

70.61
119
2
34
2
41

● Commonwealth of Kentucky ●
EDUCATIONAL BULLETIN

**Defective School Administration
Penalizes
Pupils, Teachers and Taxpayers**



University of Kentu
Lexington, Ky.

Published by
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
JAMES H. RICHMOND
Superintendent of Public Instruction

ISSUED MONTHLY

Entered as second-class matter March 21, 1933, at the post office at
Frankfort, Kentucky, under the Act of August 24, 1912.

Vol. II ● April, 1934 ● No. 2

LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY

370.61

K419

v. 2

1934

no. 2

copy 1

TIME TO BEGIN BUILDING

Good school laws do not automatically produce good schools. The efficient and economical operation of any school system depends upon wise administration, careful planning, competent teaching, and a close relationship between the people and their schools.

The new school code is an excellent foundation for our educational structure, but it is only a foundation. It is now time to begin building upon it. Superintendents and board members must evaluate and readjust their school programs in order to promote the welfare of the children and at the same time to safeguard the interests of the taxpayers.

Taking into consideration the old school laws and the meager financial support given them, Kentucky schools, on the whole, have been operated with a remarkable degree of efficiency. No agency of government has given a better accounting of its stewardship during the financial crisis; none has demonstrated a greater willingness to practice the most rigid economy.

This does not mean, however, that all of our schools are being effectively administered, nor does it imply that every dollar is being spent in the wisest possible way. You will find no school leader worthy of the name who will not admit that some schools are inefficiently managed. It is to their lasting credit that those responsible for the operation of our public schools have openly and candidly admitted the shortcomings of the school system and have sought to correct them. There has not been, and there must never be, any attempt to "white-wash" education.

The facts set out in this bulletin reveal one of the principal defects in our school system, namely the lack of long-time planning with respect to the school program, the frequent surrender to expediency, and the need for improvement of administrative procedure, particularly in the county districts. Superintendents and boards of education should study the following pages in the light of their own problems and, in cooperation with all the people in the district, should seek to operate the schools in such a way as to insure equal educational opportunities for the children, equal distribution of load upon the teachers, and economical expenditure of money supplied by the taxpayers. It is time to begin building not *schools*, but a *school system*.

JAMES H. RICHMOND,

Superintendent of Public Instruction.

Defective School Administration Penalizes Pupils, Teachers and Taxpayers

The subdistrict organization in most county school districts is the root of more controversies than all other issues requiring the consideration of county boards of education. It really challenges the serious consideration and courage of all county school district officials. They must yield often to expediency or exercise unusual courage in administrative procedure.

When the problem of determining the revenue for the support of schools is under consideration, taxpayers are exercised about having an efficient and an economical school program. They rightly insist upon the lowest tax rate possible to finance adequately their public schools. A proposition to readjust the subdistrict organization of a district provokes even more insistence from some residents of subdistricts. The temptation to yield to expediency then insidiously suggests itself to members of the county board of education.

The purpose of this article is to bring together and interpret information bearing directly upon the teacher-loads (pupil-teacher ratios) in the elementary schools employing only one teacher and those employing more than one teacher. It reveals the unfair situations resulting from poor subdistrict organizations. It shows that the taxpayer is severely penalized in many instances by the continued maintenance of many undersized classes; it shows that thousands of pupils and hundreds of teachers are severely penalized because of overcrowded classes, necessarily lowering the efficiency of the pupils and teachers.

It is assumed that a member of a district board of education is essentially an outstanding citizen, and that he has a keen appreciation of the responsibility involved. His acceptance of membership on such board adds to his responsibility as a private citizen the exacting duty to cooperate with his associates in—

- (1) Developing a public school program calculated to assure the best possible educational facilities for his district; and
- (2) Administering this program so as to provide as nearly as possible "equal educational opportunities."

It is the duty or responsibility of a board of education to set up or provide a public school program for its district and policies of administering same that assure as nearly as possible—

- (1) "Equal educational opportunities";
 - (2) Equitable distribution of the teacher-loads; and
 - (3) Economical and equitable disbursement of the public school funds.
-

A detailed analysis of the general organization reports for the current school year of 45 county school districts has been made. It appears in this article as Tables I and II. In each table, the information taken from reports showing the number of elementary pupils enrolled early in the school term is assembled or organized under 4 groups or brackets. Table I shows for each of the 45 counties the number of elementary teachers in one-room schools who enrolled—

- (1) From 1 to 34 pupils;
- (2) From 35 to 49 pupils;
- (3) From 50 to 59 pupils; and
- (4) Sixty (60) or more pupils.

Table II gives similar information arranged after the same plan about the elementary teachers of these counties who are employed in schools of more than one room.

This analysis reveals many instances of unfairness to pupils, teachers, and taxpayers, growing out of unfair subdistrict organizations and programs of administration otherwise defective. It is apparent from a cursory reading of these tables that the taxpayer is penalized severely by the maintenance of many undersized classes, that thousands of pupils and hundreds of teachers are severely penalized because of overcrowded conditions. In so far as the number of pupils enrolled is concerned, the administrative programs of county boards of education for the current school year do not provide such distribution of pupils in one-room schools as will assure—

- (1) "Equal educational opportunities";
- (2) Equitable loads for teachers; and
- (3) Legal disbursement of school funds.

This contention is sustained by the following comparisons:

Of the 74,147 pupils enrolled in one-room schools in 45 county school districts during the current school year—

- (1) 5,597 were enrolled with 82 teachers, average 68;
- (2) 10,289 were enrolled with 193 teachers, average 53;
- (3) 29,889 were enrolled with 734 teachers, average 41;
- (4) 28,372 were enrolled with 1,129 teachers, average 25.

In the fourth group (28,372 pupils) is a smaller group of pupils more favored by the administrative programs. It consists of—

9,600 pupils enrolled with 490 teachers, average 19+.

Comparing this smaller group with groups (1) and (2) above, emphasizes the conclusion that pupils and teachers in many overcrowded one-room schools are penalized, while taxpayers are penalized by the continuance of many small districts. *Overcrowded school-rooms that penalize pupils and teachers and undersized classes that*

TABLE I.—DISPARITIES IN TEACHER-LOADS
ENROLLMENT IN ONE-ROOM ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS—1933-34

County School Districts	Range of Enrollment											
	1-34			35-49			50-59			60----		
	No. of Tchs	Pupils Enr'd		No. of Tchs	Pupils Enr'd		No. of Tchs	Pupils Enr'd		No. of Tchs	Pupils Enr'd	
No.		Av.	No.		Av.	No.		Av.	No.		Av.	
1. Adair	54	1271	24	26	1041	40	3	162	54	3	204	68
2. Barren	34	880	26	41	1721	42	11	584	53	1	60	60
3. Bracken	12	301	25	3	128	43	1	56	56	0	0	0
4. Breathitt	30	871	29	27	1078	40	4	212	53	4	299	75
5. Bullitt	23	549	24	8	331	41	3	156	52	0	0	0
6. Butler	70	1634	23	9	358	40	5	262	52	0	0	0
7. Caldwell	32	757	24	5	193	39	0	0	0	0	0	0
8. Campbell	17	408	24	1	35	35	0	0	0	0	0	0
9. Crittenden	20	556	28	21	848	40	5	255	51	0	0	0
10. Daviess	47	1180	25	14	570	41	3	157	52	0	0	0
11. Estill	34	902	27	20	805	40	5	269	54	1	62	62
12. Floyd	9	269	30	38	1600	42	18	952	53	10	709	71
13. Franklin	21	483	23	2	83	42	0	0	0	0	0	0
14. Fulton	13	312	24	1	36	36	1	52	52	3	203	68
15. Grant	20	456	23	4	162	41	1	53	53	0	0	0
16. Graves	44	1064	24	8	298	37	2	109	55	1	63	63
17. Greenup	25	647	26	27	1107	41	12	630	53	1	72	72
18. Hardin	51	1288	25	21	841	40	7	386	55	1	60	60
19. Harlan	3	91	30	6	241	40	3	159	53	1	67	67
20. Henderson	22	505	23	6	232	39	0	0	0	0	0	0
21. Knott	10	287	29	14	600	43	10	548	55	6	391	65
22. Lawrence	44	1099	25	30	1219	41	7	372	53	1	67	67
23. Lee	14	350	25	28	1110	40	3	151	50	1	60	60
24. Letcher	10	286	29	20	813	41	2	107	54	1	61	61
25. Lewis	37	963	26	20	786	39	2	110	55	3	194	65
26. Lincoln	18	483	27	18	740	41	7	370	53	0	0	0
27. Logan	34	710	21	4	144	36	0	0	0	0	0	0
28. Lyon	23	611	27	12	486	41	0	0	0	0	0	0
29. Madison	24	659	27	19	785	41	2	103	52	1	74	74
30. McCracken	23	562	24	14	576	41	1	51	51	0	0	0
31. McCreary	23	536	23	23	949	41	3	160	53	0	0	0
32. McLean	28	683	24	12	471	39	0	0	0	0	0	0
33. Monroe	15	386	26	15	601	40	9	475	53	4	269	67
34. Nelson	34	812	24	3	109	36	0	0	0	0	0	0
35. Owsley	6	171	29	13	544	42	6	327	55	3	206	69
36. Perry	15	437	29	24	1007	42	14	762	54	15	1033	69
37. Powell	8	238	30	10	405	41	8	435	54	5	341	68
38. Rockcastle	13	370	28	38	1593	42	10	545	55	10	697	70
39. Russell	9	234	32	41	1678	41	5	256	51	0	0	0
40. Simpson	27	612	23	10	426	43	2	105	53	0	0	0
41. Todd	26	627	24	8	313	39	0	0	0	0	0	0
42. Trigg	35	866	25	17	700	41	4	214	54	1	78	78
43. Washington	25	652	26	16	630	39	1	50	50	0	0	0
44. Wayne	36	928	26	22	900	41	5	263	53	0	0	0
45. Wolfe	11	336	31	15	596	40	8	431	54	5	327	65
Totals	1129	28372	25	734	29889	41	193	10289	53	82	5597	68

penalize the taxpayer through excessive pupil costs are undesirable products of defective administrative programs—

- (1) 5,597 pupils were enrolled with 82 teachers, average 68;
- (2) 10,289 pupils were enrolled with 193 teachers, average 53;
- 9,600 pupils were enrolled with 490 teachers, average 19+.

Unfair subdistrict organizations and administrative programs otherwise defective account for employing—

- (3) 734 teachers for 29,889 pupils, average 41;
- (4) 1,129 teachers for 28,372 pupils, average 25.

Thus, 395 more teachers were employed for a group having 1,517 fewer pupils. The distribution of teachers (1 teacher to an average of 41 pupils) to the group of 29,889 pupils (group 3) is perhaps more consistent with conditions usually found in county school districts than the teacher-distribution made in any one of groups (1), (2) or (4). The same distribution of teachers (1 teacher to an average of 41 pupils) to the group (4) of 28,372 pupils would have provided 692 instead of 1,129 teachers, thus leaving a marginal number (437) of teachers, some of whom should have been used to relieve congestion in the 275 one-room schools enrolling from 50 to 96 pupils each.

Considering the totals of Table I leads necessarily to the conclusion that the *inequitable teacher-loads in one-room schools during the current school year result in—*

- (1) Unfairness to pupils, dissipating their activities, rendering educational opportunities unequal;
- (2) Unfairness to teachers, impairing effectiveness of service—some enroll 15, 20, 25 or 30 pupils, others 50, 60, 70 or even more;
- (3) Unfairness in disbursement of school funds—paying some teachers 30, 35 or 40 dollars per month, others 50, 60, 75 dollars or more.

This conclusion is sustained by other illustrations; for instance, the organization reports of the elementary (one-room) schools of Campbell, Franklin, Henderson, Logan, and Nelson county school districts, combined, for the current school year show that—

144 teachers reported enrolling 3,521 pupils, average 24.

The organization report for Floyd County shows that—

75 teachers reported enrolling 3,530 pupils, average 47.

A detailed analysis of the reports of these 5 counties and that of Floyd follows—

County School Districts	Range of Enrollment											
	1-34			35-49			50-59			60----		
	No. of Tchrs	Pupils Enr'd		No. of Tchrs	Pupils Enr'd		No. of Tchrs	Pupils Enr'd		No. of Tchrs	Pupils Enr'd	
		No.	Av.		No.	Av.		No.	Av.		No.	Av.
"Campbell	17	408	24	1	35	35	0	0	0	0	0	0
Franklin	21	483	23	2	83	42	0	0	0	0	0	0
Henderson	22	505	23	6	232	39	0	0	0	0	0	0
Logan	34	710	21	4	144	36	0	0	0	0	0	0
Nelson	34	812	24	3	109	36	0	0	0	0	0	0
Totals	128	2918	23	16	603	38	0	0	0	0	0	0
"Floyd	9	269	30	38	1600	42	18	952	53	10	709	71"

The incredible range in teacher-loads is revealed from a reference to the above quotation from Table I; for instance—

- (a) 34 Logan Co. teachers reported enrolling 710 pupils, av. 21;
34 Nelson Co. teachers reported enrolling 812 pupils, av. 24;
38 Floyd Co. teachers reported enrolling 1,600 pupils, av. 42;
- (b) 21 Franklin Co. teachers reported enrolling 483 pupils, av. 23;
10 Floyd Co. teachers reported enrolling 709 pupils, av. 71;
- (c) 17 Campbell Co. teachers reported enrolling 408 pupils, av. 24;
18 Floyd Co. teachers reported enrolling 952 pupils, av. 52.

Does the number of teachers employed in one-room schools suggest the probable number of pupils a teacher may enroll?

The detailed analysis of the organization reports does not show this. Check the following with Table I—

- (a) 30 Breathitt Co. teachers reported enrolling 871 pupils, av. 29;
30 Lawrence Co. teachers reported enrolling 1,219 pupils, av. 41;
- (b) 27 Simpson Co. teachers reported enrolling 612 pupils, av. 23;
27 Greenup Co. teachers reported enrolling 1,107 pupils, av. 41;

or—

- (a) 12 Bracken Co. teachers reported enrolling 301 pupils, av. 25;
12 Lyon Co. teachers reported enrolling 486 pupils, av. 40;
12 Greenup Co. teachers reported enrolling 630 pupils, av. 53;
- (b) 10 Letcher Co. teachers reported enrolling 286 pupils, av. 29;
10 Simpson Co. teachers reported enrolling 426 pupils, av. 43;
10 Rockcastle Co. teachers reported enrolling 545 pupils, av. 55;
10 Rockcastle Co. teachers reported enrolling 697 pupils, av. 70;
- (c) 23 McCreary Co. teachers reported enrolling 536 pupils, av. 23;
23 Lyon Co. teachers reported enrolling 611 pupils, av. 27;
23 McCreary Co. teachers reported enrolling 949 pupils, av. 41.

Does the number of pupils to be enrolled (census enumeration) have the proper consideration in determining the number of teachers to be employed?

The number of teachers employed for relatively the same sized groups of pupils does not suggest this. Check the following with Table I—

GROUPS RANGING FROM 949 TO 1,033 PUPILS

- (a) 15 Perry Co. teachers reported enrolling 1,033 pupils, av. 69;
18 Floyd Co. teachers reported enrolling 952 pupils, av. 53;
23 McCreary Co. teachers reported enrolling 949 pupils, av. 41;
37 Lewis Co. teachers reported enrolling 963 pupils, av. 26.

GROUPS RANGING FROM 709 TO 762 PUPILS

- (b) 10 Floyd Co. teachers reported enrolling 709 pupils, av. 71;
14 Perry Co. teachers reported enrolling 762 pupils, av. 54;
18 Lincoln Co. teachers reported enrolling 740 pupils, av. 41;
32 Caldwell Co. teachers reported enrolling 757 pupils, av. 24.

GROUPS RANGING FROM 312 TO 327 PUPILS

(c) 5 Wolfe	Co. teachers reported enrolling	327 pupils, av. 65;
6 Owsley	Co. teachers reported enrolling	327 pupils, av. 54;
8 Todd	Co. teachers reported enrolling	313 pupils, av. 39;
13 Fulton	Co. teachers reported enrolling	312 pupils, av. 24.

From instances cited, it is obvious that defective administrative programs are responsible for overcrowded conditions in many one-room schools; *the efficiency of pupil-activities, teacher-service, and the school service in general, including disbursement of school finances, are seriously impaired, defective administrative programs are responsible for the excessive pupil-cost* in many one-room schools, where teachers report enrolling from only 4 to 24 pupils each.

The general organization reports submitted from the 45 county school districts included in this study show that 2,138 elementary teachers were employed in one-room schools and 1,579 in schools of two or more rooms, a total of 3,717. These reports likewise show that 74,147 pupils were enrolled in the one-room schools and 60,598 in the schools of two or more rooms, a total of 134,745.

The analysis of the teacher-loads in elementary schools employing two or more teachers reveals undesirable results somewhat similar to those revealed in the one-room elementary schools. Again, *defective administrative programs are responsible for many overcrowded rooms and for the continuance of many undersized classes.* Of the 60,598 elementary school pupils enrolled in schools having more than one room (Table II) in the 45 county school districts—

- (1) 6,127 were enrolled with 92 teachers, average 66;
- (2) 10,517 were enrolled with 196 teachers, average 54;
- (3) 25,858 were enrolled with 626 teachers, average 41;
- (4) 18,096 were enrolled with 665 teachers, average 27.

Unsound administrative programs and unfair policies of administration account for employing—

- (3) 626 teachers for 25,858 pupils, average 41, and
- (4) 665 teachers for 18,096 pupils, average 27.

Thus, we find that 39 more teachers were employed for a group (18,096) having 7,762 fewer pupils. As in the group of one-teacher schools, we find that the distribution of teachers to the group of 25,858 pupils (group 3) is perhaps more consistent with conditions usually found in county districts than the teacher-distribution made in any one of groups (1), (2) or (4). The same distribution of teachers (1 teacher to an average of 41 pupils) to group (4) of 18,096 pupils would have provided 444 instead of 665 teachers, thus leaving a marginal number (221) of teachers, some of whom should have been used to relieve congestion in the overcrowded rooms of elementary schools, where from 50 to 96 pupils each were enrolled.

TABLE II.—DISPARITIES IN TEACHER-LOADS
ENROLLMENT IN ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS, TWO OR MORE ROOMS EACH—
1933-34

County School Districts	Range of Enrollment											
	1-34			35-49			50-59			60----		
	No. of Tchs	Pupils Enr'd		No. of Tchs	Pupils Enr'd		No. of Tchs	Pupils Enr'd		No. of Tchs	Pupils Enr'd	
		No.	Av.		No.	Av.		No.	Av.		No.	Av.
1. Adair	12	333	28	8	311	39	2	113	56	0	0	0
2. Barren	7	187	27	3	124	41	1	53	53	0	0	0
3. Bracken	13	320	25	5	209	42	3	162	54	0	0	0
4. Breathitt	28	856	31	24	971	40	1	56	56	0	0	0
5. Bullitt	7	161	23	3	115	38	0	0	0	0	0	0
6. Butler	2	50	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7. Caldwell	5	140	28	3	128	43	0	0	0	0	0	0
8. Campbell	7	243	35	5	200	40	0	0	0	0	0	0
9. Crittenden	7	189	27	12	475	40	2	107	54	0	0	0
10. Daviess	23	602	26	18	711	39	2	102	51	0	0	0
11. Estill	21	599	29	11	450	41	1	54	54	1	69	69
12. Floyd	24	703	29	68	2855	42	39	2132	54	20	1398	70
13. Franklin	25	703	28	12	490	41	2	105	53	0	0	0
14. Fulton	12	314	26	7	290	41	3	156	52	0	0	0
15. Grant	10	303	30	12	490	41	0	0	0	0	0	0
16. Graves	32	874	27	34	1519	45	2	107	53	2	124	62
17. Greenup	16	480	30	12	489	41	3	154	51	0	0	0
18. Hardin	2	58	29	6	213	36	0	0	0	0	0	0
19. Harlan	21	615	29	81	3513	43	55	2934	53	21	1354	64
20. Henderson	31	860	28	12	507	42	5	265	53	2	131	66
21. Knott	21	587	28	20	844	42	7	380	54	5	355	71
22. Lawrence	13	405	31	12	456	38	1	54	54	0	0	0
23. Lee	11	316	29	7	268	38	0	0	0	0	0	0
24. Letcher	34	966	28	34	1383	41	11	583	53	6	376	63
25. Lewis	8	205	26	9	373	41	1	53	53	0	0	0
26. Lincoln	13	391	30	20	849	42	3	164	55	1	65	65
27. Logan	71	1546	22	7	265	38	0	0	0	0	0	0
28. Lyon	3	88	29	3	115	38	0	0	0	0	0	0
29. Madison	33	844	26	25	1007	40	5	262	52	2	129	64
30. McCracken	22	605	28	7	260	37	0	0	0	0	0	0
31. McCreary	13	380	29	10	414	41	5	267	53	1	60	60
32. McLean	14	412	29	10	374	37	1	50	50	0	0	0
33. Monroe	2	51	26	4	158	40	0	0	0	0	0	0
34. Nelson	13	336	26	1	35	35	0	0	0	0	0	0
35. Owsley	7	210	30	13	533	41	2	100	50	2	123	62
36. Perry	18	522	29	43	1810	42	28	1527	55	21	1437	63
37. Powell	0	0	0	2	77	39	2	100	50	1	60	60
38. Rockcastle	5	150	30	8	347	43	1	53	53	4	261	65
39. Russell	1	30	30	24	971	40	1	50	50	0	0	0
40. Simpson	6	149	25	2	72	36	0	0	0	0	0	0
41. Todd	4	101	25	1	40	40	0	0	0	0	0	0
42. Trigg	2	60	30	2	80	40	0	0	0	0	0	0
43. Washington	28	634	23	9	372	41	3	159	53	0	0	0
44. Wayne	15	422	28	10	428	43	3	160	53	0	0	0
45. Wolfe	3	96	32	7	267	38	1	55	55	3	187	62
Totals	665	18096	27	626	25858	41	196	10517	54	92	6127	66

The administrative programs of Floyd, Harlan, and Perry counties penalize the taxpayer by providing for the operation of a few small classes in schools of two or more rooms each; they penalize pupils and teachers more severely because of overcrowded conditions in many rooms. Of the teachers employed in schools of two or more rooms each in these three counties, 184 report having enrolled 10,782

pupils, an average of 59 each; 63 report having enrolled 1,840 pupils, an average of 30 each.

The teachers and pupils of Daviess, Graves, Henderson, Logan, and Washington counties are penalized in a few instances because of overcrowded rooms; the taxpayers of these counties are penalized severely because of administrative programs providing for the maintenance of many undersized classes. Of the teachers employed in these counties, 185 report having enrolled 4,516 pupils, an average of approximately 25 each; 14 report having enrolled 764, an average of 55 each.

The organization reports from Floyd, Harlan, and Perry counties show that—

184 teachers reported enrolling 10,782 pupils, average 59,
63 teachers reported enrolling 1,840 pupils, average 30,

while the organization reports from Daviess, Graves, Henderson, Logan, and Washington counties show that—

185 teachers reported enrolling 4,516 pupils, average 25-,
14 teachers reported enrolling 764 pupils, average 55.

Reports of the number of pupils enrolled in the elementary schools are for the early part of the school term. In many instances, superintendents adjusted overcrowded conditions in schools of two or more rooms by transferring pupils. *Information available, however, does not warrant the conclusion that the correction of overcrowded or undersized classes in schools employing two or more teachers has had the serious attention that should be given by superintendents and boards of education.*

A cursory inspection of the organization reports from the other 75 county school districts reveals that many undersized and many seriously overcrowded classes are being maintained in these districts during the current school year. It may be consistently assumed that the situations revealed through Tables I and II in the 45 county school districts used as a basis of this study are duplicated frequently in the other 75 county school districts.

The seriously overcrowded elementary classes in Pike County school district illustrate the many instances where pupils and teachers are penalized. The average teacher-load for all elementary schools in this district is 47. The Pike County Board of Education provided—

- (1) 202 teachers for 8,717 pupils, average 43;
- (2) 108 teachers for 5,914 pupils, average 55.

The detailed analysis of the enrollment in the elementary schools of this district bespeaks unfairness to pupils and teachers. Because of congestion the pupil-activities are dissipated and the effectiveness of teacher-service seriously impaired. The analysis follows—

PIKE COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT

Schools	Range of Enrollment											
	1-34			35-49			50-59			60-...		
	No. of Tchrs	Pupils Enr'd		No. of Tchrs	Pupils Enr'd		No. of Tchrs	Pupils Enr'd		No. of Tchrs	Pupils Enr'd	
No.		Av.	No.		Av.	No.		Av.	No.		Av.	
One-room	9	275	31	71	3066	43	42	2274	54	12	768	64
Two or more rooms	4	129	32	131	5651	43	52	2747	53	2	125	62
Totals	13	404	31	202	8717	43	94	5021	53	14	893	64
KENTON COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT												
One-room	3	75	25	1	36	36	0	0	0	0	0	0
Two or more rooms	10	255	26	26	1062	41	2	112	56	2	128	64
Totals	13	330	25	27	1098	41	2	112	56	2	128	64

The average teacher-load for all elementary schools of Kenton County district is 39. Four (4) teachers and 240 pupils are penalized because of seriously overcrowded classes; the taxpayers are penalized by providing 30 per cent of the teachers to instruct 20 per cent of the pupils enrolled, an average of about 25 pupils for each of these teachers. The brief analysis of the enrollment in the elementary schools of Kenton County school district appears above.

Anderson, Hart, and Taylor County school districts, considered separately or collectively, afford numerous instances of the maintenance of undersized elementary classes. Exceptional attendance may compensate in some instances for the small subdistricts or the few pupils enrolled. Considered collectively, only 58 per cent of the pupils enrolled in the elementary schools of these districts during the current school year are registered with 70 per cent of the teachers; this group of 142 teachers enrolled an average of fewer than 27 pupils each. Thirty (30) per cent of the teachers (62) of these 3 districts enrolled an average of 42 pupils each, forty-two (42) per cent of the total enrollment. A detailed analysis of the enrollment follows:

Table III gives an analysis of the enrollment in the elementary classes of 10 other county school districts. The situations revealed in Tables I and II recur frequently in Table III; for illustration, there are 10 teachers in this group of counties who enrolled 617 pupils, an average of approximately 62 each; 353 teachers enrolled 9,256 pupils, approximately average 26.

Comparing the totals of Table III with the totals of Tables I and II leads definitely to similar conclusions; for illustration, the average teacher-load in one-room schools for teachers enrolling 1 to 34 pupils in the group of 45 counties is 25; it is 25 for the group of 10 counties.

ONE-ROOM SCHOOLS

Name of School District	Range of Enrollment											
	1-34			35-49			50-59			60----		
	No. of Tchs	Pupils Enr'd		No. of Tchs	Pupils Enr'd		No. of Tchs	Pupils Enr'd		No. of Tchs	Pupils Enr'd	
		No.	Av.		No.	Av.		No.	Av.		No.	Av.
Anderson	5	131	26	3	125	42	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hart	52	1432	28	18	737	41	2	105	53	0	0	0
Taylor	47	1130	24	15	611	41	1	53	53	0	0	0
Totals	125	3225	26	39	1591	41	5	266	53	0	0	0
SCHOOLS, TWO OR MORE ROOMS												
Anderson	5	131	26	3	125	42	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hart	6	185	31	12	479	40	0	0	0	0	0	0
Taylor	6	176	29	1	43	43	2	104	52	0	0	0
Totals	17	492	29	16	647	40	2	104	52	0	0	0

The wide range in teacher-loads in these 10 county school districts cannot be justified. The average teacher-load for each is: Laurel 42, Boyd 39, Morgan 39, Fayette 37, Harrison 35, Union 32, Spencer 31, Breckinridge 30, Taylor 30, and Henry 29. Taking the average teacher-load of the Fayette Board (37 pupils per teacher) as a basis for determining the number of elementary teachers, the Henry Board would have employed 42 instead of 53 teachers, the Spencer Board 36 instead of 43, the Union Board 49 instead of 57, and the Scott Board 52 instead of 64. Conversely, had the Fayette Board taken the average teacher-load of any one of these districts as the basis for determining the number of elementary teachers, it would have increased materially the number of teachers employed in that district.

Taking the Breckinridge County average teacher-load (30 pupils per teacher) as a basis for determining the number of elementary teachers, the Laurel Board would have employed 158 instead of 114 teachers; the Morgan Board 140 instead of 108; and, the Boyd Board 57 instead of 44. Conversely, had the Breckinridge Board taken the average teacher-load of Boyd County (39 pupils per teacher) as a basis for determining the number of elementary teachers, it would have employed 76 instead of 98 teachers; taking the Laurel County average teacher-load (42 pupils per teacher), it would have employed 70 instead of 98 teachers.

General information coming to the State Department of Education reveals many distressing results that arise from overcrowded conditions in many schoolrooms. *Teachers despair of approaching ideals set up at the beginning of the school term; the activities of pupils are dissipated; they conclude that they have a "poor teacher,"*

TABLE III.—DISPARITIES IN TEACHER-LOADS
ENROLLMENT IN ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS—1933-34

County School Districts	Range of Enrollment											
	1-34			35-49			50-59			60----		
	No. of Tchs	Pupils Enr'd		No. of Tchs	Pupils Enr'd		No. of Tchs	Pupils Enr'd		No. of Tchs	Pupils Enr'd	
No.		Av.	No.		Av.	No.		Av.	No.		Av.	
ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS—ONE ROOM												
1. Boyd	6	149	25	9	364	40	2	110	55	0	0	0
2. Breckinridge	52	1256	24	20	802	40	1	57	57	0	0	0
3. Fayette	9	262	29	4	153	38	1	55	55	1	61	61
4. Harrison	4	85	21	0	0	0	1	50	50	0	0	0
5. Henry	24	620	25	3	106	35	1	51	51	0	0	0
6. Laurel	21	566	27	31	1319	42	7	381	54	4	247	62
7. Morgan	17	510	30	39	1587	41	11	571	52	1	61	61
8. Scott	23	550	24	8	334	42	1	59	59	0	0	0
9. Spencer	16	398	25	11	429	39	0	0	0	0	0	0
10. Union	23	558	24	6	241	40	2	107	53	0	0	0
Total	195	4954	25	131	5355	41	27	1441	53	6	369	61
ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS—TWO OR MORE ROOMS												
1. Boyd	9	278	31	13	545	42	5	261	52	0	0	0
2. Breckinridge	14	386	28	9	338	38	2	103	51	0	0	0
3. Fayette	31	882	28	44	1772	40	11	577	52	1	65	65
4. Harrison	15	337	22	20	787	39	7	357	51	0	0	0
5. Henry	16	395	25	9	358	40	0	0	0	0	0	0
6. Laurel	9	274	30	28	1203	43	11	590	54	3	183	61
7. Morgan	14	395	28	24	967	40	2	101	50	0	0	0
8. Scott	22	556	25	10	408	41	0	0	0	0	0	0
9. Spencer	11	315	29	5	181	36	0	0	0	0	0	0
10. Union	17	484	28	8	349	41	1	55	55	0	0	0
Total	158	4302	27	170	6908	41	39	2024	51	4	248	62

and either withdraw or attend irregularly. A similar analysis of attendance records in the same groups of schools would very likely disclose results similar to those revealed from the analysis of the reports on enrollment.

The analysis of the organization reports of the elementary schools reveals incredible ranges in the teacher-loads. The interests of thousands of pupils are jeopardized in overcrowded classes; practically impossible situations are imposed upon hundreds of teachers; the legality of the expenditure of the public school funds is challenged by the maintenance of hundreds of undersized classes. *The earnestness of purpose and the efficiency of service of the State Board of Education, of members of district boards of education, of superintendents, principals, and teachers, are challenged on the basis of complications growing out of defective administrative programs. The undesirable results growing out of defective administrative programs cheapen the entire public school program, invite adverse criticism—even from the friends of public education, seriously retard efforts to*

raise public school funds, and complicate plans to further the best interests and promote the general welfare of public education.

The many situations revealed that penalize pupils, teachers or taxpayers, or all, constitute indisputable reasons why county boards of education should readjust the boundaries of their subdistricts, give more deliberate attention to the development of their educational programs, and mature a policy of administration that "smacks" less of expediency and more of response to official duties.

SCHOOL CODE BILL TO BECOME LAW JUNE 14

When Governor Ruby Laffoon, on March 14, signed the School Code Bill which had been passed by the General Assembly, Kentucky schools reached a point which educational leaders have sought for many years.

The new School Code is designed to unify, simplify, and make more available the laws which affect the well-being of those who are to become the citizens of the Commonwealth.

In volume, it is approximately one-fourth as long as the old school law; many vague and conflicting sections have been removed and the laws rearranged in a clear and logical order.

With respect to most phases of school organization, the new Code makes few radical changes. It incorporates much of the old law, bringing it up to date. In some respects, however, the new Code does materially change the State's educational set-up and these changes were discussed in the March, 1934, issue of the *Educational Bulletin*.

Kentucky's new School Code was submitted to the General Assembly by the Kentucky Educational Commission and was based on a study which lasted nearly two years and in which nearly one hundred Kentucky educators and laymen took part. Its passage by the General Assembly followed an intensive campaign of a year's duration, sponsored by the Kentucky Education Association in cooperation with the State Department of Education. Every available means was employed to coordinate the educational activities of various organizations and to acquaint the public with the findings and recommendations of the Commission.

When the School Code becomes law on June 14, it will not automatically insure a perfect school system, but it will open the door to a more satisfactory solution of many of our problems. Friends of education in Kentucky are looking on this piece of work not as an achievement, but as an opportunity to build a sound public school system. The next two years will be an interesting period of trial and adjustment.



GOVERNOR LAFFOON SIGNS NEW SCHOOL CODE

President
University of Kentucky
Lexington, Kentucky

1934
2
19
0.6