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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

It is generally agreed that in order to preserve the nation's way of life American schools must help boys and girls to learn the fundamental concepts of democracy. Yet results of a study made by M. L. Story, Professor of Education, Winthrop College, of 920 teachers and 897 central administrative personnel indicate that there are some strongly undemocratic administrative practices in the schools. Six hundred fifty-three people listed twenty-six practices which they felt were undemocratic. Two hundred and five staff members said school policy is dictated by administrators, and fifty-eight claimed a pretense of democracy carried on. According to Story, the study also seemed to indicate that teachers are not sure what democracy is all about.¹

Russel Malan, Superintendent of Schools in Harrisburg, Illinois, points out that an obstacle to democratic administration is the lack of knowledge and understanding

of the democratic process and requirements incidental to individual participation.

The obstacles that interfere with the operation of the school-faculty organization on a democratic basis and retard the growth of functional participation stem from: (1) ignorance or misconceptions about the nature and workings of the democratic process; (2) a lack of understanding of the purposes of democracy and the requirements incidental to individual participation; or (3) a perversity of will which stems from faults in respect to the area of human relations.

Obstacles to democratic administration in the school arise not only within the relationships between the administrative personnel and the instructional staff and among the teachers themselves, but difficulties also press from other sources.

Within the community there are always forces, present in varying degrees, which handicap the school's functioning along the lines of democratic procedures. These forces generally may be classified as interest groups or pressure groups.¹

Roberta Green, a classroom teacher in the Metairie Park County Day School of New Orleans, Louisiana, lists the objections to democratic administration from her point of view as lack of experience in practicing democracy on the part of the teacher, fear, doubt, and lack of desire for democracy or the democratic process on the part of some teachers.

The first factor in the teacher's difficulties is, it seems to me, lack of experience. Most of us have come up through an educational process where the general pattern has been autocratic rather than democratic. Courses of study, rules of behavior,

¹L. R. Malan, "Obstacles to Democratic Administration As Seen by An Administrator," Progressive Education, XXX (November, 1952), 37.
standards of excellence, and so on have in general been set by some one above the teacher.

One other lack is significant. We do not know, nor does anyone else seem to know, what responsibilities go with 'democratic' behavior.

A second factor in the teacher's response is likely to be fear. Accustomed to accepting outlines and plans, to referring decisions to someone above, the teacher is fearful in two senses. First he is fearful of making mistakes in judgment.

The teacher may also fear those above him. Superintendents and other administrators must recognize this fear—these fears—and deal with them carefully.

Closely allied to fear is doubt. Does the administrator really want honest opinion? Or is this merely a way of making the teacher feel important?

There are other difficulties which are not dependent upon the degree of emotional security or experience. One of these is the question of time. Schools run according to the calendar. In June the curriculum for September must be in hand; textbooks must be ordered; rooms must be assigned. The unfinished curriculum, the unplanned curriculum must be put into form. Who is to do this? Will the teachers stay on during June and July to work out the necessary steps or will they have to hand the half-done work to the office for those really significant conclusions?

We have not so far mentioned that groups of teachers who really do not want you to work, who are themselves not democratic, who do not willingly accept sacrifice as a part of the teaching profession.\(^1\)

Mrs. Annie Laurie McDonald, also a classroom teacher, knowing of no greater need that the schools have believes democracy needs to be practiced if it is to be taught, but

\(^1\)Roberta Green, "Obstacles to Democratic Administration As Seen by A Teacher," Progressive Education, XXX (November, 1952), 35-37.
sees the personalities of the teachers and administrators as vital factors if the democratic process is to be successfully practiced.

I am a classroom teacher and I have had experience under several different administrators and in five different schools. When I think of democracy in school administration, I think of a personality. So much has been written and even more has been said about democracy! What we need is to have people working at it! I know of no greater need in schools than to learn and teach the ways of democracy.

As a classroom teacher, I recognize that the democratic process requires that the administrator possess industry in large amounts, resources of a high order, competence above the average. I recognize that the administrator must have teachers who have or are developing much the same characteristics and who are willing and able to share the responsibilities as well as the privileges of a democracy. I also realize very keenly that the result of the democratic process is a happy vital situation where children are becoming all that we ourselves are striving to become.1

J. D. Grambs, Assistant Professor of Education, Stanford University, attempted to determine what a class of prospective teachers expected the administrators who they would soon be working under to be like by asking the class to complete a short questionnaire. Results of this informal study showed this group of future teachers picturing school administrators as authoritarian, conservative, and unresponsive to suggestions.2

1Annie Laurie McDonald, "What A Classroom Teacher Thinks of Democracy in School Administration," The School Executive, LXV (December, 1945), 73.

Story presents the objections to participative administration most often used by those who flatly oppose democratic participation as it is commonly advocated.

Basically, there are four objections.

First, there is the pre-eminent challenge of the 'efficiency' group—those who argue that wide participation in administration makes for a ponderous and cumbersome ineptitude in school management. The arguments of this group are particularly effective since they are supported by numerous analogies from professional fields . . . . Adherents to this viewpoint also emphasize the equally plausible viewpoint that immediate decision is of the greatest importance to administration on many occasions and that time cannot be taken for the slower processes of participation.

A second basic argument is concerned with the question of 'teacher willingness.' It is contended that teachers do not particularly care to participate in administration, in fact, that they prefer to be free of the added burdens of committee work and group meetings in order to concentrate upon time-consuming classroom problems. This view assumes a desire on the part of teachers to be left alone when purely administrative issues are involved.

As a third viewpoint, there is the related argument usually advanced by administrators that teachers are definitely not capable of effective participation in administration . . . . Such views tend ultimately to compromise but maintain with insistence that we must first educate teachers to the larger competency of being able to participate wisely in group planning and policy making.

The fourth major objection emphasized the dualism of teaching and administration by pointing out that an inevitable labor-management relationship must exist between the teacher and the administrator.¹

It is clear that democracy in school administration has its advocates and its adversaries, and that there are obstacles to be overcome and advantages to be gained. The problem for this study is to locate instances where democratic concepts have been put into practice and to obtain as much detailed information on the procedure as is possible.

In class discussion and other conversations with fellow students the author discovered that they, even more than Roberta Green, Russel Malan, and the students questioned by Jean Grambs, doubted the teacher's ability or desire to take part in the administrative affairs of a school, saw the obstacles in the way of practicing democratic administration and the objections to it, and expected school administrators to be autocratic.

The study is limited to practical applications of democratic administration which have been reported in some professional periodicals and listed in the *Educational Index*. Obviously many applications not reported in the literature are not included. Further the report includes only those applications which have actually been put into practice. The theoretical and speculative applications have not been included. The study was limited to reports found in professional periodicals for it was believed that these would be authentic and objective.
In an attempt to escape emotional factors of sentimentalism and patriotism connected to the word "democracy" as well as the difficulty in defining the term some writers use the terms "participative administration" or "teacher sharing," all of which have the same meaning to the author. According to Story, it is impossible to define the term "democratic school administration" because of the linguistic handicap of having to define an abstraction with another abstraction.

It would seem that no actual referent of democratic school administration is given until specific practices which characterize it are demonstrated. It is only when we point to an operating school and designate it as democratic in its administration that any semblance of an actual referent for our terminology is established.¹

Without attempting a formal definition, as that has been pointed out as impossible, let it be understood that by "democratic administration," the author means the administrative situation where decision making is participated in directly by persons other than the administrator; in this case by students and teachers. Cornell points out that, "teachers by this definition may participate in administrative decision making by advising, recommending, or suggesting . . . not in the final decision."²


²Francis G. Cornell, "When Should Teachers Share in Making Administrative Decisions?" The Nation's Schools, LIII (May, 1954), 44.
"Practical applications" are those which have been tried at least once and have proved, in the opinion of the person reporting, to have been satisfactory.
CHAPTER II

TEACHER PARTICIPATION IN SCHOOL ADMINISTRATION

Advisory and Administrative Councils

It is frequently assumed that the school administrator must be authoritarian. The school system which he administers is commonly thought of as his kingdom where his word is law and must not be questioned openly. In turn the teacher becomes the autocrat of the classroom. This concept leaves the student with almost no examples of democratic leadership and little area in which they might practice democratic living. Today most school administrators continue in the old pattern although some changes are being made for as Logsdon states:

Since the principal has been charged traditionally with the management of his school and held responsible by rules and regulations established by the board of education, any change in the concept of his job has been difficult. However, there is some evidence which indicates a gradual change in the concept of the principalship. The newer concept is one in which policy making and administration are shared by the principal and his faculty.¹

Evidence of the evolution of this new concept is revealed in Moore's study of advisory councils in large city school systems.

Staff participation in policy making and planning is not a new idea in school administration. As early as 1903, John Dewey was advocating 'official and constitutional provision for submitting questions of methods of discipline and teaching, and the question of curriculum, textbooks, etc., to the discussion and decision of those actually engaged in the work of teaching.' As early as 1910, teachers' advisory councils were in existence and within ten years nearly one hundred cities were using them in some fashion.

For putting such a program into practice probably no school organization offers greater difficulty than the large city school system. Large city systems have mushroomed during the period when the participation idea has been growing. It might appear that this concurrent growth would have assured a strong development in this respect. Such has not been the case.

Because of the unwillingness of large school systems and the tendency to obtain a strong specialization in administration and supervision, these systems have frequently failed to reach the levels of participation found in small and medium sized school systems. Lines of administration are frequently more strongly entrenched in the large school system, and the very great problem of administering an educational program involving hundreds of thousands of children and thousands of teachers causes the administrator to hesitate to inject what he may consider to be another complicating operating factor.

To ascertain how large cities are dealing with this problem, the author asked the superintendents of the 46 cities over 200,000 in population to supply certain information concerning the organizations set up in their respective school systems to afford the participation and communication that has been referred to in this article. The report covered conditions as they existed in the summer of 1950.

Essentially, the information was sought to determine the mechanics of the organizations themselves and their operation rather than to attempt an appraisal of their effectiveness.
Thirty-three of the 46 school systems replied to the inquiry which asked the form or nature of the organization, its aim and objectives, meetings, membership, and the name of the organization. Six simple questions requiring an appraisal by the superintendent of the local organization were also included. This appraisal represents opinion but should be worth consideration since it grows out of experience.

Of the 33 cities reporting, 18 said that they had an organization that met the stipulation set out in the original inquiry, which was as follows:

One of the current issues in many school systems is the stress being placed on participation on the part of the staff in relation to problems involving the operation of the school system and its educational system. Various names or titles, such as employee councils and the like, are applied to such groups. These groups are to be distinguished from the more commonly existing curriculum councils.

This sampling seems to offer a report sufficient to safely indicate the direction of practice in this group of cities.¹

One reason for this new trend was expressed by Mark C. Schinnerer in a statement of his philosophy of school administration. "No one person has enough ability and information to administer a school system at its highest efficiency; individual school people are now more efficient when they feel that they are an accepted 'part' of an organization."²

Henry Antell expressed the second reason more fully when he wrote:

The best efforts of teachers will not be forthcoming unless there is engendered within them a


²A. H. Rice, "Visit with Mark C. Schinnerer," The Nation's Schools, XLV (January, 1950), 41.
responsibility for the success of the school program and a feeling that their thinking is necessary in the solution of vital school problems. A creative program is directly proportional to teacher morale. There is no better over-all method for doing this job than through a democratic teachers' council.1

These "democratic teacher committees" have many different names: teachers' panel, advisory council, advisory committee, and administrative council. These are just a few. These committees vary greatly in size, organization, and purpose. In general, they can be classified into two groups: those which affect and include representatives from the whole school systems, often called the superintendent's committee; and those which affect and include representatives from just one building, commonly called the principal's committee.

An all-system committee called a "policies council" was established in Pasadena, California, by a statement of policy formulated by the board of education in October, 1936.

This policy committed the board and the entire school system to the proposition of operating within the framework of democratic principles. The establishment of a policies council was the logical outgrowth of a developmental program directed toward the problem of improving our ways of working. It was entirely in keeping with board policy and was the direct outgrowth of creative planning on the part of Superintendent John A. Sexon and George H. Merideth, 1

deputy superintendent. In this respect our council is unique in that its creation represents the work of constructive school administration.

The Pasadena council is not the brain child of a disgruntled group of teachers. It is not the outgrowth of any pressure group and has established a policy of never identifying itself with a pressure group. Instead, the council is organized as a professional body dedicated to furthering the educational services for children.¹

The Pasadena Policies Council included representatives of all school employee groups: administrators, supervisors, instructors, maintenance and custodial staff, and cafeteria workers. Each member was elected by his own group to serve a three year term and was not permitted to serve two consecutive terms. About one-third of the council retired each year, thus providing for greater continuity.

Partly because Superintendent Sexson replied, "I do not see myself as chairman," when asked how he saw himself in relationship to the policy council, the council elects a chairman to serve a term of one year.²

After about eight years of operation Howell wrote of the Council's work:

It is too early to evaluate the success of the council in terms of the purposes for which it was created. There are, however, indications that it may make a vital contribution toward improving our way of working in Pasadena. The most understanding between administration and staff and among the various school groups.³

¹Y. C. Howell, "We Run Our School on Democratic Lines," The Nation's Schools, XXXV (March, 1945), 24.

²Ibid.

³Ibid., p. 25.
Another example of a board initiated teacher committee is the Teachers' Panel of Nashville, Tennessee.

Taking the point of view that cooperation and exchange of ideas between the board of education and the teaching staff would be of benefit to Nashville the board passed the following resolutions in order that their point of view be put into operation.

1. That the Nashville City Teachers' Association be invited to select from its membership one principal and two teachers of its own choice, who will be known as The Teacher Panel, that will serve as an auxiliary to the board of education.

2. The members of the Teacher Panel shall be invited to attend all meetings of the board, shall have the right to take part in discussions and present such information and recommendations to the board as they shall from time to time consider advisable and expedient. However, before a formal recommendation is made to the board the Panel shall first discuss the question with the superintendent of schools in order to have the benefit of his advices and counsel, which is in accordance with the general practice of the regular committees of the board. The Teacher Panel shall serve on special assignments and committees if and when requested by the board.

3. The Teacher Panel shall be recognized by the board as the accredited representatives of the teachers and it is expected that among other things they shall present to the board the viewpoint of the teachers on questions affecting the conduct and operation of the school system generally and on problems affecting the teachers individually.

4. The members of The Teacher Panel can not be given the privilege of a vote on questions determined by the board because it would be contrary to the present provisions of the city charter.
5. The Teacher Panel shall serve for the rest of the calendar year 1944. In January, 1945 the board will determine whether the plan is making a worthwhile contribution to the general good of the school system and whether and under what conditions it shall be continued. ¹

The administrative advisory council in Cleveland, Ohio, was begun by the superintendent rather than through action of the board of education. Believing that "no one person has enough information to administer a school system at its highest efficiency," and at the same time believing "the superintendent must not sidestep his responsibility," Mark C. Schinnerer announced a plan for sharing the administration of the Cleveland schools with his staff when he became superintendent in the fall of 1947.

In order to provide me with the advice and council of the people who are closest to the workday operations of the Cleveland Public Schools and to give these people an advisory voice in the administration of the schools, I am announcing here and now the appointment of an administrative advisory council.

As the name implies, the council will advise with the superintendent on administrative procedures and policies which are his responsibility by state law or by administrative code of the board of education . . . . It may be that I shall not always be able to take your advice. That is another way of saying that I have no intention of abrogating my responsibilities as superintendent of schools. This is an experiment. Its success depends upon me and upon you. ²

The Cleveland administrative advisory council is composed of the presidents of the Cleveland Teachers¹

¹"Nashville Board Asks Teacher Cooperation," The American School Board Journal, CVIII (June, 1944), 40.

²Rice, op. cit., p. 42.
Association and the American Federation of Teachers Local, one other member from each of these two groups, an elementary school principal, a secondary school principal, and a member of the headquarters staff. Each member is chosen by the superintendent and the group he represents. The purpose of the group is to secure information and to advise. Having no power to make decisions on policy or to legislate, the council meets upon the call of any of its members and considers any problem proposed by any member. The council advised the superintendent and worked as a "board of strategy" to get a six mill tax levy passed, proposed and aided in the adoption of a new salary schedule, and revised the administrative code which was adopted in part.  

The superintendent's council of Shaker Heights, Ohio, was established in 1937 but by 1941 was to be known as the staff council. With the change in name came an even greater change in the function and purpose of the council.

Initially, its functions were definitely limited, mainly to advisory action on matters brought before it by the superintendent. Its membership included the officers and building representatives of the teachers' association and the administrative officers of the school.

One year later the council was invited to take full responsibility for decisions relating to school policies. On those policies which are established

---

1 Ibid., pp. 41-43.
or changed only by action of the Board of Education and on which the board usually expects to receive definite recommendations from the superintendent, the superintendent proposed, in making his recommendations to be bound by the decisions of the council. In establishing or changing policies which the board leaves in the hands of the superintendent, he agreed to be bound by the decisions of the council.\footnote{Arthur K. Loomis, "Democratic School Administration in Practice," The Elementary School Journal, XLI (February, 1941), 417.}

Not wanting to accept the proposal on their own the council asked that the whole faculty be given an opportunity to review the new plan of making policy. At a general meeting the plan was explained and discussed. By vote of the entire staff it was agreed to assume full responsibility for making policy as proposed except the \textquote{any decision must be referred to the entire staff if the teacher members of the council deemed such referendum necessary.}\footnote{Ibid., p. 418.}

In four years, seventy subjects were dealt with of which twenty-three needed no decision. Of the seventy subjects considered twenty related to the curriculum; eighteen dealt with teacher personnel; eleven involved budgetary problems; seven had to do with defining the powers of the council; four decisions were concerned with publicity; and four related to the calendar.\footnote{Ibid.}

An example of a superintendent's committee with a rather elaborate organization is that which Superintendent
Irvin P. Murphy provided for so that he could include representatives of his 140 teacher faculty in the administration of the Carlsbad, New Mexico public schools. The Carlsbad administrative council is composed of the administrative officials, teachers assigned administrative duties, one teacher from each school unit, and representatives from civic groups closely allied with the school. This council is divided into several small committees: the administrative staff, the principals' conference, the welfare committee, and the heads of departments. The purpose of the administrative council is to provide a medium through which ideas, suggestions, criticisms, and grievances may be presented and to serve as a proving ground for suggestions, innovations, temporary plans, and proposed changes developed by the administrative staff. ¹

Superintendent Dan T. Williams of Garvery, California attempted to practice democracy in administration by providing for two-way communication through the use of an administrative cabinet, which meets twice a month, composed of administrators, supervisors, and heads of departments. A teachers' advisory council which meets two or three times a semester was also organized. It is composed of one teacher from each grade level, one from each school, a representative

¹F. E. Devaney, and G. E. Brown, "Let the Faculty Have A Voice," The Nation's Schools, XL (September, 1947), 51-52.
of the Teachers' Club, a member of the trustees, and the
district administrators.¹

All the superintendent's committees cited were
organized by school board resolution or upon the invitation
of the superintendent, but this was not the case with the
principal's advisory council at the Heights High School in
Cleveland Heights, Ohio. Line and staff was the only type
of administration known when E. E. Morley began his profes-
sional career and after twenty-five years of successful
practice with this philosophy of school administration,
he was not about to change. Not at least until the faculty
of his high school began the breakdown of his authoritarian
control shortly after World War II when they organized a
Classroom Teachers' Council. "According to their consti-
tution it was 'an attempt on the part of high school teach-
ers to have more voice in determining educational policies
and other policies related to the educational program.'"²

Grievances and causes of teacher frustration soon
appeared in the forms of reports to the principal, super-
intendent, and board of education. Assertions were bold
and frank.

¹C. C. Trillingham, "Teamwork Is the Essence of Good
Morale," The School Executive, LXX (June, 1951), 60-61.

²E. E. Morley, "Democratic Practices in the Secondary
School," National Association of Secondary School Principals
The principal shows an attitude of indifference to teacher problems, is autocratic, and shows a lack of respect for teacher opinion on educational policies. Administrators' salaries as compared with teachers' salaries are too high.¹

Although the council offered few constructive suggestions they did say that they thought many of the faults and weaknesses could be corrected by sharing with teachers some of the responsibilities of planning and management. With this background a general self-survey was conducted and plans for a principal's advisory committee were made.

Each teacher nominates seven of his colleagues for the council. From the list of those nominated an election committee selects the top fourteen who are willing to serve if elected to the council. Ballots, with the names of the fourteen candidates, are prepared and distributed to all teachers who vote for any seven. The seven receiving the most votes compose the council. This method of selection has been criticized because some departments may have no representatives while another may have several.

An agenda may or may not be prepared for the meetings which are held on alternate Wednesday afternoons. The principal presides and his four administrative and guidance assistants and the seven elected members are present. Minutes, mimeographed and distributed to all

¹Ibid.
staff members, are kept on all pertinent discussion as well as on motions and resolutions.¹

In a report of the advisory council, made in 1948, Morley said the accomplishments of the council were according to comments made by teachers: working relations between the teachers and the principal's official staff were improved; teachers had been made more aware of the nature and hazards of administration; the principal and his staff have been more aware of many angles of classroom and home room teacher service which are too often overlooked; administrative attention has been brought to school and classroom situations which might have been otherwise passed unnoticed; self-respect of many teachers has been enhanced; the principal has received guidance and advice in many difficult school situations; and there is an increasing evidence that democratic policies and procedures have been extended downward.²

Reporting again in 1951 Morley wrote, "Now after nearly six years' experience with the principal's council these same conclusions are still valid."³


²Ibid.

More recent matters which have come before the council which were not included in the 1948 report were:

The school recently opened up for public use a swank new social room in which to hold school parties and dances. This facility is part of a new addition voted by the taxpayers to expand the school's social program. Setting up the necessary organization for the scheduling and supervising activities in the social room is another very real challenge to the principal's council.

Another problem now under study in the council concerns the matter of intercultural relations in the school. Since the student body is approximately half Jew and half Gentile, increasing attention to this matter is required.\(^1\)

Continuing, Morley appraised the work of the council and its organization.

There is never a scarcity of business to be performed or any lack of readiness on the part of members of the council to tackle anything put before it. Moreover, decisions reached in the meetings are far more favorably received and more conscientiously supported by the faculty at large than similar rulings made by the principal alone.

Including elected representatives from the faculty in the principal's staff of advisers may involve some waste of time and may, on occasion, test official patience and tact but it does provide an invaluable sounding board of teachers' opinion. It may slacken speed in making decisions but it also helps to avoid mistakes.\(^2\)

Of course there is the teachers' point of view when it comes to evaluating the work of the council and to be sure, there are teachers at Cleveland Heights who refused to serve on the council for they did not wish to waste their time. But comments from one who has seen the council

\(^1\)Ibid. \(^2\)Ibid.
at work and has worked to make it a success are more favorable. The following is a quote by a teacher who had served on the council.

I have counted it a privilege to have served as a member of the principal's advisory council. The discussion without exception has aimed at improvement of the school's procedures. Since the council has included teachers from various subject-matter fields as well as members of the administrative staff, its conclusions are based on broad premises. Its decisions are accepted by pupils and teachers alike throughout the whole school.\(^1\)

The Principal's Advisory Committee of Shorewood High School, Shorewood, Wisconsin had been in operation for six years in 1950. The committee's membership of seventeen included one elected member from each department, the school librarian, the principal, who served as chairman, and the vice principal. The department representatives are elected for a term of three years, one-third retiring from the committee each year. The school librarian was included because her position gives her an opportunity to meet most of the faculty members daily.

The faculty is fully informed of the scope and function of the committee and are asked to offer items that should be considered by the group. These items can be written and given to the principal or any other member of the committee. Committee meetings are held once a month

\(^1\)Ibid., p. 212.
at three-thirty o'clock and begin informally with light refreshments. Minutes of the meeting are kept and copies are sent to all members of the faculty and to the superintendent.

The committee has influenced twenty-six aspects of school administration besides sponsoring a survey to determine how well pupil needs are being met, developing a handbook on pupil adjustment and uniform practices, and devising a new class record book.

In evaluating the committee the principal and the faculty agreed that:

The experience of the Principal's Advisory Committee of Shorewood has: (1) resulted in an increased awareness of the complex nature of administrative duties; (2) given a broadened conception of the teachers' responsibility for the total welfare of the school; (3) strengthened a feeling of mutual respect for all members of the faculty; (4) demonstrated the benefit of strong faculty support for innovations and revisions and change in policy and procedure; (5) shown the value of the group in creative enterprise; (6) provided a better understanding for administrative problems; (7) furnished a technique for promoting a united front for all-school problems; and (8) given support to the principal in effecting reform and provided assistance in relieving him from much administrative detail.1

The Faculty Council of George Washington High School in San Francisco, California was organized in 1948. The council membership is limited to a representative from each

1Logsdon, "Advisory Council," p. 36.
department, who serves for three semesters on a rotating basis, and three members at large. A chairman is elected by the council. Regular meetings are held once a month with extra meetings called as they are deemed necessary. All faculty members are invited to attend the meetings and submit suggestions for the agenda. Minutes are mimeographed and distributed to each faculty member.

In its three years of existence the George Washington Faculty Council has made recommendations on simplifying the clerical work for teachers, on lightening the teachers' load, and on making provisions for sponsor time for the proper supervision of extracurricular activities. The Council has studied the subject of the distribution of study hall assignments, the management of registry rooms, and the bugbear of classroom interruptions. Further, the Faculty Council has managed the hospitality extended to community business leaders visiting the school on the local Education-Business Day, has endorsed a form for the duplication of records, and has supported a Board of Education member particularly favorable to teacher interests. Finally, the Council has been a cohesive body in preparing statements in the name of the entire faculty. Such a democratic body eliminates the helpless shrugging of shoulders on the part of the teachers who view the monster of school organization as something too gargantuan for him to cope with. If a teacher has a Faculty Council in which to speak, he feels that because provision has been made for him to speak, what he has to say is worth listening to.¹

The principal of Hutchinson Senior High School, Hutchinson, Kansas has an advisory committee composed of the vice principal, the secretary, the boys' and girls'

counselors and four teachers elected by the faculty. Meetings are held the first Wednesday of each month from three-thirty to five o'clock. The agenda for each meeting is prepared by the principal and is sent to the members of the committee well in advance of the meeting so that they may have time to study the items that will come up as well as to get the opinions of the teachers. "The committee acts as a sounding board for new policies or regulations. . . . furnishes an opportunity for teachers to initiate suggestions . . . provides for frank discussion on controversial issues."¹

When Harold Elsbree, Principal of the Mexico Academy and Central School in Mexico, New York realized that although his teachers would not participate in solving administrative problems at teachers' meetings they had many good ideas to offer in private conferences, he knew he had to find some way to get them to present their ideas. He finally came up with the idea of an administrative council.

The council idea was first discussed with many staff members individually. Since there seemed to be merit in the plan, it was organized for a try-out period. The council consists of seven members--three elected and three appointed--with the principal an ex officio member. Two teachers are from the elementary school, two from the junior high school, and two from the senior high school.

The three appointed members are the elected chairman of the elementary faculty, the junior high school administrative assistant, and the senior high school administrative assistant. One elected member from each division of the school and the principal complete the membership.

The council deals with problems that have bearing upon the welfare of the pupils or the faculty but it does not deal with matters of board of education policy. However, its advice is sometimes sought in board matters. Whether the question is one in which the senior high school or the elementary school is predominately interested makes no difference since the group feels that the successful solution of the problem will have an effect upon the well-being of the entire school.¹

When a problem comes before the council and a solution for it is agreed upon by the group the solution is then explained to those teachers who will be affected by it. They are asked to express their reactions and to make suggestions. At the next meeting of the council a final plan is adopted and put into operation. Results of the councils' work and their plans for the future are uncertain.

So far we are able to detect a unity on the part of the faculty which for too long has been missed. The organization may be revised as we continue to work with it. We are considering adding the presidents of our student councils to the membership when problems concerning them arise. No one is sure where all this will lead. Anyway, it is a worthwhile adventure in democratic administration.²

The librarian of Brentwood High school, Pittsburg, Pennsylvania asserted that results of teacher and administrator cooperation are gratifying after having observed the

¹Harold M. Elsbree, "Our Administrative Council," The Nation's Schools, XXXVIII (October, 1946), 43.
²Ibid.
Principal's Advisory Council there for about three years. The council had begun in 1948 as a means for bringing teachers' ideas to the administration. It is described as follows:

... a representative group made up of a teacher from the junior high school, one from the senior high school, the guidance counselor, the junior high and senior high activity sponsors, the assistant principal, and the principal. Student members include the presidents of the Senior Student Forum and the Junior Student Forum as well as presidents of tenth, eleventh, and twelfth grades. Depending on the subject to be discussed, students may or may not be present at a meeting.

Any teacher may present an idea or question to the Advisory Council (and some will do so much more readily than to the principal himself) and be sure that it will receive consideration. Problems concerning teacher and pupil activities receive attention of this group. The assembly programs are determined here. Teachers are shown how to become better counselors in personal problems of children and such routine matters as schedule making. The Council has made acceptable recommendations for reallocating teachers' duties and regularly considers current problems.

Although the council at Brentwood had been organized for just a short time it seemed to have been successful enough to warrant expansion.

As a type of democracy at work, the plan has worked so well toward close relationship and understanding between principal, teachers, and students that a Superintendent's Advisory Council has been inaugurated this year. This Council has three basic aims; namely, inservice training for teachers, a channel through which hesitant teachers may easily contact the superintendent without a personal interview, and through which the superintendent may send

---

information to the teachers. Ultimately the idea is to produce better understanding through closer co-operation.1

Practicing democracy at Brentwood has caused teachers and administrators to view old tasks with a new understanding of that task and a new respect for each other.

Since its organization the teachers of Brentwood High School have had the supervisory benefits of periodical classroom visits on the part of the superintendent of schools and the principal. The important part of this conventional plan has been the absence of criticism and the attention to cooperative advice and help.2

Teacher Participation in Personnel Selection

One of the areas of teacher participation in administration that met with the greatest opposition from fellow teachers and acquaintances of the author was that of teacher participation in the selection of other teachers. Many said it just would not work; it would require too much time, time the teacher did not have to give; and teachers would hire their friends without regard to qualifications. Others thinking in terms of being on such a committee suggested they knew nothing about selecting teachers and that they would be afraid of causing hard feelings among those who applied for a position but did not get it. Some thought they would prefer to be hired by a superintendent or a member of the board of education.

1Ibid.  
2Ibid.
Reports of actual practice show most of their fears and doubts to have no real bases and that after once tried teachers like the teacher participation method better.

During and after World War II teacher turnover was so rapid the superintendent at Fair Lawn, New Jersey realized he would not be able to interview as many candidates as he would like for all the openings he had to fill. He also feared that because of the large number of replacements needed the quality of the instructional staff would decline. As a possible solution to this problem it was suggested that the faculty be allowed to help in the selection of new members. It was decided to give this suggestion a try and a plan for putting it into effect was devised.

For each position that is open, a faculty chairman is chosen, and he selects his own committee of three or four other teachers. . . . As applications are received, they are distributed to the chairman of the various committees. The applications are screened by the committee to determine which applicants they wish to interview. After the interview, if, in the opinion of the members of the committee, the applicant is worthy of consideration, they recommend that the principal talk with the candidate. If the opinion of the principal concurs with the opinion of the committee members, he in turn asks the superintendent to talk with the prospective staff member. If the superintendent concurs with the opinion of the principal and the members of the committee, recommendation for appointment is made to the board of education.\(^1\)

During the 1949-1950 school year fourteen committees screened almost six hundred applications, conducted 148 interviews, and sent forty-six applicants to the principal. The principal sent thirty-two applicants to the superintendent and the superintendent recommended fourteen for jobs.

Commenting on this selection method Charles W. Mintzer, Principal of Fair Lawn High School, wrote:

There is no doubt in the mind of anyone that our staff members are of higher caliber as a result of our method of selection. No one thing has given such a lift to faculty morale. Our teachers are glad to serve on these committees and it helps them to help the new members of our staff, because they feel responsible to a much greater degree for their success.¹

Teachers at Waller High School in Chicago were given an opportunity to help in selecting a new assistant principal. When it became apparent that the assistant principal was about to receive a promotion the general superintendent told Principal Milton J. Cohler to recommend someone from his faculty who he wanted for an assistant. Cohler in turn asked each teacher who wanted to assist him in making the selection by making suggestions and giving advice to recommend some faculty member for the position of assistant principal. To help those who wanted to make a recommendation a rating scale was constructed by the principal, the assistant principal, a class advisor selected by the principal,

¹Ibid., p. 66.
and two teachers elected by the Waller Teachers' Council. Twenty-six teachers accepted the opportunity, recommending six people for the position. From this list of six the principal made his recommendation to the general superintendent.

The probability that the person chosen for the position will succeed is considerably enhanced because: (1) the principal learned a great deal about selection in the process; (2) the teachers have acquired a greater degree of objectivity in the selective process; (3) the teachers are likely to want success for the person they have helped to choose.\(^1\)

In Newark, Delaware a group of teachers helped in selecting a new principal. It all came about after the construction of a new elementary school was well under way. Superintendent Wilmer E. Shue said to a teacher committee studying the problem of equipping the new school, "Select your principal for the E. Frances Medill School where many of you have volunteered to teach."\(^2\) Assured that they were not carrying democracy too far the committee decided to accept the job but before advertising the new position they set about to make a list of guiding principles for the selection of a principal. After the position was advertised and several applications had been received the screening operation began. Applications were screened until just

\(^1\)Milton J. Cohler, "Faculty Helps Select the Assistant Principal," The American School Board Journal, CXVIII (February, 1949), 34.

\(^2\)Eugene F. Sharkey, "This Happened in Newark, Delaware," The American School Board Journal, CXXVIII (April, 1954), 54.
eight remained. These eight were asked to come for interviews with the committee, the superintendent, and the elementary supervisor. When the interviews were complete a secret ballot was taken in which each teacher voted for five candidates. This vote eliminated three candidates. A second vote excluded two more, leaving three.

These three names were submitted to the superintendent for consideration. He in turn presented the candidates' names to the board with the recommendation that they name the candidate to whom the teacher committee had given the greater number of votes.\(^1\)

If teachers expect to be interviewed by superintendents when seeking a new position it would just about be a reversal of the normal procedure for a group of teachers to interview a candidate seeking the position of superintendent. This is just what happened at Plainfield, New Jersey and Allentown, Pennsylvania.

The teachers of Allentown took an opportunity to propose the broader implications of teacher participation in educational planning in the spring of 1949. By November, time for the school board election, teacher and parent participation in policy making had become an important issue. Candidates supporting teacher and parent participation won the election, opening the door for the new type of administration. At the January, 1950 board meeting a motion

\(^1\text{Ibid.}\)
was adopted to invite a committee of teachers to sit in on discussions of policy but they were also asked to wait until a new superintendent had been appointed.

In a letter to the board of education the Teachers' Policy and Consultation Committee replied that they were eager to begin as soon as possible and asked to be permitted to meet with the board of education to discuss the selection of the new superintendent. They also requested that they be allowed to voice a choice in the selection of the finalists. The requests were granted and as the finalists appeared for personal interviews the Teachers' Policy and Consultation Committee was on hand to meet them informally, to become acquainted with the candidate’s personality and to hear answers to questions on local problems. After all interviews were completed the board of education and the committee of teachers met to express their opinions about the most desirable candidate. As it turned out individuals favored the same person and that person was the one selected by the board.1

At Plainfield things began as differently as possible. Members of the board of education were faced with the problem of replacing the superintendent of schools. They not only wanted to find the best person they could,

1R. L. Waller, "Teachers Help Select A Superintendent," The Nation's Schools, XLVII (February, 1951), 63-64.
they wanted to acquaint him with the staff, the school system, and the community in the shortest possible time. They finally decided to enlist the help of the staff by inviting twenty-five key administrators, supervisors, and teachers to draft a visitation schedule for the six leading candidates after the preliminary screening was completed. The six candidates visited on different days and were taken on a tour of the school system where they met and talked with many teachers, heard and discussed many school problems, and exchanged views. Two of the candidates were asked to return with their wives for a second interview and tour of the city. Each visit ended with a dinner in honor of the candidate and his wife. Later the final selection was made.

The fact that staff members were given a voice in selecting the superintendent of schools contributed to the feeling that members of the Plainfield professional staff are considered and have a part in making important decisions where their welfare is involved. Most of the staff members who participated in this visitation process enthusiastically claim greater insight and understanding into the problems of a superintendent.¹

Teacher Participation in Plant Planning

Following a similar line of argument presented by Dewey that methods of teaching, selection of educational materials, and questions of curriculum should be left up

to those who are engaged in teaching, the advocates of staff members planning school buildings claim the schoolroom is also an educational tool and should be planned by those who are to use it. This argument is presented by Charles Bursch, Chief of the Division of Schoolhouse Planning, State Department of Education, Sacramento, California in the following statement:

The planning and construction of improved school building, from the point of view of educational usefulness, may not be expected until a better schoolhouse planning procedure is adopted generally in school districts.

The key to the recommended procedure is to have competent persons plan classrooms for specific type of educational service and then organize those classrooms into a workable school building. The planning procedure may be termed successful when it results in a school building composed of classrooms whose size and shapes facilitate the adopted educational program and practices, when all of those spaces are sound conditioned and have adequate and easily controlled lighting, heating, and ventilation. Then and only is a school building worth what it costs, is it worth being made beautiful, safe structurally, easy and inexpensive to maintain.

When the school plant is given its deserved place of educational significance, the carrying out of planning procedures will fall naturally among the more important duties of the chief executive officer of the school district. Likewise, when such significance is recognized, it will become obvious that no school building can not be as well planned without the assistance of the teaching and supervisory staff as with such assistance.

When the superintendent of schools and his entire staff really go to work on plant planning problems, it is inevitable that a different set of values, a different ranking of planning elements than has heretofore prevailed will emerge. Local school administrators and school architects often shudder, at first, at the consequences of planning a school building from the inside out; of designing and orientating classrooms first and then organizing them unimpaired,
into the best looking school building possible. It is granted also that an adjustment period may be necessary for people to become accustomed to the looks of the new buildings. Such adjustment is normally prompt and satisfactory when the classroom design has been based upon functional requirements.1

In a study conducted by O. S. Williams of six school systems, of different sizes, that were making great efforts to develop democratic school administration, 526 teachers, principals, and superintendents were sent questionnaires and were asked to check on a list of administrative activities those in which teachers had participated. Two hundred fifty-seven teachers, 49 per cent, eighteen principals, 72 per cent, and all six superintendents replied.

In the case of planning school buildings, half the principals and superintendents stated that teachers participated. Yet only 13 per cent of the teachers agreed. However, in this activity, in terms of responses of teachers within the three systems where principals and superintendents indicated teacher participation, 70 per cent of the teachers agreed that they had a real share in planning school buildings.2

Of course this study was made of those school systems "making intensive efforts to develop democratic school administration" and as such is not at all true of all school systems. Having studied the literature available until the time of his report, H. C. Chastain made the following statement.


Evidence from the field indicates that the full utilization of school faculties and noncertificated personnel in planning educational plants is yet largely sporadic and incidental. Altho the philosophy of teacher participation has practically reached the undeniable stage, practice lags woefully. Research which explores actual values and specific types of contributions which school staffs might make are negligible, and studies involving techniques and procedures of utilizing the intelligence and experience of teachers are needed. An increasing number of excellent examples, however, are in evidence.¹

About 1937 the East Waterloo School Board in Waterloo, Iowa decided that three of the old elementary school buildings were no longer safe or adequate for continued use. It was also decided that a single building constructed near the center of the three adjacent elementary school districts should replace the three old buildings. The planning of the new building, as described by Superintendent Jack M. Logan in the following statement, is in accord with the most recent philosophy of schoolhouse planning.

Longfellow School is the result of the combined planning of teachers, principals, supervisors, superintendent of schools, superintendent of buildings, and architect. The architect was willing to take the time in conferences to understand the philosophy of the people who were to work in the building, and then designed a building to fit that philosophy. As a result, after two years of planning the teachers feel that the building contains most of the physical features which facilitate a modern educational program—space to move about without disturbing others, space to work on individual and group projects, provision for group conferences, and for creative

activities, storage space, bulletin boards, exhibit cases, etc.¹

Postponed because of the depression in 1929 the construction of the Northeast High School in Lincoln, Nebraska was not started until 1938. The planning of the new high school building which began optimistically in 1926 was continued through the depression period. The following is an account of that period of planning.

Cooperative planning over a considerable period of years has contributed to the success of the new building of the Northeast High School of Lincoln, Nebraska. This careful planning has been participated in by the staff of the school and the professional executives of the school system who limited their work largely to the educational planning and community service. Valuable planning was contributed by the school executives and the board of education who had primarily in mind the financing of the project and the economic problem of getting the greatest amount of educational service at a reasonable outlay of money.²

The board of education of Tucson, Arizona was forced into an extensive building program because of a rapid influx of population when several war industries and permanent military installations came to Tucson.

In planning these buildings the school board and the superintendent asked teachers, principals, custodians, parents, and in some instances, the boys and girls themselves for suggestions. Many


²Planned for Functional Uses—the Northeast High School, Lincoln, Nebraska," The American School Board Journal, CVI (June, 1943), 29.
of the recommendations made by these different groups were incorporated in the plans.1

Central High School, Lansing, Michigan could no longer serve the educational needs of the student body. Built for another generation, the building was too small and antiquated to be functional. The problem of planning and constructing the building to replace Central High was a great one but caused the board of education no great alarm.

The personnel to do this was at hand. Serving the board of education as superintendent of schools was Dr. J. W. Sexton . . . The board of education business manager was Mr. Harry L. Chamberlan, who is a civil engineer . . . Mr. A. D. Taylor, Cleveland, Ohio was employed as landscape architect, and last but not least there were the experienced faculty members of old Central, many of whom had been formulating dreams for a long time about how to improve their teaching and the work of their students, when proper facilities could be made available. Now these dreams could be realized if they could be crystallized. It was not easy; it necessitated innumerable conferences and almost daily revisions of plans for many months, but presently the plans began to take on concrete form. Every square foot of wall and floor space in every classroom, laboratory, and workroom was utilized to meet definite needs connected with this new school program.2

A fire destroying all but the gymnasium annex of the high school at Green River, Wyoming prompted the building of a new high school building there.

In order to determine the facilities needed in the building, the curriculum was kept in mind at


all times. There was a great deal of consultation among the teachers, administrators, and the school board. Each teacher conferred with the architect in regard to the size and arrangement of the rooms, lighting, and furnishings required for his department. The general arrangement of the building and the location of special classrooms and shops, together with the problems of student circulation, etc., were passed upon by the superintendent. Finally, the architect, having all of the particulars, developed the plans to suit rather adequately the needs of the town of Green River.  

Given an opportunity to help in the planning and a small margin of freedom in decorating the interior of the building, teachers in Vicksburg, Mississippi feel that Grove Street Elementary School belongs to them.

Every teacher joined in the planning of the Grove Street Elementary School, Vicksburg, Mississippi. They were present at each conference and worked directly with the architect, the principal, and the superintendent, pooling experiences and ideas for a building that was to serve grades one through six.

Although equipment is standardized its height and placement vary, giving each classroom an individual appeal. Each teacher selected a different color for his classroom. . . . Cabinets are natural pine, and again each teacher chose the color for the interior shelves to harmonize with the color scheme of his room.

The children love Grove Street School and the patrons are pleased. But the teachers are proudest of all, and their participation has given staff morale an unbelievable lift.

Teachers at Greenville, Alabama were so interested in the construction of a new elementary school there that

---
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one teacher suggested a section of football bleachers be set up on the building site so that she and her colleagues might watch each step in the construction of the building they had planned.

In looking toward the building of the new ten-room addition to the Greenville Elementary School, the administrative personnel of the county felt that planning was highly essential. We all desired to obtain as much teaching value from this unit as was possible with our budget.

Since it was planned that the building should house the ten sections of the first three grades, the teachers of these grades were called into conference. They were told that, since this building would be one of their tools of teaching, we wanted all of their suggestions as to how the building could be built to obtain maximum teaching efficiency. The teachers were encouraged to visit towns in which new school buildings had recently been completed. They were to evaluate the new features seen in these buildings and to make recommendations to the building committee. Every teacher in the group visited one or more schools and read many school publications in her search for good ideas for our dream building.

When this preparation had been completed, a meeting was called. These ten teachers, Mrs. Rubye Crane, the elementary supervisor, and William Eddins, principal, sat down with the architect and me to talk over just what kind of a school they would like to have.

This meeting took place before the architect had drawn plans or made any preliminary sketches. Each suggestion made by a teacher was evaluated as to its cost and teaching value. Many valuable suggestions were made about good lighting, good color, comfort of rooms, and equipment. Plumbing fixtures were added in the rooms at the request of the teachers.

The only important suggestion made by teachers that could not be incorporated in the building dealt with the size of classrooms. Most of the teachers felt that standard sized classrooms were too small for the varied activities they would like to conduct in their teaching programs. The rooms could not be made as large as the teachers suggested because of the additional cost.
The effect of this program on the teachers had been highly encouraging. Since the teachers had a large part in the planning of the building, they are looking forward to its completion with great enthusiasm.¹

There are many things which Carl J. Burk, Director of Curriculum and Research, Compton Union High School District, Compton, California would want to do differently if he were ever to enter into another building program. But one of the things he would repeat would be the wide use of staff participation in planning.

Organizing for teacher participation in a major program of building planning is a profitable administrative task. Early in December, 1950, each teacher in the Compton (California) Union High School District was given an opportunity to make specific recommendations for classroom facilities in his subject area. The suggestions were collected, classified, and reviewed by committees and architects. Also upon the invitation of the superintendent and the business manager, the subject area curriculum committees (subgroups of a Curriculum Council) shared in the planning of the two new junior high schools and two new senior high schools. These committees met in half-day sessions to resolve problems relating to the suggested facilities and to develop additional suggestions. The meetings, marked by enthusiasm and hard work on the part of the teachers, were chairmanned by the director of curriculum and frequently visited by the superintendent, deputy superintendent, and business manager. From the direct suggestions of the teachers and from the committee recommendations for each subject area, a summary of recommendations was written, mimeographed, and distributed to the architects, the board of trustees, the administrative staff, and interested teachers.

¹Frank H. Echols, "Designed for Six to Nine Year Olds, the Teachers Put in Their Requests," The Nation's Schools, XLII (October, 1948), 39.
The teachers have been enthusiastic in expressing appreciation for the opportunity to participate in the planning. And since the initial planning, innumerable groups and individuals have worked at scheduled conferences on building plans with the curriculum office staff and architects. All interested teachers have had opportunities to review and propose suggestions and improvement of the architects' plans. Some teachers were released from classes to spend considerable time with the problem. But those interested in the project used mostly their own time, energy, and transportation.1

Teacher Participation in Budget Making

There appears to be an abundance of evidence of teachers having taken part in determining their own salaries by preparing salary schedules. It is a common occurrence to hear a teacher tell that in his school the teachers had prepared a salary schedule for the board of education. The superintendent of La Mesa, Spring Valley, California, Glenn E. Murdock, claimed, "Our best single practice is the annual construction of a new salary schedule."2

Some of the advisory councils discussed in a previous section mentioned working on salary schedules in such a casual manner as to give the impression it was so common it had no importance. Eighty per cent of the teachers who replied to the questionnaire used in the previously mentioned study conducted by O. S. Williams indicated that


2Trillingham, op. cit., pp. 60-61.
they had participated in the preparation of a salary schedule.

Common practice seems to be that a committee of
teachers appointed by the local teachers' organization
prepares a schedule and submits it to the board of educa-
tion. There is often a certain amount of padding added
just in case it is necessary to bargain. There is, at least
in the experience of the author, more of an air of labor-
management relations rather than that of cooperative plan-
ning engaged in by professionals in many of these instances
where teachers prepare a salary schedule. This was not the
case, however, at Amarillo, Texas where a teachers' commit-
tee worked for three years, with the approval and encourage-
ment of the superintendent and the board of education, to
prepare a schedule to take the place of one which had been
hurriedly prepared some years before but had proved to be
unsatisfactory to everyone concerned.

Prior to April, 1940, the Amarillo public school
system had no adequate salary schedule. The schedule
in operation had been hurriedly constructed by the
superintendent four years before but it had not been
satisfactory to the board, to the superintendent, or
to the teachers. During the 1937-38 school session
the Teachers' Interest Committee of the Amarillo
Teachers' Club made a study of teacher salaries in
Amarillo as compared with those in other cities, but
did not work out a definite new schedule. Again dur-
ing the 1938-39 session the Teachers' Interest Com-
mitee, with the approval and encouragement of the
superintendent of schools, continued its study of
the problems of salary scheduling but decided not to
recommend the adoption of a new schedule until the
1939-40 session at which time the committee would
have access to valuable salary information then being
collected by the school administrators' section of
the Texas State Teachers' Association.
In January, 1940, the Teachers' Interest Committee, which was already at work, was enlarged to thirteen members and asked specifically to work out a new salary schedule. This enlarged committee was composed of five elementary teachers, three junior high school teachers, three senior high school teachers, an elementary principal, and a junior high school principal. By vote of the committee, the elementary principal was selected as chairman and a junior high school teacher as secretary.

The personnel of the committee was divided into five subcommittees each to study one of the following problems:

1. The economic status of Amarillo teachers.

2. Comparison of teachers' salaries with those in other occupations.

3. Minimum and maximum salaries in Amarillo and comparable cities.

4. Teacher preparation in Amarillo and other comparable cities.

5. The ability of Amarillo to pay increased teachers' salaries.

Each subcommittee was asked to gather and analyze pertinent data and to report the progress of its work at each regular meeting of the whole committee. Before the first meeting, the chairman met once with each subcommittee and prepared for each one a list of type-written suggestions concerning data to be considered and references of probable value . . . . The superintendent issued a bulletin to the entire school staff outlining many of the problems which the committee would have to solve in order to develop a satisfactory salary schedule. Teachers were asked to study these problems and to send the committee any suggestions they wished to offer.

The construction of the salary schedule was a wholesome experience for the members of the committee responsible for its development. Much time, thought, and energy were put into the collections and organization of data. Six regular meetings of the whole committee were held, in addition to some eighteen subcommittee meetings. Each member of the committee spent an estimated average of thirty hours in individual work
outside of committee meetings. It was a valuable educational experience for all, and each member of the committee now feels a genuine personal responsibility for the success of the program.¹

As for teachers taking part in the other areas of budget making procedures other than the making of salary schedules, there has been very little reported in the literature. As a matter of fact only one report of actual practice was found.

Cooperative budget planning dealing with department allotments for expendables and equipment had been used successfully for the past two years in the P. K. Yonge Laboratory School of the University of Florida. The first step in starting the procedure was to "elect a three member faculty advisory group which would serve as a budget committee to work with the school director in determining general budgetary policy."²

By committee study and conferences with faculty suggestions and approval of a set of principles upon which school moneys could be allotted were established. The committee next prepared a tentative budget applying the principles previously established. This tentative budget was distributed to all faculty members for their study and consideration. Later in a general session suggestions were
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accepted and changes were made until the budget was finally accepted. From there on administration of the budget became a matter of accounting.

Several advantages of this kind of cooperative budget planning come readily to mind: faculty members feel that they belong to a team working for school improvement and can better understand the school as a total unit and appreciate the needs of all departments in the school; . . . and even the children benefit indirectly, as it is shown that teachers become democratic in their dealing with pupils almost in proportion to the amount of democracy they find practiced by school administration which directly affects them. . . . School morale arises as teachers understand and appreciate the problems and needs of others within the system.

Administrators, however, must be careful not to delegate their own clerical or decision-making functions to classroom teachers under the guise of democratic administration. The budget committee is advisory to the school administration. As a 'sounding board' it helps direct policy making.1

The fact that teachers are better able to see the school as a unit and the position of their particular department of activity as a part of that unit after taking part in this method of budget making is more clearly shown by the reaction of one of the teachers who served on the committee.

It was my privilege to be the teacher representing the elementary teachers on the budget committee of our school, and I consider it one of the most valuable experiences in professional learning I have ever had. It gave me a clearer understanding of the needs and functions of all areas of the school and how each part and activity fits into the whole.

---

1Ibid., pp. 42-43.
I saw all other staff members come to realize that every part of the school has needs and that for the welfare of the whole school each of us would have to sacrifice, share, and adapt. It satisfied my philosophy that the administration of school finances could be done democratically and could be used as a tool to further wholesome human growth and development of both children and staff. It was also conclusive proof that school finances can be handled on the basis of policies and principles, rather than on a basis of dogmatic determination or hand-to-mouth opportunism.¹

¹Ibid.
CHAPTER III

STUDENT PARTICIPATION IN SCHOOL ADMINISTRATION

Methods of Student Participation

Student participation in administration automatically brings to mind the idea of student councils and student government. The student council has become so generally accepted that the desirability of student councils is no longer questioned. At the Thirty-eighth Annual Convention of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, William F. Carlson, Principal of Northfield Junior-Senior High School, Northfield, Minnesota made the following introductory remarks while making a presentation on "How Can the Principal Utilize the Student Council in Administering the School?"

As high school principals, we have rather generally come to recognize the student council, student senate, or a comparable representative of the student body as an integral part of our school organization and school life. There are few schools, and the number is becoming fewer, of which the student council is not a part. Not only have student councils increased in number, but they have also expanded in scope and function.¹

In a study conducted by Max Guffie and J. B. Unstattd, it was discovered that student councils were reported to have taken on responsibility for thirty-one administrative or semi-administrative functions. These were as follows:

... chartering school banks and student organizations; publishing three types of publications; planning, scheduling, and conducting assemblies; conducting orientation programs for new students; maintaining information and lost and found centers; promoting proper conduct; helping to cultivate self-respect and to develop morale; and managing divers, social functions, and homecoming celebrations.¹

Speaking of the same subject William S. Sterner, Assistant Professor of Education, School of Education, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, New Jersey made the following statement relative to the common acceptance of student participation in the administration of a school.

The question, 'How can the principal utilize the student council in administering the school?' seems to have been based upon the assumption that the principal should utilize the student council in this way. It does not ask whether the student council should help to administer the school; rather it suggests that the principal should use the student council in conducting at least some administrative functions. Certainly it acknowledges that the student council occupies a key place in school affairs.²


The controversy over student participation in school administration does not stem from whether or not students should participate but in what manner they should participate and to what degree. Identification of the different organizational patterns by which students have been allowed to participate in solving school problems is a help in clarifying this issue.

One of the attempts to make school lifelike is permitting pupil participation in affairs of the school. Experiments in this field illustrate beautifully the problems, dangers, and advantages of all attempts to make a school democratic and lifelike from the pupils' point of view.

Confusion first arises from failure to distinguish clearly three possible arrangements for pupil participation. The one most publicized is that which is properly called pupil self-government. Under this form a government organization is set up that parallels some form of adult government. One school may have a city form with mayor, council, police, and fire departments, and courts.

This form is often simplified by having only a student council with committees or appointees to control various pupil affairs. Pupils are arrested for infractions of rules passed by the official body, are arraigned before pupil courts, sentenced and punished. Sometimes the teachers leave the school for a day and the pupils take complete charge. Such replicas of adult government are said to demonstrate that pupils can govern themselves and to give the pupils genuine experience in social control.

A second form arranges for pupils to share with teachers in such control. The school council is made up of teachers and pupils; the teachers and pupils share opinions and points of view so that school policies may reflect the rights and problems of both groups and so that free discussion may enlighten each group as to the needs, feelings, and opinions of the other.

Such an organization provides not so much for legislation and control, as for clarification of points of view and for mutual understanding. It
provides for democracy in the sense that all may express their opinions and that all regulation is made and enforced with an understanding of the feelings and personalities of those on whom the regulation is enforced.

The real seat of authority is frankly in the hands of those legally responsible for running the school but it is exercised with the intelligence that comes from a firsthand comprehension of the human values of all persons concerned.

The third form also frankly lodges all control in those legally charged with such control but allows free pupil participation in the management of activities of the school and free pupil discussion of policies in voluntary organizations of pupils.

In such an arrangement, for example, pupil groups manage ticket sales, publish the school paper and annual, help in the management of athletics and other school public performances, serve on all kinds of committees of arrangement, and are free to organize extracurricular groups for the promotion of ideas of interests of their own initiation.

Furthermore, pupils are encouraged to form voluntary representative councils of their own for the discussion and understanding of school policies; such groups may include a vocational council, an athletic council, a civic council, and health council. These councils may call upon school officials, city officials, or anyone else to discuss and explain matters of interest and concern; they also may express and formulate opinions of their own to present to school authorities for consideration.

All these pupil activities are frankly carried on with the advice and guidance of a teacher sponsor. There is no pretense that ultimate real control is lodged anywhere but in those who actually have the responsibility of such control.

A great amount of failure and dissatisfaction in various pupil participation schemes are due to the fact that these three distinctly different phases of participation are so confused that the plan is vulnerable to the charge of inconsistency and hypocrisy and brings about so much wrangling, unevenness, friction, and misunderstanding that the end result is merely a continual series of impasses that have to be resolved by arbitrary official ukases.

As a next step the plan becomes merely perfunctory as far as pupils are concerned.
Then comes eventual abandonment of the entire plan and thereafter the ordinary school routine seems even more arbitrary and undemocratic because of the false hopes engendered during the interim of the pseudo-democratic regime.1

Of the three arrangements Cline believes the third rates the highest when they are evaluated using the six usual objections to pupil participation schemes as criteria for judgment. The six objections are:

1. The procedures are undemocratic. Pupils are too young to carry so much responsibility with equanimity. Those in power become arbitrary and snobbish; they exercise power for its own sake. Those not in power do not willingly acknowledge authority from those of their own age because they do not honestly believe they can properly handle such responsibilities. A genuine rift is created between the leaders and the led. Cliques, favoritism, and petty politics flourish.

2. They are inefficient. Pupils are inexperienced in all matters of control; some school matters baffle even the most highly trained mature educators. Costly errors are made; the right decisions are slowly arrived at and clumsily and expensively enforced. Even the things that pupils can do can be done more efficiently by teachers.

3. They are spurious and hypocritical. Even the dullest pupil knows that no pupil organization has any legal status and that any pupil action, no matter how camouflaged, is valid only by the sufferance of the school officials. Any form of pupil government is perforce only make-believe. Even such a spectacular 'stunt' as allowing pupils to have complete charge for a day is recognized as a 'stunt,' and no one really believes that real school was had.

---

1E. C. Cline, "When the Pupils Participate in School Control," The Nation's Schools, XXII (September, 1938), 33-34.
4. They are not even replicas of real life. In real
life citizens are governed by those legally en-
trusted with government affairs. Groups of adult
citizens, for example, do not regularly meet with
the city council, discuss problems with them, and
join in the voting on city ordinances; certainly
children do not do such things outside of school.
Pupil government is just another example of the
danger that lurks in reasoning by analogy. The
cleverer the imitation, the more disastrous is
the error of acting as if it were the real thing.
Finally, one might raise the question of whether
an exact replica of adult government practice
would be a good thing.

5. They emphasize social control rather than self-
control. Intrinsically, self-control is more
valuable than social control. The real basis
even of successful social control is not more
social control but more self-control. The proper
function of social control itself is the develop-
ment of more self-control.

6. They actually discourage participation in school
activities among pupils generally. The more
officious and active the relatively few pupils
officials are, the less incentive there is for
others to do things. Adult society displays
precisely the same phenomenon. The real value
of extracurricular activities, for example,
varies directly with the amount of teacher inter-
ference and direction.\(^1\)

The Rufus King High School in Milwaukee is an
example of a school organized for student participation in
administrative affairs similar to the third pattern
described by Oline.

Rather than one student council to govern all
affairs it has inaugurated a system of twelve
councils, each overseeing one particular branch
of school activity. Among those governing groups
are the following: library, cadet, social, school

\(^1\)Ibid., p. 34.
bicycle, newspaper, auditorium, publicity, cafeteria. Each home room elects one member to represent it at each of the individual council meetings held twice a month.

The cafeteria council concentrates its efforts on the formulation and regulation of the dietetic and social problems involved in successful cafeteria management. Each of the 54 home rooms sends one representative to meet with two faculty advisers at the semimonthly meetings. The opinions and desires of the home room groups are presented by the representatives during these monthly meetings and impartial discussions follow. Before any final decision is made, the representative presents the problem to his home room group and at the following meeting votes according to its decision. Thus, the ideas and desires of the pupils are incorporated into the policies of the cafeteria.\(^1\)

Another school organized for the greatest possible student participation in the administration of the school's affairs and activities is the Portsmouth School in Portland, Oregon. Principal W. C. Painter's account is as follows:

One of our goals at the Portsmouth School is that our program shall be a meaningful segment of life rather than a project concerned with preparation for some future period of life. If we are to achieve this goal, if the school day is to become a real experience, pupils must have a part in the school's organization and management. Therefore, we have developed in our school a plan of pupil participation in school management which seems to us to be both logical and practical.

Portsmouth also has tried to develop school spirit by means of such phrases as 'our school,' and 'our activities.' Such phrases are constantly heard in the children's conversation. A wholesome school spirit and school pride seem to be growing day by day.

\(^1\)Marguerite Tice, "Students Solve Cafeteria Problems," The Nation's Schools, XXII (August, 1938), 60.
Many of our school activities are carried out with the assistance of pupil committees which help to plan and supervise the work. The important committees, whose activities affect the entire school, are (a) the traffic committee, which functions in halls and on the stairways; (b) milk committee; (c) lavatory committee; (d) bicycle court committee; (e) safety lane committee or schoolboy patrol; (f) school sign committee; (g) lunchroom committee; (h) attendance card committee; (i) school ground committee; and (j) fire drill committee. The activities of all these groups are in addition to the opportunities for participation and group service which normally occur within the various classrooms. About fifty pupils render service on one of the all-school committees. At times, when these committees start moving, one would almost think that school was being dismissed.  

Student Days

The spectacular "stunt" of allowing pupils to take complete charge of a school for a day is believed by those who have tried it to be a worth-while experience in democratic living, truly an educational adventure of the highest value. The pattern of this experience is quite general although there are as many variations as there are schools where this type of adventure has been tried. Usually this new type of educational experience is given some operational title such as "S-Day," "Senior Day," or "Student Day." Students who are to fill the various administrative and instructional positions are either elected by the student body or appointed by the student council. Service and

---

custodial positions may or may not be filled by students but are usually left to those who normally fill them. Several days before the operation is to take place, the students, usually seniors, meet with the adult teachers or administrators whose positions they are to fill to make plans for the big day; in some cases two or three planning conferences were necessary. Typical of this sort of educational experience is Student Government Day at Downsville Central High School in Downsville, New York reported by the student council adviser, Robert F. Penrose.

February 7, 1951 found an experiment being tried by students and faculty of the Downsville Central School. The day had been proclaimed Student Government Day by the Student Council. Under its auspices students were to assume all possible positions of responsibility in the teaching, administrative, and service sections of the school staff.

On the high school level all classes, home rooms, and study halls elected by majority vote the necessary teachers, principals, secretaries, school nurses, and custodians for each period of the day. All departments of the school participated. Regular faculty members conferred with the 'student teachers' several days in advance so that an appropriate and adequate lesson plan could be arranged. Classes taught by these students proved to be interesting and informative . . . . Both students and faculty agreed that the day was very successful and a very real step had been made in the student's realization of his responsibility in the program of the school.

At the end of the day, a special assembly was held during which a panel of students and teachers selected by the Student Council discussed the question: 'Should the Student Council Establish A Student Court to Regulate Infractions of School Regulations?' Many points pro and con were discussed. It was necessary to continue the panel's discussion for a second day. Comments by the panel members and questions and statements from the assembled students revealed a keen interest in the whole question of student self-government.
As a result of the day's activities, a genuine interest in student government with its privileges and responsibilities has developed in the student body.

A step in the direction of democratic control has been taken by the students of D. C. S.—a step that will bring them to the experience of building, administering, and working with a democratic society. Surely such an experience is valuable for future adults in our American society.¹

Mrs. Evelyn Beckford, an English teacher at Jamesburg High School, reported how the students took over the operation of the Jamesburg, New Jersey school for a day.

It was carefully planned and worked out between faculty members and students, and involved at least three conferences and required lesson plans that had to be approved. Consequently, each student teacher knew exactly what was expected of him and was determined to make his part in the day successful.

The day's activities progressed according to schedule and without confusion, with the student body cooperating 100 per cent. There wasn't an administrative job for every senior. If there had been, it would have interfered with the normal schedule. Those who continued in their usual roles as students seemed quite as pleased about the idea as those in temporary authority.²

Students of Mrs. Beckford's English classes were later asked to write on the subject, "My Reaction to Senior Day." The following excerpts are typical of statements made by students in their essays.

I think Senior Day was one of the most thrilling experiences that I have had yet.  


I was thankful for my thorough preparation of the nights before. I never realized what a teacher goes through in a day.1

When the president of the student council of the University High School in Morgantown, West Virginia found out that there was to be a short Easter vacation he called for an assembly of the student body. At the assembly the reasons for the short vacation were explained by the student council president, who said that he thought the teachers needed a vacation and suggested that the student body run the school for three days while the faculty enjoyed three days vacation. The student body accepted the idea and it was approved by the principal. Planning began immediately, students were selected to take over the various teaching and administrative positions, students met with the teacher or administrator whose job they were to fill and made detailed plans for the three days when the teachers would be absent. On the last day the teachers were on duty, a complete plan was presented to the principal and was approved as submitted. According to all reports everything went very well while the school was operated by the students with only the help of the janitors.2

The idea of preparing an activities budget seems to be a very new one or at least an idea which has not become popular for of the 1,581 student councils responding to the Seventh Annual Report of the National Association of Student Councils, only eighty-six indicated they adopted a budget for the year for all activities. Newberg Union High School is one of forty-one schools out of 137 Oregon schools responding to a similar survey in 1951 that prepared and adopted an activities budget as a student council project. Willard Bear, Supervisor of Secondary Education, State Department of Education, Salem, Oregon reported the steps in preparing their activities budget at Newberg Union High School and the other Oregon high schools with which he is familiar as being very much alike. The seven steps for preparing an activities budget are:

**Step I.**—A budget committee is appointed or the job is delegated to a committee already in existence, such as the finance committee. The budget committee should consist of both student and faculty representatives who should do the major part of their work in the spring so that the budget for the ensuing year can be finally adopted before the close of school.

**Step II.**—Incomes and expenditures for the current year are summarized as the basis from which estimates for the ensuing year may be derived. A more accurate estimate can be obtained by using the figures of two or three previous years, which figures are available from the treasurer's records.

**Step III.**—Advisers and student officers of all organizations and activities for whose funds the student council accepts responsibility are asked to submit statements of their estimated needs for the new year.
Step IV.--All requests for allotments of funds are totaled and compared with the total estimated income. If total requests for funds, which might normally be expected, exceed estimated income, either new sources of revenue must be found or requests for some items must be reduced or eliminated. Perhaps both means will be required in order to balance the budget.

If requests still exceed anticipated incomes after all possibilities for new revenues are exhausted, it will be necessary for the budget committee to meet with activity advisers and officers and cooperatively to work out reductions in allowances until the budget is balanced.

Step V.--After the budget is tentatively balanced by the committee, it is submitted to the student council. Before final approval the budget should be referred to the home rooms or classes for examination and discussion by all students.

Step VI.--After the student council has considered recommendations of home room representatives and made any changes that are deemed desirable, the budget is finally adopted and copies are prepared for distribution.

Step VII.--After the budget is adopted, all major requests for expenditures are referred to the budget or finance committee before being allowed by the student council.¹

¹Willard Bear, "Making A Student Body Budget," School Activities, XXIII (March, 1952), 219-220.
CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSION

Although definite conclusions are somewhat difficult to make in a study of this kind there are several patterns or trends which have been observed that should be given special attention. First, it is very obvious that the reports sighted in this study have originated from large schools and large school systems. This fact may or may not be of significance; its explanation is entirely speculative. Possibly, examples of democratic administration in small schools have not been reported in the literature or were simply not discovered by this writer in his study. Probably, democratic administration is not practiced in the small school system where it is found that teacher turnover is greater and where there are fewer administrators who are familiar with democratic administration or are willing to practice it.

It is believed by those having observed democratic administration in practice that morale is better after a faculty has had an opportunity to share in the administrative activities of a school. When teachers and other school employees are allowed the privilege of participation, if
only to the extent of speaking their minds, the personal and professional growth of these individuals is greatly increased. Because of their opportunity to share in the various administrative activities teachers gain a broader viewpoint for and appreciation of all school problems. Teachers who share in the administration of a school learn to see their position in terms of the whole school and their contribution to the school in terms of what it does for the student.

Although it must be admitted that there are those who would prefer not to be bothered with administrative problems, the literature creates the impression that these teachers are the exception rather than the rule. The author has gained the impression that most teachers are not only willing but anxious to share in school administration. In many instances school time has been allotted for meetings and conferences but just as many extend past the end of the school day into the teacher's time. There has been no indication that a teacher's regular duties have been lightened because he had agreed to serve on a committee; therefore, it is necessary to assume that much committee work has been done in addition to the regular duties, requiring time and energy that might have been used to the teacher's personal advantage. In one instance some teachers provided their own transportation to nearby
towns that they might observe new school buildings to get ideas which would be of help as they made plans for a new building in which they would teach.

In some instances administrators have agreed to be bound by decisions reached by their advisory committees, whereas others have made it clear from the start that they intend to make all administrative decisions but that they did want the advice and help of an advisory committee. Those who reserve the right to make decisions themselves point out that legally they are responsible for all decisions and that not to perform this function would be to abrogate their responsibility. There is, however, agreement on two important points in this general area. First, that no teacher or group of teachers should be forced to participate in administrative decision making against their wills. Second, that any group participating in administrative functions should at the outset be made aware of the scope and function of their group. These two principles also apply to the area of student participation where the greatest controversy is over the manner in which students should be allowed participation in administration. The idea that students should have the right to participate in administration seems to have been established.

There is sufficient evidence to show the ability of a group of teachers to solve administrative problems.
Whether the problem is one of personnel selection, making a salary schedule or planning a new building, the literature shows that when a group of teachers come up against a problem with which they are unfamiliar they set about in a scientific way to reach a conclusion. Naturally much time is consumed for the problem must be defined, information must be gathered and reported to the committee, possible solutions must be suggested, investigated, and revised, and finally agreement on one solution must be reached. No doubt the final solution might have been reached by an experienced administrator in a shorter time and with much less effort. However, teacher acceptance of the final decisions are more rapidly and more completely received when they have been reached by a teacher committee than when they are made by an administrator.
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