition at Philaphelia, of the works and tools of Victor Della-Vos, of the Imperial Technical Schools, of Moscow, Russia. To this exhibit, perhaps more than to any other single influence may be attributed the impetus given the movement toward the close of the nineteenth century.

The development up the twentieth century was purely along the lines of manual training. Now the movement assumes an entirely
different aspect, that of vocational education. This is to be
differentiated from manual training in that the latter is a train-
ing in the use of tools for woodwork, hence it is not much more
than carpentry. Vocational education is a training in the trades.
It includes manual training, but extends also over metal work,
sheet metal construction, printing and book-binding, electrical
construction, bricklaying, telephony, concrete construction,
salesmanship, and others.

The first school of this type to be opened was private, and
was called The Evening School of Trades of Springfield, Massa-
chusetts. It was organized in 1898.

4. The entrance of the trade school upon the stage of public
administration was ushered in by legislative enactment in 1906
in Massachusetts. This was in the form of permissive legislation.
It provided for industrial and evening schools subject to the
approval of the Commissioner of Industrial Education.

Wisconsin and Connecticut both followed in 1907, each with
permissive legislation. The industrial schools of Wisconsin were
to be for persons having attained sixteen years of age; the work
offered in Connecticut was to be subject to the approval of the
State Board of Education.

Then followed: New York, 1908, permissive legislation;
Maine, 1911, "a special act for the encouragement of industrial
education; Pennsylvania, 1911, permissive legislation; New Jersey,
1911, permissive legislation; and Indiana, 1912, mandatory legis-
lation.

Though permissive legislation marked a stage in the evolution
of the movement, it is not common today. In no state unless it is
New Mexico, does merely permissive legislation exist. And New Mexico, while it does not grant money out of the state treasury for the benefit of vocational schools, the legislature has empowered the State Board of Education (1912) to prescribe and adopt a course of study in industrial education for the public schools. In every state in which a definite state system has been set up, state aid is granted.

5. Persuasive legislation.

Vermont was the first state to provide by legislative enactment (1909) for state aid for education of this kind. In the case of Vermont, however, it is for manual training only. It provides for the payment of $250.00 annually to any town city or district maintaining such an approved course.

Other states in which state appropriations are made to communities offering approved courses in industrial, manual, or household arts are: Maine, Minnesota, Montana, North Dakota, Rhode Island, and Tennessee.

In Connecticut the law provides for industrial schools under two plans: (1) support and control by the state Board of Education; and (2) control by the local community, with state aid.

The provisions for state aid made in states creating state systems of vocational education can hardly be classed as persuasive, and hence such states are not included in this section. The educational of vocational education schools under such a system is mandatory, the state aid being granted only to make easier the financial burden.
6. State systems.

In the evolution of the industrial education movement as in the other movements considered in these pages the state system represents the most comprehensive centralization. It represents the ultimate unit of organization and supervision of vocational schools, and of assisting local communities in the maintenance of such schools through state aid.

In six states specific machinery for the administration of such systems has been established, and in each case under the direction of a special deputy, or expert assistant, attached to the staff of the state superintendent or commissioner of education. These states, together with the enactment of the present law, are: New York, 1910; Massachusetts, 1911; Wisconsin, 1911; Indiana, 1912; New Jersey, 1912; Pennsylvania, 1912.

Four other states, Connecticut, 1909; New Mexico, 1912; California, 1913; and Maine, 1914, have provided for the administration of the vocational education of the state by a state official.

Nine of the above states, all but Connecticut, have created a separate division of vocational education as a part of the state department of public education, for the organization and supervision of this work. Connecticut leaves it to the State Board of Education.


Perhaps the most significant event in all the progress of the movement, was the passage, July 31, 1916, of the Smith-Hughes Act, providing Federal aid for vocational education.
The main provisions of this bill are:

1. Federal aid to be granted to public supported and controlled schools of less than college grade for (a) training teachers for agricultural education, trade and industrial education, and home economics, and (b) for paying part of the salaries of supervisors and directors of agricultural subjects and teachers of trade and industrial education.

2. The appropriation for trade and industrial schools to be $500,000.00 the first year, increasing to $3,000,000.00; for agricultural schools the same as for trade and industrial schools; for teacher training $500,000.00 the first year, increasing to $1,000,000.00 in 1918-1919, and remaining at that amount.

3. For every dollar of Federal aid, the state or local communities are required to expend an equal amount, besides meeting all maintenance costs.

4. A Federal Board of Industrial Education is provided for to consist of five members; the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of the Interior, the Postmaster General, the Secretary of Commerce, with the Commissioner of Education as executive officer.

5. States to create or designate state boards to handle the funds.

8. Conclusion.

Thus it appears that in sixteen states vocational education has some legal recognition: New York, Massachusetts, Wisconsin, Indiana, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Connecticut, New Mexico, California, Maine, Vermont, Minnesota, Montana, North Dakota,
HARTS INDICATING THE PROGRESS TOWARD CENTRALIZATION IN THE CONTROL OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION.

PROGRESS OF THE STATE SYSTEM.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1909</th>
<th>1910</th>
<th>1911</th>
<th>1912</th>
<th>1913</th>
<th>1914</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>States</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

States indicating the total number of states granting some legal recognition to vocational education.

Shaded portion indicates number of state systems.
Rhode Island, and Tennessee.

The tendency is unmistakably toward centralization. Some factors indicating this are:

(1) The abandonment of permissive legislation.

(2) That ten of the sixteen states legally recognizing vocational education have placed it in charge of state officials.

(3) That the other six states require certain requirements to be met.

(4) That the Federal aid makes each state responsible for its apportionment.
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