

6-1-1949

A comparison of coaches with other teachers in Montgomery County with regard to salary, training, teaching loads and other factors

Leland D. Melvin
Indiana State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholars.indianastate.edu/etds>

Recommended Citation

Melvin, Leland D., "A comparison of coaches with other teachers in Montgomery County with regard to salary, training, teaching loads and other factors" (1949). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. 404.
<https://scholars.indianastate.edu/etds/404>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by Sycamore Scholars. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Sycamore Scholars. For more information, please contact dana.swinford@indstate.edu.

A COMPARISON OF COACHES WITH OTHER TEACHERS
IN MONTGOMERY COUNTY WITH REGARD TO SALARY,
TRAINING, TEACHING LOADS AND OTHER FACTORS

A Thesis
Presented to
the Faculty of
Indiana State Teachers College


INDIANA STATE
TEACHERS COLLEGE
LIBRARY

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Science in Education

by
Leland D. Melvin
June 1949


The thesis of Leland D. Melvin,
Contribution of the Graduate School, Indiana State
Teachers College, Number 633, under the title _____
A COMPARISON OF COACHES WITH OTHER TEACHERS IN
MONTGOMERY COUNTY WITH REGARD TO SALARY, TRAINING,
TEACHING LOAD, AND OTHER FACTORS
is hereby approved as counting toward the completion
of the Master's degree in the amount of 8 hours'
credit.

Committee on thesis:



David A. Glascock, Chairman

Representative of English Department:



Date of Acceptance June 3, 1949

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. THE PROBLEM AND DEFINITION OF TERMS USED . .	1
The problem	1
Statement of the problem	1
Importance of the study	2
Other studies of this nature	2
Definition of terms used	3
Organization of remainder of the thesis . .	3
II. DATA AND METHOD OF PROCEDURE	5
Data	5
Sources of data	5
Treatment of data	5
Validity and reliability	6
Method of procedure	6
III. COMPARISON OF COACHES WITH OTHER TEACHERS WITH RESPECT TO SALARY, TRAINING AND EX- PERIENCE, TEACHING LOAD, AND EXTRACURRICULAR DUTIES	9
Salary	9
Training and experience	10
Teaching load	16
Extracurricular duties	19

CHAPTER	PAGE
IV. EFFECT OF MINIMUM SALARY LAWS ON SALARIES OF TEACHERS AND COACHES	27
V. PUBLIC CRITICISM	31
Definition of specific terms	31
Criticism as reported to principals and trustees	32
Criticism by patrons	32
VI. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION	37
BIBLIOGRAPHY	39
APPENDIX A. Working Sheet of Teacher Data	41
APPENDIX B. Questionnaires	44
APPENDIX C. Daily Class Schedules	47
APPENDIX D. Public Opinion Recording Sheet	63

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
I. Minimum Salary and Actual Salary of Montgomery County Teachers and Coaches for School Year 1946-1947	11
II. Average Minimum Salary and Average Actual Salary of Teachers and Coaches in Montgomery County for 1946-1947	12
III. Weeks of Training and Years of Ex- perience of Teachers and Coaches of Montgomery County for 1946-1947	14
IV. Average Training and Average Ex- perience of Teachers and Coaches in Montgomery County for 1946-1947	15
V. Teaching Loads of Teachers and Coaches of Montgomery County for School Year 1946-1947	18
VI. Average Teaching Units of Teachers and Coaches of Montgomery County for 1946-1947	20
VII. Number of Hours Spent in Academic Preparation and Extracurricular Duties by Teachers and Coaches of Montgomery County for School Year 1946-1947	23

TABLE

PAGE

VIII.	Average Number of Hours Spent Outside of School for Academic Preparation and Extracurricular Duties by Teachers and Coaches of Montgomery County in 1946- 1947	25
IX.	Average of Montgomery County Teachers' and Coaches' Minimum Salaries for School Years 1944-1945 and 1946-1947	28
X.	Averages of Montgomery County Teachers' and Coaches' Salaries Received During School Years 1937-1938, 1944-1945, and 1946-1947	29
XI.	Criticism of Montgomery County School Officials as Reported by Principals and Trustees	33
XII.	Public Criticism of Montgomery County School Officials as Reported by School Patrons	35

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM AND DEFINITION OF TERMS USED

The struggle of teachers for greater salaries from employers has been in evidence for many years. In Indiana this struggle reached a climax in the form of an organized effort which effected the Indiana minimum salary law of 1945. Not only have teachers been at odds with their employers, but in many instances poor relations have existed among teachers. Each teacher thinks his particular field of endeavor is of utmost importance and remuneration for performance in such field should be greater than that of a colleague in another department.

I. THE PROBLEM

Statement of the problem. The objectives of this study are (1) to compare Montgomery County coaches to other teachers of the county with respect to salary, training, experience, teaching load, and extracurricular duties; (2) to compare the salaries of these groups, before and after the passage of the 1941 and 1945 minimum salary laws to ascertain the effect of these laws, if any, on these salaries; and (3) to attempt an evaluation of criticism received by various teachers of the high schools of Montgomery County.

Importance of the problem. To reach an intelligent decision on any problem reliable information must be available for consideration. This study intends to show facts relative to salary and teaching load of Montgomery County teachers and coaches. In so doing there will be conclusions at hand which will give understanding to the validity or fallacy of the present conditions of teachers' salaries and teaching loads in Montgomery County.

In the study of this problem a great deal of attention will be given to salary, teaching load, and extra-curricular assignments. The conclusions reached should be of great value in determining a salary schedule and would aid materially in the construction of a daily class schedule.

Other studies of this nature. This particular topic is an original project inasmuch as it deals with certain comparisons of Montgomery County teachers and coaches. Nale's study,¹ which is referred to later in the thesis, deals with teaching loads of teachers in Montgomery County for the school year 1946-1947. That thesis touches only one section of this study and many other conditions were different.

¹Russell Milton Nale, "A Survey of the Teaching Loads of the Secondary Schools of Montgomery County." (unpublished thesis, Indiana State Teachers College, 1947)

II. DEFINITIONS OF TERMS USED

Daily schedule. A schedule which shows what each teacher of a school is doing each period of the day.

Minimum salary. The least amount of money a school corporation may legally pay a teacher per year for services rendered. This minimum salary is based on the training and experience of the teacher. In this study all minimum salaries are those based on an eight-month term.

Actual salary. The amount of money actually paid by the school corporation for services of the teacher.

School year. That period during which schools are in session. In this study the school year consists of eight and one-half months.

Extracurricular duties. That part of a teacher's work that has no connection with academic work. Usually this work must be done after school hours.

Listener. A person who was strategically placed in order to listen and record public opinion.

III. ORGANIZATION OF REMAINDER OF THE THESIS

Chapter II reveals the sources of data, explains the treatment of data, and gives a description of the

procedure followed in this study.

In Chapter III the comparison of classroom teachers with coaches is presented. In this chapter salary, training, experience, teaching load, and extracurricular duties are considered.

Chapter IV attempts to determine the effect, if any, the minimum salary laws have had on the comparison of teachers' and coaches' salaries. A study of salaries of three different periods are presented: (1) prior to the first minimum salary law of 1941, (2) after the 1941 minimum salary law was passed, and (3) after the 1945 minimum salary law was passed.

A study in public opinion with respect to criticism of public officials is presented in Chapter V. This is an attempt to discover which teacher, or group of teachers, if any, is the target of major criticism.

Finally, the summary and conclusions of the study are presented in Chapter VI.

CHAPTER II

DATA AND METHOD OF PROCEDURE

I. DATA

Sources of data. The sources of data for this study consist of (1) information from inspection reports required of every school by the State Department of Public Instruction; (2) replies to questionnaires sent to every teacher and coach in Montgomery County; and (3) ideas and opinions of school patrons.

Treatment of data. With information received from teachers' questionnaires and from the inspection reports, a working sheet was constructed which showed the teacher's name, minimum salary, actual salary, training, number of classes taught, and number of preparations made.² From this working sheet information and tables were derived which described the comparisons of salary, training and experience.

The daily class schedules were used in conjunction with the Douglass formula³ in determining the teaching load of all teachers and coaches of the county. These daily schedules and the questionnaires gave the necessary

² See Appendix, p. 41

³ Harl R. Douglass, Organization and Administration of Secondary Schools. Ginn & Co. Chicago, 1945. p. 113.

information to determine the total number of hours spent in academic work and extracurricular duties. From this information tables were constructed which showed the comparison of teaching loads and extracurricular duties.

Finally, the ideas and opinions, as given by school patrons, were tabulated which gave a graphic picture of the criticism received by the different groups of high school teachers.

Validity and reliability. The inspection reports used in this study are accepted by law as a legal record and can be accepted as valid data. The questionnaires sent to all teachers included space for the teachers' signatures which validate their origin. The fact that these questionnaires were sent through the county superintendent's office should increase their reliability. The opinions of school patrons were recorded on the spot of conversation, therefore eliminating the error of second-hand gossip.

II. METHOD OF PROCEDURE

This thesis is a product of the normative survey type of research. For information concerning salaries, training, and teaching schedules the files of the Montgomery County Superintendent of Schools were used. Nearly all the necessary data were obtained from the inspection reports which are required by the State Department of Public Instruction.

For information regarding the amount of time spent in extracurricular duties, a questionnaire⁴ was sent through the county superintendent's office to each individual teacher and coach. This questionnaire was not only valuable in this primary respect, but also in determining the amount of time spent in making preparations, grading papers, and other duties. In the field of fine arts it is difficult to judge from a daily schedule just how much preparation is necessary for these classes. This questionnaire contained a special section which showed the activities of fine arts teachers.

Possibly the most delicate undertaking of this discourse was the attempt to record school patrons' criticism of teachers and coaches. A questionnaire⁵ was prepared and sent to each principal and trustee of the county. It was believed that these officials would be aware of direct criticism of the teachers working under them.

Far more important, however, was another device contrived to record public opinion without the public realizing the process. In the towns having schools in this study, persons of good reputation were enlisted to help obtain the desired information. Careful scrutiny was observed in choosing desirable persons who understood the nature of the problem and were willing to cooperate in the project throughout its entirety.

⁴ See Appendix, p. 44

⁵ See Appendix, p. 45

All these individuals were given a definite and distinct idea of the problem and specific information was given them with respect to the recording of data. In most cases all the listener had to do was make a mental note of the remarks passed, and after contributors had left the scene of conversation these remarks were recorded on a provided form.⁶

It is well to note that in Montgomery County there are twelve high schools. The city school, Crawfordsville, was eliminated from the study because the salary schedule and coaching staff are on a different basis than county schools. Also, two of the county high schools were eliminated from this study because the principal and coach appear as the same person.

Principals are excluded from this study since the administrative nature of their positions places them under different categories of salary, teaching load, and other duties.

In this study 100 per cent of questionnaires sent were returned. In some instances it was necessary to send a second questionnaire, but inasmuch as all questionnaires were sent through the county superintendent's office, most teachers were quick to reply.

⁶ See Appendix, p. 46

CHAPTER III

COMPARISON OF COACHES WITH OTHER TEACHERS WITH RESPECT TO SALARY, TRAINING AND EXPERIENCE, TEACHING LOAD, AND EXTRACURRICULAR DUTIES

In this chapter the following comparisons of coaches and teachers will be made: salary, training, experience, teaching load and extracurricular assignments. Data for the subjects of salary, training, experience, and teaching load were taken from records in the county superintendent's office, while data for extracurricular duties were obtained through questionnaires sent to teachers and daily schedules of the several high schools.

All figures presented in this chapter are those of the school year 1947-1948 unless otherwise indicated.

I. SALARY

For the school year 1948-1949 Montgomery County ranked seventy-eighth in the state with a median salary of \$2688 for secondary classroom teachers.⁷ This indicates much is to be done to bring salaries of Montgomery County up to the median of all counties in the state.

⁷ Research Service Circular No. 6, (Indianapolis: Indiana State Teachers Association, March, 1949), pp. 1-2.

Table I shows a comparison of coaches' and teachers' minimum salaries and actual salaries. This table shows that in more than half the schools the coach received a greater salary than any other teacher of the staff. Usually teachers who received a salary greater than the coach had a minimum salary which exceeded the actual salary received by the coach. This was true because of the long experience of a few such teachers.

In Table II, page 12, the average teachers minimum and actual salary of each high school is compared to the coach's minimum and actual salary. Finally, the averages of all county teachers are compared to those of all county coaches.

This table shows that in the county as a whole, the average minimum of coaches exceeds that of teachers by approximately thirty-three dollars. The actual average salary of the average coach exceeded that of the average teacher by \$358. This would lead us to assume that the difference of salaries is out of proportion to the difference in minimums, and that there must be another basis for this difference.

II. TRAINING AND EXPERIENCE

Minimum salary is based upon the training and experience a teacher has had. Hence, it is well that training

TABLE I
MINIMUM SALARY AND ACTUAL SALARY OF MONTGOMERY COUNTY TEACHERS AND COACHES
FOR SCHOOL YEAR 1946-1947

TEACHER	SCHOOL A		SCHOOL B		SCHOOL C		SCHOOL D		SCHOOL E		SCHOOL F		SCHOOL G		SCHOOL H		SCHOOL I	
	Minimum Salary	Actual Salary	Minimum Salary	Actual Salary	Minimum Salary	Actual Salary	Minimum Salary	Actual Salary	Minimum Salary	Actual Salary	Minimum Salary	Actual Salary	Minimum Salary	Actual Salary	Minimum Salary	Actual Salary	Minimum Salary	Actual Salary
1	2133	2351	2533	2691	2133	2550	2213	2380	2133	2380*	2533	2776*	2133	2400	2533	2692	2213	2780
2	2173	2309	2373	2521	2213	2351*	3200	3244	2477	2125*	3005	2338*	2493	2691	3200	3400	2293	2436
3	2293	2436	2000	2125	2133	2304	2133	2400	1800	1913	2378	2417	3111	3305	2333	2482	3054	3244
4	2293	2436	2553	2691	2293	2436	2957	3143	3111	2550*	2333	2479	2957	3142	2533	2692	1800	2125
5			2000	2125	2413	2564	3005	3191	2293	2440	2533	2691	2173	2267*	1800	2172	2533	2686
6			2293	2436	2533	2691	2533	2694	2533	2691	2253	2479	2373	2805*	2533	2692		
7			2533	2800	2293	2436			3200	3400	2293	2521	3200	3400	2861	3043		
8					2173	2309*			2533	2691					3200	3400		
9									2173	2312								
10									2765	2938								
COACH	2453	2900	2413	2965	2493	3000	2533	3100	2173	2805	2373	2850	3200	3400	2841	3060	2173	2720

* Ten or twelve month salary converted to eight and one-half month salary

TABLE II
 AVERAGE MINIMUM SALARY AND AVERAGE ACTUAL SALARY
 OF TEACHERS AND COACHES IN MONTGOMERY COUNTY
 FOR 1946-1947

SCHOOL	MINIMUM SALARY		ACTUAL SALARY	
	AVERAGE TEACHER	COACH	AVERAGE TEACHER	COACH
A	2223	2453	2383	2900
B	2322	2413	2470	2965
C	2398	2493	2455	3000
D	2674	2533	2842	3100
E	2502	2173	2544	2805
F	2475	2373	2529	2850
G	2634	3200	2859	3400
H	2749	2841	2827	3060
I	2379	2173	2654	2720
COUNTY AVERAGE	2484	2517	2618	2976

and experience be considered closely following salary and minimum salary discussions.

Data for this part of the study were taken from the annual inspection reports of the State Department of Public Instruction.

Table III shows the training and experience of each teacher in this study and that of each coach. In this table it is seen that in six of the nine schools the coach had more training than the average teacher of that school. In five of the nine schools the average teacher's experience was greater than that of the coach. Only two of the coaches had more than ten years of experience, while thirty-one other teachers were in this category. This indicates that, as a group, the coaches are newer in the teaching profession than other teachers.

Table IV, page 15, shows the average county teacher's training to be six weeks less than that of the average county coach, while the average county teacher had slightly over two years more experience than the average county coach.

These figures do not seem significant in determining a cause for the difference of \$358 between the salaries of coaches and other teachers.

With minimum salaries, training and experience showing no justification for a great variation of salary, further investigation is necessary.

TABLE III
WEEKS OF TRAINING AND YEARS OF EXPERIENCE OF TEACHERS AND COACHES
IN MONTGOMERY COUNTY FOR THE SCHOOL YEAR 1946-1947

TEACHER	SCHOOL A	SCHOOL B	SCHOOL C	SCHOOL D	SCHOOL E	SCHOOL F	SCHOOL G	SCHOOL H	SCHOOL I
	Training Experience	Training Experience	Training Experience	Training Experience	Training Experience	Training Experience	Training Experience	Training Experience	Training Experience
1	144 0	162 20	144 0	156 3	144 0	181 11	144 0	156 38	152 2
2	144 1	144 6	144 2	264 20	247 8	183 19	144 9	202 29	176 4
3	168 4	108 25	170 0	163 0	72 12	158 6	216 22	144 5	180 20
4	144 4	144 24	156 4	255 18	180 22	144 5	183 18	178 22	97 25
5		112 23	148 7	217 19	144 4	153 11	147 1	84 29	159 29
6		144 4	144 24	156 14	168 20	144 3	144 6	178 30	
7		144 8	144 4		207 25	144 4	192 28	198 16	
8			144 1		156 16			203 25	
9					162 1				
10					180 14				
COACH	166 8	144 7	162 9	172 15	184 1	144 6	180 30	212 9	144 1

TABLE IV
 AVERAGE TRAINING AND AVERAGE EXPERIENCE OF
 TEACHERS AND COACHES IN MONTGOMERY
 COUNTY FOR 1946-1947

SCHOOL	TRAINING		EXPERIENCE	
	AVERAGE TEACHER	COACH	AVERAGE TEACHER	COACH
A	150	166	2.25	8
B	137	144	15.7	7
C	149	162	5.25	9
D	202	172	12.33	15
E	176	184	12.2	1
F	158	144	8.4	6
G	167	180	12	30
H	168	212	24.25	9
I	153	144	16	1
COUNTY AVERAGE	162	168	12.04	9.95

III. TEACHING LOADS

Teaching load is a term used in describing the work done by teachers. In this study the following formula as stated by Douglass⁸ is used:

$$TL = \left[CP - \frac{2 \text{ Dup}}{10} + \frac{(NP - 20CP)}{100} + \frac{PC}{2} \right] \left[\frac{PL}{100} \frac{55}{100} \right]$$

TL = units of teaching load per week

CP = class periods spent in classroom per week

Dup = number of class periods spent per week in classroom teaching classes for which the preparation is very similar to that for some other section, not including the original section.

NP = number of pupils in classes per week

PC = number of class periods spent in supervision of study hall, student activities, teacher meetings, assisting in administrative or supervisory work, or other cooperation

PL = gross length in minutes of class periods

In applying the formula to special types of classes such as physical education or music, the number of pupils were not counted. This reduces the load since there is no reading or grading of papers. In classes that meet for double periods such as typing, practical arts, or vocational subjects, certain changes were made. Each class period was counted, the second period of a double period was counted as

⁸ Douglass, loc. cit.

a duplicate of preparation, and the number of pupils were counted for each period.⁹

Table V shows the teaching load of each teacher and each coach covered in this study. This table reveals that the coaches' loads are not as heavy as those of the other teachers. In only three schools did the coach outrank any other teacher in the number of teaching units. In two schools the highest teacher showed seven more teaching units per week than the coach. This does not agree with the conclusion reached by Nale¹⁰ in which he states that teachers of physical education and social studies have the heaviest teaching loads.

In that study, however, Nale attempted to compute the outside work done by coaches into the teaching load while in this study the academic teaching load and extra-curricular duties are separated. The findings of Table V agree with those of the Iowa study¹¹ and the Minnesota study¹² which show that teachers of music and physical education have the lightest teaching loads.

⁹ Ibid., p. 114

¹⁰ Nale, op. cit., p. 44

¹¹ Ethel M. Soupe and Harl R. Douglass, "The Professional Load of Secondary Schools in Iowa," School Review, XLIII (June 1935) 428-437.

¹² Martin Quanbeck and Harl R. Douglass, "Teaching Loads in the High School," The Nation's Schools, XV, No. 2 (February, 1935), 37-39.

TABLE V
TEACHING LOADS OF TEACHERS AND COACHES OF
MONTGOMERY COUNTY FOR SCHOOL YEAR 1946-1947

	SCHOOL A	SCHOOL B	SCHOOL C	SCHOOL D	SCHOOL E	SCHOOL F	SCHOOL G	SCHOOL H	SCHOOL I
TEACHER	UNITS PER WEEK	UNITS PER WEEK	UNITS PER WEEK	UNITS PER WEEK	UNITS PER WEEK	UNITS PER WEEK	UNITS PER WEEK	UNITS PER WEEK	UNITS PER WEEK
1	28.69	32.80	22.75	26.57	28.14	29.37	30.29	31.88	29.40
2	29.84	29.89	30.19	28.51	29.61	31.35	26.57	27.44	30.77
3	25.95	28.26	29.40	27.65	28.30	29.12	29.59	26.38	29.19
4	30.21	32.20	25.10	25.65	31.50	28.55	28.35	31.39	29.93
5		22.31	28.00	26.89	24.38	30.69	31.40	27.25	26.88
6		33.86	29.45	24.30	28.98	26.79	28.89	30.46	
7		32.70	28.04		29.03	26.40	25.06	30.52	
8			26.15		27.35			29.59	
9					29.07				
10					27.04				
COACH	26.96	25.73	28.25	26.73	26.62	30.53	23.22	25.23	27.30

Table VI compares the average teacher of each school with the coach with respect to teaching units per week. The table shows that the average teacher of the county has nearly two more teaching units per week than the average coach. The teaching load could not be the reason for coaches receiving greater salaries than teachers when it is shown that coaches have the lighter teaching load.

IV. EXTRACURRICULAR DUTIES

The school of today does not consider a child's education complete unless he participates in some activity outside the academic area. There is much to be learned by working with other students in some common project. In speaking of extracurricular activities Grinnell says:

. . . educated opinion today is almost unanimous on the importance of such activities in the whole education of the child. They furnish experience that the regular curriculum cannot conveniently furnish. They build up in the child self-confidence and a needful spirit of team work. Through them, socialization is gained and initiative is developed. Leadership is one of the most valuable outcomes of a well-controlled extracurricular program.¹³

Much discussion has arisen from critics of the school who question the wisdom of teachers being paid with tax-payers' money to supervise extracurricular activities. However, Tead, a leading educator of the East, states:

¹³ J. Earle Grinnell, Interpreting the Public Schools (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1937) p. 270.

TABLE VI
AVERAGE TEACHING UNITS OF TEACHERS AND COACHES
OF MONTGOMERY COUNTY FOR 1946-1947

SCHOOL	TEACHERS' AVERAGE TEACHING UNIT PER WEEK	COACHES' TEACHING UNIT PER WEEK
A	28.67	26.96
B	30.29	25.73
C	27.39	28.25
D	26.60	26.73
E	28.34	26.62
F	28.90	30.53
G	28.73	23.22
H	29.36	25.23
I	29.23	27.30
COUNTY AVERAGE	28.61	26.73

An important factor here is for us to recognize more explicitly and consistently that the work which teachers do in student counseling and in the guidance of extracurricular duties is work that will be accorded full credit when promotion is being considered.¹⁴

It is generally understood that a teacher's day does not end simultaneously with the dismissal bell. Much work must be completed at some other time. In some schools of this study it is a practice for each teacher to have at least one free period for such work.¹⁵ This practice is not uniform for all schools, however, and even if it were, the time is not sufficient. In many cases the period is free in appearance only. Students constantly seek consultation with the teacher and often such conferences occur during the free period. In general, teachers do not object to this, but it cuts down considerably the amount of preparation the teacher can do while at school.

In this particular part of the study an attempt is made to discover the number of clock hours spent outside the teaching day in preparation of class work, as well as the amount of time spent at extracurricular duties. Information regarding these matters was taken from questionnaires which each teacher in the county filled out.

In certain activities the participating teachers reported such a variance of answers to the question of time

¹⁴ Tead Ordway, "The Extracurricular Challenge in Urban Universities," School and Society, LXV (April, 1947) 259.

¹⁵ See daily schedules in the Appendix, pp. 47-62

required that it was necessary to determine a standard to follow. Teachers who coached class plays, were class sponsors, or kept time or score at all basketball games were credited with a standard amount of time for this activity. This standard was determined by taking the greatest frequency of the number of cases. Of course it was necessary to convert the time spent into a figure which would represent time spent per week throughout the school year. On this basis it was discovered that play directors and timekeepers or scorekeepers at basketball games worked for a period of time equal to two hours per week, while class sponsors worked for a period equal to one-half hour per week.

In all cases of irregular activity individual recognition was given as it was reported on the questionnaire. It must be noted that some teachers reported that they were required to keep school accounts on their own time, while some schools granted time in the daily schedule for this. In this study all teachers who kept school accounts were given recognition of this fact in the teaching load. If a period was provided in the daily schedule for this work, it was counted as such. If time was not allotted in the schedule for this function an extra cooperation period was added for such teachers and was computed into the teaching load.

Table VII shows the number of hours every teacher and coach spends outside of school hours for class

TABLE VII

NUMBER OF HOURS SPENT IN ACADEMIC PREPARATION AND EXTRACURRICULAR DUTIES
BY TEACHERS AND COACHES OF MONTGOMERY COUNTY FOR SCHOOL YEAR 1946-1947

Teacher	SCHOOL A		SCHOOL B		SCHOOL C		SCHOOL D		SCHOOL E		SCHOOL F		SCHOOL G		SCHOOL H		SCHOOL I	
	Academic Preparation	Extracurricu- lar Duties	Academic Preparation	Extracurricu- lar Duties	Academic Preparation	Extracurricu- lar Duties	Academic Preparation	Extracurricu- lar Duties	Academic Preparation	Extracurricu- lar Duties	Academic Preparation	Extracurricu- lar Duties	Academic Preparation	Extracurricu- lar Duties	Academic Preparation	Extracurricu- lar Duties	Academic Preparation	Extracurricu- lar Duties
1	8	1	8	5	6	10	9	5	5	5	5	10	15	1	5	1	8	3
2	0	8	10	5	15	12	15	2	10	15	3	3	15	1	8	3	8	2
3	15	4	2	0	8	2	5	2	10	9	8	5	3	3	10	3	10	2
4	10	2	4	2	14	3	10	1	5	5	15	5	6	1	10	5	10	6
5			10	2	4	2	3	4	8	2	10	4	16	3	5	3	10	2
6			10	4	8	4	5	1	8	2	6	1	15	3	9	5		
7			4	2	5	3			10	2	5	4	5	4	12	4		
8					5	2			7	3					8	1		
9									12	4								
10									10	4								
COACH	10	13	5	20	6	15	3	14	4	23	8	17	2	23	1	21	10	15

preparation, grading of papers, and other duties in connection with academic work as well as the number of hours spent outside the school day in extracurricular duties.

This table shows that nearly all teachers spend more time outside of school hours than do coaches in work connected with academic duties. However, the coach far outranks the other teachers in the amount of time spent in extracurricular activities. These findings are to be expected because (1) the coaches' teaching loads were found to be less than other teachers, (2) the physical education classes taught by coaches do not require the hours of preparation and evaluation that other subjects require, and (3) 86.3 per cent of all coaching duties must be done outside of school hours.

Table VIII illustrates that the average county teacher spends 3.31 hours per week more than the average county coach in making preparation for academic work. The average county coach spends 14.1 hours per week more than the average county teacher in extracurricular duties.

It was found that the average school in this study was in session from eight o'clock in the morning until three-thirty in the afternoon, with thirty minutes off for lunch. These figures show that the working day at school is seven hours. From Table VIII it is seen that

TABLE VIII
 AVERAGE NUMBER OF HOURS PER WEEK SPENT OUTSIDE
 OF SCHOOL FOR ACADEMIC PREPARATION AND EXTRA-
 CURRICULAR DUTIES BY TEACHERS AND COACHES
 OF MONTGOMERY COUNTY IN 1946-1947

SCHOOL	PREPARATION		EXTRACURRICULAR DUTIES	
	TEACHERS AVERAGE	COACH	TEACHERS AVERAGE	COACH
A	8.25	10	5	13
B	6.95	4	3.9	20
C	8.13	6	4.5	15
D	7.83	3	2.5	14
E	8.00	4	6.4	23
F	7.43	5	4.6	17
G	10.71	2	2.3	23
H	8.38	1	3.1	21
I	9.12	10	3.0	15
COUNTY AVERAGE	8.31	5	3.8	17.9

the total number of hours per day for the average county teacher would be 9.42, while the total hours per day for the average county coach is 11.58. This difference of 2.16 hours spent each day may be a partial basis for the greater salary received by the coach.

Some school corporations have a definite schedule set up to compensate those teachers who spend time outside of school hours directing extracurricular activities. Anderson¹⁶ describes the Merrill, Wisconsin, salary schedule which provides extra pay at the rate of \$100 per extra unit for special services. He states:

Each special service is assigned a number of units based upon the additional work involved. It is understood that this special work is not so-called curricular activity conducted during the school day except in the cases of supervisors or principals.¹⁷

It is reasonable to assume that the coaches would be allowed three or three and one-half units of special service for coaching duties. This would indicate that the relationship of coaches' and teachers' salaries of Montgomery County is comparable to those of other localities.

¹⁶ Stuart Anderson, "Salary Schedule Practices," The Nation's Schools, XLIII, No. 2 (February, 1949) 54.

¹⁷ Loc. cit.

CHAPTER IV

EFFECT OF MINIMUM SALARY LAWS ON SALARIES OF TEACHERS AND COACHES

In this chapter an attempt will be made to show any effect the passage of minimum salary laws has had on the relationship of teachers' and coaches' salaries. It will be remembered that the first Indiana minimum salary law was passed in 1941. This law was superseded by a new minimum salary law in 1945.

Data for this part of the study were taken from inspection reports on file in the office of the county superintendent of schools.

Table IX compares the average county teacher's and coach's salary of 1944-1945 with that of 1946-1947. This shows that the average county teacher's minimum increased from 1944-1945 to 1946-1947 by \$1120 or 82 per cent, whereas the average county coach's minimum salary for the same period increased by \$1184 or 89 per cent.

Table X, page 29, compares the average county teacher's and coach's actual salary of 1937-1938 to those of 1944-1945 and 1946-1947. For the period 1937-1938 to 1944-1945 the average county coach's salary increased \$568, 46 per cent, as compared to an increase of \$410, 37 per cent, for the average county teacher. During the second period, however, the average county teacher's increase amounted to

TABLE IX
 AVERAGE OF MONTGOMERY COUNTY TEACHERS' AND COACHES'
 MINIMUM SALARIES FOR SCHOOL YEARS 1944-1945 and 1946-1947

SCHOOL	AVERAGE COUNTY TEACHER'S MINIMUM SALARY		AVERAGE COUNTY COACH'S MINIMUM SALARY	
	SCHOOL YEAR 1944-1945	SCHOOL YEAR 1946-1947	SCHOOL YEAR 1944-1945	SCHOOL YEAR 1946-1947
A	1420	2223	1300	2453
B	1346	2322	1160	2413
C	1325	2398	1400	2493
D	1453	2674	1400	2533
E	1398	2502	1160	2173
F	1317	2475	1360	2373
G	1324	2634	1480	3200
H	1368	2749	1480	2841
I	1315	2379	1260	2173
COUNTY AVERAGE	1363	2483	1333	2517

TABLE X
AVERAGES OF MONTGOMERY COUNTY TEACHERS' AND COACHES' SALARIES RECEIVED
DURING SCHOOL YEARS 1937-1938, 1944-1945, AND 1946-1947

SCHOOL	AVERAGE COUNTY TEACHER'S SALARY			AVERAGE COUNTY COACH'S SALARY		
	SCHOOL YEAR 1937-1938	SCHOOL YEAR 1944-1945	SCHOOL YEAR 1946-1947	SCHOOL YEAR 1937-1938	SCHOOL YEAR 1944-1945	SCHOOL YEAR 1946-1947
A	1100	1420	2383	1040	1920	2900
B	1080	1470	2470	1200	1520	2965
C	1131	1553	2455	1280	1800	3000
D	1080	1587	2842	1240	2400	3100
E	1044	1485	2544	1280	1600	2805
F	1139	1600	2529	1200	1480	2850
G	1107	1528	2859	1440	2200	3400
H	1134	1485	2827	1360	1800	3043
I	1068	1450	2654	1160	1600	2720
COUNTY AVERAGE	1098	1508	2618	1245	1813	2976

\$1110, 75 per cent, as compared to an increase of \$1163, 64 per cent, for the average county coach.

For the period from 1944-1945 to 1946-1947 the average county teacher's minimum increased \$1120, 82 per cent, and the salary increased \$1110, 75 per cent. During the same period the average county coach's minimum increased \$1184, 89 per cent, and the salary increased \$1163, 64 per cent.

From these figures it is concluded that the minimum salary laws have not worked to the special advantage of any particular group of teachers.

It is seen that in each of the periods considered in this chapter, the average coach has always drawn a greater salary than the average teacher. It is also noted that over the period of ten years from 1937-1938 to 1946-1947, the average county coach's salary has increased by 139 per cent as compared to an increase of 127 per cent for the average teacher.

CHAPTER V

PUBLIC CRITICISM

When a teacher signs a contract for a year of teaching, there is no mention of the amount of public criticism to be endured. It is true that certain teachers have personalities which invite more criticism than others, and some communities are known to be more critical of teachers than are other communities. With this in mind, the purpose of this chapter is to detect which teacher, or group of teachers, if any, is the target of unjust criticism.

I. DEFINITION OF SPECIFIC TERMS

For the sake of clear understanding, certain terms peculiar to this particular chapter must be explained.

Personal biased. Criticism which is given by a parent or close relative.

Momentarily biased. Criticism given by a patron while under emotional strain who ordinarily would not criticize unjustly.

Chronic criticism. This type of criticism is given by one who is dissatisfied regardless of circumstances or outcome.

Intelligent criticism. Carefully thought-through ideas presented at times when all parties concerned are emotionally stable.

II. CRITICISM AS REPORTED TO PRINCIPALS AND TRUSTEES

The data for this part of the study was obtained from questionnaires which were sent to all principals and trustees of the schools covered in this survey.

Table XI shows the criticism of certain teachers as reported by principals and trustees. The table shows the rank of criticisms. The number one indicates that that teacher was criticized most. Of eighteen cases reported, coaches were criticized most in ten cases, and second most in four more. Principals were criticized most in five cases, and second most in seven more. Teachers were criticized most in two cases, second most in three reports, and third most in four reports. Eight reports did not show criticism of teachers, five did not show criticism of principals, and one did not show criticism of the coach.

This report would indicate that officials of the schools are criticized in the following order: (1) coaches, (2) principals, and (3) teachers. In only one report did the official consider the criticism justified.

III. CRITICISM BY PATRONS

Data for this section were obtained by a listener

TABLE XI

CRITICISM OF MONTGOMERY COUNTY SCHOOL OFFICIALS
AS REPORTED BY PRINCIPALS AND TRUSTEES

OFFICIAL REPORTING	RANK OF CRITICISM				
	COACH	PRIN.	TRUSTEE	TEACHERS	CO. SUPT.
A				1	
B	1	2	3	4	
C	3	2	1		
D	1			2	
E		1	2		3
F	2	1			
G	2	1			
H	1	2		3	
I	1	2		3	
J	1			2	
K	2			1	
L	1	2		3	
M	1	2			
N	2	1		3	
O	1	3	2		
P	3	1		2	
Q	1	2			
R	1		2		

who was located in each town which had a school in this survey. The investigator, because of his position, was not able to gather this information first-hand because if he should appear on the scene of a discussion, the topic of conversation would rarely be adverse criticism of him. For this reason reliable and intelligent persons were enlisted to help obtain the necessary information.

Table XII shows the report of criticism as given by school patrons and tabulated by the listener. This reliable person was given a score sheet similar in form to that shown in Table XII.¹⁸ As the listener heard criticism he would make mental notes of what was said until such time as actual recording could take place. In this manner, the school patrons were not aware that their opinions were being recorded.

Table XII shows that coaches were criticized most severely, 259 cases being recorded. Teachers were second with 74 cases being recorded, and principals were third with 73 cases being recorded.

Of the 421 cases reported, 196 or 47 per cent were chronic criticisms, 91 cases, 22 per cent, were momentarily biased criticisms, while personal biased and intelligent criticisms each reported 67 cases or 15 per cent of the total.

¹⁸ See Appendix, p. 63

TABLE XI
PUBLIC CRITICISM OF MONTGOMERY COUNTY SCHOOL OFFICIALS
AS REPORTED BY SCHOOL PATRONS

SCHOOL	PRINCIPAL					COACH					TEACHERS					OTHERS				
	P.B.	M.B.	C.C.	I.C.	Total	P.B.	M.B.	C.C.	I.C.	Total	P.B.	M.B.	C.C.	I.C.	Total	P.B.	M.B.	C.C.	I.C.	Total
A	2		5	3	10	7	10	23	6	46	4		2	3	9	1		1		2
B	1		3		4	4	9	12	3	28		1	4	1	6				1	1
C	2	4	9	1	16	2	5	9	5	21	1		5	2	8		2	1		3
D			3	2	5	6	3	14	3	26	2	1	7		10					
E	3	1	4		8	5	7	6	2	20		3	5	1	9	1		2		3
F	4		2	3	9	3	9	14	4	30	1	4	2		7		1		2	3
G		2	6	1	9	6	2	11	5	24	2		3		5				1	1
H	1		3	2	6	1	5	16	7	29		3	5	1	9				1	1
I	2	2	1	1	6	3	14	12	6	35	3	2	6		11		1			1
TOTAL	15	9	36	13	73	37	64	117	41	259	13	14	39	8	74	2	4	4	5	15

Reports from these two separate sources showed that coaches were criticized approximately three times as much as teachers. What effect such criticism has on coaches and teachers is a phenomenon that cannot be measured. Considering a theoretical case of a teacher and a coach having identical personalities, it is reasonable to assume that three times the amount of criticism directed toward one would have a greater adverse effect on that person's mental well-being.

It is interesting here to note that apparently the clientele reporting in this study is much more concerned about the type of athletic supervision than about the academic opportunities offered the pupils of their communities. This public criticism follows closely an idea expressed by Koos when he declares:

The spontaneous interest in interscholastic athletics as now emphasized makes it particularly difficult to achieve anything like a balanced recognition in the press and in public attention for all aspects of secondary education . . .¹⁹

Public criticism is sometimes reflected in the turnover of teaching personnel. Hedge²⁰ found in his study that in the middle thirties, coaches had a 25 per cent greater turnover than teachers.

¹⁹ Leonard V. Koos, and others, Administering the Secondary School (Chicago: American Book Co., 1940) p. 638.

²⁰ Melvin O. Hedge, "Turnover Among Teachers in Township Schools of Indiana in 1934-1935." (unpublished thesis, Indiana State Teachers College, 1936) p. 73.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

The summary of the findings in this study is as follows:

1. In over half the schools in the study the coach received a higher salary than any other teacher on the staff.
2. The average county coach's minimum salary exceeded the average county teacher's minimum salary by thirty-three dollars.
3. The average county coach's actual salary exceeded that of the average county teacher by \$358.
4. In over two-thirds of the schools, the coach had more training than the average teacher of that school.
5. In more than one-half the schools the average teacher had more experience than the coach.
6. The average of all county teachers showed this group to have had six weeks less training, but slightly over two years more experience than the average of all county coaches.
7. The average county teacher's teaching load exceeded that of the average county coach by nearly two teaching units per week.
8. The average county teacher spent 3.31 hours more per week than did the average county coach in outside

preparation for academic work. This includes grading papers and making lesson plans.

9. The average county coach spent 14.1 hours more per week than did the average county teacher in extracurricular duties.

10. In total time spent, the average county coach spends 2.16 hours more per day than the average county teacher.

11. The minimum salary laws of Indiana have not given any advantage to any particular group of teachers.

12. Coaches receive three times the amount of criticism received by other teachers.

The average county coach received \$358 more per year than the average county teacher for the school year 1946-1947. In minimum salary, training, experience, and teaching load there was not a great deal of difference between teachers and coaches. The average coach spends approximately fourteen hours per week more than the average teacher in extracurricular duties, and receives three times the amount of criticism than the average teacher receives.

Within the limits of this study, this leaves the conclusion that the greater amount of time spent in extracurricular duties and the greater amount of criticism received must be the justification of the coach's greater salary.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. BOOKS

Douglass, Harl R., Organization and Administration of Secondary Schools. Chicago: Ginn and Company, 1945. 660 pp.

Grinnell, J. Erle, Interpreting the Public Schools. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1937. 360 pp.

Koos, Leonard V., and others, Administering the Secondary School. Chicago: American Book Company, 1940. 678 pp.

B. PERIODICAL ARTICLES

Anderson, Stuart, "Salary Schedule Practices," The Nation's Schools, XLIII, No. 2 (February, 1949), 53-54.

Quanbeck, Martin and Harl R. Douglass, "Teaching Loads in the High School," The Nation's Schools, XV, No. 2 (February, 1935), 37-39.

Soupe, Ethel M., and Harl R. Douglass, "The Professional Load of Secondary Schools of Iowa," School Review, XLIII (June, 1935), 428-437.

Tead, Ordway, "The Extracurricular Challenge in Urban Universities," School and Society, LXV (April, 1947), 257-60.

C. PUBLICATIONS OF LEARNED ORGANIZATIONS

Research Service Circular No. 6 Indianapolis: Indiana State Teachers Association, March, 1949. 6 pp.

D. UNPUBLISHED MATERIALS

Hedge, Melvin O., "Turnover among Teachers in Township Schools of Indiana in 1934-1935." Unpublished thesis, Indiana State Teachers College, Terre Haute, 1936. 87 pp.

Nale, Russell Milton, "A Survey of the Teaching Loads of the Secondary Schools of Montgomery County." Unpublished Master's thesis, Indiana State Teachers College, Terre Haute, 1947. 53 pp.

APPENDIX

APPENDIX A

WORKING SHEET OF TEACHER DATA

School	Teacher	Minimum Salary	Actual Salary	Weeks of Training	Experience	Classes Taught	Class Preparations
A	1	2133	2350	144	0	6	6
	2	2173	2309	144	1	5	5
	3	2293	2436	168	4	5	5
	4	2293	2436	144	4	6	6
	Coach	2453	2900	166	8	6	5
B	1	2533	2691	162	20	5	5
	2	2373	2521	144	6	5	5
	3	2000	2125	108	25	6	5
	4	2553	2691	144	24	5	5
	5	2000	2125	112	23	7	5
	6	2293	2436	144	4	7	5
	7	2533	2800	144	8	5	4
	Coach	2413	2965	144	7	4	3
C	1	2133	2550	144	0	4	3
	2	2213	2351	144	2	5	5
	3	2133	2304	170	0	6	4
	4	2293	2436	156	4	4	4
	5	2413	2564	148	7	6	4
	6	2533	2691	144	24	5	5
	7	2293	2436	144	4	5	4
	8	2173	2309	144	1	4	4
	Coach	2493	3000	162	9	6	4
D	1	2213	2380	146	2 $\frac{1}{2}$	6	5
	2	3200	3244	264	20	5	5
	3	2133	2400	163	0	5	3
	4	2957	3143	255	18	4	4
	5	3005	3192	217	19	5	5
	6	2533	2694	156	14	5	6
	Coach	2533	3100	172	15	6	5

School	Teacher	Minimum Salary	Actual Salary	Weeks of Training	Experience	Classes Taught	Class Preparations
E	1	2133	2380	144	0	5	5
	2	2477	2125	247	8	5	3
	3	1800	1913	72	12	6	4
	4	3111	2550	180	22	4	4
	5	2293	2440	144	4	3	3
	6	2533	2691	168	20	5	4
	7	3200	3400	207	25	5	3
	8	2533	2691	156	16	5	5
	9	2173	2312	162	1	6	5
	10	2765	2938	180	14	4	3
	Coach	2173	2805	184	1	5	3
F	1	2533	2776	181	11	5	5
	2	3005	2776	183	19	5	5
	3	2378	2417	158	6	5	5
	4	2333	2479	144	5	5	4
	5	2533	2691	153	11	5	5
	6	2253	2479	144	3	6	4
	7	2293	2521	144	4	5	3
	Coach	2373	2850	144	6	5	4
G	1	2133	2400	144	0	5	5
	2	2493	2691	144	9	4	4
	3	3111	3305	216	22	5	5
	4	2957	3142	183	18	4	4
	5	2173	2267	147	1	5	5
	6	2373	2805	144	6	6	5
	7	3200	3400	192	28	5	4
	Coach	3200	3400	180	30	5	3
H	1	2533	2692	156	38	6	5
	2	3200	3400	202	29	5	4
	3	2333	2482	144	5	5	4
	4	2533	2692	178	22	5	5
	5	1800	2172	84	29	4	4
	6	2533	2692	178	30	6	6
	7	2861	3043	198	16	7	5
	8	3200	3400	203	25	5	5
	Coach	2841	3060	212	9	5	3

School	Teacher	Minimum Salary	Actual Salary	Weeks of Training	Experience	Classes Taught	Class Preparations
I	1	2213	2780	152	2	7	5
	2	2293	2436	175	4	6	6
	3	3054	3200	180	20	5	5
	4	1800	2125	97	25	6	6
	5	2686	2533	159	29	5	5
	Coach	2173	2720	144	1	5	5

APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRES

To teachers of Montgomery County:

This is a survey to determine the amount of time spent by teachers beyond classroom duties. Please fill out the enclosed blank immediately and return to my office in the provided stamped envelope.

Sincerely,

John W. Ward

Teacher's Signature

School

1. Approximately how many hours per week do you spend outside of school hours preparing lessons, grading papers, and so forth? _____
2. Check any of the following duties which you perform:

Class Sponsor	Home Room	Keep Register
Librarian	Counselor	Co-ordinator of school lunch
Sec. of School Activity Fund	Club Sponsor	
3. How much time is spent each week during school hours for this activity? _____
4. How much time per week is spent outside of school hours for this activity? _____

To Fine Arts Teachers:

5. How many different preparations do you make each week for class work? _____
6. How much time is spent per week during school hours in teaching private lessons? _____
7. Do these lessons require any preparation on your part? _____ If so, how many hours per week? _____
8. How much time per semester is spent outside of school hours for band or chorus rehearsals? _____
9. Do such rehearsals require extra driving and expense on your part? _____

To Coaches:

10. Can any of your coaching duties be accomplished during the school day? _____ How much? _____
11. How many hours weekly is spent outside of school hours in practice sessions? (includes high school, junior high, and grades) _____
12. How much time is spent per week at actual ball games of which your team participates? _____
13. Are you required to provide transportation at your own time and expense? _____
14. How much time do you spend on administration of the athletic program? _____

To all teachers:

15. List any duties not included in this questionnaire, or use this space to explain any item not fully covered in this form.

To the school official:

An attempt is being made to judge public criticism of school personnel. Would you please fill out the following questionnaire and return to my office immediately.

Sincerely,

John W. Ward

1. List in order the school officials who in your opinion receive the most adverse criticism from the citizenry.
2. About how many actual cases of criticism have come to your personal attention? Again list in order and the number each have received.
3. To the best of your knowledge is the criticism justified? Yes No. (underline)
4. Is the criticism chronic or spotty? (underline)
5. Are the people in your community cooperative and in accord with the school policy and officials (1) at all times, (2) only when things go smooth, (3) never? (underline)
6. Make any other comment here which describes the attitude of the people in your community toward your school.

APPENDIX C

DAILY CLASS SCHEDULES

	8:20- 9:05	9:07 $\frac{1}{2}$ - 10:02 $\frac{1}{2}$	10:07 $\frac{1}{2}$ - 11:02 $\frac{1}{2}$	11:05- 11:50	12:35- 1:20	1:22 $\frac{1}{2}$ - 2:17 $\frac{1}{2}$	2:22 $\frac{1}{2}$ - 3:17 $\frac{1}{2}$
Coach	Gov't. 22*	World Hist. 15	Assem.	Geog. Tu-Th 14	Eng. 9 11	Phys.Ed. 7-8 M-W-F 14	Phys. Ed. 9-10-11-12 20
1	Health 7 M-W-F 14	Shorthand 8	Gen. Bus. 8	Adv. Typ. 7	Assem. 9	Type I 9	Sec. 5
2	Eng 10 14	Biology 11	Speech 11	Lib. 11	Eng. 10 11	Assem. 16	Gen. Sc. 16
3		Assem.	Home Ec. 7	Girl's Phys. Ed. 14	Health & Art 15	Home Ec. & Art 16	Adv. Home Ec. 8
4	Arith 8 16	Arith 7 14	Hist. 7 14	Hist. 8 16	Eng. 8 16		Eng. 7 14

*Indicates number of pupils in class.

SCHOOL B

	8:15- 8:55	9:00- 9:40	9:45- 10:40	10:45- 11:40	12:20- 1:00	1:05- 1:45	1:50- 2:40	2:45- 3:30
1	Lib.	Latin 14	Adv.Latin 6	Eng. 10 22	Lib.	Eng.11 24	Eng.12 4	Lib.
2	Hist.11 28	Hist. 10 22	Geo. 7 Hist. 7 23	Assem.	Civ. 12 14	Hist.8 27		
Coach	Gen.Sc.8 27	Assem.	Bio. 24	Lab. M-W-F		P.E. 7-9 Tu-Th 38	Assem.	P.E. 10-12 38
3	Assem.		Eng. 8 27	Arith 8 27	P.E. 9-12 Tu-Th 24	P.E. 7-8 M-W 22	Arith 7 23	Eng.9 24
4	Conf. 4		Eng. 7 23	Assem.	H.E. 7-8 11	H.E.9 13	H.E.9 13	H.E. 10-12 8
5	Physics 22	Shop 7 16	Assem.		Mech. Draw. 11	Shop 9 11	Shop 9 11	Shop 8 M-W-F 15

SCHOOL B (CONTINUED)

<u>6</u>	Music Art 7 23	Music Art 8 27	Music - Art 1-6		Glee Cl. M-W 34 Tu-Th 18	Music - Art 1-6		
7	Gen. Bus. 6	Book. 6	Adv. Typ. 6	Type 6	Type 6	Assem.	Type 8	Short. 6

SCHOOL C

	8:15- 9:10	9:15- 10:10	10:15- 11:10	11:15- 12:00	12:50- 1:35	1:40- 2:25	2:30- 3:25
1	Ag. 9-10 18	Ag. 9-12 10	Ag. 11-12 10	Assem.	Ag. 7-8 M-W-F 27	Assem.	
2	Gov't. 24	Assem.	Gen. Sc. 25	Hist. 8 25	Hist. 11 27		Bio. 24
3	Music 7 Tu-Th 22	Band Tu-Th Chorus M-W-F 24	Grade Music			Lessons	Music 8 Tu-Th 28
4	Assem.		Latin 10 11	Latin 11 5	Speech 21	Lib.	Eng. 10 21
Coach		Alg. 11-12 11	Alg. 9 26	Geom. 10 8	P.E. 7-9 25	P.E. 9-10 Health 23	P.E. 11-12 M-W-F 17
5	Type I 15	School Accts.	Type I 12	Bkbp. 12 25	P.E. 7-8 20	P.E. 9-10 M-W-F 30	Type II 15

SCHOOL C (CONTINUED)

6	Math. 8 25	Assem.	Hist. 7 22		W. Hist. 21	Geog. 7 Health 21	Math. 7 22
7	Eng. 11 12		Assem.	Eng.7 22	Eng. 9 25	Eng.12 25	Eng. 11 16
8	H.E. 9-10 17	H.E.Conf. 4	H.E. 11-12 7	H.E.Conf. 2	H.E.7-8 Tu-Th-F 20	Health Tu-Th 15	Assem.

SCHOOL D

	8:20- 9:15	9:20- 10:15	10:20- 11:15	11:20- 12:00	12:45- 1:40	1:45- 2:40	2:45- 3:40
1	Shop 7-8 15	Shop 9-11 12	Shop 10-12 5				
Coach	Health 10 9	Hist 7 16	Assem.	P.E. 7-8 M-Tu 15	Alg. 9 18	Hist 11 18	P.E. 9-10 M.-Tu. 9
2	H. E. 7-8 10	H.E.9-10 13	H. E. 11-12 16	P.E. 7-8 Th-F 18	Eng.10 9	Assem.	P.E. 9-10 Th-F 15
3	Eng. 11 19	Eng. 12 8	Eng. 9 18		Assem.	Gov. 12 16	Hist 8 17
4	Bio. 9 18	Gen.Sc. 17	Chem. 11-12 14	Assem.	Adv. Math 11-12 7	Geom.10 6	
5	Assem.	Lib.	Lat.10 5		Eng. 8 17	Lang. 8 17	Eng. 7 16

SCHOOL D (CONTINUED)

6	School Accts.	Adv. Type 11	Math 7 16	Adv. Type 5	Short. 11		Type 11 5
7		Assem.	Grade Music 25	Band 36	Grade Music 25	Music 7-8 33	H. S. Chorus 32

SCHOOL E

	8:05- 8:55	8:58- 9:50	9:56- 10:51	10:54- 11:49	12:22- 12:45	12:48- 1:38	1:41- 2:31	2:34- 3:29
1	P. E. M-Tu-W-F	H. E. 9 21	H. E. 10-12 14	Conf.	Assem. M	H. E. M-Tu-W-F 17		Bio. 26
2	Lessons	Theory of Music 4	Grade Music	Grade Music		Grade Music	Band Glee Cl.	Grade Music
3	Health 7 M-Tu-W 37	Math 8 18	Math 7 20		Assem. Tu-W-F	P. E. M-Tu-W-F	Math 7 18	Math 8 17
4	Ag. M-Tu-W-F 20	Ag.9-10 26	Ag.11-12 14	Conf.	Assem. Th		Assem.	Bio. 20
5	Eng. 11 17	Assem.	Hist. 8 20	Assem.		Assem.		Eng. 10 27
6	Lib.	Lat. 10 13	Eng. 9 25	Eng. 8 16	Lib.	Eng. 9 20		Eng. 8 18

SCHOOL E (CONTINUED)

Coach	Assem.		Health 20	P. E. 20	Assem. W	Alg. 9 23	Alg. 9 24	P. E. 15
7		Eng. 7 21	Eng. 7 17	Gen.Sc. 21	Assem.	Health 19	Gen.Sc. 18	Assem.
8		Type 8	Short. 9	Short. 6		Comm. Arith 23	School Accts.	Bkbp. 15
9		Hist 7 17	Hist 8 22	Geo. M-Tu-W-F 20		World Hist. 9	Speech 16	Hist 7 21
10	Civics 15	Civics 15	Assem.	Eng. 12 17	Assem.		Counsel	Hist 11 18

SCHOOL F

	8:10- 9:05	9:08- 10:03	10:06- 11:01	11:04- 11:59	12:35- 1:30	1:33- 2:28	2:31- 3:26
1	Eng. 9 21	Assem.		Eng. 8 13	Health 7-8 17	Hist 8 13	Math 7 20
2	Ag.7-8 15	Ag.9-10 20	Conf. 7	Ag.11-12 14	Bio. 9 21		Gen.Sc. 13
3	Assem. M-Tu	H.E.9-10 15	Conf. 4	H. E. 11-12 5	H.E.7-8 M-W-F 19	Eng. 7 20	Health- Safety 6
4	Assem. W-Th-F	Math 8 13	Physics 11-12 7	Physics 11-12 3	Assem.	Geom 10 10	Alg. 9 26
Coach	Geog. 10 16	Hist- Geog 7 20	Assem.	Assem.	Hist 11 19	P.E.9-10 22	P. E. 11-12 17
5	Eng. 12 10	Eng. 11 19	Lib.	Lat. I 10	Eng. 10 15	Lib.	Lat. II 4

SCHOOL F (CONTINUED)

<u>6</u>	Type I 6	School Accts.	P.E.7-8 M-W 16	P. E. 9-12 25	Type II 7	Type I 5	Bkbp. 11-12 8
7	Music 7-8	Lessons	Band 29	Lessons	Grade Music	Grade Music	Grade Music

SCHOOL G

	8:15- 9:00	9:02- 9:57	10:02- 10:57	11:00- 11:55	12:45- 1:35	1:38- 2:33	2:35- 3:30
1	Hist 11 23	Hist 8 23	Soc. 12 10		Hist 10 24	Assem.	Hist 7 31
Coach	Civics 19	Health 7 31	Assem.		P.E. 7-8 M-Tu-Th 24	P. E. 9-10 21	P. E. 11-12 20
2	School Accts.	Type II 6	Eng. 7 31		Eng. 9 22	Bkbp. 11-12 13	Assem.
3	Alg. 9 22	Adv. Alg. 11-12 10	Math 8 23	Assem.	Math 7 31		P. Geom. 12
4	Eng. 10 25	Assem.	Lat. 10 33	Lib.	Eng. 11 24		Eng. 8 23
5	Ag. 7-8 M-Tu-Th 24	Ag. 11-12 12	Ag. 9-10 6	Conf. 4	Assem.	Gen.Sc. 23	Bio. 9 24

SCHOOL G (CONTINUED)

<u>6</u>	P.E. 7-8 M-Tu-Th 30	P.E. 9-10 M-Tu-Th 24	H. E. 9 9	Conf.	H.E. 7-8 M-Tu-Th 30	H.E. 10-11 20	H. E. 12 5
7	H.S. Music W-F 26	Lessons	Lessons	Band M-W-F 52	Jr. Band Tu-Th 33	Grade Music	Grade Music

SCHOOL H

	8:19- 9:14	9:17- 10:02	10:05- 11:00	11:03- 11:58	12:34- 1:29	1:32- 2:27	2:20- 3:25
1	Ind. Art 10-12 7	Ind. Art 7 Tu-Th 8	Adv. Math 6	Ind. Art 9 5	Assem.	Ind. Art 8 M-Tu 11	Math 7 18
2	Eng. 7 18		Assem.	Hist 11 27	Eng. 9 18	P.E. 4-6 W-Th 36	Gov't. 24
3	Type I 11	Assem.	Bkbp. 16	Type II 9	Short. 7	Type I 11	
4	Lat. I 6	Lib.	Lib.	Eng. 10 20	Lat. II 3	Eng. 12 20	Eng. 11 27
5	H.E. 10 5	P.E. 7-8 Th-F (21) H. E. 7 M-Tu-W 10	Conf. 4	H.E. 9 12	H. E. 11-12 13	H. E. 8 M-Th (11) Conf. W-Th-F 11	P.E. 9-10 Th-F 21

SCHOOL H (CONTINUED)

6	Eng. 8 22	Assem	Hist 7 18		Hist 8 22	Geog 7 18	Assem.
7	Grade Music & Art	Glee Cl. M-W-F(37) Band Tu-Th(22)	H.S.Art 5	Jr.Cho. F (40) Jr. Band Tu-Th(11)	Grade Music & Art	Music & Art 7 22	Grade Music & Art
Coach	Alg. 9 18	P.E. 7-8 M-Tu-W 19	Math 8 22	Assem.	Bus. Arith. 7	Assem.	P. E. 9-10 M-Tu-W
8	Physics 22		Hist 10 11	School Accts.	Health 18	Bio. 15	Gen.Sc. 22

SCHOOL I

	8:15- 9:05	9:08- 9:58	10:01- 10:51	10:53- 11:43	12:30- 1:20	1:23- 2:13	2:16- 3:06
1		At New Richmond			H.S. Art & Music 17	Grade Art & Music	Music & Art 7-8 12
2	Eng. 9 19	Type 12 7	Type 11 13	Short. 4	Assem.	Lat. I 8	Lat. II 5
3	Gen.Sc. 15	Assem.	Assem.	Chem. 8	Math 7 15	Aeronau. 4	Health- Safety 34
4	Hist 7 15		Eng. 7 15	Eng. 8 15	Math 8 15	Geog 7 15	P.E. 7-8 M-W-F
5	Eng. 10 15	Eng. 11 14	Eng. 12 7	Assem.		H.E. 9 9	H.E. 7-8 M-W-F 12
Coach	Hist 11 14	Hist 8 15	Bio. 9 19	W. Hist 15	Civics 7	Assem.	

APPENDIX D

PUBLIC OPINION RECORDING SHEET

TO RECORDERS:

MAKE A MENTAL NOTE OF OPINIONS AND AT A TIME UNKNOWN

TO PATRON LIST THE OPINION BELOW IN PROPER CATEGORY.

	PERSONAL BIASED	MOMENTARY BIASED	CHRONIC CRITICISM	INTELLIGENT CRITICISM
COACH				
PRINCIPAL				
TEACHERS				
OTHERS				