UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

OU_164335

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

OSMANIA UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

Call No. 370.6/S466 Accession No. 5605

Author Selby, Bigge.

Title Board of education.

This book should be returned on or before the date last marked below.

THE BOARD OF EDUCATION

THE WHITEHALL SERIES

Edited by SIR JAMES MARCHANT, K.B.E., LL.D.

THE HOME OFFICE. *By* Sir Edward Troup, K.C.B., K.C.V.O. *Permanent Under-Secretary of State in the Home Office*, 1908-1922.

MINISTRY OF HEALTH. *By* Sir Arthur Newsholme, K.C.B., M.D., F.R.C.P. *Principal Medical Officer Local Government Board England and Wales*, 1908-1919, *merged in the Ministry of Health.*

THE INDIA OFFICE. *By* Sir Malcolm C. C. Seton, K.C.B. *Deputy Under-Secretary of State since* 1924.

THE DOMINIONS AND COLONIAL OFFICES. *By* Sir George V. Fiddes, G.C.M.G., K.C.B. *Permanent Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies*, 1916-1921.

THE POST OFFICE. *By* Sir Evelyn Murray, K.C.B. *Secretary to the Post Office since* 1914.

THE TREASURY. *By* Sir Thomas L. Heath, K.C.B., K.C.V.O., F.R.S. *Joint Permanent Secretary to the Treasury*, 1913-1919; *Comptroller-General of the National Debt Office*, 1919-1926.

THE MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE AND FISHERIES. *By* Sir Francis L. C. Floud, K.C.B. *Permanent Secretary to the Ministry*, 1920-1927.

THE BOARD OF TRADE. *By* Sir Hubert Llewellyn Smith, G.C.B. *Permanent Secretary to the Board of Trade*, 1907-1919; *Chief Economic Adviser to H.M. Government*, 1919-1927.

SCOTLAND YARD AND THE METROPOLITAN POLICE. *By* Sir John Moylan, C.B., C.B.E. *Receiver for the Metropolitan Police District and Metropolitan Police Courts since* 1918.

THE FOREIGN OFFICE. *By* the Right Hon. Sir John Tilley, G.C.M.G. *Chief Clerk to the Foreign Office*, 1913-1918, and Stephen Gaselee, C.B.E., *Librarian and Keeper of the Papers at the Foreign Office since* 1920.

THE BOARD OF EDUCATION

By
SIR LEWIS AMHERST SELBY-BIGGE,
BT., K.C.B.,
Permanent Secretary, Board of Education
1911-1925.

LONDON & NEW YORK
PUTNAM AND COMPANY LTD.

Made and Printed in Great Britain by
L.T.A. Robinson Limited, The Botolph Printing Works
Cranmer Road, Brixton Road, London, S.W.9

PREFACE

THE Board of Education has no august history. It struggled into existence less than thirty years ago, and though its predecessors the Committee of the Privy Council for Education and the Education Department and Science and Art Department spoke as "My Lords" and doubtless appeared awful to the village schoolmistress, the Central Authority does it business in no Olympian manner. It does not speak in "categorical imperatives." It "superintends" matters relating to education which is mainly provided by local authorities who are much more than its agents, and is imparted by an army of teachers which is not its own army. The public service of education is a decentralised Local Government service. Its value depends, more than that of other services, upon the qualities of mind and character which the rank and file of its servants bring to it. It is not possible to tell the story of the Board of Education or give an account of its doings without bringing in a good deal of the history of the service which it superintends, both as regards the machinery of local administration and as regards the teaching profession. The service moreover is an expansive service, its features are constantly changing and the functions of the central authority change with its development. For the understanding of the present and what may come after, it is almost essential to know the process by which the service has arrived where it is.

Two circumstances make this book rather difficult to write. Everyone has views about education, and no one hesitates to express them. Many people already know a great deal about the service and are interested in it from different points of view as administrators, teachers, or "educationists," and to them much of what must be said for the information of the general public is familiar. Conversely, that which may interest those who already know much may fail to interest those who know less. This book cannot ignore either class of possible readers, and tries to do something for both, though it cannot hope to satisfy either.

The history of the service moreover is so full of controversy, political, financial, social, denominational and pedagogical, and so much publicity is given to its doings, that one who has been long engaged in its central administration and tries to give an account of it from the point of view of central administration, necessarily feels some trepidation. He cannot ignore controversial subjects, though comment upon them may lead to undesirable inferences as to the attitude of the Central Authority and the workings of the official mind. I sincerely hope that anything which is found amiss may be attributed entirely to myself and not to the Department in which I have served.

The arrangement of the book in sections, each including some history, has involved some repetition; different facts suggest the same reflections, and the same facts in a different setting suggest different reflections. Repetition could only be avoided by a great deal of cross reference which

would probably be more troublesome to the reader.

This book is in no sense a history or general account of education in England. That has been written by many others and is still being written. I owe much to many other books, particularly to Sir Graham Balfour's "Educational Systems" and Mr. Birchenough's "History of Elementary Education." I also owe much to the help and criticism of my old colleagues, whom the practice of the Civil Service does not permit me to name.

There is not room in this book to give adequate accounts of the Royal College of Art, of the Victoria and Albert and Bethnal Green Museums, and the Science Museum, and they have therefore not been attempted. Although their establishments are part of the Board's establishment, and, for certain administrative and financial purposes, their business is done by the Board, they are conducted by a Principal and Directors who have special freedom and responsibility in respect of the actual work of those institutions.

L. A. S.-B.

19th January, 1927.

PREFACE TO SECOND EDITION

In this edition the original text is unaltered, but corrections and additions bringing the book up to date are grouped together in appendices, with references back to the pages of the book.

Appendix A contains a list of the administrations and Ministers responsible for the public service of Education since 1870. The service is so sensitive to political "atmospherics," that there is a close relation between stages in its growth and Parliamentary changes. This appendix also contains figures shewing the cost of the Board's administration and summarising public expenditure on Education for 1934–5.

Appendix B contains notes on some occurrences of special significance since 1927, viz.:—(1) The economy measures of 1931-2 and the reports of the "May" and "Ray" Committees. (2) The modification of the "Necessitous Areas" grant. (3) Fees in Secondary Schools and the substitution of "special places" for "free places." (4) The "fixed grant" system of the Local Government Act, 1929. (5) The proposals of 1929-31 to modify the "dual system" of Council and Voluntary schools. (6) The Bills of 1929-31 to raise the school leaving age. (7) The "reorganisation" of public elementary schools.

Appendix C contains a number of miscellaneous corrections and additions. Some of the particular

matters noted are of minor importance in themselves, but illustrate the trend of development and adjustment.

This book is primarily a study of the organisation and operation of the Central Authority which is responsible for the "Supervision," Administration and Finance (so far as the Exchequer is concerned) of the public service of Education in England and Wales.

Although it is impossible to deal with administration altogether apart from issues and problems arising out of the processes of education and the actual work of the schools, this book has no pretensions to be regarded as a history of Education in England.

The Board of Education has recently issued an "Outline of the Structure of the Educational System in England and Wales" (1933 educational pamphlet no. 94), which summarises the present position.

L. A. S-B.

April, 1934.

CONTENTS

PAGE

CHAPTER I. The Central Authority 1

1833-56: 1870: *Board of Education Act*, 1899: *Education Acts*, 1902 *and* 1918.

CHAPTER II. What the Board does not Do 22

CHAPTER III. What the Board Tries to Do 29

School Provision: School Attendance and "Accessibility": "Efficiency": "Value for Money": Organisation: Systematisation: Criteria of "Value."

CHAPTER IV. Staff and Organisation 69

CHAPTER V. Finance 80

Education Grants: Royal Commission, 1897-1901: *Departmental Committee*, 1911-14: *Finance Bill*, 1914: *Grants Related to Expenditure: Economy Measures*, 1920-21: *Résumé of Financial History: Problems of Financial Partnership.*

CHAPTER VI. Inspection and Examination 121

Organisation of Inspectorate: Inspection of Elementary Schools: 1862-95 *"Payment by Results":* 1890-1902: *Examinations in Elementary Schools: Science and Art and Technical, etc., Schools: National Certificates: Inspection of Secondary Schools: Criticisms of Inspection: Constructive and Administrative Functions: Recruitment of Inspectorate.*

CHAPTER VII. Regulations 159

CONTENTS

PAGE

CHAPTER VIII. Local Education Authorities 175

The Present System: 1870 School Boards: Act of 1902: Wales: Act of 1918: Development of Idea of Partnership: 1919 and 1925 "Schemes" and Programmes: Education Committees and Sub-Committees: Associations of Authorities: "Directors" of Education and Local Officials: National System and Autonomy.

CHAPTER IX. Consultation and Information 203

Consultative Committee: Juvenile Organisations Committee: Adult Education Committee: Secondary Schools Examination Council: "Burnham Committee": Departmental Committees, etc.: Office of Special Inquiries and Reports: Imperial Education Conference: Reports, Statistics, etc.

CHAPTER X. The Denominational Question 221

1833-70: 1870-1902: Denominational Instruction Controversy: 1906-08 Attempts to Revise the Settlement of 1902: 1920-26 Proposals for "Concordat" and "Enabling" Bill.

CHAPTER XI. Teachers 247

Training: Recruitment: Supply: Remuneration: Superannuation: Employment and Conditions of Service: Teachers' Associations and Registration Council.

CHAPTER XII. Educational Endowments 283

APPENDIX - - - - - - - - 291

APPENDICES TO SECOND EDITION - - 293

A. Administrations and Ministers since 1870: Cost of the Board's Establishment for 1934-5: Expenditure on Education.

B. Economy Measures of 1931: Necessitous Areas Grant: Fees in Secondary Schools: Statutory Fixed Grants: The Dual System: The School Leaving Age: Reorganisation of Elementary Schools.

C. Miscellaneous.

INDEX - - - - - - - - - 325

THE BOARD OF EDUCATION

Chapter I

THE CENTRAL AUTHORITY

THE Board of Education was established by an Act of August 9th, 1899 (62 & 63 Vic. c. 33), which came into operation on April 1st, 1900, and was thereby charged "with the superintendence of matters relating to education in England and Wales."

1833–1856

For six years the Treasury was the channel by which a sum of £20,000, first voted by the House of Commons in 1833, was distributed in aid of subscriptions for the education of children of the poorer classes. The Treasury has been described as merely a subscriber to the two great Societies—the National Society and the British and Foreign Schools Society—on whose recommendation the money was applied in aid of building Elementary Schools.

In the period between 1835 and 1839 attempts were made to establish a Central Authority for education. In 1831 Mr. Wyse had been successful in obtaining the establishment in Ireland of a Board of seven unpaid members representing all denominations, appointed by the Lord Lieutenant to assist him in applying a sum of £30,000 voted by the House of Commons. In 1838, being the Chairman

of the Central Society of Education, he moved an Address for the establishment of a similar body of Commissioners in England, coupled with a system of Local Boards. Lord John Russell argued that such a Board would be paralysed by differences of opinion, and that it was better to wait till there was greater agreement on the subject. In this period also Lord Brougham's fertile imagination found expression in Bills, one of which proposed to constitute a "respectable" public Board to preside over the Department of Education, consisting of the Speaker of the House of Commons, three Ministers and three permanent and irremovable Commissioners. On February 12th, 1839, Lord John Russell outlined in the House of Commons a scheme for setting up a Board or Committee composed of "official servants of the Crown who must always depend upon the confidence of that House and must always be responsible to Parliament." The scheme was received with some suspicion, Mr. Gladstone inquiring as to the rules or principles by which the Board would be guided, and Sir Robert Peel objecting to give control of education to a body composed of party men.

By Order in Council of April 10th, 1839, a Committee of the Privy Council was set up consisting of the Lord President, Lord Privy Seal, Home Secretary and Chancellor of the Exchequer, "to superintend the application of any sums voted by Parliament for the purpose of promoting Public Education." It was originally proposed to give the Committee the function of "considering all matters affecting the education of the people,"

but these words were omitted on the advice of Lord Lansdowne, and though the implications of "superintendence" of Parliamentary funds grew wider and wider, the province of the Committee remained so limited until 1870 when certain specific functions were assigned to it. The Committee of 1839, which even then was often referred to as a Board or Department of Education, was born in a tempestuous hour, significant of much that was to happen to it in later years. The matter came before the Commons on a proposal to increase the grant for education from £20,000 to £30,000. On April 13th the Committee had somewhat injudiciously issued a Minute setting out a plan for a normal school including a model school, which, though it was practically withdrawn on June 3rd, raised the whole question of the control and character of religious instruction. It was taken as indicating an intention to establish schools on the "comprehensive" system providing for "general" and "special" religious instruction and the participation in it of ministers of all persuasions. This precipitated, on the modest enterprise of substituting a Committee of Council for the Treasury, a Parliamentary storm which extended over seven days in the two Houses, and is recorded in over four hundred columns of Hansard. It was denounced as an attack on the Established Church and the Monarchy, and Mr. Gladstone saw in it consequences which would "destroy the principles on which the religion of the State was founded and with them that national character which had hitherto been the boast of England." Mr. Disraeli objected on

principle to the interference of the State in matters of education; it was a return to "the system of a barbarous age, the system of paternal government: wherever was found what was called a paternal government was found a state education. It had been discovered that the best way to secure implicit obedience was to commence tyranny in the nursery." In that period it was often contended that to place popular education in the hands of the State was to introduce "Prussianism," and to take it out of the hands of the Church was to open the door to Continental licence and infidelity. On the constitution of the Committee the contradictory criticisms were made, on the one hand, that it would be "irresponsible, unfettered, and consequently despotic," and on the other that, being composed of Ministers and party men, it would be too responsive to political and Parliamentary influences, a criticism which finds echoes at the present day. From another point of view it was also argued that there would be no continuity in its administration, that there was no security for the fitness of its members for the work of education, that they would be in the hands of their officials, and that it was unrepresentative of different points of view. The House of Lords was indignant at the exclusion of Bishops from the Committee, and at the Parliamentary procedure which only required a single money vote in the other House; they had been excluded from a voice in the matter by "sleight of hand." The Government should have proceeded by way of a Bill. The fact was, and it remained a fact for many years, that no Bill for the establish-

ment of a general State system of education could have survived the denominational and anti-denominational passions which raged in the field of popular education.* An address to Her Majesty to rescind the Order was rejected in the Commons by five votes, and the motion to increase the State grant to £30,000 was carried by only two votes in a House in which only twenty-four members were unaccounted for. In the Lords a similar address was carried by 111 votes and presented to Her Majesty, who expressed regret that they should have thought fit to take such a step. Lord Brougham found consolation in the reflection that "thirty years ago it would have been impossible that the fate of the Government should have been dependent on a question of general education." Many of the arguments used in these debates were revived in later periods. In 1846, when Lord John Russell introduced a new plan of education, including the payment and pensioning of teachers out of an increased grant, the Parliamentary storm broke out again. Mr. Bright somewhat optimistically championed voluntary effort against State interference: "Is it likely," he said, "that we shall have to wait long before it will be no more necessary to pay and pension the schoolmasters out of public funds than it is now to build schools for the accommodation of the children taught?" At that time those who resented the dominance of the Established Church

* Mr. F. D. Maurice said: "The State rushes in and says we will make you members of our family whether you like it or no. You shall love by Act of Parliament and embrace by Order in Council."

in the field of popular education had ceased to advocate State control, because they had come to the conclusion that State action had only augmented and would always augment the influence of the Church.

As regards the extent of State intervention, it is probably true that in the period from 1839 to 1849 during which Dr. Kay (afterwards Sir James Kay-Shuttleworth) was Secretary to the Committee of Council, the effective authority of the Committee was concentrated in his person. He had to contend with many obstructions, jealousies and suspicions, and had to submit to many compromises. But in the story of public education in England he holds a place of high honour as its constructive and far-sighted pioneer.

By Order in Council of February 25th, 1856, an "Education Department" was constituted to include the Educational Establishment of the Privy Council Office and the establishment for the encouragement of Science and Art, which had grown up under the Board of Trade, out of the central and provincial schools of design established in 1837 and 1841, into a Department of Practical Art in 1852 and a Department of Science and Art in 1853. The Education Department was still a Committee of Council, and in the same month a Bill was introduced into the Lords to create a paid post of Vice-President of the Committee, who would be responsible to the House of Commons for the proper distribution of grants and would answer questions, but would be subordinate to the President of the Council and act under his orders. Lord Derby

urged that the Privy Council should be superseded altogether and an ordinary Department created with a Minister at the head of it. Lord Brougham, however, welcomed the proposal as creating a "real Education Department." Certain resolutions aiming at the provision of schools out of the rates, which were moved by Lord John Russell in March, roused suspicion. They were debated for three days and defeated, and when the Bill came before the Commons in July Mr. Gladstone rejoiced that the design to "establish the office as a great and extended agency in the matter of education" was now "numbered with the things that were." Opposition to the Bill in the Commons took the form of questioning its necessity—the new Minister would have little to do and would only have three or four questions to answer in the course of a session! It was, however, passed.

1870

The Elementary Education Act of 1870 transformed the Education Department from an agency for subsidising voluntary effort, whose influence, great as it was, rested solely on its function of distributing and determining the conditions of Parliamentary Grants, into an active agency with statutory authority for the extension and improvement of elementary education. The Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Lowe, said: "At present we have really no public education at all . . . what is called public education is merely the humble and ancillary task of following private benevolence and

societies which interest themselves to educate the people. Instead of leading boldly we follow timidly. . . . We are not allowed to give our money where it is most wanted and are not allowed to look at national education as a national problem: we are not allowed to look at the wants of one part of the country and balance them against another." The Act empowered the Department to insist, through the machinery of School Boards, on the provision of sufficient accommodation in public Elementary Schools, as defined in the Act, and on their efficient maintenance. If the School Board machinery failed the Department was empowered to appoint persons to perform the duties of a School Board. The Act prescribed certain general conditions for Parliamentary Grants, broke with the tradition of nearly forty years by prohibiting building grants, concentrated grants on efficient instruction, and provided for a special grant for poor areas. Otherwise it left the determination of the conditions and amount of grants to the "Minutes" of the Department, stipulating only that they should not come into force till they had lain for one month on the table of both Houses, and that the Department should lay an annual report of its proceedings before Parliament. In the debates in both Houses the Government was urged to convert the Education Department with its fiction of "My Lords" into a distinct Department of State with a responsible Minister of its own. Mr. Forster, who as Vice-President of the Committee of Council, introduced and carried through the Bill, bearing the brunt of seventeen days' debate in the Commons, had no

ministerial responsibility and was obliged to use the words "if I am permitted by the Government to say so and so." The only substantial defence of the constitution of the Department was that it included members of the Privy Council selected for their personal qualifications and Ministers whose Departments were more or less associated with education—a sort of perpetual Cabinet Committee on Education. It was admitted, however, that the great extension of the Department's functions might later on involve reconstitution.

By a series of statutes extending from 1872 to 1899 the field of the Department's administration was greatly enlarged and its importance in the hierarchy of Government Departments emphasised. But twenty-seven years were to elapse before any change was made in its constitution, and then it was occasioned rather by the urgent necessity of co-ordinating the administration of the two branches of the Department and defining the relations of higher and elementary education than by recognition of the dignity and importance of the public service of education.

A good deal of light was thrown on the working of the Education Department by Select Committees of the House of Commons in 1865–1866 and 1884, with Sir John Pakington and Mr. Childers as Chairmen. The first Committee did not complete its work owing to the change of Government, though it had before it suggestions for "material and fundamental changes in the whole system of national education and in the constitution of the Department," on which it was unable to pronounce.

The second Committee, appointed "to consider how the ministerial responsibility under which the votes for Education, Science and Art are administered, may be best secured," recommended that there should be a real Minister of Education, acting for both England and Scotland, with a Board or Committee of Privy Councillors whom he might summon for his occasional assistance. His duties should be recognised as not less important than those of some Secretaries of State. He should have a Parliamentary Secretary able to sit in either House, and there should be a distinct Permanent Secretary for Scotland.

The members of the Committee of Council were selected by the Lord President, and Lord Granville said that he regarded it as a standing Cabinet Committee useful for occasional consultation. The constitutional relation of the Lord President to the Committee was, however, not clear. Mr. Lowe thought that in case of difference between them the view of the Committee would prevail; but Lord Granville said he would not have submitted to be out-voted and would have taken the matter to the Cabinet. The Committee was summoned by the Lord President when he thought fit, to consider matters of principle or importance, such as legislation or extensive changes in the regulations or practice of the Department. It met with more or less frequency in different periods and still met occasionally in 1884. The general view expressed was that it was of some use. As between the Lord President and the Vice-President there was no doubt that the Vice-President

had to act under the orders of the President, though the position of the Vice-President was higher and more responsible than that of an ordinary Under-Secretary of State. Their relations were anomalous. In two cases, Lord Sandon and Mr. Acland, the Vice-President was himself a member of the Cabinet. On one occasion the Vice-President, Lord George Hamilton, finding that the Chancellor of the Exchequer had privily persuaded the Lord President to let him cut down the Department's estimates, invoked the aid of the Prime Minister, Lord Beaconsfield, who asked the Lord President to summon a meeting of the Committee. The Vice-President made a statement and Lord Beaconsfield moved that the Committee do agree with the Vice-President. This was accepted, "both the Chancellor of the Exchequer and the Lord President looking rather foolish." The Vice-President ordinarily controlled all the administrative work of the Office, referring questions of principle to the Lord President, by whom all questions of patronage were decided. The Permanent Secretary referred to and took his instructions from the Vice-President, though he might suggest reference of a particular question to the Lord President.

As regards Scotland there was a separate Committee of Council, but the Lord President and Vice-President and Secretary acted for that Committee as well as for the English Committee till 1885, when the Secretary for Scotland was substituted for the Vice-President, and the Scottish Department of Education received a Secretary of its own. It was, however, mainly a Department

for primary education till 1886,* and the Science and Art Department at South Kensington continued to function for Scotland till 1897 and for Ireland till 1900. The Scottish Education Department is still technically a Committee of the Privy Council.

As regards the Science and Art Department, the Committee of Council had no voice in its management. It was controlled by the Lord President and Vice-President alone,† with the assistance of a Committee of executive officers and by the Permanent Secretary, until 1884, when it received a Secretary of its own. It was under no statutory obligation to lay its regulations before Parliament or report to Parliament. It was responsible not only for the distribution of parliamentary grants but also for the conduct of the Royal Colleges of Science and Art and the Royal School of Mines, the Victoria and Albert and Bethnal Green Museums, the Science Museum, the Geological Museum and Survey, and the Solar Physics Committee. It is impossible within the compass of this book to do justice to the manifold activities of the Science and Art Department. It may be observed, however, that it was hampered both by the rule that the benefits of its grants were to be confined to the industrial classes, and by the fact that its grants and administration had to be brought under the specific headings of art, or science, or, in Ireland,

* Craik, "The State in its relation to Education," p. 180.

† They were made into a corporate body by a Royal Charter of 1864. In 1901, in the "Cockerton case," it was held that the Science and Art Department was still an establishment quite separate from the Education Department.

technical instruction. It had no general authority to promote secondary or higher education. It was a specialist department. It is true that it displayed much ingenuity in enlarging or evading such restrictions, and in securing the combination of general with specialist instruction on sound educational principles. It established co-operative relations with the Charity Commissioners, and under the Technical Instruction Acts it anticipated the Act of 1902 by establishing similar relations with Local Authorities. Although "payment by results" started at South Kensington and dominated its distribution of public money, it did most valuable pioneer work and at small cost fostered much voluntary effort. But its activities resulted in great confusion in the organisation of education, both as between secondary and technical education and as between elementary and higher education. It overlapped the Department for Elementary Education at Whitehall. In 1895 it was paying £145,559 in grants for drawing, and £15,467 in grants for manual instruction to elementary day schools, and in 1901 a considerable number of night schools, conducted by School Boards as public elementary schools, under the "Evening Continuation Schools Code" of 1893, were receiving grants as science schools. Its operations were so large and miscellaneous that they penetrated the system of elementary education at many points, and it became inevitable that the reorganisation of the whole system of public education and the concentration of its administration in a single Department should be undertaken.

The Royal Commission on Secondary Education of 1894-1895 had recommended the constitution of a Central Education Authority and of Local Education Authorities for counties and county boroughs, and by an abortive Bill of 1896 an attempt was made to carry out the second part of that recommendation. The Bill was complicated by controversial provisions, but it broke down owing to acceptance by the Government, under pressure from its supporters, of an amendment admitting boroughs with a population of not less than 20,000 as Local Education Authorities.

Board of Education Act, 1899

In 1899 the Government recognised that the constitution of a single coherent Central Education Authority was "a necessary preliminary to the constitution of any satisfactory local organisation" and the creation of "competent Local Authorities." It accordingly, in 1898, introduced, and in 1899 passed a measure consolidating the Education Department and the Science and Art Department under a Board with its own President, charging the Board "*with the superintendence of matters relating to Education in England and Wales*," and providing for the transfer by Order in Council of any powers of the Charity Commissioners or the Board of Agriculture relating to education. The Board consisted, and still consists, of the President, the Lord President of the Council, the principal Secretaries of State, the First Lord of the Treasury, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer. The Act

also contained provisions relating to the inspection of schools, and for the establishment by Order in Council of a Consultative Committee for the purpose of framing regulations for a register of teachers and advising the Board "on any matters referred to the Committee by the Board." (*See* Chapters IX and XI.)

In debate on the Bill it was suggested that it would be much simpler to have a Ministry than a Board, and the Duke of Devonshire with characteristic candour said that the point was mooted when the Bill was first prepared, but he was quite unable to recollect the reasons which weighed in favour of a Board rather than a Ministry. "It has the advantages at all events of numerous precedents, and it is perfectly well understood that there will be no Board at all."* The criticism that the Board would be a "sham" and a "phantom" was repeated in the House of Commons. Sir John Gorst excused himself from further explaining the reasons given by the Duke of Devonshire, referred to the precedents of the Board of Trade, Local Government Board, and Board of Agriculture, and suggested that Boards were "potential," because they might meet. So far as the intention of Parliament goes it does not appear that the demand for "a real Board of Education," referred to hereafter, derives much force from what was said in discussion of the Bill of 1899.

Early in 1901 the Court of Appeal upheld the disallowance by Mr. Cockerton, District Auditor under the Local Government Board, of expenditure incurred by the London School Board in supplying

* Hansard, 4th Series, Vol. 70, Col. 353.

at the cost of the rates advanced instruction under the Directory of the Science and Art Department and beyond the scope of the Public Elementary Schools Code.* This decision upset many of the arrangements under which School Boards were providing higher education in "higher grade schools," evening schools, and classes for adults. On May 7th, 1901, the Government introduced a measure constituting the Councils of counties and county boroughs, acting through Education Committees, as Education Authorities for purposes of higher education. These Education Authorities were to have power to deal with the situation created by the "Cockerton" judgment, but in the end it was met by two temporary Acts. The organisation, however, of a local system for the provision of higher education still remained urgent.

Education Act, 1902

The Government approached the matter with some timidity, for the Bill which was introduced on March 24th, 1902, was, as regards elementary education, only adoptive, and as regards higher education was, in effect, only permissive. The Act, however, as passed on December 18th, 1902, and as applied to London by an Act of 1903, established the system of Local Education Authorities which exists at the present time and which is described in Chapter VIII.

* Mr. Cockerton's surcharge was supported by a "Secondary and Technical Education Defence Committee" in the interests of institutions which suffered from the competition of the London School Board.

The act of 1902 was full of complications and compromises. The "fortuitous, piecemeal and haphazard processes," to use the Duke of Devonshire's words, by which the English service of education, like many other English institutions, had developed, made it impossible to establish a clean-cut and simple system of Local Authorities through whom education in all its grades from bottom to top could be organised by the Central Authority. In respect of higher education the position assigned to the Board was that of consultant. No specific duty to provide higher education was imposed on the authorities (though the application of the "whisky money" (p. 81) to it was made obligatory) and the Board had no power to require its provision by anyone. As regards elementary education the imposition on the Local Education Authorities of the duty of maintaining and keeping efficient all public elementary schools which were necessary, whether provided by themselves (or their predecessors the School Boards), or by voluntary agencies, had a great consolidating and widening effect on the Board's administration. Instead of dealing with some 2,568 School Boards and 14,238 bodies of Managers, it came to pay grants to 318 Local Education Authorities. The Act assigned to the Board various functions incidental to bringing it into operation, such as the establishment of schemes for the constitution of Education Committees, the appointment of "foundation managers" of voluntary schools, and the application of endowments. It also gave to the Board the embarrassing function of deciding disputes between

the Authorities and Managers of voluntary schools arising out of the complicated and controversial provisions prescribing their respective rights and duties. The working of the Act was indeed embarrassed and the life of the Board embittered for some years by controversies clustering round the "dual system" and by legislative attempts to reopen the settlement of 1902.

The organisation of the Board's office and its inspectorate was transformed in the years following 1902. With all its imperfections the Act embodied the idea that the service of public education should be a specific function of ordinary local government as reorganised by the Act of 1888, that in every area there should be a Local Authority primarily responsible for the provision, organisation and administration of public education, amenable, through electoral processes, to the influence of ratepayers. The Act of 1902 provided for the intervention of the Board on certain specific points incidental to the operation of the Act, but did not generally define the relations of the Board to the Local Education Authorities except by giving the Board in the last resort power to apply to the Courts for a writ of mandamus to compel them to perform their duties. The Board, however, as the channel through which moneys voted by Parliament for education reached the Local Authorities, retained the power of the purse, and determined (subject to any statutory provisions and, of course, to Parliamentary criticism) the conditions on which grants in aid of education should be made. A relation of co-operative partnership between the

Central and Local Authorities was implicit in the Act of 1902, and the main object of the Board in the following years was so to organise its own administration as to stimulate, guide and assist the effective and systematic development of the services of education by the Local Education Authorities. Accordingly the administrative staff and inspectorate of the Board were rearranged under three main branches—Elementary, Secondary and Technical, and under geographical divisions. Though it was not till 1908 that the administrative staff could be concentrated in Whitehall, the Board was enabled to operate through a coherent staff designed to respond organically to the activities of Local Authorities, receiving from and communicating to them the stimulus of progressive development. Immense labour was spent upon recasting and supplementing the Board's Regulations, the series of which constantly embodied modifications suggested by experience. The period following the Act of 1902 was a great period of constructive administration, the fruitfulness of which is mainly attributable to Sir Robert Morant, the Permanent Secretary from 1903 to 1911.

In 1907 the Board was empowered to decide the question whether any purpose for which an Authority wished to exercise its power was a purpose of higher or of elementary education. In 1911 the Board was made the umpire in cases of dispute between Local Authorities as to the cost of providing elementary education for children who live in one area and attend school in another, a matter which may seem

of trifling importance but which has given considerable administrative trouble.*

Education Act, 1918

The main idea underlying the Act of 1918 was that there should be an active and constructive partnership between the Central and Local Authorities to organise the service of education on a progressive, systematic and comprehensive plan. The root assumption of the Act was that the service of public education, a service in which the social, as distinguished from the academical activities were constantly becoming more prominent, was in the nature of things expansive, and that it was the business of the Central and Local Education Authorities to provide liberally for its expansion.

Its main features were the "scheme procedure," the abolition of particular statutory grants, the establishment of a minimum percentage grant and provision for adolescent education by a system of continuation schools on a basis of part time obligatory attendance under a procedure of appointed days. The adequate provision of higher education became a specific duty of Local Education Authorities. The Board were empowered

* It is characteristic of the English system of education that though the Acts of 1902 and 1918 speak of "higher" education, the only definition of that term which can be collected from the statutes is that it is education "other than elementary," or education within the scope of Part II of the Act of 1902. "Elementary education" however has no statutory definition, and for practical purposes it means education given in an elementary school as defined by Section 170 of the Act of 1921, which embodies the definition of the Act of 1870 as modified by subsequent enactments.

to require the submission of "schemes" showing the mode in which the duties and powers of the Authorities under the Education Acts were to be performed and exercised, to insist on the adequacy of schemes by withholding or reducing grants, subject to a report to Parliament.

This being so, it was considered necessary to make such financial arrangements as would, subject to proper Parliamentary and administrative control, assure the Local Education Authorities and ratepayers that they would receive aid from the State and the taxpayer proportionate to the local expenditure primarily involved. This assurance was given by Section 44 of the Act. The finance of public education is dealt with later in Chapter V.

Like other Departments concerned with social services, the Board is intimately concerned with legislation in the sense of proposing, preparing and carrying through Parliament measures of reorganisation, extension or improvement. Its legislative record is large and not uncontroversial. From 1870 to 1921 some twenty-three Acts, exclusive of superannuation Acts and measures incidentally affecting education, contributed to build up the public system. In 1921 the long desired and very desirable consolidation of the law relating to education was undertaken. It was a troublesome business, but profitable not only in that it brings together the provisions of many Education Acts, but also brings into relation with the provisions of the Education Acts proper a number of provisions from other Acts relevant to the service of education, especially those affecting the employment of children.

Chapter II

WHAT THE BOARD DOES NOT DO

THE Board's jurisdiction is confined to England and Wales. Members of the public, and even Members of Parliament, sometimes indicate by their criticisms or suggestions that their ideas as to the functions and activities of the Board are not very clear or precise. It may be convenient, therefore, before attempting to describe what the Board does and how it does it, to mention some things which the Board does not do or has no power to do.

(1) The Board does not itself directly provide, manage or administer any schools or educational institutions except the Royal College of Art, and, so far as they may be regarded as educational institutions, the Victoria and Albert Museum (including the Bethnal Green Museum) and the Science Museum. Other institutions which it used to administer have split off from it. The Royal College of Science and Royal School of Mines were merged in the Imperial College of Science and Technology on January 1st, 1908, and the Geological Museum and Survey were transferred to the Department of Scientific and Industrial Research on November 1st, 1919.

(2) Generally speaking, the Board has no authority over universities, university colleges, or university education. Fixed grants in aid of certain

universities and university colleges and medical schools, and grants in aid of technological instruction in universities and university colleges were paid by the Board up to 1919; since then grants in aid of university education have been made by the Treasury with the assistance of the University Grants Committee. There is, however, contact between the Board and universities in respect of university departments for the training of teachers (the work of which is subsidised by the Board), State scholarships tenable at universities, examinations conducted by universities for secondary schools, "tutorial classes" for adult students, and in a few cases in respect of technological and art instruction given in university institutions.

(3) The Board has no jurisdiction, even as Charity Commissioners, whether under the Endowed Schools Acts or Charitable Trusts Acts, over the Colleges of Eton and Winchester; as regards the other five great schools named in the Public Schools Act of 1868, viz. Charterhouse, Harrow, Rugby, Shrewsbury, Westminster, it has jurisdiction under the Charitable Trusts but not under the Endowed Schools Acts. Generally speaking it has no authority except under the Endowed Schools Acts or Charitable Trusts Acts (in respect of administration of estates) over endowed schools which do not receive grants (Chapter XII).

(4) The Board has no authority over schools conducted for private profit, and does not make grants to them. It does, indeed, in the case of secondary and preparatory schools, if the results of inspection are satisfactory, award them the title

of "efficient," and include them in its official list, even if they receive no grants or are conducted for private profit. Prior to 1918 the Board had no means of ascertaining the number or size or character of schools not in receipt of grants, but by Section 28 of the Act of that year (Section 155 of the Act of 1921) "the responsible person" was required to furnish information to the Board about each school not receiving grants. In 1921-1922 returns had been received from some 7,300 such schools educating 326,000 pupils. Most of these schools were elementary. In view of certain misconceptions, it is perhaps not superfluous to add that the Board has no authority over Sunday Schools, whatever their complexion.

(5) The Board has no authority over those schools or branches of education which are in the province of other Government Departments, e.g. reformatory and industrial schools, Poor Law schools and Army and Navy schools. The Act of 1899 contemplated the transfer to the Board of the powers of the Board of Agriculture in respect of education. No action was taken in this matter, and both Boards continued to make grants in aid of agricultural education (on lines explained in a Memorandum of 1909 [Cd. 4886]), until in January, 1912, it was decided to transfer the Board's grants to the Board of Agriculture.

(6) The medical inspection and treatment of school children had been developed by the Board as part of the School Medical Service since 1907, but the Act of 1919 which established the Ministry of Health assigned the control of this part of the

School Medical Service to the Minister, with power to make arrangements with the Board of Education to perform and exercise his duties and powers and to make grants on his behalf in this respect (Sections 16 and 80 of the Education Act, 1921). Such arrangements have in fact been made.

(7) The Board does not engage, pay, promote or dismiss the teachers in grant-aided schools and institutions, though it does pension those who come within the scope of the School Teachers Superannuation Acts in respect of age or disability. The Board does not enter into direct relations with individual teachers in respect of their actual employment (except in cases of misconduct), responsibility for which rests with Local Education Authorities or governors or managers of schools (Chapter XI).

(8) The Board does not supply or prescribe or proscribe any textbooks for use in grant-aided schools, though it may criticise, through its inspectors, the use of unsuitable text-books as affecting the efficiency of schools. (From 1847 to 1861 the Education Department supplied books from an approved list at a special rate of discount averaging 43 per cent.)

(9) It has not for many years been the practice of the Board to prescribe in its Regulations, except in general terms, the curriculum of grant-aided schools or the methods of teaching. The Regulations were designed to leave, both for elementary and higher education, ample room for variety of curriculum and variety in the adaptation of curriculum to the circumstances, capacities and needs

of particular schools and their teachers and pupils. On the other hand, for the purpose of maintaining and increasing the efficiency of schools on which public moneys are spent, the Board till recently reserved the right to approve, through their inspectors, the detailed curricula and time tables submitted to them. When, however, the Regulations were revised in 1926 it was decided to omit from the Code all reference to the subjects of the curriculum, and to substitute a general requirement "that the secular instruction in a school or centre must be in accordance with a suitable curriculum and syllabus framed with due regard to the organisation and circumstances of the school or schools concerned" (Chapter VII).

The Board is frequently asked in Parliament why it does not require the teaching of particular subjects, or particular aspects of them, in which Members are interested. The answer is that the Board deliberately refrains as far as it can from interfering in this respect with the discretion of Local Education Authorities, governing bodies and teachers.

(10) The Board has no general power to interpret the Education Acts or determine questions of law. It has, for instance, no power to decide whether educational expenditure incurred by a Local Education Authority is expenditure which is legally competent to incur, a question which in the first instance falls within the province of the District Auditor, who reports to the Ministry of Health, subject to appeal to the Ministry or the Courts. Even where the determination of certain questions is assigned

to the Board by statute, they may involve points of law which may be and are taken to the Courts to decide.

(11) The Board has no power, in relation to Local Education Authorities, such as was possessed by the Education Department under Sections 63 to 66 of the Act of 1870 in relation to defaulting School Boards, to "dissolve" Local Education Authorities or to appoint persons to perform their duties or exercise their powers, though Sir John Gorst's Bill of 1896 did propose to give such powers to the Education Department.

(12) The Board does not provide school buildings, and the raising of loans by Local Education Authorities for erection of buildings, purchase of land, etc., is not sanctioned by the Board but by the Ministry of Health. The Ministry will not sanction a loan unless the Board supports the application on educational grounds, but it is not under any obligation to accept the view of the Board as regards the amount which should be sanctioned. Differences between the two Departments are, however, reduced to a minimum by close and continuous consultation. The introduction of the "district valuer" where purchase of land is proposed by a Local Authority has recently caused a new complication. His function is to protect the Local Authority against the payment of excessive prices to vendors.

The London County Council deals in the matter of loans directly with the Treasury, and the "Machinery of Government Committee" of 1918 recommended that the function of sanctioning loans

should be transferred from the Ministry of Health to the Treasury.

(13) The audit of the expenditure of Local Education Authorities is not performed by the Board but by officers of the Ministry of Health. The Board's grants, so far as they are calculated on expenditure, are related to audited expenditure and cannot be finally determined till the audit is complete. On the other hand expenditure passed by the auditor as expenditure which the Authority is legally competent to incur, may be excluded by the Board from the calculation of grant, either in virtue of limitations contained in the Board's regulations or in the exercise of the general discretion reserved to the Board by statute.

The Machinery of Government Committee of 1918 recommended that audit of accounts of Local Authorities should be transferred to the Exchequer and Audit Department.

Chapter III

WHAT THE BOARD TRIES TO DO

THE Board of Education is now charged with the "superintendence" of a service which in respect of its significance for the welfare of the community is national, and in respect of its administration and a large part of its maintenance is local. The function of the Central Authority was not formally re-defined by the Acts of 1902 or 1918, but it was profoundly modified by the creation of Local Education Authorities under the former Act and by the developed conception of partnership between the Central and Local Authority which is conspicuous in many provisions of the latter Act. Continuity, however, is characteristic of English administration; old methods and points of view are only gradually adapted to new circumstances and ideas, and if in this chapter the memory of things that happened long ago is revived it is because the present position and functions of the Board can be best appreciated in the light of the process which has led up to them.

One obvious element of continuity runs through the whole history of the Central Authority. It has always been its business to obtain money from Parliament and distribute it locally for the support of education on certain conditions. This was the sole official function of the Committee of Council

up to 1870, all attempts to give it statutory authority to extend and organise public education having failed. To some the Board's financial function is still its dominant function, to which all others are or should be subordinated. It is certainly from one point of view fundamental, because the power to withhold or reduce grants in aid of education is the ultimate source of its influence and the only effective sanction of its requirements. The amount of the Parliamentary grants for this service (some 44¾ millions in 1926-1927) makes the Board's performance of its financial function a matter of supreme importance in the national housekeeping. An account of the Board's administration in its financial aspect is given in Chapter V.

In this chapter an attempt is made to describe certain features and aspects of the service of education which at different periods have specially engaged the attention and endeavours of the central administration. They may be summarised as (1) school provision; (2) school attendance and accessibility; (3) minimum efficiency; (4) value for money; (5) organisation; (6) systematisation. The idea of expansion of educational facilities has in most periods been prominent, but the course of that expansion could not be traced without outrunning the scope of this book. These headings very roughly represent stages in the administrative attitude towards the service and the gradual progress from a narrower to a broader view. They overlap, and the ideas of earlier stages not only survive in later stages but again come to the front. But broadly speaking the balance of emphasis shifts,

and what is explicit in earlier stages becomes implicit in later stages.

The means by which the Central Authority has tried to attain the objects which have been at different times most in its mind are (1) regulation, (2) inspection (dominated for a considerable period by examination), (3) the training and recognition of teachers and regulation of school staffing, (4) the distribution of information and propaganda, including all the machinery of inquiry and consultation. These are discussed in subsequent chapters.

School Provision

There can be no system of public education without schools and without scholars. In the earliest days the efforts of the State were entirely directed to remedying the great insufficiency in the number of elementary schools. For this purpose building grants were given to voluntary agencies from 1833 to 1882, though the winding up of this method of promoting education began in 1870. They were revived for a few years in 1907. The defects of the early system were obvious and were constantly pointed out in Parliament. The State had no initiative; it had to follow and could not lead. Schools were provided only where local bodies could be found to make up the amount required for building and subsequent maintenance with the consequence that rich localities got schools and poor localities got none at all. The deficiency was most marked in the large and populous industrial areas. The "partiality" of the system

was strongly criticised by the Royal Commission in 1861, but Mr. Lowe thought it was hopeless to change it and the State had no power to require provision of schools till 1870, when the rates first became available for the service of education and the Central Authority obtained power to require an adequate provision of elementary schools. In 1893 and 1899 provision was made for special schools for afflicted children. For higher education, building grants were made for training colleges till 1861 and again from 1905 to 1917, but in early days training colleges were classed as "Normal Schools" and came under the elementary school regulations. For the provision of technical schools the rates and "whisky money" (p. 81) became available after 1889, but, except in Wales, for the provision of secondary schools the State had to rely mainly on endowments up to 1902. In the meantime a good deal was done to encourage the establishment of day and evening schools of various types, providing education higher than elementary —science schools, higher grade schools and pupil teacher centres, some of which were subsequently absorbed into the secondary school system.

It was only after 1902 that it was possible for the Board to press Local Authorities to deal systematically with the provision of schools of all grades in relation to each other, and it was not till 1918 that the Board obtained power to require in every area an adequate supply of schools for higher education as a local contribution to a national system. By that time the problem of obtaining the replacement of old, unsuitable and inadequate buildings, particu-

larly those of elementary schools, had become acute.* Effective treatment of the problem was interrupted by the war and subsequent financial stringency, and there are large arrears both of replacement and of new provision, required both by increased demand for educational facilities and by shifting of the population, which have still to be overtaken. The Board has, according to its lights, at different periods, tried to secure good and economical planning of schools, and by building regulations,† and the

* *See* Report of the Board of Education, 1908-09, pp. 11-31, and 1923-24, pp. 53-56. As long ago as 1872 the Department was faced with the problem of school buildings planned and fitted up according to its own advice and with the aid of its own grants, which had become obsolete. In 1872 Inspectors were warned not to press for the removal of "galleries," and in 1877 were told not to report unfavourably on school premises without first looking up the history of the school; they were to secure improvement rather by advice and encouragement than by threatening reduction of grants. In 1893, however, the condition of all elementary school buildings was reviewed, and between 1894 and 1903 formal "warnings" were given to 370 voluntary and seventy Board Schools. In 1907-08 the Board again reviewed school buildings concurrently with a revision of the accommodation and found that about 2,000 schools or 3,000 departments were housed in buildings more or less seriously unsatisfactory; a "time limit" had already been fixed for about 660 schools or 970 departments. A third review was made in 1924-25, and the defective school buildings were classified according to the degree of their badness. In 1926 it was stated that 665 schools had been placed in the worst class.

† From 1871 to 1904 the Board issued "Rules for planning and fitting up schools," which till 1896 contained model plans. In 1871 the rules favoured the provision of large school rooms divided by light curtains as combining the advantages of supervision by the head teacher and "isolation" of the class teacher; they regarded separate class rooms as objectionable. In 1904

criticism of plans by its architect, which has certainly not favoured extravagance, previous to the sanction of loans, has exercised a good deal of influence. The number of good school architects has greatly increased and building regulations have been recently dispensed with. The increased interest in education aroused by the war led to great pressure on the accommodation of secondary schools, and in 1920 a Departmental Committee recommended that a provision of such schools for twenty scholars per thousand of the population should be the objective. This standard is approached in very few areas, and though progress is being made its attainment is far distant.*

The great increase in the cost of building is, of course, a serious obstacle; the average cost per school place in 1913 was about £13 in elementary and £50 in secondary schools. Those figures must now be doubled for secondary and more than doubled for elementary schools. Thus in these later days the original problem of school provision has, through the greatly enlarged conception of the service, again become urgent. There is still a deficiency of schools for mentally and physically

---

Building Regulations for Secondary Schools and Pupil Teacher Centres were issued. In 1914 the Building Regulations were extensively revised. Departmental Committees on the cost of elementary school buildings sat in 1910-11, on school playgrounds in 1912, and another Committee on the cost of school buildings was set up in 1925.

* It would mean provision of places for about 307,000 more pupils. At present about 8,000 new places are being provided annually, and old places are being renewed at a rather smaller rate.

defective but educable children. The expansion of secondary education is to a considerable extent held up by an insufficient number of schools, and the cost of building, and the organisation of advanced and practical elementary instruction is also, apart from the complications of the dual system, seriously hampered.*

After the general abandonment of building grants, the grant system contained no element of inducement to the adequate provision or improvement of school buildings. The Board could rely only on the fear of penalty, till the system of expenditure grants was introduced under which local "loan charges" for capital expenditure were taken into account for the calculation of grant at the rate of 20 per cent. for elementary and 50 per cent. for higher education.

School Attendance and Accessibility

To get the children to school, to get them to attend regularly, to keep them there long enough for them to get full profit from instruction and prevent the cost of their instruction being thrown away, and to remove obstacles to their attendance are primary objects of the Central Authority's endeavour.

The law requiring attendance of children at elementary schools has a long and complicated

* The Board's Consultative Committee in their Report of 1926 recommend that children over 11 who do not go to Secondary Schools shall be educated in "Modern Schools," approximating in construction and equipment to the standard in Secondary Schools.

history and is mixed up with the law regulating the employment of children. It now occupies nine sections of the consolidating Education Act of 1921. The Committee of Council did not dare to tackle the question at all till 1870, and the Central Authority has always proceeded cautiously in the matter. It has been since 1876 the duty of every parent whose child is not otherwise receiving efficient elementary education, and for whom there is no "reasonable excuse" such as sickness or distance from a school, to cause it to attend regularly a public elementary school. In 1880 local provision for the enforcement of school attendance was made obligatory. The administration of the law of school attendance has always been a local matter; its effectiveness requires the co-operation of local magistrates who have not always given it readily or consistently. But it has incidentally produced a very valuable body of "school attendance officers" whose usefulness in many ways goes a good deal beyond the performance of their primary functions.

Regularity of attendance has been fostered by the Central Authority by basing grants partly on the "average attendance" of scholars, and for elementary education the number of units of average attendance is still an element in the calculation of grants. The percentage of scholars in average attendance to scholars on the registers is an index of regularity, and though it has some imperfections for other administrative purposes, aggregate average attendance is a carefully guarded and trustworthy figure for England and Wales. Comparison with

other countries is often vitiated by the absence of equivalent figures.

For part-time education and the miscellaneous activities of higher education, the index of average attendance is not available for the calculation of grants, and the grant for higher education would have to be split up between institutions in which continuous full-time attendance is the rule and those in which it is discontinuous or part-time, if it was desired to use average attendance as an index in that field.

As regards the length of school life, the age of obligatory entrance to elementary schools was fixed as long ago as 1876 at 5 years, and children may be admitted at the age of 3. The age of entrance is lower than in any other country except Scotland by one year.*

Under the Act of 1876 exemption from attendance might be obtained at the age of 10 for a child who had attended regularly and reached a prescribed standard. In 1893 the minimum age of total or partial exemption was raised to 11 and in 1899 to 12, but if the Local Authority adopted a general leaving age of thirteen, children employed in agriculture could obtain partial exemption at 11 and other children at 12. The leaving age is now

* In the United States the age is 8 in thirty States, and 7 in twenty States. In Canada it is 7, except in two States where it is 6 and 8. In Australia it is 6 in three States and 7 in two States. In Switzerland the age is 7 in thirteen cantons and 6 in the rest. In Holland, Norway and Sweden it is 7, in Austria, Belgium, France, Germany (except Würtemburg), Hungary, Italy, Spain it is 6. In Scotland it is 5, in N. Ireland and in the Free State it is 6.

fixed at the end of the term in which a child reaches the age of 14, but this may be extended by local by-law (and has been extended in two cases) to 15. The leaving age is the same as or higher than that of Australia and all European countries except Hungary and eleven cantons of Switzerland. It is lower than in twenty-seven States of the United States and one State in Canada and in New Zealand. But here again comparisons with other countries are vitiated by differences both of law and practice in the matter of exemptions, regularity of attendance, and the amount of attendance required, and it is dangerous to base arguments for altering the English law on such comparisons. The universal raising of the upper age of obligatory attendance to 15 or 16 has often been advocated, but it would certainly be a "major operation."* The Act of 1918 tentatively carried the law of school attendance into the field of higher education and contained provisions for making part-time attendance at day

* "The workers of the country demand full time secondary education for all normal children up to the age of 16"—Tawney, "Secondary Education for All," p. 63. The Board's Consultative Committee, in its Report of December, 1926, on "The Education of the Adolescent," recommend legislation to make full time attendance at school obligatory up to the age of 15, by the beginning of the school year 1932. The Committee refrained from expressing an opinion on the financial aspect of this proposal. The Committee remark (Section 162) that two County Councils have under the powers given by the Act of 1918 adopted by-laws raising the leaving age to 15, but have granted exceptions so liberally that the by-laws have operated "as a means of retaining children who would otherwise have entered unsuitable employment rather than as a means of establishing any general system of education for all children up to the age of 15."

continuation schools up to 16 obligatory, but unkind circumstances have put them into cold storage. There is no prescribed lower age for admission to secondary schools (though capitation grants are not paid in respect of children under 10), and the attendance of very young children in them is an anomaly which can only be defended on the ground that "it works." The shortness of school life in secondary schools and the leakage of scholars under the age of 16, which the Board regard as the lowest leaving age consistent with individual and public interest, has been a matter of great concern, and there is still room for much improvement in this respect.* For part-time higher education, the regulations exclude, for the calculation of grants, students who are below the age at which elementary education ceases to be obligatory, but there is no upper age limit, and old age can find a solace in the pursuit of education inside the public system.

As regards the accessibility of public education the principle that the benefit of public money should not go to those who could afford to pay for their children's education was held in honour for many years. In elementary schools attempts were made up to 1870 to confine the benefit of grants to "the classes who support themselves by manual labour" (which excluded "hucksters," but included "simple policemen," railway porters, shopkeepers who have only petty stocks and employ no

* The percentage of pupils leaving at or over the age of 16 has increased from 49 per cent. in 1919-20 to 66.2 per cent. in 1924-25.—Board's Report, 1926, p. 101.

one but members of their own family). The Science and Art Department also was under an obligation to confine the benefit of its grants to "the industrial classes," which by 1875 included all those who could claim partial exemption from income-tax on an income not exceeding £500.

The obstacle of having to pay fees for elementary education was met by special provision for necessitous children in 1870 and 1876, the claim to free elementary education was conceded in 1891, and the payment of fees in public elementary schools was prohibited in 1918. By Section 4 (4) of the Act of that year it was, moreover, provided that "in schemes made under this Act adequate provision shall be made in order to secure that children and young persons shall not be debarred from receiving the benefits of any form of education by which they are capable of profiting through inability to pay fees." For higher education fees are permissible and are usually charged, though the Board's regulations do not require them to be charged. But the Board do require that a proportion, normally at least 25 per cent., of scholars shall be admitted without payment of fees to grant-aided secondary schools, and it was estimated that of the 367,290 pupils in the schools on October 1st, 1925, 145,995, or 39.7 per cent., did not pay fees. The abolition of fees for higher and particularly secondary education is often advocated and in some areas has been effected. If they were abolished in all grant-aided secondary schools the sacrifice of fee revenue, some three million pounds, would be considerable, but trifling in comparison with the great extension of

maintenance allowances which the advocates of free secondary education usually attach to it.

It has, of course, long been recognised that something more than exemption from fees is necessary to make public education accessible. For many years, however, provision for scholarships, otherwise than out of endowments, or the funds of philanthropic agencies, was confined to those awarded centrally by the Education Department (starting with the Queen's scholarships for intending teachers in 1846)* and the Science and Art Department and locally by the Local Authorities under the Technical Instruction Act. Whitworth scholarships and Royal scholarships tenable at the Imperial College, Royal Exhibitions and National Scholarships tenable at the Royal College of Art, are still awarded by the Board. In 1920 a Departmental Committee with Mr. Hilton Young as Chairman reported on the provision of scholarships and free places, and in that year local expenditure on "aid to students" generally came within the grant system. In 1924-1925 it amounted in the aggregate to £1,621,000.

After the war some £8,000,000 was spent by the Board in allowances to ex-Service men to enable them to pursue courses of higher education at universities and other institutions. These allowances were assessed on the basis of the student's individual requirements, after taking account of his own financial resources, and demonstrated on a very large scale the possibility of assessing aid to

* For the system of bounties for the education and training of intending teachers *see* page 257.

students in relation to their means without the offensiveness usually attributed to "inquisitorial methods."* In 1920 the Board also established State scholarships for pupils of both sexes from grant-aided secondary schools to universities. The provision for them was suspended in 1922 but revived in 1924. The number available each year is 200, and in 1925 the average amount awarded for fees and maintenance was £94. The number of candidates in that year was 3,027.

"*Efficiency*"

Efforts to obtain the provision of schools and to make them accessible are, of course, futile unless the schools give a good education. The proposition that it is the business of the Central Authority first to insist on "efficiency" or some degree of it in all schools supported by public money and secondly to do its best to obtain progressively greater efficiency both in particular schools and the service as a whole would be readily accepted. The second part of the proposition, however, leaves room for a great deal of confused argument, and it is doubtful whether the term "efficiency," unless it is very carefully used, does not give more trouble than it is worth.

Efficiency is relative and is estimated by ascertaining in what degree a process or institution

* At the end of the academic year 1924-25, 21,172 students had completed approved courses. An account of the scheme is given in the Board's Report for 1921-22.

does what it professes or is designed to do and what is the proportion between the result attained and the energy or money expended on the process of attainment. It cannot be estimated without some assumption of the end or purpose to be attained, and endless disputes as to the efficiency of the service of education or its agencies have arisen because the disputants have not clearly stated their assumptions even to themselves and have, therefore, been at cross purposes. Efficiency is often spoken of as synonymous with "value," but it is not by itself even a good index of value. It is consistent with a low aim and a restricted purpose. A school or method of education may be highly efficient in the sense that it does what it sets out to do, but what it does may be worth little.

On the other hand, it is, especially in such a service as education, easy to aim so high or widely and to so disregard or overestimate the capacity of material or instruments to respond to or serve such aims that the degree of accomplishment is small, and the value of what is accomplished is trifling. Perhaps it may be said that in applying the test of efficiency to a school we ask ourselves whether it puts before itself a respectably high objective and attains it. The application of the test to the service or system of education as a whole is a still more difficult matter.

In the early days of the service the efforts of the Central Authority were mainly directed to removing the obvious causes of gross inefficiency in respect of staffing, premises, equipment, curriculum, methods

of instruction, organisation, discipline and regularity of attendance. The task of the Committee of Council was relatively simple—to get out of managers of schools as much improvement as the fear of losing the grants altogether could obtain, the amount of pressure which could be exerted being limited on the other hand by the fear of losing more schools than the Committee could afford to lose. Even bad schools were then better than no schools at all. The amount of public money available was so small (it was only £842,000 in 1861) that it could not do much. The standard of the conditions of efficiency prescribed as conditions precedent to the payment of any grant at all, gradually rose, but except in respect of buildings and staffing, they were usually stated in general and not in specific terms. A progressive endeavour to obtain higher efficiency was indeed made by attaching higher grants to compliance with certain conditions, and the system of "dynamic" grants, in which the amount of grant was graded in proportion to result, was employed till quite recent days. But the requirement that a school must be "efficient" to qualify it for any grant at all has in practice always meant little more than that it must not be grossly inefficient. And the Regulations were both chary of saying what constituted inefficiency, and careful to guard against hasty condemnation for inefficiency.*

* In 1886, Article 86 of the Code said: "A school or infant class must be efficient. A school or class is regarded as satisfying this Article if the Inspector does not recommend the withholding of the grant" under certain other Articles. This only means that a school was "efficient" unless the Inspector said it was

Recently all attempts to define efficiency by reference to specific conditions have been abandoned and the Regulations merely say that "every school must be kept on a satisfactory level of efficiency."

The function of obtaining higher efficiency by exhortation, stimulation, criticism and propaganda must always belong to the Central Authority and has always been performed by it, though it has sometimes taken the wrong road. It is indeed sometimes suggested even now that the Board's duty is done if it secures a "national minimum" of efficiency. This suggestion is made from two quite opposite points of view, on the one hand by those who hold that when the minimum is secured the Board should not, in the interests of economy, concern itself to get any more and still less should incite or press Local Education Authorities to go any further; on the other hand by those who hold that as regards anything above the minimum the less official interference there is with Local Education Authorities and teachers the better, because it is sure to be restrictive. Those who take the latter view would naturally put this minimum pretty high, but while urging the Board to insist on a high minimum they regard it as improper that the

---

"inefficient," and he had to state specifically the grounds of his judgment, the managers had to be formally warned, it had to be again reported as inefficient on specific grounds, and on appeal the school must be again visited and the report confirmed by a Chief Inspector. This kind of provision remained in the Code till 1903. It is obvious, therefore, that "efficient" as equivalent to "not-inefficient" carried the department very little way in those days.

Board should, on grounds of cost or otherwise place any obstacle in the way of Local Authorities who think fit to pursue any ideal, however lofty.

But neither of these views receives much support from public opinion and they reflect occasional discontents rather than mature reflection. The process of getting higher efficiency is a double one and operates in opposite directions. Usually it consists in pressing or encouraging schools, teachers or Local Authorities to pursue a higher or broader objective and to strengthen the instruments for attaining it. The establishment of the school medical service and the provision of school meals illustrate the view that the way to get more is to do more. The progressive widening, differentiation, prolongation and co-ordination of curricula which characterise the last thirty years are features which with many others reflect the idea that higher and wider aims not only yield higher value but are consistent with or even favourable to a higher measure of attainment. On the other hand the risk, especially in periods of general advance and enthusiasm, when new methods of education are propounded in facile profusion, that ambition may outrun ability to perform, is by no means negligible. High aims are sometimes vague and their vagueness infects the methods used to attain them. Experiments, the success of which requires favourable circumstances and exceptional ability, are copied under ordinary and unfavourable conditions which foredoom them to failure. The function of preserving a high standard of efficiency and raising it general level involves the restraint as well as the

encouragement of ambition, so that on balance the loss shall not outweigh the gain. And that the Central Authority should exercise a restraining influence by well-balanced criticism, difficult and invidious as the function is, affords no ground of complaint to the ardent reformer. It is indeed his best protection against set-backs and reaction.*

However much the absence of an objective standard of efficiency may tend to make general debate as to the efficiency of the service inconclusive or unprofitable, it does not render the Central or Local Authority powerless to promote it, to distinguish between degrees of efficiency or to detect or remedy inefficiency. The process is one of comparison of school with school, of area with area, of a branch of education at one period with the same branch at another. Any conclusions must in the last resort rest on what is found in individual schools and become more precarious and disputable as they become more general and cover more ground. Even in respect of individual schools they are not indisputable because they depend on personal judgment which may be coloured by personal prejudices or assumptions. But broadly speaking, when it is found that one school in respect of the discipline, attainments and interest of the pupils falls noticeably below the level of other schools similarly circumstanced, or the level of the mass of ordinary schools, it may safely be classed as relatively inefficient. Similarly with areas—one area is judged by comparison with other similar

* *Cf.* Matthew Arnold: General Report for 1878, p. 197. Ed. F. S. Marvin. H.M. Stationery Office, 1908.

areas in respect of the effectiveness of its organisation and administration and the proportion of bad schools. A classification of schools or areas as good, moderate or bad may be rough, and different people would classify them rather differently. But when it is made by persons of long and wide experience it is on the whole trustworthy. The process of eliminating inefficiency and increasing efficiency in each area and its schools is that of bringing the weakest and most backward group up to the level of the next group. It is frankly an opportunist process, and for a long time there will be no finality about it; the rate of its accomplishment depends on those financial, political and social considerations which determine the attitude of the Government, but it can be quite an effective process.

"*Value for Money*"

"Value for money" is a phrase which naturally makes considerable appeal to the practical man and economist, and to the conscience of every administrator of public funds. But it at once raises the question what constitutes value, and in respect of a social service this question admits of many answers. Mr. Lowe's famous system of "payment by results" (Chapter VI) started from the idea of efficiency, but it was really based on a false conception of value, by which it was finally destroyed. It was an attempt to get value for money by making the amount of money dependent on ascertained value, but it could only work at all if a very narrow meaning was given to value, so that it could be ascertained in a very

mechanical way. In the end it was realised that however much it kept down the amount of money (and the grants fell by £200,000 in four years) it defeated its own end by reducing the value and ignoring many constituents of value.

It is true that justice has hardly been done to Mr. Lowe. He was neither so original nor so perverse as has been supposed. He was following the advice of the Royal Commission set up in 1858 which reported in 1861. It was asked to devise a means of extending "*sound and cheap* elementary instruction to all classes of the people" and found the way to it in payment on the results of examination in the three R's. It criticised much of the instruction then given in the schools as both too ambitious and too superficial, and underlying its report may be found the view that a large extension of public education to all classes would be too costly unless it were reduced to its simplest elements. If it was to reach the mass of the population it must be both cheap and simple, and indeed the great majority of children would always leave school so early that they could learn little more than the simplest and most essential elements.

Mr. Lowe's ungentle methods and his declaration that he meant to have either cheapness or efficiency did him and his scheme much damage, and obscured the value of his insistence on thorough instruction in the fundamental subjects.* His scheme unfortunately presented a dilemma—if the grants were

* In a letter written to Lord Lingen in 1882, Mr. Lowe explained what he tried to do in 1862. Martin's "Life of Lord Sherbrooke," ii, 217.

mainly determined by examination in the three R's, preparation for that examination would inevitably become the main business of the school and the "formative" influence of the school would disappear. On the other hand, if other and more "humane" subjects were introduced and specific grants assessed by examination were attached to them, the scheme would become unworkable. After his time the Education Department impaled itself on the second horn of the dilemma. In the revulsion from his system there was loss as well as gain.

Since 1895 indeed it may be said that, apart from the training and recognition of teachers, inspection has furnished the chief if not the only safeguard of "value for money." It is true that the Regulations, which were remodelled both before and after 1902, still set out and prescribed the essential features of material, staffing organisation and curriculum, embodying many years of experience as to the stipulations necessary to guard against specific defects, omissions and aberrations prejudicial to efficiency. But their effect was very limited, the detection of "irregularity" and its penalisation by particular deduction from grants became much less common. The Treasury has always laid great stress on frequent inspection as security against waste of public money, and though the establishment of responsible Local Education Authorities has given much relief to the Central Authority, and though many of them have officers whose vigilance and intimate knowledge of everything that goes on in the schools affords great security against waste, it still remains the fact that

for the prevention of waste and securing a higher return for expenditure the taxpayer has to look to central inspection. And the recent reduction of Regulations to the smallest dimensions and their expression in the most general form has reinforced that proposition.

The Board's system of inspection is discussed in Chapter VI, but its constructive as distinguished from its safeguarding function is so important that it may be mentioned here. The inspector is by no means entirely engaged in inspecting and reporting on individual schools. Educationally he is the chief agent of "cross-fertilisation," the transference from school to school and from one body of teachers to another of the latest ideas and experiments in method or organisation. He helps to inform public opinion and to build up a sound body of knowledge which in its turn becomes the foundation of educational policy. He becomes an interpreter of professional feelings and opinions to the lay mind and not least to his administrative colleagues or his political chiefs. In his capacity as a disseminator and assessor of ideas he also acts as a bulwark against the constant pressure to adopt in the schools particular methods which may have gained popularity perhaps in circumstances widely different from those existing in publicly administered schools and above all against the various kinds of propaganda, social and political, urged on the schools with the best intentions by ill-informed enthusiasts. Conservative as the inspectors' advice may be in dealing with many proposals affecting method and curriculum, the idea that the Board's inspectors are the

agents of a central bureaucracy for restricting freedom and experiment is baseless. It may be claimed quite confidently that the Board's inspection has been directed persistently against a stereotyped or mechanical curriculum and in favour of constant initiative and experiment.

"*Organisation*"

After 1902, however, the function of organising all grades, stages and kinds of public education, and of planning the expansion of educational facilities in relation to an organic scheme, became the most characteristic if not the chief function of the Board.

Organisation in so large and miscellaneous a service as education involves careful definition of the aims and functions of the different agencies, their classification under types, and for each agency or type the selection and adjustment of means to ends. It does not mean stereotyping, and in England we have never erred on that side. It is, however, necessary to good organisation that each agency should "mind its own business" and not drift inconsiderately or unconsciously into a different kind of business. It will periodically require considerate revision, and with this there is no incompatibility between good organisation and elasticity.

In 1902, the loosely related activities of the Education Department, the Science and Art Department, the Charity Commission and the Local Authorities exercising powers under the Technical Instruction Act had resulted in a good deal of confusion in the provision for higher education,

and the creation of Local Education Authorities sharing with the Central Authority responsibility for the whole field of education made organisation of their activities imperative.

It is true that the statutory distinction between elementary and higher education made by the Act of 1902 was artificial. It is an administrative and not an educational distinction and is due to recognition of the interests of the smaller urban areas. It is a stumbling-block to educational reformers and often ignored by them. It is a distinction which does not afflict Scotland. It finds some justification in the fact that while large areas are necessary as units for the administration of higher education small areas are not unsuitable and indeed have some advantages as units for the administration of elementary education. But there is great practical difficulty in defining the limits of the two grades, there is an extensive "debatable land" between them, and a "straight run" from bottom to top of the education hill is obstructed.*

* The Report of 1926 of the Board's Consultative Committee on "the Education of the Adolescent" (p. 164) recommends (*a*) the general adoption of arrangements for consultation and co-operation between Authorities for higher and elementary education in respect of the provision by the latter of advanced elementary or post-primary education; (*b*) early legislation conferring on Authorities for elementary education, which reach "a certain minimum standard of population, full powers of higher education, and transferring from Authorities which do not reach that standard their existing powers of elementary education to Authorities which already possess powers of higher education"; (*c*) a policy of grouping contiguous Authorities "united by common characteristics and common needs" and aiming ultimately at merging in "Provincial Authorities" all the powers of existing Authorities.

In view of the past history of this matter it would be hazardous to prophesy how or how soon the obstacle to educational organisation presented by the incoherence of administrative areas will be overcome. It is to be hoped that realisation of the great and increasing inconveniences of the present arrangements will lead, whether by way of central or local action, to a real effort to overcome them.

Subject, however, to this complication of administrative areas, the construction of an organic scheme of education in co-operation with Local Education Authorities became the chief business of the Board after 1902. Its principal feature perhaps was the disentanglement of the secondary school from the forest of other institutions providing higher education, and the establishment of its definite type and objective. Secondary education in England has come to mean education given in "secondary schools," just as elementary education is defined by statute as education given in an "elementary school," which itself is a term of art. The appropriation of the name secondary to the education given in a particular type of school is a stumbling-block to reformers, has occasioned a good deal of confusion and led to the raising of many false issues. The most enthusiastic admirer of this type of school would not claim for it a monopoly of that range of higher education which lies between the elementary school and the university, or contend that the internal variety of which it admits renders it unnecessary or undesirable to recognise other types of school providing "secondary" education in the wider sense in which that term is often used.

At one time no doubt the anxiety of the Board to establish the type led it to look askance on competing types of full-time day schools—the higher elementary, the junior technical and particularly the "junior commercial"—but it has become so characteristic a feature of English education and is so secure that the way is clear for the development of other types. This period also is marked by emancipation of secondary schools from certain restrictions of trust deeds prejudicial to their public character and by the increased accessibility secured by the requirement for the free admission of a substantial proportion of scholars from elementary schools.

For administrative purposes the Board grouped all agencies of higher education, other than secondary schools, under a "Technical Branch" and a "Universities Branch" which included the training of teachers. Training colleges were formerly administered under the Elementary School Code, and they were thus promoted from the bottom of the administrative scale to the top.

In the period following the Act of 1902 the basis or unit of the Board's administration naturally shifted from the school to the area. It was indeed considered that in the national aspect of the service central administration would most effectively be conducted by organising the office staff and inspectorate on the basis of grades or kinds of education—elementary, secondary, technical, etc.—and concentrating on each grade the knowledge and experience of men and women specially expert in it. But the main question to which the Board addressed itself was what was being done in each area to

improve and develop each grade or type of education, how could each area be persuaded to supply deficiencies in each grade or type and to link up the several grades and types into an organic system. Petty deductions from grant in respect of breaches of regulations in particular schools became rare; the broader basis of administration was reflected in the practice of making large deductions from grant when occasion arose for serious dissatisfaction with the performance of an Authority's duties in its area. Between 1902 and 1918 provision was made for filling up many gaps in the scheme of education, and a whole new branch of the service —the School Medical Service—was established.

"*Systematisation*"

It is too soon to estimate or forecast the performance of the functions assigned to the Central Authority by the Act of 1918. The period has been one of great financial difficulty; considerations of national finance have been dominant and central administration has been mainly financial. The readjustment of national and local finance for all social services is indeed in contemplation, and may be carried out in a way which will profoundly affect their central administration. But the leading note of the Act of 1918 was undoubtedly that of "systematisation"—the "*adequate*" *contribution* in every area by every Local Education Authority to a *national system* of education accessible on a basis of equal opportunity to every person capable of profiting by it.

"System" and "systematisation" are dangerous words. The Englishman has a healthy and sometimes excessive dislike of systems. He used to scorn them as "continental," and he now readily attributes to them the vice of "uniformity" to which he adds the epithet "cast iron." There is no easier way of gaining applause than by defending the freedom, variety and autochthonous vigour of English institutions against the artificial rigidity of system. Systematisation to have any chance in England must not claim authority from any "preconceived" plan, it must allow a wide choice of methods and instruments and pay tribute to the affection which bodies of Englishmen have for managing local affairs in their own way.

The Act of 1918 did not contemplate a "national system" which would obliterate the characteristics of the local organisation of education which had been built up since 1902. Indeed, it was careful to give the initiative in the construction of the national system to the Local Authorities. It rested on the modest proposition, reinforced by the war, that in the national interest the local inequalities which are incidental to "decentralised administration" should be reduced, that the State had a right and duty to see that the cheerful prospect of fruitfulness in one area was not spoilt by the sterility of other areas, and that the taxpayers' money, which bore a large share of the cost of the local service, ought in equity to obtain more equal advantages for the youth of the country wherever they happened to live. Each area was therefore to make, and the Central Authority was to see that it made, an

"adequate" contribution to the national system, in the form most appropriate to its own circumstances.

The idea was not only that inside each Local Authority's province the various activities of the service should keep pace with each other in their development, so that the ground gained by the advance of one should not be left in the air by the slowness of another, but also that in the country as a whole the several Local Authorities should keep pace with each other and move on well-defined and co-ordinated lines of advance. Some who started in the rear of others would have to march hard to keep up and, at first, some of those who started in front might have to wait for the others. In view of the differences in their stature, and indeed in the country in which they moved, they could not be expected to keep step with each other. Some might move with quick short steps and others with long slow steps and still "get there" fairly well together.*

It is true that the idea of system had found large expression in the Board's administration before 1918, and if it desired to claim credit for this aspect of its work it might point with some pride to the "School Medical Service," using that term in the wide sense and as comprehending the whole group of special services which are administered by its medical branch.† These include the "special schools" for

* The problem of necessitous areas, and of equalising the burden as between rich and poor areas, is eminently a problem of national system.

† An account of the initial organisation of the Service is given in Sir George Newman's Report for 1908 (Cd. 4986 of 1910) and a review of the first ten years' work in his Report for 1917 (Cd. 9206 of 1918); the present position is shown by his Report for 1925—"The Health of the School Child."

blind, deaf and physically and mentally defective children dating from 1893 and 1899, accommodating 45,439 children, together with the "open-air schools" and sanatorium schools for pre-tubercular and tuberculous children; the "nursery schools" which date from 1918; the medical inspection and treatment of school children which date from 1907, in which are engaged 1,140 school medical officers and assistant medical officers, 4,520 nurses and 584 dentists, and for which 1,395 school clinics have been provided; the provision of school meals, which dates from 1906; the arrangements for physical training, in which local organisers are engaged, together with the "play centres"; the teaching of hygiene, mothercraft, temperance; the organisation of observation and research into the common ailments of children. These departments of work must, if they are to be effective, dovetail into each other, and the influence of the main activities of the service extends to the sanitation and lighting and ventilation of schools, the organisation of school games and swimming, the adjustment of school methods to the sub-normal or retarded child who is not "certifiable," or the myopic child; the arrangements for school epidemics; the employment of school children. And in doing the block of work specially assigned to it, the Board's medical branch is bound to look both to what comes before and what follows after, and to have regard to all the protective, preventive and curative agencies of the Central and Local Authorities, to whatever department they belong, and to co-operate with them to the utmost extent of its power. The fact that

the Board's Chief Medical Officer became also in 1919 the Chief Medical Officer of the Ministry of Health, and the fact that the Board have always tried to secure that the Medical Officers of Health shall also be the Chief School Medical Officers, are significant not only of the fundamental importance of everything which promotes the health of the school child, but also of the systematic unity of all the agencies of preventive medicine. From the beginning the efforts of the Board's medical branch have been directed not only to obtaining through the Local Education Authorities systematic treatment of all problems of health in schools, but also to working it in with the treatment of other problems of public health. "Systematisation" of work in a field which is so wide and makes so great an appeal to every kind of generous sympathy involves functions of restraint, economy of resources and postponement as well as of stimulation. It is impossible to do everything at once as well as one would like to do it, and by keeping pace with each other the various agencies are more effective.*

But "systematisation" is also an appropriate term to use when the State steps in to do or get done things which are not done or cannot be done well on a basis of local organisation, in order to make a service more complete and coherent.

An illustration of national systematisation may be found in the settlement of teachers' salaries on a basis, which, though it provides for local differ-

* These characteristics of a practical system of school hygiene have been well expressed by Sir George Newman in his Report for 1917, p. 162

entiation, reflects compromise, and is not free from anomalies and imperfections, represents a big step in the direction of the comprehensive treatment of an essential element in national education (Chapter XI).

The provision of superannuation benefits for all teachers, whether employed for purposes of higher or elementary education, provides another illustration. The superannuation of other Local Government officers is still a matter of local option and in considerable measure one of local organisation, but both in 1918 and in 1925 (when a contributory basis was substituted for the non-contributory basis of 1918) it was felt that the superannuation of teachers must be national. The idea of a national system has also found expression in the admission to it, for purpose of inspection and superannuation, of schools which receive no assistance from public funds. Other illustrations may be found in the regulation of examinations in secondary schools and the rescue of them from the thicket of external examinations which had grown up through leaving the choice to local discretion. Considerable progress has also been made by co-operation with professional and scientific bodies towards the better regulation of examinations for students of commerce and technology, and the establishment of "national certificates." In the field of higher technical education, developed by unrelated local enterprise before a national system was thought of, there is still much room for systematising the provision made in order to prevent overlapping, unnecessary duplication and consequent

waste and dissipation of money and energy.* The training of teachers has long called out for greater systematisation both as between the different classes of training institutions and, financially, as between areas which provide and maintain colleges and areas which do not. The latter improvement has now been made. The institution of State scholarships from grant-aided secondary schools to the universities is an example of systematic reinforcement by the Central Authority of the facilities provided in grant-aided schools, though there is still room for a good deal more system in local "aid to students." And again, the Education (Institution Children) Act of 1923, which equitably distributed the cost of educating children collected into local institutions from many parts of the country, affords a minor example of "systematic" treatment of a financial sore very irritating to certain areas.

The progress of national systematisation in the wider sense in which it is used in the opening section of the Act of 1918 obviously depends on the degree of favour with which it is regarded by the Central Authority and the Government for the time being, whose organ it is, and on the considerations which determine general policy. It is consistent with a high degree of local freedom, and indeed, by affording greater security for the national interest in one direction, may be favourable to greater local freedom in other directions. Subordination of

* In the field of University Education, which is outside the Board's province, local enterprise and regard for a national system are not always easy to reconcile.

local preferences or habits to national interests may on balance increase rather than diminish that liberty which is essential to local responsibility.

Criteria of "Value"

But in the end the Central Authority always has to ask itself, and if it does not ask itself the question will certainly be put to it by others, what is the value which the service is rendering, is it greater than it was, and is it worth the effort and money expended on it and the vast apparatus for its performance?

The public service of education is, according to modern conceptions of it, eminently constructive and productive, and differs in this respect from services which are mainly protective, regulative, preventive, remedial or palliative, and aim mainly at mitigating the evils which afflict civilised society and affording security against forces hostile to its comfort and welfare. It is true that in early days the protective and police aspect of education —the protection of society and the individual from the perils of popular ignorance and depravity in this life and the next was prominent, and played a large part in the advocacy of extended popular education. Some, indeed, acclaimed it as a panacea. In 1839 the Bishop of London declared that "a good education, that is a religious education administered by the teachers of religion is by far the cheapest as well as the most effective measure of police which any Government can adopt." "Open a school and close a prison" was a saying of

that time.* The question whether popular education did or did not tend to diminish crime was debated for a good many years as a crucial question. At a later stage the teaching of political economy in elementary schools as an antidote to strikes was advocated, and perhaps there is a protectionist echo in Mr. Lowe's warning "we must educate our masters." The "prophylactic" view of education is indeed not without validity, and in these days finds expression in the demand for more complete education in order to protect the individual and society from the facile acceptance of fallacies and the social and economic aberrations of incomplete education and increase the power of resistance to "mass suggestion" and "slogans."

But broadly speaking the driving force behind the service of education has been and is the belief that it is an active and necessary agency to make men and women better, wiser and happier; to make society more coherent, more stable and more prosperous; to reconcile the interests of the individual and society so that he shall achieve the highest development of which he is capable and at the same time make the fullest contribution to the welfare and prosperity of society.

Professions of faith such as this have been repeated on many political and educational platforms and in many writings, with many differences of emphasis on their components at different periods and in different circumstances. The sceptical treat them

* In 1868 John Bright said: "As the school rate would rise the poor rate and the criminal rate would fall."—*Life*. G. M. Trevelyan. p. 394.

as "brave words" and adduce both general and particular illustrations of the failure of education to do what is claimed for it. Such words, indeed, admit of many different assumptions as to the criteria by which the achievement of educational purpose should be judged. The "ladder," the "highway" and the "sieve" represent very different attitudes The critical estimation of the service of education as a practical enterprise is embarrassed both by the loftiness and generality of its aims and by the wide divergence between the criteria deduced from those aims and used consciously or unconsciously in the judgment of it. It is difficult even for the experienced administrator to formulate in terms satisfactory to the plain man, such subordinate and proximate criteria as can be usefully applied to the criticism of what is actually done by the schools or institutions or by the system to which they contribute.

In education no such concrete and indisputable standards as those of commerce or industry are available. Cost can be ascertained, and those who shut their eyes to it or declare it to be irrelevant render bad service to their cause and embarrass the great majority of those who are working for it. But the result or product of education is imponderable and cannot be reduced to terms of money, and attempts to "get a line" for estimating the efficiency or value of one system by comparing its cost and results with those of Continental or American systems yield nothing more instructive than a general impression. A very slight study of comparative statistics of education shows how

precarious are any conclusions which can be drawn from them. However fertile the study of other systems may be by way of illustration of ideas and methods different from our own, or by way of suggestions for experiment or new devices, it does very little to help us in the task of estimating the value of what our own system is doing. The truth is that the value which accrues to the community from education or the service of education at any time, or its greater value at one time than another, cannot be easily demonstrated. The value of education is often overestimated by those who have had little of it and underestimated by those who have had much of it. Though it is now less commonly praised than formerly as a means of individual advancement in a competitive society, it is idle to pretend that this view of it does not still actuate a large number of parents who make sacrifices for the education of their children and of students who live laborious days. On the other hand, it is true that the earlier utilitarianism has become more enlightened and recognises that disinterested study often pays best. Practical chemistry has fallen back on physics, and by some concerned in "big business" a "First in Greats" is not unappreciated. It is a mistake to despise the utilitarian test, as it is a mistake to apply it crudely or prematurely.* And it is a great mistake for those who are concerned with education, whether as prophets

* There is an "Association for Education in Industry and Commerce," and in 1925 a Departmental Committee was set up by the Board of Education and the Minister of Labour on the public system of education "in relation to the requirements of Trade and Industry."—First Report, 1926.

and champions or as practitioners of the craft, to regard searching and frequent inquiry into its effect on the scholars, and especially on the scholar of ordinary or average ability, of the processes or methods of education, as offensive or derogatory to their cause. It is easy to provide instances of the success or failure of education, but argument from them, whether by way of attack or defence, is quite inconclusive unless it rests on such knowledge of the facts as justifies the disputant in claiming that they are or are not typical. And this requires closer study and more patience than many of the disputants are willing to give. It means getting right down into the inside of school work and school life, and seeing what the scholar does "in his stride" and how he does it; something more gritty than Mr. Lowe's "impalpable essences." And it need hardly be said that teachers must take a large share in this proceeding. The moral of all this is that general talk about the advantages of education or the value of the service or the excellence of the schools carries no conviction, even to those who want to be convinced, unless it is supported by careful and conscientious investigation and study of the material yielded by investigation. And it is not the least important function of the Central Authority to organise investigation, humane and sympathetic but critical and searching, enlisting the interest and ingenuity of the best teachers to devise the most effective methods.

It is only in this way that anything like an estimate of the working and value of the national system from time to time can be made. And it is well to remind

ourselves (and those who are disposed to think that "as things have been they remain") that when we go to the bottom of things and look at what the mass of the schools are doing for their scholars, we cannot expect to register definite advance except over long periods. It takes a long time for improvement in organisation and machinery and for pioneer work in educational methods to produce their effect. There are no quick-acting panaceas in education. In that service "long views" are essential both for construction and for estimation. Those who have longest and closest experience of the public service of education have least doubt that in the last twenty years very great advance has been made, not only in the extent but in the content of public education, not only in expansion of facilities and in the number of students, but in the use of them and the profit derived from them. To set out the specific grounds for this belief would require a long essay.

Chapter IV

STAFF AND ORGANISATION

THE President of the Board is solely responsible for the whole of the Department's administration, and takes the credit or discredit for everything done by it. His responsibility is not diluted by the fact that other Ministers are associated with him on the Board, though on one occasion the Chancellor of the Exchequer reminded the President that he, too, was a member of the Board. He has always been a member of the Cabinet, and since 1905 has sat in the House of Commons. There have been twelve Presidents since 1900, among whom Mr. Fisher held office for the longest period, viz. five years and ten months. The President's salary is fixed by statute at £2,000 a year.

The President is assisted by a Parliamentary Secretary. He is "one of the Secretaries of the Board," who by statute is permitted to sit and vote in the House of Commons. He represents the Minister in Parliament in his absence, and if he does not sit in the same House as the Minister, as happened from 1902-1905, his position is more important and onerous. When they both sit in one House, he frequently replies on points raised in debate when the Minister has spoken at an earlier stage. He can be very useful to the Department by keeping it in touch with private

members of Parliament and dealing with their particular difficulties. The scope and importance of his contribution to the administration of the Department depends largely on his own and his Minister's personality and temperament. He has no specific authority over the Permanent Secretary and other officers of the Department or its internal economy, but arrangements are not infrequently made by which certain classes of matters, of which it is desirable that the political heads of the office should have cognisance, are referred to the Parliamentary Secretary and action is authorised by him on the Minister's behalf. Since 1902 there have been ten Parliamentary Secretaries of the Board, of whom three subsequently became Cabinet Ministers.

The Act of 1899 provides that the Board "may appoint such secretaries, officers and servants as the Board may, with the sanction of the Treasury determine," and the Permanent Secretary is the chief officer of the Board. The consent of the Prime Minister is by modern practice required to the appointment (or removal) of the Permanent Heads of all Departments, their Deputies, Principal Finance Officers and Principal Establishment Officers. Documents may be sealed or signed on behalf of the Board by a Secretary or some person authorised by the President or some member of the Board to act on behalf of a Secretary.

By the practice of the Civil Service it is the duty of the Permanent Secretary to advise the Minister with the utmost candour on all matters affecting the administration of his Department and, though,

broadly speaking, policy is the concern of Ministers and administration the concern of Civil Servants, policy and administration are, in so large and complicated a service as that of Education, so mixed up that the line between them is very indistinct. Details of administration, apparently insignificant, often raise large questions of policy and afford occasion for political controversy. To detect their significance and anticipate the larger consequences of his action, the administrator has to be both alert and imaginative. So far as administration is not covered by express instruction of the Minister, the Permanent Secretary is responsible for it to the Minister alone. It is not usual for him to be censured or criticised in Parliament, because the Minister is obliged to take the discredit for his bad deeds as he is entitled to take the credit for his good deeds. The Minister sometimes directs that certain matters shall be referred to him before action, but otherwise the Secretary exercises his discretion as to the degree of importance, political or administrative, which justifies or requires reference to the Minister. Confidence between them in this respect is essential to the proper conduct of business. Similar discretion is exercised by other officers of the Board as to matters which they will refer to the Secretary. It is not the practice for other officers to approach or refer directly to the Minister, except in compliance with the Minister's express instructions or at the request of the Secretary, but if there is a serious difference of opinion between the Secretary and any of the other principal officers the Secretary would be foolish if he did not take the decision of

the Minister upon it. Of course also the Minister freely discusses matters of importance with, and takes advice from, any officer of the Board he chooses, and though it is necessary that the Secretary should be kept informed and should hold the ends of all the threads of administration, anything like jealousy between him and his colleagues would be highly prejudicial to the service. Loyalty and fair dealing as between Minister, Permanent Secretary and all grades of officer in a Department are essential.

Since 1907 there has been a Welsh Department of the Board with a Permanent Secretary of its own. It was thought desirable to make arrangements which would ensure the sympathetic and well-informed consideration of national aspirations, of the peculiar problems of Welsh education, and of proposals for development on lines not necessarily coincident with those of English education. The Welsh Department has its own inspectorate, but the administrative and clerical officers assigned to it belong to the Board's general establishment and are interchangeable. The particular arrangements between this Department and the main Department for the distribution and co-ordination of work are fluid and have been modified from time to time. The Secretary refers directly to the President, but consults and is consulted by the Permanent Secretary of the Board with a view to avoiding conflict between the two departments of the Board's administration or embarrassment arising from divergence in policy. Under the Welsh Intermediate Education Act, 1889, the Central Welsh Board is charged with the

inspection of secondary schools established under that Act, but the inspection of municipal secondary schools established under the Act of 1902 is undertaken by the Welsh Department of the Board of Education. Special endeavours to unify inspection of both classes of schools have been made, and failing that to secure due co-ordination and co-operation between the two bodies of inspectors.

Since 1920 there has been a "Second Secretary" of the Board, now called "Deputy Secretary," to whom is now assigned the general supervision of certain divisions of the Board's work which at present include the Divisions for pension awards and for the training of teachers.

There are three general branches which operate over the whole field of the Board's work—the Finance, Medical and Legal Branches. The Finance Branch is controlled by the Accountant-General (assisted by a Deputy Accountant-General), who at present is "Accounting Officer" and is responsible for the "regularity" of the Board's expenditure and the accuracy of its accounts before the Public Accounts Committee of the House of Commons, which considers the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor-General. If he has doubt as to the "regularity" of proposed expenditure or any item of it he is entitled to ask for the written authority of the President before making payment, and if he differs from the President he is entitled to record his opinion and thereupon is absolved from personal responsibility. He is not responsible for educational policy, but the Board's estimates, for the preparation of which he is

responsible, reflect policy and he is concerned to estimate and point out its effect upon finance and financial administration and their reaction upon policy, and is, therefore, concerned to keep in close touch with the trend of policy. Under the existing system of grants, as is pointed out in Chapter V the task of estimating the Board's expenditure on the basis of the expenditure of Local Authorities is difficult and complicated. The magnitude of the Board's vote renders his post one of exceptional importance.

When the functions of the Board relating to the medical inspection and treatment of school children were transferred to the Ministry of Health in 1919 and the Board's chief Medical Officer became the Chief Medical Officer of the new Ministry, it was arranged that he should continue to act as the Board's Chief Medical Officer and direct not only the services of inspection and treatment administered by the Board on behalf of the Ministry, but the whole group of "special services" relating to "nursery schools," "special schools" for mentally or physically defective children, provision of meals, and physical training. Health services and educational services touch at many points, and it was felt that this rather anomalous arrangement would conduce to unity of policy, the closer co-ordination of administrative machinery, and the more effective performance of the services in which both Departments are interested. The Medical Branch has its own staff of medical officers and inspectors of physical training, and an assistant secretary and other administrative officers are assigned to it to

conduct its administration. The bulk of the work of this branch lies in the field of elementary education. Annual Reports are made by the Chief Medical Officer to the Board, which review the progress of the work falling within the province of the branch.

The Legal Branch is in charge of a "Legal Adviser," who ranks as a Principal Assistant Secretary, and has a staff of barristers. It advises the Board on all questions of law and drafting, and does the work under the Charitable Trusts Acts and Endowed Schools Acts, which was transferred to the Board from the Charity Commissioners by the Board of Education Act, 1899. It also takes an active part in preparing legislative measures, and in the business of carrying them through Parliament.

The Establishment Branch is in charge of a "Director of Establishments," and deals generally with the organisation and distribution of the Board's staff, and particularly with the arrangements for the work done by officers of the Board below the administrative grade. There are two "Whitley Councils," for the main office and the museums, which can raise any questions affecting the staff which appear to them of sufficient importance.

There are now three Principal Assistant Secretaries, to each of whom an Assistant Secretary is attached. They supervise and carry out the Board's policy for Elementary Schools, Secondary Schools and Technical and Continuation Schools respectively. The last mentioned group covers the field of Higher Education other than that given in Secondary Schools and that directed to the Training of Teachers.

It deals not only with technical education of all grades but also with art education, evening schools, adult education, choice of employment, and schools of nautical training.

The Principal Assistant Secretary of the Secondary Schools' Branch also deals with State scholarships, higher education maintenance allowances and matters concerning the character and conduct of school teachers.

There are separate divisions concerned with the training of teachers and the superannuation of teachers, the Assistant Secretaries in charge of them acting under the general direction of the Deputy Secretary.

The administration of elementary, secondary and technical, etc., education, so far as it is performed by "Principals" and "Assistant Principals"* is "territorialised," i.e. for each of seven geographical divisions of England a "Principal" takes charge of the work of all three branches, and the organisation by subjects gives way to an organisation by grouped areas. The advantage of this arrangement is that a general view can be taken of the whole provision for education in each area or group of areas, and that representatives of a Local Authority may be able to discuss, at all events in the first instance, any question arising in respect of any grade of education in a given area, with an officer who is acquainted with the whole of that authority's arrangements and problems. On the other hand

* From 1846 till recently, these officers were called "examiners," because originally they examined the papers worked by pupil teachers and Training College students.

the fact that the territorial officer refers to the appropriate Assistant Secretary or Principal Assistant Secretary any important questions relating to a particular subject of education, ensures that the problems of that subject wherever they arise shall be dealt with on lines consistent with a national policy. This consistency is further secured by conferences between the Principal Assistant Secretaries presided over by the Secretary or Deputy Secretary.

In 1895 an "Office of Special Inquiries and Reports" was established, of which Mr. Michael Sadler was made Director (*see* Chapter IX). A very valuable educational library, accessible to the public, was also established, which unfortunately can now only be housed in the basement of the Board's office, owing to the unexpected competition of other Government Departments for accommodation in the same block of offices. This situation is perhaps preferable to the banishment of the library and the office of Special Inquiries and Reports to another building, but it is decidedly inconvenient.

The Royal College of Art is administered by the Principal, and its work is conducted by a staff appointed by the President of the Board. Many of its students hold Royal Exhibitions, National Scholarships or Free Studentships awarded as the result of the Board's examinations in Art.

The Victoria and Albert Museum and Bethnal Green Museum are administered by a Director appointed by the President of the Board and conducted by a higher technical staff, which is

ordinarily recruited by selection which may be supplemented by examination. An Advisory Council of eminent persons interested in the work of the museum has been established, and it reports to the President of the Board. The arrangements made in respect of the Science Museum are similar. Both museums contain large and valuable libraries.

The higher staff of the Board was recruited by direct appointment by the President till 1919, when in result of the recommendation of the Royal Commission on the Civil Service of 1912-1915 the Board agreed to recruitment through the Civil Service Commission in the same manner as other Departments. A considerable number of promotions from the lower to the administrative class have been made.

Below the administrative class of officers, who number sixty-five, the Board employ in their main office some 1,150 men and women, who perform executive, clerical and other subordinate duties. Most of the second division clerks in the office were, when the Treasury introduced a new classification in 1922, assimilated for purposes of salary to the "executive" class. Some of them have obtained higher clerical posts, but of the rest a considerable number have not yet found executive posts either in the Board's office or other offices. The clerical and executive staff is distributed, on a basis of subject matter, in twelve main sections, and a characteristic feature is its organisation under experienced officers to whom the special status and salary of "Head of Section" is given. They have responsible functions which make great demands on their

ability, sagacity and organising capacity. In recent years the devolution of work from the administrative to the clerical class has been progressively developed, and endeavours to remove the reproach that good ability in the clerical class is wasted on trivial work are constant.

The organisation of the Inspectorate is described in Chapter VI, pp. 123-25. H.M. Inspectors are still appointed by Order in Council on the advice of the President of the Board.

Close touch is kept between the Permanent Secretary and Principal Assistant Secretaries and the Chief Inspectors, who are responsible for advising the Board on educational problems, and the effect of administration on the actual work of education as performed in the schools.

The main office is housed in King Charles Street, Whitehall, but the medical branch is housed in Victoria Street, and the pensions division in Chadwick Street, Westminster. There is an inspectors' library and office in Old Queen Street. During the war the main office was housed in the Victoria and Albert Museum. A site for the erection of a new building for the Royal College of Art was bought in 1912, but it has not been utilised and is occupied by the "Institut Français."

The total cost of the Board's administration in 1906-1907, 1914-1915, the last pre-war financial year in which the estimates of expenditure were normal, and in 1926 is shown in the Appendix, p. 291.

Chapter V

FINANCE

THE present system of educational finance dates from 1917, and derives from the Report of the Departmental Committee on Local Taxation, set up by the Treasury, with Sir John Kempe, the Comptroller and Auditor-General, as Chairman, which sat from 1911 to 1914.

The service of education was adopted very late into the regular family of Local Government services, and lay for many years outside the field in which the principles of financial adjustment between central and local burdens, between rates and taxes, were debated. It was not in any degree a recognised Local Government "burden" till 1870, and the right of either a Central or Local Authority to concern itself with education was disputed on principle. Indeed, it was not possible till 1902 to treat it as a service for which Local Authorities had an organic responsibility. There was a system of grants, but no system of finance. Since then the service of education, by its inherent capacity for growth and its faculty of sharpening the appetite for itself, has attained, both from the administrative and financial points of view, a conspicuous if not a dominant position among Local Government services.* The importance of the

* *See* H. of C. Return 135 of 1926.

finance of public education is now so great, and its problems attract so much attention, that it is perhaps excusable to treat of it at rather disproportionate length.

Education Grants

The early history of Education Grants has often been written. Education was developed by the administrative encouragement of voluntary effort and by grants for which there was no Parliamentary sanction, except that of a Vote in Supply and the Appropriation Act. In 1870 statutory grants for elementary education made their first appearance, and a "special grant" recognised the principle that account must be taken of three factors—expenditure, assessable value, and number of children—a principle which was carried further by an Act of 1897. In 1890 technical education was fortuitously endowed with the "Whisky Money,"* a windfall which,

* The Local Taxation (Customs and Excise) Act of 1890 provided that, after payment of £300,000 in respect of police, the "residue" of the English share of certain duties (originally intended to provide compensation for the extinction of public house licenses) should be paid into County and County Borough funds for relief of rates or technical instruction. In 1902 its application to purposes of Higher Education was made obligatory. The Board has no control of its particular application, but deducts it as a "grant" from the amount payable by the Board in aid of the Local Authorities' net expenditure. By the Revenue Act of 1911 the amount of the whisky money was stereotyped at £807,260. The distribution of it among Local Authorities bears no relation to their educational expenditure, and the share of each Authority depends on the total amount of the grants received by it from the Local Government Board for some nine different purposes before 1888, when those grants were discontinued.

both in respect of its origin and the basis of its allocation, was singularly inappropriate to the service.

This item of local revenue is an anomalous survival from Mr. Goschen's system of "assigned revenues," which in 1888 handed over to Local Authorities the produce of particular taxes, and was designed to effect a separation between the central and the local purse and to check the raids of Local Authorities on the Exchequer.* The conception on which it rested was the very opposite of the conception of local and central partnership. The Act of 1902 embodied no new principle of education grants, but in respect of the new "Aid Grant" which was estimated to cost the Exchequer £2,160,000, it disregarded a principle of some value, in that it took no account of expenditure.†

Broadly speaking the finance of public education was, for many years and, indeed, right up to 1902, a matter of the purchase by the State of the provision of education, of bits of education or the improvement of education from voluntary agencies and, in a limited field, from *ad hoc* or municipal

* It was applauded by Mr. Gladstone as terminating the vicious system of grants in aid. Hansard, 3rd Series, Vol. 324, cols. 731-745. See also Treasury Committee's Report of 1914, p. 19.

† The result was that within a short time Authorities whose necessary expenditure per child was abnormally high and whose "assessable value" was abnormally low found themselves in great difficulties, and the Borough of East Ham declared that it could and would no longer administer the Act This led to the establishment, in 1906-7, of a super-grant for "Necessitous Areas" in which expenditure is necessarily high and assessable value is low, which still survives.

Local Authorities. The idea that there was a public duty, local or central, to provide and finance a comprehensive system of education was undeveloped. It is true, on the other hand, that the great societies which devoted themselves to the provision of education were inspired by large and liberal ideas, though they expressed them locally in restricted channels. It is also true that central administrative action was much in advance of Parliamentary action, and also that locally the zeal and initiative of the great School Boards and municipalities reflected and stimulated a growing national consciousness of the value of education to the community. They pushed the Central Authority and were not merely pushed by it. They created a local public spirit in education, and they gradually prepared the country for the formal recognition of a public system of education and of the joint and reciprocal responsibility of Central and Local Authorities for its maintenance and development.

But right up to and beyond 1902 the original idea persisted that State subsidies for education should be specific and "dynamic," and should be directed to inducing local agencies to provide those additional educational facilities which at particular times seemed most necessary or most desirable. It was a system of opportunist "grants in aid" rather than a system of finance. From 1833 there was a long series of *ad hoc* fertilising grants designed to stimulate the production of particular crops in the field of education—school buildings, training colleges, teachers' houses, furniture and apparatus, books and

maps, pupil teachers, certificated teachers, regular attendance, attainments in specific subjects and practical subjects, abolition of fees, etc. At intervals, as the specially stimulated activities became normal activities of schools, there was a process to rolling up and consolidating specific grants into general capitation grants for which compliance with certain conditions of efficiency was required. But each stage of consolidation was the starting point for a fresh set of specific grants designed to secure particular improvement or extension, or to fill up gaps, and sometimes old grants which had been dropped reappeared. Thus building grants for elementary schools, which were expressly prohibited by the Act of 1870, were revived by Mr. McKenna in 1907 under the overriding authority of the Appropriation Act and building grants for training colleges, which had disappeared in 1860, were revived in 1905. In these instances, however, educational considerations were perhaps less prominent than a desire to redress the balance between the provision made by voluntary and denominational agencies and the provision made by Local Authorities. Better instances of recent "dynamic" grants are found in the grants which were paid at a higher rate for higher elementary schools, the grants in aid of "medical treatment" established in 1912-1913 (based on expenditure and graded according to the value of the work at rates ranging from 40 to 60 per cent.), and the grants in aid of expenditure under the Choice of Employment Act of 1910, and the grant in aid of "Play Centres" of 1917. At the date of the passing of

the Education Act of 1918 there were some fifty-seven separate grants, of which seventeen were for elementary and forty for higher education, calculated on ten different bases or combinations of bases, and related to seven different periods. These grants, so far as Local Education Authorities were concerned, were rolled up into two main "block grants" for elementary and higher education respectively.*

As regards the principles embodied in the old grants, the earliest were that State contributions should be met by at least equal local contributions, and that they should not in the aggregate exceed a fixed sum. The first principle did not either in theory or practice represent any idea that the cost of education or any of its services should be shared equally between central and local funds. There are many instances of the abandonment and re-assertion of both principles at different periods. As long ago as 1864 grants for the maintenance of training colleges were made up to 75 per cent. of the cost, and in 1902 the grants for voluntary elementary schools covered 78 per cent. of the cost.

The principle of compensation for local poverty as measured by low assessable value is illustrated in several statutes, and the analogous principle of compensation for abnormal expense attributable to small population and small schools or other special

* Grants payable to bodies other than Local Education Authorities in aid of colleges, schools, classes, etc., which stand outside the ordinary local provision of education out of the rates, had still to be made piecemeal, and in 1922-23 there were some twenty-seven of such grants mainly for higher education, most of which were assessed on a capitation basis, though in some cases expenditure was taken into account.

local circumstances has frequently been recognised both in statutes and regulations. The principle of grading grants in relation to the value or merit of educational work, found its most emphatic assertion in the revised Code of 1862.* In the field of technical education, grants assessed professedly on a review of the character or merit, efficiency, volume and cost of the work of certain schools and classes, were paid up to 1919, and in course of time this method of particular assessment produced some striking anomalies.

Royal Commission of 1897-1901

The Report and Memoranda of the Royal Commission on Local Taxation which sat from 1897 to 1901 opened a new chapter in the history of local and central finance by their discussion of the principles which should govern State subventions in aid of locally administered "national services." They were naturally much concerned with that aspect of the problem which relates to relief of the local "burden," an aspect which for the service of education had been only occasionally prominent, though in 1902 and afterwards it was much discussed. The Commission classed education as a service which is "national in a high degree" but must "be treated in a different way from the other

* Though the system of "payment by results" was modified from 1875 onwards, grants on the result of examination in "specific subjects" survived till 1895. At one time or another some thirty-five of such subjects were recognised. The complication of this assessment of grants is well shown in Volume I of the "Special Reports" (Cd. 8447 of 1897) issued by the Education Department.

main national services because of the large part played by voluntary effort and for other weighty reasons." They did not deal with education except by recommending an increased subsidy for technical education. The majority clung to the idea of "assigned revenues" and the separation of the local and central purses. The minority report, however, of the Chairman, Lord Balfour of Burleigh, Sir Edward Hamilton and Sir George Murray, pronounced in favour of a return to "grants in aid," designed to secure economy, efficiency and uniformity.

The minority recommended that the State contributions to "national" services locally administered, should take the form of an aggregate grant charged on the Consolidated Fund, limited to half the total expenditure estimated to be incurred by Local Authorities, fixed by statute, possibly in the first instance by reference to standard years, and periodically revised. The object of fixing the grant for a term of years was obviously to give the Exchequer certainty and security against constant pressure. The term suggested was ten years. The fixed aggregate grant was to be distributed as between the services in fixed block grants for each service as a whole, but it was made clear that the limitation to half the expenditure need not be applied to all services alike, and that some services might properly be subsidised to an extent of more or less than half the expenditure on them. The system of fixed grants to each Local Authority for each service was commended as best calculated to bring home responsibility and to ensure economy—it "*obliges*

those who administer services to raise at their own cost every pound in excess of a fixed sum, and thus gives them a direct interest in economical administration." The principles on which the aggregate grant should be distributed as between the services were somewhat lightly treated, but the grant for each service was to be fixed "with due regard to the nature of the service and to the necessary expenditure on the service."

It was in respect of the allocation of the aggregate "service" grant between individual Local Authorities that the Minority Report was perhaps most instructive. The principle of differentiation on the ground of local "ability" measured by assessable value (on the assumption, which was certainly premature, that the system of valuation would be reformed) was strongly emphasised. Equalisation of the burden of national services as between rich and poor areas was treated as the most essential principle of an equitable allocation. The second great principle was differentiation according to the "necessity" of the expenditure in each case, i.e. the magnitude of the local burden measured by population and by actual expenditure. "In an estimate of necessity the actual expenditure ought in some way and to some extent to be taken into account because it is clear that owing to causes beyond their control, Local Authorities, however economical their administrative intentions may be, are obliged to burthen the rate more in some localities than in others." The Minority Report suggested a scheme of allocation based first on the assumption of a standard minimum expenditure for each service

(the minimum sum per head of the population for which the service can under the most favourable conditions be performed), and secondly on the assumption that a small standard rate of a given amount in the pound would be uniformly imposed. The State would first make up the difference between the assumed standard expenditure and the produce of the assumed standard rate in each area. It would then contribute at the rate of one-third towards the excess of actual expenditure above the assumed minimum expenditure, provided that the total grant should never exceed two-thirds of the total expenditure. The grant would thus be in two parts—a primary grant towards the difference between the standard expenditure and the produce of the standard rate, and a secondary grant towards the excess expenditure. The illustrations given for the Poor Law service show total grants representing in one area 38.9 per cent., and in another area 66.7 per cent. of the total expenditure. Great emphasis was laid on equalisation of local burdens as essential to improvement of services and the levelling up of backward areas. The excuse for this lengthy account of the Minority Report of the Royal Commission is that perhaps for the first time it made a serious endeavour to solve the problem of financing locally administered national services as a standing problem—a problem which could not be disposed of once for all by any short cut or by arbitrary guesswork or bargaining, but demanded intelligible and stable principles which in changing circumstances would still be capable of application. Mr. Goschen had tried to eliminate it by his plan

of "assigned revenues," but it refused to be eliminated. The idea that a plan could be devised to secure that he who calls the tune shall pay the piper and conversely was described by Lord Farrer as "devout imagining," and must be abandoned.

One way of protecting the Central Authority, the Exchequer and the taxpayer, against the growing demands of locally administered services for more and more money, was definitely condemned by the Minority Report, viz. the device of piecemeal *ad hoc* grants for particular pieces of work as inducements to Local Authorities to do them at rates which are just adequate to get them done decently, or to get specific improvements of them executed. Under this device the grants will still tend to increase as the scope and cost of services rises, but *pro tempore* they are fixed, and the Central Authority can, if it pleases, preserve the attitude of a "grudging paymaster" and yield only to demonstrated insufficiency of its subsidies, and the sub-division of its subsidies enables it to yield at one point while resisting at another.

The Minority Report pronounced quite definitely and on merits in favour of block grants for whole services. The block grant has the advantage of leaving to those who administer the service locally a wide choice of the particular branches of the service which they will develop, and of the methods which they will follow. They will not be moved to consider what piece of work will pay them best by attracting most grant. Whatever line they follow, as most appropriate to local circumstances,

they will, if they do not in any branch fall into demonstrable inefficiency, get the same amount of money from the State. This freedom is valuable and conducive to good administration. But for the protection of the Exchequer the Minority Report declared that block grants should be fixed for a term of years and revised only periodically. But the advantage of the *fixed* block grant is only the advantage of postponing for a short or long period, according to the intervals between its revision, the consideration of the real problem. It substitutes periodical for continuous consideration of it, and during the interval throws on local administration and resources the whole burden of development of the service. If a grant fixed in advance for a term of years is not to act as a "drag" on development, it seems necessary either that it should be larger in the later than in earlier years, or that it should be arranged so that the larger expenditure in the later years may be defrayed by savings made in the earlier years.

The pronouncement in favour of fixed grants is characteristic of the period and of the national point of view of those who made it. At that time the idea that local services ought, in the interests of the community to grow and expand, and that the State ought to foster their growth and expansion, was not in vogue. Economy and efficiency to be obtained at no greater aggregate cost was the object in view. The question whether under a system of decennially fixed grants there was any likelihood of growth or improvement, or whether the Central Authority, armed only with a power

of penal reduction of grant for proved inefficiency, would have any power to secure it was ignored.*

1911-1914 *Departmental Committee on Local Taxation*

In 1911-1914 the Departmental Committee on Local Taxation, which was set up by the Treasury, reviewed for the first time the problem of financing the service of education as part of the general problem of financing "semi-national" services. Their report led to a new conception of education grants, and of the relation between the Central and Local Authorities which should govern the finance of education.

The Committee were faced with a number of new facts. Apart from the local and central reorganisation of education under the Act of 1902

* The famous Minority Report of the Poor Law Commission of 1905-09 trod in the steps of the Minority Report of the Commission of 1901. It says : "We recognise the advantage of separating the fluctuations of local expenditure from those of the National Exchequer. But this object can be completely attained without sacrificing the important advantages of making grants in aid vary according to efficiency of service. There is no objection to the aggregate total of the grants in aid being fixed in advance . . . either permanently or for a term of seven or ten years. This total can then be distributed among the Local Authorities according to certain fixed principles, leaving the amount to be allotted to each according to the amount or the efficiency of the service." They proposed that the aggregate grant should be allocated among the Local Authorities in proportion to the total expenditure of each, but also "in proportion to its poverty as measured by the assessable value of its area per head of population" (1909. Cd. 4499, p. 976.)

there was a great growth of local expenditure generally. The net expenditure of Local Authorities on six specified services (including education) had risen from nearly 33 millions in 1901-1902 to nearly 55 millions in 1911-1912, and of this the expenditure on education (other than in Poor Law Schools and Reformatories) represented over 28¾ millions, or more than half the total. In 1905-1906 the Parliamentary grants to Local Education Authorities for elementary education defrayed 53.9 per cent. of the net expenditure, and in 1911-1912 only 48.2 per cent. And the unequal incidence of the burden of education on different localities had, with growth of the service, become more striking and more onerous to the poorer areas with the larger populations. In 1911-1912, for elementary education, the rateable value per child ranged from £13 to £106, the expenditure per child from 52*s.* to 150*s.*, the rate from less than sixpence to more than two shillings. But over and above material facts there was the increased sense of the interest of the community in the performance of local services. The "process of nationalisation" had gone a long way since 1901, and there is no doubt that the development of education itself had accelerated this process.

The Committee pronounced in favour of a system of direct grants in aid of local services, to be paid as "block grants" in respect of whole services, related to total expenditure as distinguished from expenditure per unit, and differentiated as between areas according to their relative wealth or poverty and ability to pay. "Block grants, which are independent of the details of administration of a

service, are more suited to the complex and ever-changing character of present-day administration and to the varied circumstances of Local Authorities." As regards the service of education, they declared "that no reform of this present system can attain to any degree of permanence which does not tend to reduce substantially the existing inequalities of rate, and at the same time provide for an *automatic expansion of the Government grant concurrently with an increase in the local expenditure which it is intended to aid.*" The Committee were quite alive to the objection that a grant related to expenditure would tend to increase expenditure, but they did not anticipate that such increases would approximate to extravagance, if a sufficient share of this cost (which apparently might be as little as one-third in some areas) were left to be borne locally, and if adequate safeguards were provided for the proper and economical administration of local funds. "It is one of the advantages of a system of grants based upon expenditure that it would tend to increased Parliamentary control over the action of Government Departments in regard to semi-national services and over the expenditure of Local Authorities on those services generally." This remark indicates a movement away from the old idea that semi-national services should be treated as the subject of particular subsidies, towards the idea that their finance was an integral element of national finance.

For higher education the Committee did not suggest a block grant formula, but expressed a doubt whether any other basis but that of expendi-

ture would be practicable.* The Committee noted that under this scheme the local rates would still have a range of 8.3*d.* to 26.8*d.* in the pound (as compared with a previous range of 5.8*d.* to 34.5*d.*), and admitted that there were some exceptional areas which could not be satisfactorily dealt with by any scheme of grants. They subsequently recommended a special "small schools grant."

Finance Bill of 1914

In June, 1913, Mr. Pease explained the plan of the Government for "the development and maintenance of a complete and progressive system of education, and their intention to introduce an expansive system of grants following the Minority Report of the Royal Commission of 1901."

Mr. Lloyd George's Finance Bill of 1914 provided (subject to the condition precedent that Parliament should alter the method of ascertaining rateable value so as to distinguish the value of houses and improvements from the value of land) for a comprehensive scheme of grants in aid of services administered by Local Authorities (including Poor Law, Police, Roads, Public Health and Education), on the lines recommended by the Treasury Committee

* For elementary education they proposed that grant should be calculated on a formula equivalent to 36*s.* per child + two-fifths of the total net expenditure less the produce of a 7*d.* rate, with an upper limit of two-thirds expenditure. The grant might rise to two-thirds of the expenditure if it did not reduce the actual rate below 1*s.* The 36*s.* per child was three-fifths of 60*s.*, which corresponded to the "standard expenditure" per child of the Minority Report of 1901.

of 1914.* It also provided for a deficiency grant "to prevent the ratepayers in any area being put at a disadvantage owing to the benefits received from the grants under this Act being less than the benefits received from the grants for which the grants under this Act are substituted." "Benefits" presumably meant something more than "amount," and would be measured by the ratio of grant to cost. How the general deficiency grant would work was never explained. It was an experiment in "pooling" both centrally and locally, the cost of a number of services and making up a single general account for them as between the Exchequer and the Local Authorities. But pooling of this kind presupposes identical local areas and authorities (which did not then and do not yet exist) for the pooled services, and if complete would lead to the absorption of the Central Authorities which paid separate grants for them, in a single grant-paying Central Authority. It also assumes such camaraderie between the pooled services that the friends of a service which suffered loss would find consolation in the good fortune of another service which gained under the pooling arrangement.

The additional cost of the proposed Education Grants was estimated at £3,900,000 in 1915-1916,

* For elementary education the Bill provided a "Block Grant" (the first use of this term for legislative purposes) calculated at 36*s.* a child plus two-fifths of net ordinary expenditure minus the produce of a 7*d.* rate; it also provided "Special Grants" at the rate of half the net expenditure for a group of School Medical Services; and a "Small School Grant" for schools in county areas at the rate of 5*s.* 4*d.* for each unit of average attendance below 150.

of which £2,750,000 was attributable to the Block Grant for Elementary Education. The structure of the Bill gave rise to questions of procedure, and the scheme of grants did not survive. The outbreak of war occurred immediately afterwards.

Grants Related to Expenditure

In 1917 the Board issued Regulations for the payment to Local Education Authorities of a Supplementary Grant for Elementary Education (Cd. 8515) which adopted the principle and expenditure basis recommended by the Treasury Committee of 1914, but varied the formula so as to encourage the payment of adequate salaries to teachers. It made up the ordinary grants to the amount yielded by the following formula: 36*s.* for each unit of average attendance, plus three-fifths of salary expenditure, plus one-fifth of other expenditure, less the produce of a 7*d.* rate. Upper and lower limits were imposed by which no authority would receive more than two-thirds of its expenditure unless its rate for the remainder would exceed 1*s.*, nor less than two-fifths of its expenditure unless its rate for the remainder would be less than 1*s.*

The regulation declared that in paying the grant the Board would "have regard" to the provision made in each area as a whole for certain matters conducive to the establishment of "a complete and satisfactory system of elementary education."

On August 13th, 1917, an Education Bill was introduced, which proposed to abolish all statutory education grants and leave the Board with a clean

sheet on which to write the future scheme of grants by Regulations.

This feature was criticised, one body of critics desiring that the amount and basis and scale of grants should be prescribed by statute so as to tie the hands of the Board and the Treasury, and even of Parliament itself (except by way of a new statute), against any future reduction of education grants under stress of economy. A more moderate body of critics, recognising the grave inconvenience of statutory grants prescribed in detail, urged that in the Bill the principle that Government grants should meet at least half the net expenditure should be expressly asserted. The interest of London in this principle far outweighed that of all other authorities put together, and its concession in the Act of 1918 was mainly a concession to London, which in 1916-1917 was receiving in grants only about 32 per cent. of its expenditure on elementary and 35.6 per cent. on higher education. It is obvious, however, that by fixing a high minimum proportion of grant to expenditure, the range within which the grant system could differentiate between rich and poor areas, and so equalise the burden of rates, was somewhat restricted.* The effect of the Education Act of 1918 on the relations between the Central and Local Authorities is dealt with in Chapter VIII. Broadly speaking it substituted for the relation of paymaster and recipient of subsidies a relation of active and constructive partnership in the comprehensive and systematic supply and organisation of education.

* *See* "Report of Departmental Committee of 1914," p. 28.

The distinction between authorities for higher and elementary education made by the Act of 1902, under which the areas for higher and elementary education are in many cases not identical, prevented and still prevents the establishment of a single grant for both branches of education; but, apart from this, consolidation of the numerous piecemeal grants was effected on a basis which, for higher education, took account of expenditure alone, and for elementary education took account of the three variable factors of expenditure, number of pupils, and ability to pay measured by assessable value. The Act directed the payment of "substantive grants" subject to conditions and limitations laid down in regulations (which were brought within the procedure of "Statutory Rules and Orders"), and also the payment of a "deficiency grant" to bring the substantive grant for each area up to half the net expenditure "*recognised by the Board of Education as expenditure in aid of which parliamentary grants should be made to the authority.*"

Under the regulations for elementary education and the complex formula for calculation of grant, most of the authorities have received substantive grants in excess of half their expenditure, the proportion of grant to expenditure ranging up to 68 per cent. In 1925-1926 the cost of bringing the substantive grants in some fifty areas up to half the expenditure was estimated at about £755,000 only. The average proportion of grant to expenditure for the whole country is about 55 per cent. For higher education the distinction between substantive and deficiency grant has disappeared, grant being paid

at the uniform rate of half the expenditure. To introduce the factor of "ability to pay," and to give a higher rate of grant to poor areas for higher education would, of course, involve an increase in the Board's Vote, unless the rate of grant to rich areas were reduced below 50 per cent.

The question whether this system of financing education gives the Central Authority too much or too little administrative control of educational services and of the expenditure upon them, and of the grants related to that expenditure, or, alternatively, whether under that system central control can be effective without being vexatiously minute, soon came under debate and is still under debate.

As regards the first of the two main aspects of administrative control of a locally administered national service—the prevention of inefficiency or inadequacy—the Act of 1918 left matters much as they were, so far as the power of penal reduction of grant is concerned. The power to prescribe conditions of grant and standards of efficiency by regulation remained. Although a charge of inefficiency against an area must usually rest on its discovery and demonstration in particular schools, the substitution of an area basis of criticism for a school basis is on the whole advantageous and more effective. It is true that by the abandonment of graduated grants related to the merit of particular pieces of work some of the "dynamic" quality of grants was lost, but grants graduated by merit are difficult to administer consistently, and leave Local Authorities uncertain as to the grants they will get till they are actually awarded. On the whole any

"dynamic" loss was outweighed by the "inducement" quality of the new system. Indeed, subsequent criticism of the system took the line that it, or any system which relates grant to expenditure, offers too great inducement.

As regards the prevention of excess or extravagance, the Act left untouched certain statutory powers of control, the most important of which is the control of loans for capital expenditure and consequently of such expansion as is usually preceded by capital expenditure, which is exercised by the Board in conjunction with the Ministry of Health. It also confirmed the Board's power to impose by regulation "limitations" in respect of the payment of substantive grant, and limitation by reference to standards of cost or quantity has in fact been embodied in the Regulations, e.g. in respect of maintenance allowances and free places, etc. The aggregate grant for necessitous areas was at one time "rationed" and subject to *pro rata* reduction. It is, however, over the exercise of the administrative discretion to recognise or refuse to recognise expenditure as "expenditure in aid of which parliamentary grants should be made to the authority" that most controversy has arisen. Disallowance on the ground of "irregularity" or disregard of regulations and declared conditions cannot be disputed on principle; the question whether the regulations or conditions themselves are too restrictive or minute and ought to be altered is a different question which is always open to discussion. It was generally admitted at the time that the Board must have power to disallow (even retrospectively), for the

calculation of grant, expenditure which, on merits, it was prepared to declare improper or extravagant, though it is admittedly impossible to define extravagance, and the line between what is reasonable and extravagant is a shifting one. On the other hand, it would be agreed that retrospective disallowance, even "on merits," of expenditure actually incurred or to which Local Authorities are contractually committed is to be avoided, if possible, as at least inimical to comfortable relations. It can be and has been in great measure avoided by previous and sometimes excessive consultation. Any doubt as to the Board's power to disallow expenditure on the ground of extravagance, as discovered by reference to certain standards, has been removed by Section 14 (1) of the Economy (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act of 1926, which declares that "the Board shall not be bound to recognise, as expenditure in aid of which parliamentary grants should be made to a Local Education Authority, any expenditure which in the opinion of the Board is excessive, having regard to the circumstances of the area of the authority and *the general standard of expenditure on corresponding services in other areas*, or which in the opinion of the Board unreasonably exceeds any estimate of expenditure made by the Authority." The last words of this clause introduce a new consideration, the significance of which is discussed later. But from the point of view of parliamentary control and the constitutional relations between Central and Local Authorities, a further question has been raised which is not touched by the Act of 1926 though a Bill of 1922 proposed to deal with it.

Is it open to the Central Authority under such a system as that established by the Act of 1918, by an exercise of administrative discretion, to disallow expenditure, even prospectively, not "on merits" as undesirable or extravagant in relation to any particular accepted standard or particular local circumstance, but on the general ground that its amount places on the Exchequer (and the taxpayer who foots the bill) a burden which it cannot afford to carry? If no such power is reserved to the Central Authority, is the system of expenditure grants consistent with the national interest or defensible on principle? The words of the Act of 1918 are unqualified, and are perhaps wide enough to cover almost anything which the Board might think fit to do. But the administration of any Act must be consistent with the general intention and structure of the Act, and it would be easy to imagine instances in which extreme use of such a discretionary power, such use, for instance, as the Geddes Committee suggested, would be destructive of the Act itself. Some aspects of this question were conspicuously illustrated by events which occurred very soon after the Act of 1918.

1920-1921 *Economy Measures*

In 1920 and 1921, in pursuance of the Government's policy of rigid economy, the Board issued circulars (1185 and 1190) the general effect of which was that, while the ordinary educational services must be carried on effectively and room must be left for the actual or prospective growth of these

services, authorities should not undertake new commitments without submitting specific proposals and estimates of cost to the Board for approval. The Board thus undertook the detailed consideration of proposals for expansion or improvements of educational services with a view to recognising or refusing to recognise prospectively expenditure for the calculation of grant. About the same time the "standard scales" of salary for teachers in elementary schools, recommended by the "Burnham Committee," came up for consideration (Chapter XI). They were accepted by the Government subject to two principal stipulations, viz. that the scales should be introduced gradually, and that local expenditure in excess of the scales would not be recognised for the calculation of grant. The Central Authority thus claimed and exercised a discretion to refuse recognition to expenditure which, on review of the total financial effect of certain proposals, it was prepared to declare excessive, as well as a discretion to limit an expenditure grant by reference to specific standards of expenditure.

The economy procedure worked pretty smoothly and expeditiously on the whole, but it naturally gave rise to disappointment and complaint on the part of the more progressive authorities, and reinforced the feeling aroused among Local Education Authorities by the central checks on local salary expenditure, that in periods of national economy the high degree of central control incidental to a system of expenditure grants was a disadvantage which weighed heavily against the advantages. The Geddes Committee were evidently aware of this

feeling. The local application of the Burnham Scales in itself imposed on the offices of Local Education Authorities a novel and intricate task, the difficulty of which was increased by the Government's decision to restrict the "elbow room" within which they could exercise a discretion to depart from the scales. It is not surprising that in these circumstances the process of standardising salaries was accompanied by friction and some "hot bearings." On the other hand it is worth considering whether this procedure did not assert effectively the ultimate authority of Parliament to control its own expenditure and adjust it to circumstances of financial stringency without grave disturbance to the educational system or prejudice to its immediate development, where necessary, or its future development.

On July 6th, 1922, the Chancellor of the Exchequer introduced an Economy (Miscellaneous Provisions) Bill which, *inter alia*, temporarily empowered the Board for a period ending March 31st, 1925, to "limit any grants made by them to Local Education Authorities to such extent and in such manner as they may consider necessary in order that the total grants so made may fall within the amount provided by Parliament for the purpose." This part of the Bill was not proceeded with, and on the change of Government in October the proposals were not revived, but both in 1922-1923 and 1923-1924 "rationing" was effected without legislative sanction.

In those years the Board's Estimates placed limits on the aggregate expenditure of Local Authorities

which would be recognised for grant, under the head of Higher Education generally, and in the case of Elementary Education under the heads of Salaries of Teachers, Loan Charges, Special Services, Provision of Meals, Administration and Other Expenditure.

The "ration" of £300,000 for expenditure on Provision of Meals was the only one which took effect, as under the other heads the limits of expenditure were fortunately not reached. In 1921-1922 the expenditure on meals for school children, owing to a stoppage in the coal mines and the lack of co-ordination between this service of education, as established by the Act of 1906, and the service of poor relief, had reached the abnormal figure of £943,000. This is the most conspicuous instance of actually operative rationing. It may, perhaps, be observed that though it is easy to fix an aggregate ration for a whole service or branch of a service, it is not at all easy to distribute it equitably or intelligibly among a large number of Local Authorities. Circular 1190 was withdrawn on April 3rd, 1924, and in 1924-1925 all rations were dropped.

In the meantime the whole principle of expenditure or percentage grants had been brought into question. In December, 1921, the "Committee on National Expenditure," with Sir Eric Geddes as Chairman, submitted their first interim Report. (Cmd. 1581 of 1922.) It handled the system of percentage grants as distinguished from fixed or *per capita* grants somewhat roughly. "It is in fact a money-spending device. . . . We consider that the percentage grant should be abandoned in the interests of economy, and replaced by fixed grants

or by grants based on some definite unit." In their summary of conclusions they said: "We are impressed by the position of impotence of the Board of Education in either controlling expenditure or effecting economies, once the policy has been determined. There is no doubt on the other hand that Local Authorities have been urged into expenditure upon a scale which they would not have contemplated if left free." The path of economy which the Committee indicated would have involved the exclusion of all children under the age of six from elementary schools, a drastic reduction of teachers' salaries, a reduction of the number of teachers in elementary schools by some 43,000, involving a proportionate increase in the size of classes, and in view of the obvious impossibility of a sudden contraction of local expenditure by ten million pounds, the transfer on a large scale of the burden of education from taxes to rates. The Committee made no constructive proposals for a reformation of the existing system of grants and did not mention the elaborate investigations which had preceded the establishment of that system.

In 1922 a Departmental Committee, with Lord Meston as Chairman, was set up to consider "what system of Exchequer grants in respect of locally administered services assisted from the Exchequer can be substituted for the percentage grant system, and to what extent and with what exceptions, if any, the alternative systems can be applied." This Committee has not yet reported, and the Report of the Treasury Committee of 1914 is still the last authoritative document in which the principles

of grants in aid of local services are expounded. In July, 1922, the Board submitted to the Committee (*inter alia*) a memorandum on the existing grant system which has recently been published (Cmd. 2571 of 1926). After indicating the principles relevant to the criticism of any grant system, and the main facts illustrating the working of the existing system, it expressed a preference for its retention as compared with any other systems which had been proposed, and suggested certain lines of possible improvement. It called special attention to the feeble effect of the formula for elementary grants in equalising the rate burden as between different areas. As regards economy, the Board contended, in opposition to the view of the Geddes Committee, that the existing system was "under present circumstances a powerful engine for restricting expenditure," but they looked forward to a further development of the system of applying standards of cost as limitations of the expenditure which the Board should recognise for grant purposes.*

Apart from questions of principle it must be admitted that central grants based on and related to the actual expenditure of Local Authorities on an inherently expansive service are not easy to administer, with due regard to the proper anxiety of the Chancellor of the Exchequer to see ahead, to be furnished in good time with reliable estimates, and to be protected against unpleasant surprises.

The difficulty is increased if the grants for a given year are related not to the ascertained expen-

* Circular 1388 of February 11th, 1927, formulates three new standards.

diture in a previous year, but to the estimated expenditure in the current year. In 1921 the objection that the payment of grants in arrear of the expenditure to which they are related acts as a "drag" on expansion (the rates having to defray the cost of it for some time before the grants are paid) was allowed to prevail; since then the grants for the year and the money required for them have been calculated on the assumed local expenditure of the current year. The forecasts and estimates of Local Authorities (who dislike Supplementary Estimates as much as the Treasury does) have usually allowed a margin of safety, and, however skilful the Board's financial officers may be in discounting it, there is an element of guess work in the Board's estimates which is not comfortable from the point of view of the Exchequer.

The problem is an administrative one, and the question whether it can be dealt with by a procedure which does not go outside the implications of the Act of 1918 has recently come under discussion.

The Board, by Circular 1119 of July, 1919, had invited all Local Authorities to submit schemes on lines which had been previously discussed with Local Education Authorities. It was suggested that they should be drawn up with reference to a period of about ten years, but should "contain concrete and definite proposals as regards matters which require to be dealt with during the first few years." In 1922, however, authorities were informed that "for the present the Board's approval to any general scheme cannot be given in such a form as would commit them to recognising for the calculation of

substantive or deficiency grant, expenditure incurred under it."

On March 31st, 1925, the Board issued a Circular (No. 1358) in which they emphasised the importance of dealing with proposals for development "not in isolation but as part of a well-considered plan of orderly advance," and asked for the submission of "programmes" in which the items would be arranged in order of priority determined by consideration of their relative urgency, importance and practicability. The object of the programme procedure was to provide material on which the Board could base an estimate of their future commitments, avoid fluctuations and "secure a greater degree of continuity and stability in policy and administration, so that even if the rate of advance has to be regulated by financial limitations it will not be interrupted or diverted." It is obviously necessary that the Central Authority should be able to look ahead, and it can only look ahead if its local partners supply it with ample prospective information. The Act of 1918 clearly meant to give the Local Authorities the right and, indeed, the duty of initiative, but equally clearly it did not mean that they should "call the tune" as they pleased, and, when it had been played, present the bill for the piper to the Central Authority. It is not consistent with anything like partnership that one partner should commit the firm deeply without consulting the other partner or keeping him informed as to the immediate and prospective cost of executing in detail an agreed general policy. On the other hand it is not open to one partner suddenly to alter or

recede from an agreed policy without notice to or consultation with the other, and ignoring the momentum already acquired in its execution. Close and continuous contact, and exchange of opinion, information and intention, are essential, and the Board's request for "programmes" was an essay in this direction. It is not easy for Local Authorities to make programmes, expressing them accurately in terms of money, or to assure themselves or the Central Authority that they can and will be executed according to plan and time table. Allowance must be made on both sides for unforeseen demands and unforeseen impediments. But, broadly speaking, a "programme procedure" may reasonably be regarded as necessary to give stability to expenditure grants, and almost necessary to their survival.

In November, 1925 the Board of Education announced its intention to substitute a system of fixed grants, described as "block grants," for the existing system. The fixed grants were to be related to programmes which the Local Authorities were asked to submit. The proposal in its original form was dropped, and the future arrangements for education grants are still under discussion. The intention to have recourse to a system of fixed grants was consonant with an announcement made by the Ministry of Health in "Provisional Proposals for Poor Law Reform" issued in December, 1925, that it was intended to establish for Health Services a block grant fixed from time to time for a term of years and distributed among Local Authorities on a basis of population qualified by a factor representing low ability to pay.

Résumé of Financial History

This somewhat detailed account of recent stages and happenings in the financial history of education may perhaps be excused on the ground that they are of more than ephemeral interest. The finance of Local Government Services is under review. The finance of Public Education, both on account of its magnitude and its political and social significance, is of preponderant importance. Its history reflects the progress as between central and local agencies or authorities from patronage to joint responsibility, from contract to status; from dole or purchase or subsidy to partnership, from distribution of particular grants to a system of joint finance. The relation of the State to the body of Local Authorities is perhaps analogous to the relation of a "holding company" to a number of subsidiary companies in an enterprise which is being actively developed. Education finance can no longer be appropriately discussed in terms of "grants," though it is difficult to get away from the language to which we are accustomed. The Geddes Committee approached the matter, as it was their business to do, from the point of view of reducing expenditure, and did not care whether grants were fixed or were distributed on a *per capita* basis or some other basis of specific units. Both the Minority of the Royal Commission of 1901 and the Treasury Committee of 1914 pronounced in favour of block grants for whole services. The former favoured fixed aggregate grants distributed on principles which gave weight to the actual amount of expenditure, circumstances which deter-

mined its "necessity," and the local ability to pay. The latter pronounced in favour of grants *automatically expanding with expenditure* on a complex formula embodying the principles of the Minority Report of 1901. The Governments of 1914 and 1918 followed the plan of the Treasury Committee. When hard times came in 1920 and 1921 the Government adhered to the plan of grants proportioned to expenditure, but controlled the grants by controlling the expenditure, particularly the expenditure on teachers' salaries to which they were related, and claimed the right to ration expenditure so as to bring it within limits up to which the Government could afford to pay corresponding grants. Expenditure fell owing to fall in prices and other circumstances, and the education estimates proved excessive. The Conservative and Labour Governments of 1923 and 1924 made no substantial alteration in the estimates, though the latter abandoned "rations" and "reversed the engines" so as to permit and encourage expansion. The Conservative Government of 1925 started by emphasising the programme procedure, and has strengthened it by legislation. But later, alarmed presumably by the tendency of services to expand and grants to increase, it revived, both as regards services administered by the Board of Education and the Ministry of Health, the old idea of fixed grants, subject to periodical review. The Ministry of Health's proposal admitted only population and ability to pay as factors determining the distribution of grants, and excluded expenditure, but it was a mere outline. For the service of education it was subsequently recognised by Ministers

that grants must be related to actual and prospective expenditure, and that the service was an expanding one; though no doubt any Government would be shy of committing itself to indefinite expansion no *terminus ad quem* has been suggested. That is where the matter stands at present. Past experience suggests one general reflection. Any large change in the system of grants to Local Authorities means at first at all events, not less central expenditure but more. For the acceptance by the House of Commons of a large scheme, which affects local interests everywhere, it must appear financially advantageous to those interests. Of course it may be worth while to spend more now, if national resources allow, in order to save spending still more hereafter, though—as Mr. Goschen's experiment showed—it is somewhat hazardous to rely on the "finality" of any scheme.

Problems of Financial Partnership

The increasing cost of social services has, since the war, caused much anxiety to those responsible for the national finances, and that anxiety is bound to be recurrent. The enlargement of the field of all such services, the more generous conception of them, their progressive "nationalisation," have on the one hand changed the character of local administration and continuously magnified the status of Local Authorities, and on the other they have made the support of those services a much larger element in national finance. How is the taxpayer and the Government which extracts and administers the

taxpayer's money to be protected? Must the Central Authority retrace its steps, go out of the partnership business and become the paymaster rather than the partner of the Local Authority?

That idea has some attractions. Partnership is a troublesome relation. Would it not be much better to devise a system of grants which would relieve the Central Authority from any intimate concern in the way in which its money is spent or not spent and conversely would relieve the Local Authorities from tiresome interference and give them freedom? The Central Authority would then have only to see that the service does not fall below a minimum standard and supervise it sufficiently to offer friendly advice, criticism and exhortation. That line of thought is not likely to be pursued; it would mean leaving a national system to take its chance or pronouncing it unattainable.

It is probably too late in England to resort to Solomon's device and divide the service of Education into two parts, assigning the maintenance of one to the Central and of the other to the Local Authority.* It is easy to understand the temper

* The cost of Teachers' Salaries so far exceeds the cost of all the other components put together that it cannot be assigned in its entirety to either party. To assign it to the Central Authority less a specific contribution from the rates (e.g. the produce in each area of a fixed rate in the pound) might be justified by figures, but would almost inevitably bring in its train much more centralised administration in a sphere where centralisation has hitherto been carefully avoided. To assign it to the Local Authority and the remainder to the Central Authority would involve a central contribution towards its cost, and would transfer to central administration a number of items which local administration is far better fitted to control

which says: "Let us get rid of expenditure as the basis of the Central Authority's contribution to the support of social services: expenditure is always increasing, and if we take account of it at all our contributions will be always increasing." But one thing is certain. The exclusion of expenditure as a recognised element in the calculation of central contributions to locally administered services will be nominal rather than real, and there will be no finality about it. *Expellas furca, tamen usque recurret.* However the central contribution is calculated, whatever other data or indices are employed; its fairness or adequacy will always be judged in the aggregate by the proportion which it bears to the total cost of the services conducted in accordance with national policy, and in respect of its several local recipients by the proportion which it bears to their necessary local expenditure. It can only be defended if, in the aggregate, it represents a fair and adequate share of the total cost, and if it is so distributed that the share of each locality reflects the difference in cost which different local conditions involve, as well as differences in local ability to defray it. While expenditure must remain the ultimate criterion of the fairness and adequacy of central contributions, it is of course possible to employ it indirectly instead of directly—to interpose mediate criteria—such as population, or number of children or teachers, which have the advantage from the point of view of the central purse of slowing down the increase of central contributions and the expansion of the local expenditure which they aid, and increasing the Central Authority's power of

resisting those who "ask for more." But they have the disadvantage of reflecting the fundamental datum of cost or expenditure uncertainly and capriciously, and, as between one locality and another, inequitably. No simple formula will do justice unless an excessive amount of adminstrative discretion is used in its application. The device of fixing the central contribution for a term of years and revising it periodically would import no new principle and is consistent with the retention of an expenditure basis. It has some advantage in steadying expansion, but is usually advocated as a drag on expansion and, frankly, as a money-saving device. It is much easier to apply to the aggregate contribution than to its distribution. The device of relating grant to the expenditure of the period covered by a programme is quite consistent with the idea of partnership in a national service, and indeed strengthens it. It recognises that responsibility for local work and expenditure, from which everything starts, belongs to the Central as well as to the Local Authority, and is the negation of the old idea that the intervention of the Central Authority in local work is interference which should be resented. For the Local Authority to adjust its administration to this condition of partnership need not involve any diminution in the status of the Local Authority. The Local Authority would naturally claim to come more and more inside the councils of the Central Authority, and the action of Local Authorities generally would be governed more and more by national standards. The machinery of consultation and discussion has been greatly extended in the last

twenty years, and the considered opinion of the body of Local Authorities has come to carry much more weight. Indeed, it may be said without hesitation that as between the Central Authority and those great Local Authorities with whom consultation is most frequent and intimate, there has been the greatest accession of prestige and influence to the Local Authorities. But it is inevitable that if expenditure is to remain the recognised basis on which the burden of maintaining locally administered services is to be shared, and, indeed, if the idea of partnership is not to be abandoned, the Central Authority must retain an effective voice, however broad the lines on which it is exercised, in the determination of the local expenditure to which it contributes. The problem of retaining both the necessary measure of central control and the great advantages of local responsibility, initiative and energy, is a problem of high statesmanship, which now presents itself in many fields besides those of education.

NOTE.

The chief problems of educational finance are illustrated in the series of memoranda on the Board's Estimates, supplementary to the Notes on the Estimates themselves, which have been presented to Parliament since 1922. (Cmd. 1922, 1638; 1923, 1841; 1924, 2148; 1925, 2386, 1926, 2688.) For 1926-1927 the total net expenditure in England and Wales, from rates and taxes, on educational services within the purview of the Board was estimated at £76,034,000, of which £44,158,000 would fall on taxes and £31,876,000 on rates. The total does not include public

expenditure on university and agricultural education, which in 1924-1925 amounted to £1,843,346, nor expenditure within the purview of the Home Office, the Ministry of Health, the Ministry of Pensions, the Ministry of Labour, the War Office, and the Department of Scientific and Industrial Research.

The Board's grants to Local Education Authorities were estimated for 1926-1927 at £37,364,000, related to an assumed net expenditure of £70,960,000, of which £58,460,000 is for elementary and £12,500,000 for higher education.

For 1924-5 the grant for elementary education, as a percentage of local expenditure, ranged in different areas from 49 per cent. to 70.6 per cent.; the average proportion being 56.6 per cent.

The expenditure on the salaries of 167,730 teachers for elementary schools was assumed for 1926-1927 at £41,270,000.

The total expenditure on salaries of all teachers in State-aided Schools within the purview of the Board is about 52 millions, or about 71 per cent. of the aggregate expenditure on the service.

The complexity of the problems of equitably distributing grants, whether fixed or not, between a large number of Local Authorities may be illustrated from the range of variation in their net expenditure per child on elementary education and certain items which compose it. It reflects both variation in the necessary local cost which is uncontrollable, and variation in the standards of adequacy adopted by authorities and their activity in providing educational facilities. Salary expenditure is now standardised as regards the scales of salaries, but not as regards the number and qualifications of teachers, and thus the range of salary expenditure per child represents both necessary expenditure, according to the scale allocated to the area, and discretionary expenditure reflecting the local standard of the authority.

Tables analysing the cost per child for elementary education in each area were published by the Board in 1923 and 1926.

For elementary education the range of local expenditure *per child* was approximately in 1924-1925 :—

						Average.	
	s.	*d.*		*s.*	*d.*	*s.*	*d.*
Total expenditure from	152	10	to	346	6	233	3
Salary ,, ,,	117	5	,,	248	5	166	7
Loan charges ,,	nil		,,	28	7	11	8
Administration ,,	3	9	,,	26	0	10	10
"Other" expenditure,,	10	7	,,	58	9	32	10
"Special Services" ,,	2	2	,,	33	9	11	4

Care must be used in drawing inferences from such figures as to the extravagance or parsimony of individual authorities. The circumstances which determine cost per child differ so widely from one area to another that without knowledge of them it is impossible to deduce a standard figure of cost above which expenditure is excessive and below which it is inadequate. The uneven distribution of the burden of educational expenditure as between rich and poor areas, where the produce of a penny rate per elementary school child ranges from 1*s.* 4*d.* to 12*s.* 7*d.*, is illustrated by the fact that the rate in the pound equivalent to the expenditure of Local Authorities falling on rates ranges, for elementary education, from 9.3*d.* to 53.9*d.*

To some extent this inequality is due to difference of method or practice in the assessment of property to local rates, reform in which was, as long ago as 1901, regarded as essential to a proper system of Local Government finance, and which now is happily in progress.

Chapter VI

INSPECTION AND EXAMINATION

In Chapter III inspection was mentioned as one of the agencies by which the Central Authority tries to attain its objects whether expressed as "efficiency" or "value for money." The scope and character of inspection have naturally changed with the wider conception of the service of education, its more complete organisation, and the general improvement of its apparatus, but historically and logically this function of the Board rests on the necessity both of supervising and safeguarding the expenditure of public money and of getting the largest possible return for it.

Broadly speaking, central inspection of subsidised public services always has two sides—protective and constructive. On the first side of his work the inspector checks and verifies compliance with general or particular conditions attached to the distribution of public money. But the efficacy of regulations is limited; in England there has usually been a wholesome dislike of minutely particular regulations, and the more general they are the less they lend themselves to mechanical verification. It is the spirit rather than the letter of their observance which matters, and there is no way of getting at this except through personal observation.

Every State-aided public service is challenged by

the question whether and in what degree it is fulfilling the purpose for which public money is spent on it, and whether it is fulfilling it in a greater degree as more money is spent on it. This lies behind all other questions and is perpetual. At times the answer seems so uncertain that special inquiries by Royal Commissions, Select Committees, or Departmental Committees are instituted, but whatever their value, no one doubts that intermittent investigation is no effective substitute for continuous observation, which goes right down into the actual working of the service. The process by which an inspector endeavours to answer or provide material for an answer to the perpetual question is a process of criticism based on comparison in many instances of good, bad and indifferent performance and appreciation of the factors relevant to performance—a process which demands not only knowledge and experience and common sense but a good deal of imagination and sympathy. And anyone worth his salt who is engaged in such work, especially for so lively a service as education, inevitably becomes a good deal more than a reporter of compliance or non-compliance with specified conditions of State aid. He becomes a constructive agent doing all he can on behalf of the Central Authority by admonition, criticism, advice and encouragement, to build up a higher standard of performance and get better and better value for public money. Even in the earliest days, when, for diplomatic reasons, the nominal functions of inspectors of education were most restricted, their actual functions were extensively constructive. They

were quite as much missionaries as inspectors, and when they came under public criticism in 1861 it was not because they did or tried to do too much but because they had not been able to effect more. And in those days the amount of public money concerned was trifling.

The Board's inspectorate forms an organised body with now not far short of a century of continuous history behind it. Our system of State inspection for education is quite unlike foreign systems, and is, in its merits as well as in its defects, at any rate a native growth. It was not instituted to satisfy the demands of any theory, certainly not of any educational theory.

Organisation of the Inspectorate

In the period 1903-1905 the inspectorate, previously divided between the Education Department in Whitehall and the Science and Art Department in South Kensington, was consolidated and reorganised in five groups corresponding to the five main branches of education—elementary, secondary, technical, training of teachers and art. A body of women inspectors (the first of whom were appointed in 1883 and 1890 for needlework and domestic subjects) was also established "to undertake inspection and inqury into all matters especially needing the scrutiny and advice of a woman."

This organisation was based on the view that the main types of educational institutions differed so widely that they required for their inspection men

of different qualifications and experience, that a single man would not be able to master all the problems presented by all of them, and that if he were to deal with all types of institutions in an area, that area could only be a small one in which there might be little variety in the working of each type. It was better therefore that the inspector should be an expert in one type and bring to bear on its problems an experience drawn from a relatively large area in which he would see its working in a number of different forms and under many varying conditions. It was of course recognised that the several types and branches of education could not for purposes of inspection, any more than for purposes of administration, be treated in watertight compartments, and that there must be a great deal of contact and co-operation between the different branches of the inspectorate.

There are now for England three chief inspectors for the elementary, secondary and technical branches respectively, one of whom holds the post of "Senior Chief Inspector" and is responsible for the control and co-ordination of the work of the inspectorate as a whole. The inspection of training colleges and schools of art is also placed under the general supervision of the Senior Chief Inspector. There is also a Chief Woman Inspector responsible, under the Senior Chief Inspector, for organising the inspection of domestic subjects and the co-ordination of information on questions affecting women, girls and younger children. Below these there is a body of nine Divisional Inspectors each of whom, in respect of his territorial division, is responsible to

the Senior Chief Inspector for the co-ordination of the work of the inspectorate in all branches. The principle of unification is not carried below the Divisional Inspectors, and the District and Assistant Inspectors are still distributed in groups each of which deals with one of the main branches of education in an area. There is also a body of "Staff Inspectors," twelve men and ten women, available for use according to their special aptitudes and qualifications under direction of the Chief or Divisional Inspectors in the exploration and treatment of special problems or aspects of education in all branches or in particular branches.

There are also a number of officers on the establishment of the medical branch of the Board who deal, *inter alia*, with the inspection of special schools for mentally and physically defective children, and the inspection of physical exercises in all types of educational institutions.

In Wales there has been a separate inspectorate of the Board since the Welsh Department was formed in 1907, and until 1920 it had a separate Chief Inspector. Its organisation always differed in certain respects from that of the English inspectorate, and in 1915 the distinction between the elementary, secondary and technical branches was abolished and each inspector assumed responsibility for practically all types of educational activity within the area assigned to him. Certain functions are still performed in Wales by members of the English inspectorate in respect of the training of teachers, higher technical work, art and music and matters within the provision of the School

Medical Service. The Welsh inspectorate is now supervised, under the permanent Secretary of the Welsh Department, by two Divisional Inspectors.

Inspection of Elementary Schools

In 1839 the Committee of the Privy Council on Education decided to attach the right of inspection to all future grants and obtained with some difficulty the consent of the Cabinet to the appointment of the first two inspectors. The need for them was not so readily admitted as that for inspectors of factories. The schools were maintained entirely by voluntary effort, and State inspection of them was regarded as intrusion on the ancient province of the Churches. A concordat of 1840 gave the Churches a voice in the appointment of inspectors, and up to 1876 inspection was organised not according to districts but according to the three religious types of schools—Church of England, Nonconformist and Roman Catholic.

The Instructions to Inspectors issued by Dr. Kay (afterwards Sir James Kay Shuttleworth), the first Secretary of the Committee of Council, carefully limited their functions. They were not to interfere with the religious instruction, discipline or management of the schools, they were not to offer advice or suggestions or take upon themselves the functions of school managers, it being their object to collect facts and information "and report them to the Committee." At the same time, however, the constructive function of inspection was clearly

indicated and was expanded in the long series of instructions which followed.*

The institution in 1846 of annual grants in aid of improved teaching staffs gave the inspector a great hold upon the machinery of the schools. In 1853, when annual capitation grants were instituted to encourage regular attendance at school in rural areas, and in 1856, when they were extended to urban areas, a system of continuous State supervision by inspection was established. It is true that the capitation grant was of very modest amount —only £61,183 in 1859, divided among 3,986 schools. Even before 1862 an inspector was expected to do a great deal of examination, but he did not do it with a view to recording specific results, but to enable himself to form a good general judgment of the school, its organisation, the methods of teaching and their effect on the scholars. The procedure of inspectors no doubt varied a good deal according to the taste and the ability of the individual. Matthew Arnold, in his well-known general report of 1863, described, no doubt at its best, how government inspection worked, or should have worked, during the first two decades of its existence.†

* It is interesting to note, however, that in 1860 the first "Code" still said: "The Inspectors . . . are employed to verify the fulfilment of the conditions on which grants are made, to collect information and to report the results to the Committee of Council." A similar passage, indeed, occurs in the Code right down to 1903. This prolonged divergence between official theory and practice affords a pleasant illustration of our respect for continuity.

† "Reports on Elementary Schools," 1852-1882, p. 91. Ed. F. S. Marvin H.M. Stationery Office, 1908.

The inspectors also made general reports, published by the Committee of Council, on the state of education in their districts, which covered a much wider field of social observation than would be appropriate in similar reports to-day, and this brought down on them somewhat severe criticism by the Department and in Parliament in 1862. They throw much light on the social conditions of that period and the difficulty of educating scholars, many of whom Dr. Kay did not hesitate to describe as "brutish."

"*Payment by Results*"

In 1861 the Report of a Royal Commission, with the Duke of Newcastle as Chairman, recognised the valuable work done by the Committee of Council through its system of aid and inspection, particularly in creating a superior class of teachers and pupil teachers. But it thought that, however successful with the older and better scholars, the system failed to impart to the majority of scholars who left school before 11 years of age (only 29.6 per cent. of the scholars were aged 10 years or over) the rudimentary knowledge of reading, writing and arithmetic which were essential. Inspection, however excellent, could not secure this, and recourse must be had to examination and to payment of grants partly on the results of examination of individual children. The Report has a good deal to say about the limitations of inspection. It did not undervalue the general impression of a school's work obtainable from inspection, but a general

impression did not go far enough. It does not discuss or even disclose the grounds of the Commissioners' belief in the complete efficacy of examination, a belief which prevailed for many years afterwards.

Mr. Lowe's "revised Code" of 1862 adopted the main principle of the Newcastle Commission's Report, that we must look to examination rather than inspection to check, test and secure the efficiency of public education, and that State aid should be determined by the results of individual examination of children.* It is true that the Department was most anxious to convince inspectors that the scope of their duties was little changed. "You will judge every school by the same standard that you have hitherto used as regards its religious, moral and intellectual merits. The examination . . . does not supersede this judgment but presupposes it." Experience showed that the Department was trying to combine incompatible ideas, and the tribute which it thus paid to the true idea of inspection was little more than verbal.

Mr. Lowe had his own quarrel with inspection—he was much annoyed by the inclination of inspectors to take refuge in "impalpable essences," such as the "moral atmosphere" or "tone" of a school, and their habit of treating a school as something distinct from the scholars. He certainly had the inspectors against him, and there was perhaps poetic

* Inspectors also were partly paid by results, a bonus of £50 being given to Inspectors and Assistant Inspectors who in the year had marked examination schedules for 12,000 and 24,000 children respectively! These were known as the "penny payments."

justice or injustice in the fate which befell him. He resigned in consequence of a vote of censure by the House of Commons for alleged mutilation of inspectors' reports, a charge from which he was subsequently exonerated by a Select Committee. In connection with this incident, the principle was established that an inspector's report was not to be altered without his consent. At that time, however, inspectors were allowed much greater liberty to express their own opinions in the Reviews and non-official publications than the practice of the Civil Service would now permit. Matthew Arnold took full advantage of this liberty, and the freedom with which, even in his official reports, he criticised the policy of the Department is remarkable.*

The revised Code of 1862 (which was a milder version of a revised Code put out in 1861) provided that every child over 8 years of age was to be examined every year by an inspector in reading, writing and arithmetic, and—the vital matter—that the amount of the grants was to depend as to two-thirds upon the examination results and as to one-third upon the attendance. This Code was subsequently modified in various ways, but its essential feature, viz. the dependence of grants upon the results of the examination of individual children, remained unaltered. Upon it the practice both of elementary schools and of inspectors was based for over thirty years, and, though it died an unregretted death in the 'nineties of the last century, its influence may still be traced in many

* *Ibid.* General Reports for 1863 and 1869.

ways in the language (e.g. the organisation of schools in "standards"), conception and working of elementary education. As was inevitable in an examination imposed by a Central Authority, its uniform character allowed no scope for variety as between school and school; the standard it prescribed was below what the more intelligent children could achieve; its results were minutely and unreasonably related to the Government grant, and, perhaps worst of all, its demands left no time over for teachers and inspectors to think of anything else. In its initial stages, and for so long as it was concerned only with a minimum standard of education, the system worked; but, as the minimum gradually and inevitably rose, and fresh subjects of instruction and other aspects of education came to be assessed for grant, it became at length so complicated as to be almost unworkable.

The Act of 1870 had a great effect on the educational system; the number of children increased and more inspectors were wanted. Religious instruction was removed from the purview of the inspector by the abolition of the 1840 concordat and the inspectorate was organised according to districts instead of according to the denominational character of the schools. The curriculum was widened and successive attempts were made to mitigate the crudity of the 1862 system by the institution of grants for "specific subjects," "class subjects," "organisation" and "discipline," and a "merit grant," and by a change in the method of paying the grant. These changes widened the scope of examination and also threw on the inspector

the burden of assessing variable grants for each school under a large number of heads. The instructions to inspectors became most elaborate.

In 1886 a Royal Commission, with Lord Cross as Chairman, took a great deal of conflicting evidence on the system of "payment by results," and the majority as well as the minority were fully conscious of its mischievous consequences for teachers, children and inspectors.

They found in the evidence of the teachers "a very heavy indictment of the system"; it was represented that if it was true in 1861 that the younger and duller children were neglected in favour of the brighter and more advanced, in 1888 the brighter children were being sacrificed to the necessity of getting a high percentage of passes; that if in 1861 the teachers had insufficient motives to exertion, in 1888 their reputation and emoluments were so dependent on examination results that, being human, they tended to think of little else, and as subjects of instruction were "priced" they naturally chose those which paid best; the system demoralised the teachers; that if in 1861 the schools were easy going, in 1888 there was much overpressure both of teacher and child; "the Code drives the teacher and the teacher drives the child." They found that the existing system did involve a grave risk of sterile over-pressure. Mr. Charles Alderson, himself one of H.M. inspectors, gave figures to show how perfunctory the individual examination of three million children must necessarily be, and declared that "the chief objection to compulsory recorded individual examination is

that it is omnivorous . . . it has crowded out inspection." "At present the inspector works entangled in a network of Lilliputian regulations." The majority were quite clear that the existing system must be greatly modified, but found a good deal of difficulty in saying how. The minority saw no escape from the mischief of the present system except in the establishment of "local representative authorities over sufficiently extensive areas with full power of management and responsibility for maintenance," the present system being "forced upon the country by the irresponsible and isolated character of the management of the majority of our schools."

Both reports still laid great stress on the importance of examination, and the minority declared that "there should be a searching yearly examination" of every school, but it was to be subordinate to inspection, the object of which is to "ascertain the value of the work and the possibility of improving it," "making allowance for all the circumstances which affect the work of the school."

1890–1902

The Royal Commission reports were the beginning of the end. Between 1890 and 1895 the Department realised that an inspector could not successfully combine the functions of certifying on "ascertained results" that certain grants were payable in respect of instruction and those of maintaining and raising the standard of education by personal influence, criticism, remonstrance, advice and exhortation.

The extent of examination was greatly modified.* In 1898 inspectors were told not to use "any of the processes hitherto employed in formal examination," and any formal record of examination was prohibited, except where it was required to convince the managers that the inspectors' unfavourable judgment of the methods of teaching was justified by unfavourable results.

In 1899 and 1900 it was suggested to inspectors that they would do well to confine even their oral questioning of the scholars to supplementing the teacher's own questions and not to set written exercises except in the higher standards.

In 1901 it was declared that the teacher's own examinations were the only examinations that it was desirable to continue, though the inspector was allowed to "put a few simple questions on the subject of the lessons and also on other parts of the school work."

The Act of 1902 provided the solution advocated by the minority of the Royal Commission in 1888 —the establishment of Local Education Authorities operating in most cases over extensive areas provided with the means and charged with the duty of keeping all public elementary schools efficient. The idea, however, that the State would be able to dispense with central inspection of schools and content

* One of those most eloquent in denunciation of the theory and practice of external examinations has expressed much doubt as to the wisdom of the sudden gift of freedom to the teachers in 1895. "For thirty-three years they had been treated as machines and they were suddenly asked to behave as intelligent beings." Edmond Holmes, "What is and what might be," p. 111. Constable, 1911.

itself with general supervision of public education and seeing that Local Authorities did their duty, did not go very far. It is obvious that in the period preceding the Act of 1902 the reaction against formal examination carried the Department a very long way in the direction of fettering the discretion of inspectors to satisfy themselves as to the efficiency of schools in any way other than simple observation. Till 1909 the Code contained provisions limiting the scope of examination in the course of inspection. In 1909 the function of examination in relation to inspection was put on the footing on which it still stands. "Inspectors have properly used a wide discretion as to the appropriate methods of arriving at a definite opinion of the value of the education and training given to the children in a school . . . they have freely questioned the scholars and set exercises with a view to giving precision to their general impressions."

In 1904 and 1908 the Board's grants became pure capitation grants on an age basis, subject only to reduction on the ground of demerit. Henceforward there was no payment related to the results of the inspector's judgment; specified grants were automatically paid unless he recommended that they should be reduced or withheld.

Inspectors now aim at doing what Matthew Arnold described in his report of 1863, mentioned above. They always, or almost always, question the children freely on their work, especially towards the top of the school where the children have, or should have, the most to talk about. But they also feel that something more exact and searching is needed

than the formation of a general impression. Clearly, this cannot be done for the whole school, there is neither the time nor the staff; it remains, therefore, to combine with the oral questioning some exercise of a definite kind done on paper. In places where such regular testing as this had gone out of fashion for some years, it was found that the children had gone back seriously in their power of tackling a definite problem, of doing a piece of work thoroughly, neatly, and with orderliness and application, that is, in just those qualities that the old elementary training at its best had cultivated in the scholars.

After 1902 the Board ceased to issue "Instructions to Inspectors" (which in 1897 had become more voluminous than the Code and its schedules), and in 1905 they expressed their views as to the method and content of elementary education in a volume of "Suggestions to Teachers," indicating the features which characterised the best practice and affording a general basis for constructive criticism. The annual reports by inspectors had already given way to reports in alternate years, and in 1907 the Treasury consented to be satisfied with reports once in three years.

Examinations in Elementary Schools

The question of the use and abuse of examinations, which will probably be debated till the end of the educational world, has come up again recently in respect of examinations conducted by Local Education Authorities of children in elementary schools

for the award of "free places" in secondary schools. A Departmental Committee recommended* that "qualification for admission as a free place pupil should normally be determined by a written test in English and arithmetic, followed by an oral examination (with reference to school record) designed to test capacity and promise rather than attainment; *all pupils in public elementary schools between* 11 *and* 12 *at the date of examination being examined.*" Referring to the objection that this arrangement "would reintroduce into the primary schools the evils of a general external examination and would lead to a loss of teaching freedom and to invidious comparisons between teachers and schools," the Committee thought that the examination they had in view was so different in purpose and character from the kind of examination which some teachers remembered and justly feared, that it was unlikely to lead to a recrudescence of the old evils; they contemplated, indeed, that the teachers themselves should take a large part in conducting it, and concluded that if there were risks they were outbalanced by the advantages. Four members of the Committee expressed their strong dissent from the last part of the Committee's recommendation which they characterised as "a blunder of the first magnitude."

The practice of including in the "free place" examination all children in elementary schools at about the age of 11 is a growing one (it prevails in the areas of about 144 Authorities), and in any case a very large number of children are examined for

* Report of 1920. Cd. 768.

that purpose.* The Board itself in 1924 conducted through its inspectors, with the co-operation of teachers, an examination in arithmetic of some 55,000 children in about 1,250 elementary schools of all kinds in different parts of England, with a view to finding out how much children know when they leave school and illustrating thereby the efficiency of the teaching, and incidentally how the performance of children at the present day compares with that of children under the old system of individual examination. The results, which were neither alarming nor wholly reassuring, were summarised in a pamphlet published by the Board in 1925.† There are indications that Local Education Authorities will not be content to rely entirely on inspection, especially if its volume is curtailed, and dispense entirely with some form of examination in elementary schools, over and above the examinations ordinarily conducted by the head teacher and staff in each school. They are sensitive to public opinion, and though the censure of employers of children when they leave school may be discounted as undiscriminating, they cannot disregard it. The proposition that all the evils which attached to the old system, when grants and salaries were largely

* *See* Consultative Committee's Report of 1926, p. 132-9. The Committee recommended a general examination of all children at the age of 11 + to discover the type of " post primary " school most suitable to the child's abilities and interests.

† The London County Council also in 1924 issued a report on the standard of attainment in Public Elementary Schools " based on an examination of 3,000 children in forty-eight departments who were within one year of the statutory leaving age.

determined by the results of an examination conducted under conditions which condemned it to failure, must inevitably be reproduced in an examination directed to a different end and conducted in a different spirit, is disputable.

Science, Art and Technical, etc., Schools

The Science and Art Department, which was transferred to the Education Department in 1856 and found a home at South Kensington, did its work mainly through written examinations centrally regulated and related to centrally prescribed syllabuses. Such inspection as there was, was chiefly concerned with the administration of the examinations. In 1872 there were only two inspectors, assisted part-time by officers of the Royal Engineers. The grants were awarded on results, and the schools or classes were regarded as little more than collections of grant-earning units till 1893, when the system of payment by results was modified and, particularly in respect of organised science schools, inspection was seriously undertaken. The idea that in that field of education in which the student primarily thinks of obtaining an equipment for industrial, commercial or professional occupations, central examination has special utility, is of old standing. It has found expression in such bodies as the Society of Arts, the City and Guilds Institute and the Union of Lancashire and Cheshire Institutes, as well as in the great professional institutes. The general object of their examinations has been to secure standardised courses of instruction and

standardised judgment of attainments, so that certificates or qualifications awarded in the result of examination would have a definite meaning and value all over the world.

National Certificates

In 1911 the Board announced the discontinuance of its external examinations in elementary stages of science and art, but not of the more advanced examinations which were not given up until 1917. The Board's first plan of internal examinations, assessed by independent persons, did not go far, and the abandonment by the Board of its old system of examinations gave an impetus to other examining bodies. These bodies, however, acted independently, and it was not possible until after the war had come to an end and schools had resumed their normal activities to make any fresh and more satisfactory plan. In 1921, however, the Board came to an agreement with the Institution of Mechanical Engineers for the award of National Certificates endorsed by the Board in mechanical engineering, and subsequently schemes of co-operation with the Institute of Chemistry and the Institute of Electrical Engineers, and, on rather different lines, with the Institute of Gas Engineers, were arranged. All these schemes have been successful, and the majority of schools which are eligible to participate in them are now doing so. In each case a Joint Committee representative of the institution and of the Board is established, the Board's representatives always being inspectors

with expert knowledge of the branch of instruction concerned. The field of technology, moreover, is so wide and variegated that the work of inspection is peculiarly difficult. The organisation and supervision of suitable training for industries so different as engineering, dyeing, textiles, boot and shoe manufacture and printing, presents problems of the greatest variety and complexity. In this field the inspector has not only to be inventive but capable of securing the co-operation and personal assistance of persons concerned in the industries and the adjustment of plans of technical education to the changing conditions of industries.

One of the most important duties which has been placed on the Board's technological inspectors in recent years is that of organising and conducting short courses of instruction intended to increase the knowledge and skill of teachers in technical schools, in respect of commerce, building, textile, boot and shoe and engineering subjects. There is at present no public provision for the training of persons who aim at becoming teachers in this type of school. Indeed, it is difficult to envisage any economical and workable scheme of training in a field where industrial and commercial experience of so many kinds counts for so much. Apart from their specialist activities connected with technological education, the inspectors of this branch deal with a vast mass of miscellaneous education provided in day and evening continuation schools and classes, junior technical schools, trade schools, the various forms of adult education, whether under the auspices of the Workers' Educational Association or other

organisations, which present special problems to the inspectors, and afford a field in which their is room both for wide sympathy and cool criticism.

Inspection of Secondary Schools

In the field of secondary education, or rather that part of it which is traditionally given in "secondary schools," the view that the interests of the public are best secured by a co-ordinated system of inspection and examination is of long standing, though the effective organisation of such a system began only in 1904-1905. Its development has been little affected either by the system of "payment by results" or by the reaction from it. Though in the period between 1893 and 1903 the Science and Art Department made considerable advances towards the establishment of a system of inspection in connection with its limited distribution of grants (in 1901-1902 they amounted to £314,000 only), a new start was made in entirely new circumstances, when the regulations of 1904-1905 defined what was meant by a secondary school as recognised by the Board, and established a system of grants in aid of the maintenance of secondary schools as such.

The Schools Inquiry Commission of 1864 to 1868 regarded central inspection as indispensable to secure efficiency in endowed schools, and recommended that their examination should be in the hands of "Courts of Examiners" with which inspectors would be closely associated. The Endowed Schools Act of 1869 conferred no powers of inspection, and Mr. Forster's idea of a State guaranteed examination

which would give parents, who were the paymasters of the teachers, a better chance of extracting "results" in return for their payments, did not materialise. Provisions requiring that the whole school should be annually examined by an external examiner were, however, commonly inserted in schemes for endowed schools. From 1874 onwards the Charity Commissioners pressed without success for powers of inspection, and in 1888 they began a series of inspections of endowed schools, ostensibly for the purpose of seeing how their schemes were working. In 1858 the institution of Local Examinations by the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, and in 1874 the establishment by them of a "Joint Board" for leaving examinations in schools, were stages in a movement which brought London and other modern Universities into the business of school examinations The Treasury regulations made under the Welsh Intermediate Education Act of 1889 required yearly inspection and examination of the schools coming under that Act, and in 1896 entrusted those functions to a representative Central Welsh Board. The Royal Commission of 1894-1895 recommended inspection of schools by persons appointed and paid by the Local Authority but approved by the Central Authority and working under regulations made by the Central Authority. The Commission's apprehension of the dangers of State control found an echo in the Board of Education Act of 1899. The Board of Education Bill of 1898 gave the Board power "to visit, inspect and examine any school," but as regards schools not subject to the Charitable Trusts or Endowed

Schools Acts only with the consent of the Governing Body. The Bill was dropped and the Act of 1899 gave no power to the Board to examine or, unless the schools desired, to inspect schools. Under that Act there were a considerable number of inspections between 1900 and 1904, but the latter year introduced a new era. Inspection by the Board was made a condition of grants, and was necessarily free. Free inspection was extended to endowed schools, and in 1906 to such schools as, without receiving grants, desired to be classed as "efficient."

It may here be noted that apart from the schools receiving grants, many of the older public schools have voluntarily availed themselves of the Board's inspection, and of the 127 schools in England which are represented on the Headmasters' Conference only 14 have not been inspected by the Board. The secondary schools which do not receive grants but are classed as "efficient" in the result of inspection, numbered 288 in 1924-1925 (of which 169 were endowed schools or schools of similar type) educating about 54,000 pupils. There were also 95 schools on a separate list of "efficient" preparatory schools, educating about 8,000 pupils.

One of the first steps which the Board took after 1904 was to develop the system of "Full Inspections," which has been the outstanding feature of secondary school inspection for fifteen or twenty years past.* A full inspection takes place at comparatively long intervals, lasts from two to four days, is conducted by a body of inspectors, one of whom is the district inspector who knows the school and

* *See* Report of the Board for 1913–14, p. 10.

visits it periodically, and aims at reviewing thoroughly the whole administration, work and life of the school. A secondary school covers a wide variety of subjects; it may, and often does, carry many of them to an advanced stage; it may include on its staff men of acknowledged eminence in various branches of learning. But the value of the work which a school does cannot be estimated by a mere review of the subjects taught; it is a living thing; its life, which may have behind it a long historic tradition, extends beyond the class-room and must be grasped as a whole. The reason why a body of inspectors should undertake its inspection is not so much that the skill of specialists is needed to inspect the work of specialists, but that a collective judgment of all sides of the school life and work is necessary for the appreciation of what it is and does. The inspectors do not make any claim to be either abler or better teachers or schoolmasters than many whom they meet in the course of their work, nor have any such claims ever been preferred on their behalf. Most teachers recognise that the claim of the Board's inspectors to advise is based on the fact that they see all sorts and conditions of schools and can gather ideas from them all. The teacher's own intensive experience is supplemented by the inspector's extensive experience; there is exchange of ideas between the two sides, nor does it appear that the difference of function between them need, or as a rule does, create any feeling of antagonism. And one of the most fruitful features of such an inspection is the meeting with the governing body which concludes

it and the frank interchange of opinions. In 1922 the Board decided that full inspections should normally be held at intervals of ten instead of five years, though the interval will naturally be elastic and depend on the circumstances of the schools. In some cases arrangements have been made for intermediate inspection by Universities. The average number of full inspections held in the years 1908-1915 was about 200, and after rising to 327 in 1920 owing to war arrears and the number of new schools requiring first inspections, they numbered 208 in 1924-1925. It must not, of course, be supposed that the work of the inspectors of secondary schools is confined to that of full inspections. In recent years special visits of a less formal character, usually by two inspectors, have been frequently arranged, at the request of the Head Teacher, to inquire into the work in particular subjects.

As regards examinations in secondary schools, the Board has made considerable progress in the direction of checking the preparation of pupils for miscellaneous external examinations, which had in the absence of any central control become a serious mischief. In 1917 the Board propounded a scheme for concentrating the examination of pupils in secondary schools in the hands of examining bodies for whom the universities would take responsibility. A most important feature of the scheme was the establishment of a representative Council to secure the co-ordination of examinations and standards (*see* p. 209). The examinations are divided into first and second examinations, designed for pupils of

the ages of about 16 and 18 respectively.* The second examinations are used for the award of the "State scholarships" to universities, which were established in 1920, the nomination of candidates being entrusted to the examining bodies. They are also used to an increasing extent for the award of scholarships by Local Authorities.

Criticisms of the System of Inspection

The Board's system of inspection does not suffer for lack of criticism. It is not infrequently declared that the aggregate volume of inspection, central and local, is too great, that there is duplication of central and local inspection, that the schools are harassed and their work interrupted by "hordes of inspectors," that Local Authorities, managers and teachers are embarrassed and put to unnecessary expense by the different demands and "fads" of successive inspectors, or (alternatively) that inspection is dominated by an ideal of cast-iron uniformity and tends to suppress initiative and discourage experiment, and that the best way to get good value for public money is to get good teachers and "leave it to them," trusting that if they are not good they will somehow or other be got rid of.

* In 1924-25 the first examination was taken by 40,732 pupils from 1,261 grant-aided schools, and the second by 5,665 pupils from 905 grant-aided schools, the percentage passing in the first examination being 70 per cent., and in the second 67 per cent. In addition, about 10,000 candidates from other schools sat for the first and 1,300 for the second examination.

As regards the allegation that schools are over-inspected, it is obvious that in the case of secondary schools a full inspection about once in ten years cannot be regarded as too frequent, if it is desirable at all. In the case of elementary schools it was found in 1922 that the Board's inspectors had great difficulty in reporting on them at regular intervals, and that 26 per cent. of them had not been the subject of a formal report for three years or more. The recent reductions in the establishment of the inspectorate affords further security against over-inspection.

As regards "duplication" of inspection by the Board and the Local Education Authorities, inquiry was made in October, 1922, and the results were summarised in a memorandum presented to Parliament (Cmd. 1878). The inquiry showed that the work of the Local Authorities' inspectors was complementary rather than parallel to that of the Board's inspectors, and was usually work which could not be done at all or at all events not so well by an officer of a Central Authority, and did not in fact duplicate the work of the Board's inspectors, though, as in the case of London, it did enable the Board to employ fewer inspectors. Quite apart from ordinary inspecting work, the employment of outside officers by Local Authorities to act as their eyes and ears and agents is necessary for the transaction of business the detail of which is enormous. In the case of some of the larger authorities employing a relatively large number of inspectors, working arrangements to avoid duplication are made between the two bodies of inspectors. There is reason to believe that Local Authorities generally

would like more rather than less inspection of their schools by the Board's officers, and there is certainly no reason to believe that they would like to take over the whole function of inspection. As regards the invasion of the schools by "hordes of inspectors," the full inspection of a secondary or a technical school has its obvious inconveniences, and no doubt everyone is glad when it is over. But those inconveniences cannot be altogether avoided. As regards elementary schools also, it is by no means easy so to arrange the visits of district inspectors, specialist inspectors, and local inspectors or organisers that they shall not clash or come too soon after each other.

As regards divergence of opinion or practice among inspectors, the difficulty of maintaining a consistent standard in inspection was recognised long ago, and in 1882 and 1883 the Department directed the holding of periodical conferences in divisions, "so as to secure substantial uniformity of judgment and practice throughout the country." The divisional conferences of inspectors are a well-established agency for the exploration of problems and for settlement of common lines of action. They are also periodically attended by administrative officers, who explain and discuss with the inspectors developments in the Board's policy or its application. The inspector certainly does not live an isolated life, and, even if his views are peculiar, does not develop them in solitude. The influence of the general body may as a rule be trusted to correct in an individual inspector tendencies to undue severity or undue laxity or eccentricity. But human nature

is fallible, and it is of course inevitable that the operations of a large body of men and women in so varied a field, touching so many interests, so beset by conflicting opinions, should not always be consistent or command approval. The charge of affection for uniformity, or dislike of originality, is probably one which can be least easily maintained against inspectors.

As regards the teachers in the schools which he inspects, it is clearly part of the inspector's duty to criticise the manner in which they perform their duties when he finds occasion for criticism. Among so large a body of men and women of all ages there are bound to be some whose performance of their duties is unsatisfactory in various degrees. It is in the interests of the public, the schools and the teaching profession, that those who fail in their duty should be stimulated to do it better or, in the last resort, should be eliminated. A good teacher has no reason to fear or resent such criticism as is incidental to inspection. If the condition of a school as a whole or any part of it is found to be unsatisfactory and that condition is attributable to any member of the staff, it is the practice for the inspector to communicate to the head teacher or to the teacher concerned the substance of any seriously adverse criticism which will appear in the report in order that he may have an opportunity of explanation or defence.

Any extensive study of inspectors' reports would convince an impartial reader that they do not err on the side of excessive fault-finding.

Constructive and Administrative Work

The inspector, however, is by no means entirely engaged in inspecting and reporting on individual schools. He often, by himself or in association with others, investigates the teaching of a particular subject or a particular problem of organisation as illustrated in the schools of an area or schools in different areas.* Inspectors are also often members of Departmental Committees and of numerous Office Committees set up to explore administrative problems.

An inspector also attends conferences that may be held on educational matters outside and inside his own district, and may himself arrange for holding such conferences from time to time.†

The provision by the Board of supplementary

* Among recent published reports of such investigations may be mentioned that of 1912 on the teaching of needlework in elementary schools, that of 1916 on the teaching of French in London secondary schools, that of 1919 on promotion in elementary schools in London, that of 1925 on the teaching or arithmetic in elementary schools, and that of 1926 on the position of French in grant-aided secondary schools in England.

† As regards contact between Inspectors and that part of the public which is interested in Education, the Department showed some nervousness in 1870, and in 1876 forbade them to attend public meetings to discuss educational topics. It is, of course necessary for an Inspector to use a good deal of discretion if he is to avoid embarrassing inferences as to his attitude in matters of controversy, but in 1900 Inspectors were told by the Board to encourage and attend local meetings to discuss changes in the programmes of town and country schools, but not to join in any vote approving or disapproving the action of the Board or urging any course of action upon them.

short courses for teachers in the technique of teaching particular subjects, which are usually held in the vacations, has opened to inspectors another line of direct work for the improvement of teaching. These courses have been organised and largely conducted by inspectors, who have, however, been successful in enlisting the co-operation of distinguished scholars. In addition to part-time and full-time courses organised by Local Education Authorities and other bodies, which in 1924-1925 were attended by nearly 34,000 teachers, there were held in 1925 some forty short full-time courses in various subjects in all branches of education, attended by over 1,500 teachers. In this field of work at all events the relations between teachers and inspectors are those of cordial and even enthusiastic co-operation, and possibly in it the State secures the largest return for a relatively small expenditure.

In recent years many duties of an administrative or quasi-administrative kind have been allotted to inspectors. Inspectors have to transact much business with the Local Authorities, upon whom the Education Acts of 1902 and 1918 laid the responsibility for the maintenance of all branches of State-aided education in their respective areas. Inspectors may be regarded in their districts as intermediaries between the Central and Local Authority, and it is their duty to maintain by every means in their power those co-operative relations which the Act of 1918 contemplated. The inspector must not only keep himself and keep the Board informed on important matters of local administration and policy, and place his own experience and

advice unreservedly at the Local Authority's disposal; he must also, on occasion, use his personal influence to lubricate the action of official machinery and to adjust the difficulties which are bound from time to time to arise in the working of any official system.

In this sphere, the Board has devolved upon inspectors a good deal of responsibility for taking or approving action on matters which can better be dealt with locally and personally than by correspondence. Still wider functions have come to them in consequence of the Act of 1918. The inspector may often be called upon to take part in the central and local discussions involved by the programmes and forecasts of expenditure which Local Authorities are required to submit, e.g. on questions of relative urgency as between various proposals. These and numerous other matters which are always arising call for the joint consultation and advice of the inspectors responsible for all branches of education in the district.

In recent years, moreover, the Board's position as the adviser of other Government departments in educational matters, following the recommendation of successive Departmental Committees, has been more extensively recognised, and they now maintain a close contact with other departments that are concerned with education in their own spheres. As regards school work, the education provided in industrial schools, reformatory schools and Borstal institutions is inspected by the Board on behalf of the Home Office, and that provided in Poor Law schools on behalf of the Ministry of Health

Inspectors may also be called upon to advise on references as to educational matters from e.g. the Colonial Office, the War Office and the Air Ministry.*

Recruitment of Inspectorate

Since the functions which the inspector is now asked to perform are so many and important they must obviously be men and women of high quality, and it may fairly be asked how and on what principles does the State choose them. At the present time, following the recommendation of the Royal Commission on the Civil Service of 1912, all recruits for the inspectorate are chosen and recommended to the President of the Board by a Selection Committee, on which a representative of the Civil Service Commission sits, with an administrative officer and some inspectors of the Board. On each occasion every endeavour is made to attract suitable candidates for the more specialised posts, and the intention to appoint assistant inspectors is advertised. In all cases candidates are interviewed, and in the case of assistant inspectors the Selection Committee becomes itinerant. The present system of selection and appointment may fairly be regarded as immune against the traditional vices of patronage, and no

* The Board's Inspectors have been freely used for inspecting or advising on education overseas, e.g. in the Falkland Islands, Ceylon, Cyprus, British Guiana, Gibraltar and the Channel Islands; and Inspectors have been exchanged with New Zealand and Ontario. They have also made excursions of inquiry to Scotland, Ireland, Prussia, Sweden, Denmark and Austria, Canada and the United States.

suggestions have been made that it could without grave risk be brought within the field of competitive examination.

As regards the qualifications looked for in inspectors, the provision of education was in early days wholly inadequate, the supply of competent teachers was small, voluntary effort was sporadic and dislike of State intervention was general. The tact of a diplomatist, combined with the zeal of a missionary, was more wanted for a school inspector than any mastery of school technique. It was the inspector's main business to obtain the removal of glaring defects, and he was not called upon to exercise nice or critical discrimination in matters of pedagogy. The early inspectors were perhaps "enlightened amateurs," and, in view of the archiepiscopal confirmation of their appointment which was conceded in the concordat of 1840, they were even described as "itinerant curates." Anyone, however, who reads their reports will have little doubt that they were the kind of men who were wanted, and anyone who reflects on the service of men like Matthew Arnold and Archbishop Temple will hesitate to throw a stone at amateurs of such quality.

The practice of recruiting the inspectorate by the direct appointment of men between the ages of 25 and 35 possessing a university degree with first or second-class honours was followed for many years. It was, however, found necessary as early as 1850 to reinforce the corps of inspectors by a class of "assistant inspectors," a class which, with many changes in name, numbers, functions and relation

to the class of full inspectors, remains to the present day. It has ordinarily been recruited from head teachers of elementary schools, subject in some periods to the qualification of a university degree or success in examination.

At the date of the Cross Commission of 1886-1888 there had been no instance of promotion from the lower to the higher grade of the inspectorate, and the salary of the lower grade was so insufficient as to debar some of the ablest head teachers from entering it. The Commission strongly recommended that the door between the grades should be opened. The principle of the "open door" then laid down has been followed, and in recent years has been conspicuously honoured. The Commission was alive to the view that the unfamiliarity with school work of young men taken from the universities was a defect in the system, and at a later date the device was adopted of interposing between the assistant inspectors and inspectors a class of "junior inspectors" from whom inspectors would ordinarily be recruited. This class became extinct in 1913. The Commission favoured the idea of enlisting women in the work of inspection, though they saw a good many difficulties in it, and suggested the experiment in large towns of appointing women sub-inspectors to assist in the examination of infant schools and children in the lower standards. Women were first appointed as specialists in domestic subjects, and their organised participation in the work of inspection dates from 1905. It is obvious, however, that the Commissioners were strongly impressed by the wide scope and importance of the

duties of an inspector of elementary schools, and they describe them in terms which, *mutatis mutandis*, are still applicable. They certainly regarded inspectors as a great deal more than "peripatetic masters of method." It is clear that in their view "other and higher qualifications" were required in a competent inspector than expertness in the craft or technique of teaching, and that in the selection of inspectors professional qualifications could not be predominant.

In recent years the teaching experience of candidates has certainly not been disregarded in the selection of inspectors; many of them have had long and distinguished records as teachers, and the teaching profession is the main though not the exclusive recruiting ground of the inspectorate. Recently recruitment from the teaching profession has been considerably embarrassed by the rise in teachers' salaries, consequent on the activities of the "Burnham" Committees and by the liberal provision of pensions for them. By its own action in these respects the State has raised the market against itself. At the same time the Board does not take the view that selection for and promotion in the inspectorate should be determined solely or primarily by pedagogical considerations, or that the best teacher necessarily makes the best inspector. The more comprehensive the service of education grows, the longer and wider the vistas which are opened up, the more closely the different stages and branches of education are organised in relation to each other, and the broader the lines on which it is administered, the more important it becomes

to obtain for the inspectorate and keep and promote in it men and women of academic distinction, high general ability, wide outlook and steady sense of balance and perspective, together with those personal qualities which are indispensable for dealing with the great variety of men and women engaged in different capacities in the service of education. An inspector in that service has more need than most people to be a paragon, and if the quest for paragons is to be even occasionally successful, the field of search cannot be circumscribed.

The inspection of education, or of anything else, cannot be regarded as an end in itself; the ideal towards which it works is, or should be, that of rendering itself superfluous. It is certainly to be desired that educational progress should be maintained at such a rate as will, before very long, diminish the need for the inspector's functions of watching and trying to increase the return for public expenditure. The extent, however, to which inspection would be necessary in a perfect system worked by perfect agents is a matter which is hardly likely to call for early consideration.

Chapter VII

REGULATIONS

It is the practice of Parliament to leave to the Privy Council or Government Departments or various public bodies the function of filling up the framework of many statutes, and prescribing the manner in which effect shall be given to their intentions. There are some who consider that this practice is carried too far, that under it the intention of Parliament may be defeated whether by defective or excessive exercise of the powers conferred on the central or local agencies responsible for implementing that intention, and that, as the value of most statutes depends on the way in which they are worked, Parliament ought to prescribe their working much more thoroughly and carefully, and say what it means in terms from which there is no escape by way of subtraction or addition. This contention is supported by high judicial authority. To balance the considerations relevant to it would require a long essay. In support of the practice it may be advanced that the complexity of the modern social organism is so great that only superhuman wisdom could foresee all the circumstances, conditions and situations in which a statute would have to operate, that Parliamentary time is short and Parliamentary procedure is not favourable to the elaborate weighing of pros and cons of particular devices of

administration, and that the public interest suffers if relief from embarrassing or detrimental consequences of minute statutory provisions can only be obtained by an amending statute. The fault most commonly found with the present practice is that it augments the powers of bureaucracy and lends support to its inordinate pretensions.

Statutes are sometimes implemented by "Orders in Council," the solemn form of which suggests, even if they are of Departmental origin, that they are made on the advice of the Government of the day. More commonly they are implemented by Departmental orders, rules or regulations, or by resolutions of Local Authorities where the statutes are adoptive or permissive, or by by-laws of Local Authorities made with Departmental approval. Departmental regulations are, of course, made under the authority of Departmental Ministers, who are solely responsible for them, and whose action is open to criticism in Parliament by way of question, motion, or debate on Departmental estimates. Very commonly also they are now issued in accordance with the procedure prescribed by the Rules Publication Act, 1893, which, except in cases of emergency, requires notice of proposed rules to be published for forty days before they are made and drafts of them to be available for the public, and provides that any representations or suggestions made to the Department concerned by any public body interested shall be taken into consideration by the Department. It is probable that this procedure (which was applied to the Board's regulations by the Act of 1918) affords better protection to the public

against the vagaries of bureaucracy and the alleged impotence of Ministers to control their Departmental officers, and is more convenient than the alternative procedure which requires Departmental regulations to be laid on the table of both Houses of Parliament, while they are sitting, for a month (or other specified period) before they come into force. It is true that regulations can be now made while Parliament is not sitting, but Departments are not usually so unwise as to take advantage of this to avoid probable Parliamentary criticism. Various devices have been suggested to check the bureaucratic arrogance, ineptitude or extravagance expressed in Departmental regulations, and the Board of Education has attracted its full share of such imaginings. The doctrine of ministerial responsibility has hitherto stood in the way of their translation into practical form. It is not easy to get over or get round that solid obstacle. On the other hand the Board has usually, to a greater extent than is commonly realised by its critics, been wise enough or prudent enough to seek advice and criticism from interested bodies or competent persons, whether Local Authorities, or teachers, or local officials or their Associations, or expert individuals, before embarking on important changes in their administrative regulations. There are, of course, occasions—and in recent years there have been several—when under stress of financial or political considerations Departmental decisions have to be made and action taken in circumstances which preclude previous consultation or restrict the time available for it, but ordinarily it is the Board's practice to consult often

and widely those who are concerned in the service of education.

There are many Departmental regulations which are not reinforced, or only to a slight extent, by financial sanctions, though they may have large financial implications. To this class belong mainly the regulations relating to factories, the Poor Law, and sanitation. In many cases the service is governed by local by-laws for which Departmental approval is required. In many also, loans to cover capital expenditure on the service cannot be obtained by Local Authorities without Departmental sanction. In some cases the appointment or removal of local officials, to whose remuneration the Department may or may not contribute, requires Departmental sanction. In other cases the Department has power to displace Local Authorities who do not perform their duties, or perform them improperly. The regulations of the Board of Education belong to the class in which, the service being largely subsidised out of Parliamentary money, the financial sanction is predominant. The Board, as is explained in a previous chapter, has no power to displace a defaulting Local Authority, and has no control over local officials. The scope of local by-laws requiring the Board's approval is small. There are some things which a Local Authority cannot legally do at all without the Board's approval, and many things which they are commanded by statute to do, but, apart from the rusty and cumbrous instrument of "mandamus," the Board's power to get things done, to get them done well, or prevent their being done in the service of education, rests mainly and in the

last resort on the power of the purse, exercised by way of stimulus or penalty.

Looking at the Board's regulations as a statement of the conditions on which grants may be obtained, the position is much simpler than it was. As is pointed out in a previous chapter there has been a movement as between the Central Authority and the local agencies engaged in the service from purchase of education, or payment for educational work done, to a correlated system of central and local finance. In early days the Department's regulations were almost entirely limited to defining the conditions of specific payments, and as the service expanded the regulations governing payment became voluminous and intricate. Almost everything was priced, and the process of settling the price to be paid was elaborate. The establishment of Local Education Authorities in 1902 led to a great consolidation of grants, and in 1918 the statutory establishment of an expenditure basis for grants led to a more extensive consolidation into "block grants." The statement of the conditions of grants and the method of their assessment became broad and simple.

The regulations had, however, for many years contained much that was not mandatory or of direct effect on the determination of grants. They formulated standards of performance which could not be enforced but which should be aimed at, offered guidance towards higher attainment, and warnings against the most common causes of failure. They indicated the lines on which the work and organisation of the schools and the service generally

would be criticised by the Board's inspectors. Indeed, as the service of education developed and improved, the definition of the faults which would entail reduction of grants had become of much less importance, because remonstrance seldom failed to render penal action unnecessary. The secondary purpose of the regulations, to obtain better value for public money, became more prominent than the primary purpose to make sure of minimum value. In 1904, indeed, the Board tried its best to humanise the regulations and so simplify them in phraseology and arrangement that they might serve for edification. The Prefatory Memorandum to the Code of that year said that, whereas the regulations had hitherto been chiefly of value to persons officially concerned in the practical work or administration of education, it was hoped "that the Code in its new form may be read and understood by the general public also, and especially by the parents of children attending or likely to attend public elementary schools." The Code of that year in fact contained a notable "Introduction" summarising the purpose and aims of the public elementary school, and in its first chapter indicated the principal features of a good curriculum. In spite of these attractive features it is perhaps doubtful whether it has been read by many parents of elementary school children. At the same time the Board announced the publication, which followed in the next year, of a volume of "Suggestions to Teachers and others concerned in the work of Public Elementary Schools," in which the methods of giving effect to the ideas or ideals embodied in the

Code were extensively discussed. The Board's view evidently was that a humane and informative Code and a supplementary exposition (in circulars, prefaces to annual reports and regulations) of the way in which its spirit would be best realised, were both necessary for the advancement of education. The other regulations of the Board were revised on the same lines. The Prefatory Memorandum to the Secondary School Regulations of 1903-1904 attempted to define the function of the secondary school as a type of institution "inside the wide and vague scheme of 'education other than elementary' with the provision and organisation of which" the Local Education Authorities had been charged by the Act of 1902. Since in England we do not talk of "primary" or "tertiary" education "the term 'secondary education' has been left in the air, and to this fact in no small measure may be attributed the extreme vagueness with which the term is used, and the actual misuse of it which may be often observed." A secondary school is "one which offers to each of its students up to and beyond the age of 16 a general education, physical, mental and moral, given through a complete graded course of instruction of wider scope and more advanced degree than that given in elementary schools," and the memorandum proceeds to expound the meaning attached to the terms "general," "complete" and "graded" giving effect to these principles, but the money available for grants was very limited and could not finance courses of more than four years for pupils from 12 to 16 years of age. In 1907-1908 the political movement to free

grant-aided schools and institutions from denominational restrictions, to introduce a large element of popular control, and render them more accessible to all classes of the population, led to large changes in the regulations for secondary schools. It was provided that in secondary schools charging fees, a proportion, usually not less than a quarter, of the scholars admitted should be children from public elementary schools without payment of fees. A similar course was taken as regards training colleges, and new regulations were made "designed to secure that candidates shall not in future be debarred from access to training colleges by denominational restrictions," and to secure that all new colleges and hostels should be free from such restrictions or requirements. This period of administration affords a conspicuous illustration of the use of regulations to effect a large and, as would now be agreed, a beneficial change in the system of public education, not on strictly educational grounds but on grounds of national policy.

As regards technical etc., education, the endeavour to establish graded "courses" of instruction in related subjects as distinguished from instruction in unco-ordinated and often disparate subjects given in detached classes, which characterised much of the work formerly aided by the Science and Art Department, began in 1903. It is true that that Department had in science schools advanced a considerable way in that direction, but the great bulk of educational pabulum provided by all sorts of miscellaneous classes was still on an *à la carte* basis rather than a *table d'hôte* basis. The aim of

the Board was to persuade as many purveyors and students as possible to realise the advantages of a well-balanced diet. In 1906-1907 the title of the regulations was changed from "Regulations for Evening Schools, Technical Institutions and Schools of Art and Art Classes" to "Regulations for Technical Schools, Schools of Art and other Schools and Classes (Day and Evening) for Further Education," so as to suggest more clearly "the distinctive features of the schools to which the regulations refer. These schools deal with forms of education which are continuative; that is to say they are based on some degree of previous education and are intended to carry that education further, either on the same lines or in some fresh direction whether general or specialised." At the same time a beginning was made to encourage in county areas, by an "inclusive grant," "complete and systematic provision for the varied types of further education which are needed" on lines which present a remarkable anticipation of some provisions of the Act of 1918 and of the "programme procedure" of 1925 and 1926. It is unfortunate that the idea of working the plan on an expenditure basis, which is peculiarly suitable for a field in which the volume of work is so variable and so dependent on temporary economic conditions such as the state of employment, and even on the condition of the weather, was not then in favour. At the same time a "block grant" was instituted for "a satisfactorily organised school" which occupies "a settled position in the educational scheme of the area, and which provides courses extending over not less than four years."

This provision was specially suitable to urban areas in which such schools would be ordinarily situated, though they might, and often did, serve wider areas than that of the Local Education Authority.

In 1926 the Board's regulations were subjected to a process of evaporation which dissipated their more liquid, volatile and aromatic components and left only a residue of financial solids. The process was effectively and skilfully carried out, and the new regulations have all the neatness of compressed tabloids.

The reduction in bulk was enormous. The Code and its Schedules boiled down from some fifty pages to ten pages; the Secondary School Regulations from twenty-seven pages to eight; the Regulations for "Technical and Further Education" from thirty-seven pages to five; the Regulations for the Training of Teachers from seventy-eight pages to nine. The "Building Regulations" contained in a document of twenty-three pages, largely hortatory and expository, were repealed pending a revision of "the statement of the principles of school planning upon which the Board proceed in criticising the plans submitted to them." The plain man can carry them all in his pocket and read them in a couple of hours, together with the brief circulars explanatory of the changes made in the principal regulations which were issued. The general idea of the draftsman was obviously to eliminate all "mays" and "shoulds" and allow no regulation to survive which cannot say "must." The "prefatory memoranda" which in 1903-1904 and 1904-1905 had expounded the Board's policy

and the spirit which informed the Regulations, and in subsequent years furnished an illuminating commentary on the changes which marked the development of the service, were dropped. In the circulars, however, it is recognised that the regulations will, even for administrative purposes, have to be supplemented by and must be read in the light of other documents, e.g. "Instructions with regard to the Returns and notifications which will be required by the Board, and with regard to certificates needed in respect of them, or of the satisfaction of the conditions of grant, will be issued with any appropriate documents from time to time." As regards the very important substitution of an "approved establishment" of elementary school teachers, and their satisfactory distribution among the schools, in the area of each authority for compliance with requirements for the minimum staffing of each school, it is stated that the Board will continue to be guided by the views expressed in a previous circular (No. 1360) "as indicating a general level below which an authority might reasonably be expected not to fall without some special justification."* Again referring to the omission in the Code of any statement of the subjects of instruction, it is stated that while the curriculum of a school will remain subject to the general approval of the Board, "detailed comment or advice on the

* As regards teachers the new regulations have a cumulative effect. In respect of their recruitment, adjustment of supply to demand, their training and their distribution among the schools, they devolve much of the Board's responsibility and substitute general for particular control.

syllabus will in future be confined to the volume of 'Suggestions for teachers and others concerned in the work of public elementary schools,'" and the general statement is made in the same circular that "The Board's views on matters of educational policy can be expressed in more convenient ways than by inclusion in statutory regulations governing the payment of grant." The historian of the future or the student of educational administration (or the man in the street—if he ever dreams of reading regulations) will certainly not be able to draw from a study of the Board's regulations any but the most general idea of the structure of the system of education.

The question whether it is better for such a service as education, in which a great many groups and kinds of people are concerned, to collect and set out in one volume not only the Board's specific regulations but also any subsidiary instructions and explanations incidental to their working, and what the Board has to say about their intention and the spirit in which they will be administered, or whether it is better to keep text and commentary entirely separate, is mainly a question of convenience. Supplementary documents which are not in the form of regulations have the convenience that they can be modified at any time without formality. But there is no intrinsic virtue in the divorce of a text from its commentary, nor indeed in the brevity of a text if it does not cover the ground and explain itself.

Again the question whether at a given time a service has reached such a point in its development

and has become so stable that the provisions necessary for its regulation can safely be expressed in the simplest and broadest terms without much risk of divergence from the accepted standards by way of unprofitable excess or wasteful defect, is one which can only be decided by study of all the relevant facts and forces of the period, checked by experience of the past and intelligent anticipation. The idea that the aim of regulations should be to render themselves unnecessary is one which those who make them may well admit, and they will rightly take any opportunity of moving in that direction whenever it is safe to do so. The progress of the service of education has been so great in the last twenty-five years, the business of its organisation has become so much more systematic, the majority and perhaps the great majority of Local Authorities have met their responsibilities so well and shown so firm a desire to get the best they can out of it, their officials are so much more competent, their teachers enjoy so greatly improved conditions, and the service makes so strong an appeal to public opinion, that there are many grounds for thinking that the harness of particular regulations can be lightened and the whip left in the coach-house.

On the other hand, a change in regulations from particularity to generality has consequences which must be thought about from two points of view. It appears from the circulars that one of the main objects of recasting the regulations in an abbreviated and general form is to give Local Education Authorities, as regards elementary and secondary education, "a wider field for the exercise of their

discretion," or, as regards "further education," to "leave to the responsible school authorities a larger discretion in such matters" as the formulation of "conditions having an educational intention as guarantees for the quality and standard of the work." A small kernel of specifically imperative provisions is left in the regulations, the operation of which is unmistakable and independent of interpretation by the Board. But the main provisions only sum up under different heads what the authorities are expected to do, and refrain from saying, even by way of guidance, how they are to do it, or by reference to what particular considerations they will be criticised if they do not do it. On the other hand the payment of grant, which is presented as the dominant and exclusive concern of the regulations, is dependent on the absolute discretion of the Board unfettered by any previous declaration of the way in which it will be exercised—whatever the Board does, no appeal can be made to the legal maxim *expressum facit cessare tacitum*—and an endeavour has been made by the Board to express its regulations in "legal language." The payment of grant for "further education" depends on the Board's "recognition" of a school as belonging to one of the types briefly described in a schedule, on its "satisfaction" with the "scope, organisation, courses of study and syllabuses of a school," and with the "suitability of the educational conditions of admission and tests of progress of students."

The regulations for "further education" perhaps carry to the furthest point the application of the principle of generalisation; but in the regulations

for secondary schools and the "Code" for elementary schools, the omission of the large body of details or illustrations contained in previous regulations throws much more weight on general terms such as "recognition" or "approval," or "satisfaction," "efficiency," "sufficiency" and "suitability."

There is nothing new in the reservation to the Board of absolute and final discretion to interpret its own regulations or decide whether grant is or is not payable. That is common form in most Departmental regulations for subsidised services. There is also nothing new in the use of the general terms above mentioned.* But the context is so scanty that it gives hardly any line for their interpretation, and affords little ground for remonstrance against adverse interpretation as going beyond standards indicated elsewhere. Apart from a few mandatory regulations, the regulations might be almost summed up in a single general regulation. It is obvious that if the "satisfaction" of the Board is to be a reality, and based on real knowledge of the working of the system of education as distinguished from its machinery and the facts capable of statistical presentation, its information must be derived more than ever from inspection; and the tendency of the new regulations is to direct the inspector's attention rather to the work of an area as a whole than to particular "cases."

The Board's new regulations are a bold and very interesting experiment. They give a wider discretion

* As is pointed out in Chapter III, "efficient" has meant, for grant purposes, nothing more than "not conspicuously inefficient."

to the Local Authority, and a more absolute because a more general discretion to the Central Authority. In the first respect they move perhaps further and more quickly than was expected in a direction in which all concerned with the central administration of education have wished to move. Whether they are successful will depend entirely on the way and the spirit in which they are worked. If they are worked in the spirit of paymaster and claimant they will make matters very difficult for both parties, especially as their form exposes their working more, and not less, to the influence of political fluctuations. If they are worked in the spirit of partnership, and a genuine acceptance on both sides of the obligations and conditions of partnership, they may contribute greatly to the consolidation of that relation.

Chapter VIII

LOCAL EDUCATION AUTHORITIES

The Present System.

THE public service of education in this country is decentralised, and it is conducted by representative local bodies which are not the agents of the Central Authority. The service is essentially a Local Government service. Although there are a number of governing bodies which conduct State-aided schools and educational institutions, they mostly are, or are coming, under the influence of the Local Education Authorities.

In England and Wales there are 318 Local Education Authorities for elementary education—viz. the Councils of 63 counties, 82 county boroughs, and 173 boroughs and urban districts, having populations of over 10,000 and 20,000 respectively according to the census of 1901.* For higher education there are 145 Local Education Authorities—viz. the Councils of administrative counties (i.e. the area of the geographical county except the areas included in county boroughs) and the Councils of county boroughs. Besides these, 868 boroughs and urban districts inside administrative counties have concurrent but limited powers of spending money on

* Non-county boroughs and urban districts were empowered to relinquish their duties and powers in favour of county Councils, and this has been done in some thirteen cases.

higher education, and about 85 of them still exercise those powers. This system of Local Education Authorities was set up by the Act of 1902.*

Both from an administrative and an educational point of view, the distinction made by the Act of 1902 between areas and Authorities for elementary and higher education is a serious embarrassment. While a County Council administers higher education in the whole of its area, it is excluded from the administration of elementary education in the areas of autonomous boroughs and urban districts. In the administrative county of Lancashire there are as many as twenty-seven of these autonomous Authorities. This arrangement greatly complicates the co-ordination of elementary and higher education.†

It is characteristic of English Local Government that Local Authorities can do only what they are empowered by statute to do. In this respect it differs, in theory if not in practice, from Local Government in many European States and in America, where Local Authorities can do anything for the good of their communities which the law does not forbid them to do. The statutes which confer powers on English Local Authorities may define the limits within which general powers may be exercised, may require that the previous approval

* In addition to the Local Education Authorities the Act recognised as "Minor Local Authorities" for purposes of appointing managers of Elementary Schools, the councils of small boroughs and urban districts, and parish councils or parish meetings. The Act of 1902 was applied to London, with some modification as regards the City and the Metropolitan Boroughs, by an Act of 1903.

† *See* Chapter III, p. 53.

of a Government Department must be obtained for their exercise, may empower Government Departments to make rules or orders prescribing the manner of their exercise and may attach particular conditions to their exercise. But in the exercise of their powers, subject to such general or particular limitations, Local Authorities are, generally speaking, unfettered, and their administrative actions are not subject to control by the central executive. The decision, whether they are acting within their powers, lies with the Courts of Law and not with the Central Authority. Local Authorities are representative bodies undiluted by any nominees or representatives or officials of the Central Authority, and in this respect differ widely from the Local Authorities in most continental systems. Their officials (though in some cases the consent of a Government Department is required for their appointment or dismissal) are their own servants and are bound to give effect to their directions. They derive part of the money which they spend from "assigned revenues"—i.e. the proceeds of certain taxes or duties handed over to them by statute—and partly from the rates, but for purposes within their powers, they can spend the whole of their money as they think fit. All these general statements are subject to some qualification, but broadly speaking English Local Authorities as compared with Local Authorities in most other countries enjoy a large measure of autonomy,* and the great majority of them display in the con-

* *See* "Local Government in Many Lands," M. Harris P. S. King & Son, 1926.

duct of their business a real and high sense of responsibility.

On the other hand, in most cases they derive their present constitution and powers from Parliament, and the Central Authority, as the executive organ of Parliament, is perpetually concerned to see that they perform their duties and exercise their powers on lines conducive to the national interest. Again, the revenues of Local Authorities, derived mainly from the rates,† are insufficient to maintain all the local services which they administer. For defraying the cost of a large class of services Local Authorities are dependent on contributions from the Central Authority. The Central Authority is therefore concerned to see both that good value is obtained for the moneys voted by Parliament and that the demands on it are not magnified by local waste or extravagance. In respect of finance, therefore, the autonomy of Local Authorities is necessarily qualified, in a degree which varies with the nature of the service and the extent of the Central Authority's financial interest. Where, however, the Central Authority acts in restraint or control of local finance, it does so directly and not, as on the Continent, through intermediate agencies such as the French Prefects. Its action, whether it belongs to the field of policy or administration, is therefore subject to

* Departmental Committee on Local Taxation, Report 1914, pp. 22-3, Cd. 7315.

† There is no counterpart in English Local Government to the continental system of raising money for local purposes by local additions to central taxes, e.g. the "centimes additionals" of France

Parliamentary criticism, and Ministers are, solely and directly, responsible for it.

In the English system the balance of central and local authority is determined by practical rather than theoretical considerations. The balance shifts with circumstances and there is no stable equilibrium. For the student of administration the history of the service of education is rich in illustrations of this conflict of ideas and forces, and of the devices which have been used to resolve it. In that service the financial interest of the Central Authority is very large, and its effect on the relations between Central and Local Authorities is discussed at length in Chapter V.

Generally speaking a local authority for a service means a body which has power to raise and spend on it money from the rates, and it took very many years to establish Local Authorities for education. Except for a few boroughs which had obtained special powers under local Acts, no Local Authorities of any kind were, till 1870, competent to spend public moneys, whether derived from rates or from taxes, on education.*

* The use of rates for public education was proposed in a Bill of 1807 by Mr. Whitbread, in Bills of 1820, 1835, 1837 and 1839 by Lord Brougham, in a Bill of 1853 for towns of over 5,000 population by Lord J. Russell, who in 1858 also proposed to set up Local School Committees with rating powers. The Newcastle Commission of 1858-61 recommended the use of County and Borough rates to provide education, and a Bill of 1867 introduced by Mr. Bruce, formerly Vice-President of the Committee of Council, anticipated in this and other respects the Act of 1870. N

1870 *School Boards*

The Act of 1870 did not touch higher education but provided for the constitution of School Boards (elected by cumulative voting) to provide and maintain out of the rates elementary schools where the supply of them was insufficient. The areas or "school districts" over which a School Board might exercise jurisdiction were the whole of London, the boroughs, and (outside London and the boroughs) the parishes, but the Education Department was empowered to form "united school districts," to provide for contribution by one district to the expenses of another, and to sanction combination of School Boards. The Education Department was also authorised to displace a defaulting School Board and appoint persons to perform its duties and to recover expenses out of the rates. Rates were to be levied by the local rating authorities on the requisition, not subject to any statutory limit, of the School Boards.

Many of the Boards in the large towns were distinguished by their active and progressive spirit; they contributed greatly to the advancement of education, and indeed (as was held in the case of the London School Board) considerably overstepped the statutory limits of elementary education. But many School Boards were very small, poor and inefficient; their representative character was impaired by the plan of cumulative voting;* and though the principle of *ad hoc* bodies for education

* In 1873 John Bright said: "The mode of election gives to the sects a power which was intended to be given to the public."

continued to have many supporters (it is still honoured in Scotland), the balance of advantage was in 1902 felt to be on the side of making the local administration of the service of education a function of ordinary local government by municipal bodies. The constitution of county Councils by the Local Government Act of 1888, the provision for the application of county rates to intermediate education by the Welsh Act of 1889, and the powers conferred by the Technical Instruction Act of 1889 on counties, boroughs and urban districts to provide or aid out of the rates "technical or manual instruction," marked a large step in that direction. In 1896 Sir John Gorst's Bill attempted to consolidate the local administration of education and place it under the Councils of counties and county boroughs only; that proposal was defeated by the opposition of the boroughs and urban districts, and the attempt was not renewed in 1902 or 1918, though in Scotland that system of areas for *ad hoc* Education Authorities was adopted by the Act of 1918.

Act of 1902

By the Act of 1902 School Boards were abolished and the powers conferred on Local Authorities by the Technical Instruction Acts (which were repealed) were merged in the powers of the new Education Authorities.

In Wales, the Central Welsh Board, originally established by scheme under the Welsh Intermediate Education Act, 1889, to some extent cuts across

the system of Local Education Authorities, and retains special powers for the inspection of secondary schools, which were confirmed by the Board of Education Act of 1899.

In respect of finance and many other purposes of administration the Act substituted 318 Local Education Authorities for 2,568 School Boards and 14,238 bodies of voluntary school managers as the local agencies with which the Central Authority would transact its business.

In respect of higher education the provisions of the Act were short but significant. The Local Education Authority was directed to "consider the educational needs of its area and to take such steps as seemed to them desirable,* after consultation with the Board of Education, to supply or aid the supply of education other than elementary, and to promote the general co-ordination of all forms of education." Though no specific duty to provide higher education was imposed on Local Authorities and no power to require its provision was conferred on the Board, Local Authorities were given both initiative and responsibility, and a relation of partnership between them and the Board was adumbrated.

In the period between 1902 and 1908, not only were attempts made to reopen the denominational question, three Government Bills being introduced to effect a new settlement, but the organisation of

* In the Commons an amendment was moved to make the provision of higher education obligatory, but Mr. Balfour urged that it was better "to lead the Local Education Authorities than to drive them."

the administrative system under Local Education Authorities was also called in question.

The Act of 1902 was disliked in Wales, and apart from the denominational controversy aroused by it, there was a strong movement in the direction of expressing national feeling in some form of national administration. An endeavour was first made to establish under Section 17 of the Act a Welsh Joint Education Council, in the form of a federation of all Welsh Local Education Authorities. Under Mr. Birrell's Bill of 1906 (as introduced) there was to be set up by Order in Council a special "Council for Wales" to act as the Central Authority under the control of the Treasury. It was to take over the powers and duties of the Board of Education, the educational powers of the Board of Agriculture and of the Central Welsh Board. It was to have power to supply or aid the supply of education of all kinds in Wales out of Parliamentary moneys handed over to it by the Board of Education and contributions paid by the Local Education Authorities; but to the Board was reserved, *inter alia*, under the Bill "the regulation and control of State-aided schools"! The Council was to be composed of persons appointed by counties, county boroughs, boroughs and urban districts with populations of over 25,000, but the Order in Council was to provide that representatives of counties or county boroughs should include representatives of minorities in the proportion, as far as possible, of at least one in three. The embodiment of so fantastic a scheme in a Government measure is remarkable, and reflects the incoherent agitations of the period.

It may be convenient here to carry on the story of special arrangements for Wales rather further. In 1907 a Welsh Department of the Board was constituted (p. 72). In 1919-1920 the Departmental Committee on the organisation of secondary education in Wales discussed the question of a National Council of Education for Wales.* Many conflicting views as to its constitution and functions were expressed. The extreme view that the Council should exercise all the powers of the Board of Education was rejected on both constitutional and practical grounds; it recommended the establishment of a representative body of not more than 120 members appointed by various constituencies; its primary function was to be advisory and deliberative, and schemes of Education Authorities under the Act of 1918 and "regulations of the Board of Education for the distribution and administration of State grants should stand referred to it." It was also to have administrative functions, including functions delegated to it by the Minister, e.g. the framing and administration of regulations for secondary schools. The aggregate sum voted by Parliament for secondary schools might be handed over to the Council for distribution under its own regulations. The cross-currents of opinion

* Report 1920. Cmd. 967. In 1908 a proposal to appoint a Secretary of State for Wales who would take over the powers of the Board of Education was agitated, and in 1920 and 1921 Bills for that purpose were introduced in the House of Commons by private members. On June 4th, 1919, the House of Commons passed a resolution for the establishment of subordinate legislatures, and the Speaker presided over a conference of members of both Houses.—Report, 1920, Cmd. 692

which the Committee experienced in 1919-1920 are still active, and the evolution of a Council which would command general support has not been accomplished.

As regards England, the Bill of 1906 embodied the idea that the areas of Local Education Authorities were too large and that if the service was administered from their offices the intimate personal knowledge and interest of persons in close touch with local conditions would be lost to it. The Bill provided that a borough or urban district with a population of 50,000 might apply to the Board to become an authority for higher education, being taken for this purpose out of the jurisdiction of the County Council. As regards elementary education, it required every County Council (except those with a population of less than 65,000) to prepare a scheme for delegating some of their powers and duties to representative bodies set up for delegation areas, boroughs, urban or rural districts or parishes or combinations of them. The County Council's scheme was to be approved by the Board if it was satisfied that the prescribed procedure had been followed. These rather vague and fanciful proposals had a short life, but in April, 1907, the Board's Consultative Committee were asked to consider what methods were desirable and possible under existing legislation for securing greater local interest in the administration of elementary education in administrative counties by some form of devolution or delegation to district or other strictly local committees. It concluded that "it would be difficult if not impossible to devise any uniform system." It could only recom-

mend that the Board should urge counties which had retained a centralised form of administration to study the experiments in devolution of other counties.* This inquiry might perhaps with advantage have preceded rather than followed an attempt at legislation.

Act of 1918 : *Partnership*

In the Act of 1918 the idea of "the co-ordination of all forms of education" was carried much further. Section 1 of the Act provides as follows :—

"*With a view to the establishment of a national system of public education* available for all persons capable of profiting thereby, it shall be the duty of the Council of every county and county borough, so far as their powers extend, to contribute thereto by providing for the progressive development and comprehensive organisation of education in respect of their area, and with that object any such council from time to time may, and shall when required by the Board of Education, submit to the Board schemes showing the mode in which their duties and powers under the Education Acts are to be performed and exercised, whether separately or in co-operation with other Authorities."

Section 2 contains specific provisions for the development of elementary education and for co-ordinating elementary and higher education. Sections 4 and 5 lay down the procedure for the submission of "schemes," and the Board is empowered to disapprove schemes which are "in-

* Report, 1908. Cmd. 3952.

adequate," reporting the circumstances and any consequential withholding or reduction of grant to Parliament. The Board's approval of a scheme imposes on the Local Authority the duty of giving effect to it.

It is no exaggeration to say that the Act of 1918 embodies not only a greatly enlarged conception of the service of education, but also a new conception of the relation of the Central and Local Authorities. The local service is to be systematic, comprehensive, progressive and available for all persons capable of profiting by it. While the duty of securing its "adequacy" as a contribution to a national service, judged by the principles stated in the opening Section of the Act, remains with the Central Authority, the initiative for its construction is assigned to the Local Authority. The Act reflects in its structure, more clearly perhaps than any other enactment, the idea of an active and constructive partnership between the Central and Local Authority, in a joint enterprise with reciprocal duties and responsibilities for the national interest. Though the idea of partnership cannot be defined in anything like the terms of a contract, and represents an attitude or temper rather than a formulated relation, it stands in the Act as something much more than a sentimental aspiration.

The financial provisions of the Act are discussed in Chapter V. They are consonant with the relation of local and central partnership and can be worked successfully only in that spirit. It is obvious that the risk of local inadequacy rather than the risk of local excess was most in the minds of the authors of the

Act. The period was one of great expansion of social services, and the keynote of the Act is the all-round expansion of the service of education by concerted effort of Central and Local Authorities. Apart from the grave interruptions and distractions caused by the lean times which followed the passing of the Act, it is not surprising that the working out of the idea of partnership, whether on the local or the central side, should not yet have been completed. To translate into satisfactory working arrangements for administration and finance an attitude so different from that which for many years had governed this service naturally takes some time. The machinery of public education is large and complicated, and those who have for many years thought in terms of an old machinery cannot at once adjust their thoughts or practice to a new perspective.

1919 *and* 1925 "*Schemes*" *and* "*Programmes*"

The "scheme procedure" of the Act was designed to secure not only comprehensive and far-seeing plans of local development, but well-balanced, coherent and practicable plans to which Local Authorities and the Board might be expected to adhere, subject of course to amendment if occasion arose. But the procedure also provided a means of "levelling up" backward Authorities, and forcing them to remedy defects in the local service. To remedy all defects at once might be impracticable, but if an Authority definitely committed itself to a plan of improvement, it could be allowed time to

carry it out by instalments. The Board in 1919 issued a Circular (No. 1119) suggesting how schemes should be constructed. The document was first circulated to Authorities in draft and revised in the light of their suggestions and criticisms. It forms perhaps the best summary available of the manifold activities of Local Education Authorities and of the problems incidental to them. In the result ninety-nine schemes were submitted, some of which were very large and elaborate, and opened up a wide field of discussion with Authorities. The financial stringency of 1920 checked the production of schemes, and in 1921 the Board announced in Circular 1190 that they could not at present commit themselves to such an approval of schemes as would involve acceptance of their financial implications. One of the principal projects of the Act, the establishment of a system of part-time day continuation schools on a basis of obligatory attendance, was suspended and has not been revived.* Although much admirable and profitable work was done by Local Authorities in reviewing all their educational arrangements for the preparation of schemes, experience has perhaps shown that short term "programmes," such as were asked for in March, 1925, by Circular 1358, which fall under the description of the "interim or provisional schemes" which the Act contemplated, are more useful or at all events more appropriate to present circumstances. They have the advantage

* "Appointed days" for this part of the Act were fixed for seven areas, including London, Birmingham and West Ham. —Board's Report for 1920-1, p. 41.

of being more specific, more limited in time and more definite as regards the expenditure involved, and it is easier for the Board and for the Local Authorities to commit themselves to their execution than to that of more general and ambitious proposals.

As regards the machinery of local administration, Local Education Authorities are empowered by the Act of 1918 to make arrangements with each other for co-operation or combination in the exercise of their powers, and Authorities for elementary education are required to make co-operative arrangements with Authorities for higher education in matters of common interest. The Board may also, on the application of two or more Authorities, provide for the establishment and incorporation of a federation of Authorities for purposes relating to matters of common interest which it is necessary or convenient to consider in relation to areas larger than those of individual Authorities (Sections 6 to 8 of the Act of 1921). No "federations" of Authorities have been established under the Act of 1918, though co-operative arrangements between them are common.

Education Committees and Sub-committees

Each Local Education Authority was required by the Act of 1902 to establish by scheme, approved by the Board, an Education Committee or Committees to which all matters relating to the exercise of its powers, except the power of raising a rate or borrowing money, were to "stand referred," and to which the exercise of powers might also, with the

above exceptions, be delegated. Each Committee must (except in a county) contain a majority of members of the Council, must include women and "persons of experience in education" appointed by the Council either directly or on the nomination of other bodies. Local Education Authorities have usually included in their Education Committees a substantial number of "co-optative" members, sometimes representing various "interests," such as those of teachers or voluntary schools. In the debates of 1902 there was some suspicion of co-optative members, and there has occasionally been a tendency to revise the constitution of Education Committees in the direction of diminishing the representation of outside "interests," and some jealousy of the influence of co-optative members has shown itself, especially as regards financial issues. There can be no doubt, however, that co-optative members have, generally speaking, rendered very valuable service.

It is not possible within the limits of this book to describe adequately the machinery of local educational administration.* The burden of it naturally falls on the statutory local "Education Committee," which has the right, except in cases of urgency, of reporting to the Council on all matters relating to the exercise of the Council's educational powers (except the power of raising a rate or borrowing money) and having its report considered prior to

* *See* "Education Department," Dr. A. E. Ikin. Pitman, 1926, for an excellent description of the working of an Education Office; also "A City Council from Within," E. D. Simon. Longmans, 1926.

action. The Education Committee thus has the right of submitting estimates of educational expenditure, though they naturally pass through the Finance Committee. The Education Committee also usually exercises extensive powers of action delegated to it by the Council, and its action under powers delegated unconditionally will be reported to the Council "for information" but will be valid without the Council's approval and cannot be varied or overruled by the Council, unless the delegation is revoked. Everything, however, depends on the precise terms in which the delegation is expressed, and the degree and extent of delegation to the Committee varies.* In counties where the Council meets only quarterly, any large reservation of administrative decision or action to the Councils would cause intolerable delay, and in these and in many urban areas delegation of powers to the Committee, within the limits of approved estimates, is extensive if not complete. In the largest areas, moreover, the Councils, owing to the magnitude

* A close study of "Standing Orders" of Councils is sometimes necessary to discover the degree of delegation, and knowledge of the actual practice is also required before any general conclusions can be drawn. In London "matters of principle," as defined in a standing order, are reserved to the Council. Moreover, members of the Council have the right of attending any Committee and of speaking "when matters which specially concern the district they represent are under discussion." Any member of the Council representing an electoral division specially affected by a resolution of a Committee (acting in pursuance of full delegation of powers and duties), or any ten members of the Council, or one-fourth of the members of the Committee then present, may require that such resolution shall be submitted as a recommendation to the Council prior to action.

of their interests, have many of the characteristics of local Parliaments, and direct or detailed Parliamentary administration, without the aid of responsible Ministers or executive departments, has obvious inconveniences.

The number of persons serving on Education Committees in England and Wales is about 9,800, and most of these persons serve on one or more sub-committees. In London there are seven standing sub-committees and a number of sectional sub-committees. In Manchester there are seven principal and twenty subsidiary sub-committees, and in Lancashire there are eight standing sub-committees and sixteen subsidiary sub-committees.

Active membership of an Education Committee means a great deal of hard work. In a large county area, such as Lancashire or the West Riding, much time and expense are involved by attendance at meetings of the Committee and ordinary and special sub-committees. Members are unpaid and are not recouped for their personal and travelling expenses in attending meetings, though they may receive them as representatives of Authorities at "educational conferences" (Section 126 of 1921). English Local Government may well pride itself on the public spirit which animates so large a body of persons, many of whom are by no means rich or leisured, in giving themselves to the laborious work of educational administration. Their devotion is a national asset and their opinions form the core of a very large body of public opinion.

In several large county areas a system of District Sub-Committees has been established with a view

to local administrative devolution. In Kent there are some 24 District Committees. In the West Riding there are 112, and in Lancashire there are 34 District Committees for elementary and 100 for higher education. In Middlesex there are 13 Local Higher Education Committees. The problem of making administration both effective and elastic, of maintaining adequate control and of still enlisting local interest, knowledge, and public spirit in aid of administration, is one which confronts Local Education Authorities as well as the Board. They also are not immune to complaints of meticulous bureaucracy, rigidity and dictatorial methods.

Associations of Local Education Authorities

For the Board the business of corresponding and consulting and negotiating with so many and so different Authorities is by no means simple. It is true that their Associations—the County Councils Association, the Associations of Municipal Corporations and Urban Districts, and the Association of Education Committees (comprising representatives of 81 county boroughs, 123 boroughs, 43 urban districts and 11 counties) are most valuable agencies for consultation on manifold issues connected with legislation, finance, regulation or administration. It has for many years been the view of the Board that the stronger and more coherent these Associations are, the better for the Board itself and for the service as a whole. The settlement of salary scales would not have been effected without them, and there is

no doubt that the "Burnham Committees" have had a consolidating effect.

Local Authorities, however, still cherish their autonomy against each other, and fear of the extension of county boroughs at the cost of counties has sometimes prejudiced the relations between them. For purposes of administration Local Authorities do not combine easily, and the idea of provinces or provincial councils, or federations such as the Act of 1918 authorised, makes little appeal to them.* On the other hand there has recently been a noticeable tendency towards consultation and common action between the Authorities inside geographical counties, both in respect of elementary and higher education, and the difficulties caused by local boundaries between places where people work and places where they sleep, places where there are schools and places where there are not, have in many cases been overcome by well-considered agreements.

But there remains a very large field in which direct contact has to be kept between the Board and each individual Local Authority. Many of the larger Authorities know the way to Whitehall well; Chairmen of Education Committees and Directors of Education tread it frequently for formal or informal discussion, and it has long been the policy of the Board to welcome them. The smaller and more remote Authorities come less often. But there must always be a great deal of written correspondence with Local Authorities

* It is advocated as an ideal in the Consultative Committee's Report of 1926, p. 165.

if only for purposes of record. Its volume has been considerably reduced by devolving on the Board's inspectors not only much preliminary exploration of general questions, but also settlement of details with the representatives or officers of Local Authorities, and in this way a great deal of useful work is done, which lubricates and accelerates the working of the official machine.

Directors of Education and Local Officials

As regards the officers of Local Authorities, the effectiveness of the public system of education and the realisation of its aims depends very largely on the establishment of a local civil service of just as high quality as the State endeavours to secure in the central civil service. The relations of a local administrative officer to his Authority and its committees are different from those of a civil servant to his Minister; they are more complicated and in some respects more difficult, because on the bodies under whom he serves different and often conflicting opinions are represented. And the local officer has to do many kinds of work which do not fall to the lot of the central officer. But it is difficult to exaggerate the benefit to the local service of education, as regards both efficiency and economy, obtainable by the employment in it of officers of high ability, integrity and industry, who combine zeal with good judgment, and on them very largely depends the maintenance of good and candid relations between the Central and Local

Authority.* Local Authorities do not hesitate to use them for this purpose, knowing that they can rely implicitly on their loyalty, and often choose their chief officers to represent them at conferences and discussions with the Board or with other Authorities. The Board also makes extensive use of their services on committees and less formally for purposes of advice or criticism on administrative proposals.

All the large Authorities have principal administrative and executive officers with the title of "Chief Education Officer," "Director of Education" or "Secretary for Education," though in the case of smaller Authorities the post of this officer is sometimes combined with that of town clerk or some other post. In the early days after 1902 these posts were frequently filled by the former secretaries to Technical Instruction Committees or clerks to School Boards. The salaries of the posts run up to £2,000. Vacancies are usually thrown open and filled by selections from a large number of applicants. Officers move on from less to more important posts. The principal education officer is the responsible officer of the Education Committee, and his functions therefore end where those of the clerk to the Council begin. His functions also are related to those of many other

* The recruitment of local administrative officers is often rather haphazard, but it is not easy to devise a system for it. E. D. Simon, "A City Council from Within," p. 192. The "Institute of Public Administration" now brings together a large number of central and local civil servants for exploration of common problems. It has 2,600 members and twelve "regional groups." A degree in Public Administration can be taken in Manchester University.

officers of the Council, such as the county or borough treasurer, the medical officer of health, or the architect. In some areas the Education Department has its own financial branch, in others the finance of education is handled by the chief financial officer of the Council. The establishments of the Local Education Departments are large and varied.* The Departmental staffs include administrative and technical officers, inspectors, organisers, school medical officers (the medical officer of health is usually the chief school medical officer), dentists and nurses and, if the Department is self-contained, accounting and architectural staff. There is also in each area a staff of school attendance officers whose primary duty is to keep track of all the children who ought to attend elementary schools and see that they do so regularly.

* In London the 1926-27 estimates (L.C.C. Annual Estimates, No. 2440. P. S. King & Son) show 811 posts on the central administrative staff of the Education Officers Department, the aggregate salaries of which were £301,305. There were ten officers receiving salaries of over £1,000 a year. In addition to the cost of this establishment, the Education Account was charged in respect of services rendered to the education service by the staffs of other Departments of the Council with expenditure on salaries amounting to £363,895, bringing the total establishment cost up to £665,200 In Manchester the administrative, inspectorial, medical, surveying and other establishments of the Education Committee number 347, and the salary bill in 1925-26 amounted to £97,154. In Birmingham the staff numbers 304 and the salary bill for 1926-27 is estimated at £87,967. In Leeds the staff (which includes architects and finance staff) numbers 208, and the salary bill amounts to £54,140. These figures are given merely to illustrate the magnitude of the business of local administration; they are not strictly comparable, and no inferences can be drawn from them as to relative extravagance or economy of administration in the several areas.

But they are extensively used for many other purposes connected with the school medical service, employment and welfare of children, provision of meals, etc., and they provide an invaluable personal link between the Education Office, the children and the parents, and contribute greatly to make the service of education a humane and social service.

National System and Local Autonomy

This is the machinery, and these are the bodies for the local administration of education with whom the Board as Central Authority and trustee of the "national system" has to deal, and with whom in the spirit of the Act of 1918 it has to get as near partnership as it can. The local partner is many-headed. The 318 heads are of many different sizes, capacities and complexions.* The Board can be the partner of each authority in planning and obtaining its contribution to a national system, but it cannot easily be the partner of all of them collectively, at all events till they become a good deal more coherent. There is a point in the construction of a national system at which the ordinary partnership relation between central and local authority is transcended or has to be qualified by regard for something larger. Account has to be taken of activities which cannot be effectively or economically

* Among administrative counties the population ranges from 18,368 in Rutland to 1,746,139 in Lancashire, and 4,483,249 in London; among County Boroughs from 23,738 in Canterbury to 919,438 in Birmingham; among Boroughs from 9,715 in Tiverton to 87,691 in Hornsey; among Urban Districts from 22,865 in Ince-in-Makerfield to 165,669 in Willesden. *See* also Chapter V, p. 120.

organised on a basis of single local government areas. The problem of necessitous areas is getting too big to be dealt with by putting a patch on to the ordinary system of grants, and apart from those which are conspicuously necessitous, we have made little progress towards that equalisation of burden as between rich and poor areas which is obviously appropriate to a national system. Moreover it is obvious that with Local Authorities so many and so different in their stature and their resources, in the geographical and social circumstances of their areas, and the traditions which spring from them, the idea of "uniformity," which the Royal Commission of 1901 postulated as the characteristic of a "national service" which the Central Authority should secure, or the idea of a "national system" providing "equality of opportunity" which is prominent in the Act of 1918, cannot easily be realised. How far is it possible, within the province of Local Government, to see that young people who happen to live in one area shall not have greatly less educational opportunities than those who happen to live in another area, and on what lines should the Central Authority try to redress such inequalities?

At present the educational landscape is largely one of "peaks and valleys," and the peaks are not all in urban areas or the valleys all in rural areas. Unevenness is an inevitable consequence of a localised system of administration, though even centralised systems have not been successful in eliminating it or neutralising local handicaps. From the point of view of a *national* system supported by the taxpayer's money drawn from all parts of the country and all classes,

a high tableland with moderate elevations and some picturesque features would perhaps present the fairest educational landscape. Its construction is a problem of central administration. It is true that the Central Authority will usually be supported in its endeavours to level up the valleys and bring the standard of backward Authorities nearer to that of progressive Authorities and so render co-operation between them easier and more effective. Progressive Local Authorities do not want unprogressive neighbours, and they would generally support greater differentiation in the central system of finance between rich and poor areas, and such greater compensation for poverty as would enable the denizens of the valleys to fill them up. But if it is a matter of checking the erection of new peaks or the further elevation of existing peaks, conflict at once arises.

It is not easy to balance the considerations relevant to this problem, which both through the emphasis laid by the Act of 1918 on the national aspect of the service of education and by the embarrassments of the post-war period, has become more insistent. It is indeed a new problem incidental to the increasing nationalisation of local services, and it is not confined to the service of education alone. Its emergence is certainly not agreeable to the central administrator. He naturally likes to see the service with which he is connected moving on, and it goes against the grain with him to stand in the way of any kind of progress which is not obviously extravagant. Indeed, he is himself often charged with extravagance for not stopping advance. He, however, is in a position to realise

how greatly steady and healthy progress depends on the continuous support of public opinion and how easily that is shaken or alienated by extravagance or the appearance of extravagance.* In the interests of progress itself he cannot ignore the argument that it is wise not to go too fast, and since extravagance is a relative term, and since the plain man is apt to regard as extravagant that which greatly exceeds the common practice, prudent administration may be shy of countenancing a much greater pace in one place than in another.

The system of Local Government is indeed passing through a difficult period, and the problems of local taxation are urgent. Under the Rating and Valuation Act of 1925, the first and long overdue step towards adjusting payment to capacity to pay is being taken by securing uniformity of valuation. The promised reform of the Poor Law is a further step in the direction of consolidating local services and their financial control and making their administration more consistent and more coherent. The problem of adjusting the relations between national and local expenditure, which is discussed in Chapter V, is being explored. The service of education is far the largest of the centrally subsidised Local Government services and has far the largest stake in the solution of that problem.

* In 1920 a proposal was made by a large manufacturing town to buy or build a ship and equip it as a cruising secondary school, paying part of its expenses by carrying cargo. The children of the workers would thus enjoy the same advantages of education by travel as Royal Princes and the children of the rich.

Chapter IX

CONSULTATION AND INFORMATION

Consultative Committee

The Act of 1899, following to some extent the recommendation of the Bryce Commission, provided for the establishment of a Consultative Committee "consisting as to not less than two-thirds of persons qualified to represent the views of universities and other bodies interested in education." It was originally constituted in 1900 by Order in Council, enlarged in 1907, and reconstituted in 1920. It has twenty-one members appointed by the President of the Board normally for six years, and provision is made for retirement of its members by rotation. They are not infrequently reappointed for a further term. Two specific functions assigned to the Committee have become obsolete, and its function is now the general one of advising the Board "on any matter referred to the Committee by the Board."

The debates on the Bill of 1898 and the Act of 1899 are illuminating. Great stress was laid on preserving unimpaired the responsibility of the Minister to Parliament. The idea of a representative committee endowed with statutory powers was rejected. The Duke of Devonshire insisted that "the Minister must be responsible for the choice of his advisers as well as for the action he

takes on that advice," and pointed out that unless the choice of subjects for consultation were left to the Minister it would be necessary to frame a comprehensive list of subjects. The view was expressed by Archbishop Temple that " the Consultative Committee ought never to become instead of a consultative committee a regulative committee with independent powers." The general idea underlying the constitution of the Committee was obviously that expressed by the Bryce Commission of 1895: " How may the State, i.e. the Minister who here impersonates it, be best informed and aided in making education itself, as distinguished from the machinery needed for its organised existance, more satisfactory and efficient without having his authority in any way restricted or his responsibility lessened."* The recommendation of the Headmasters' Conference that " the Central Authority should consist of a statutory commission composed to a great extent of persons experienced in educational matters, independent of any other Department, and responsible to Parliament through a Minister of the Crown," received no favour from the Bryce Commission.

The relation of advisory committees to Government Departments is a matter of considerable importance, as was recognised by the Machinery of Government Committee of 1918,† who commented favourably on the Board's practice in this respect. " So long as advisory bodies are not permitted to impair the full responsibility of Ministers to Parlia-

* Vol. I, p. 108

† Report. Cmd. 9230, pp. 11-12, 56-57.

ment, we think that the more they are regarded as an integral part of the normal organisation of a Department the more will Ministers be enabled to command the confidence of Parliament and the public in their administration of the services, which seem likely in an increasing degree to affect the lives of large sections of the community."

The Board's Consultative Committee has very fully justified its existence and proved its value by a series of some thirteen admirable reports (its operations were suspended during the war) on large educational subjects referred to it; they have paved the way for important administrative and legislative action, and thus enriched the public service of education. Whatever modifications may be made in the practice of the Board or the Committee in respect of the reference of subjects or procedure in consideration of them, there can be no doubt that its tradition of twenty-five years affords a pretty solid basis for its continued usefulness.

The idea, however, that not only may the ignorance of Ministers and officials be mitigated, but also that somehow or other the domination of bureaucracy should be checked by a representative body which has a statutory right to offer advice or to be consulted, has considerable vitality. This idea is more persistent as regards the service of education than any other service, and from time to time the constitution of a " real Board of Education " is demanded. As lately as 1925 a conference of teachers passed a resolution that the Board should consist of " representatives of Members of Parliament, of Local Authorities and of organised bodies of teachers."

Attempts to give effect to the idea have perhaps been carried on longer and further in Wales than in England (pp. 183–4).* While, however, the advantages to Ministers and their Departments of very liberal and organised arrangements for consultation are universally admitted, the difficulty of imposing on them statutory obligations to consult other bodies, or of giving to other bodies statutory rights to advise on the course of administration, without impairing the control of administration by Ministers and their responsibility for it to Parliament, is considerable, and that difficulty becomes much greater as the scope of those rights becomes wider, and extends not only to particular subjects or branches of a service but to a whole service embracing many different activities. In the case of the Board of Education, the demand for a "real Board" usually extends to giving a composite body a right to advise in its discretion not only as regards the methods and content and organisation of education, but also as regards the central administration of the service.

Other standing advisory committees of the Board are the Advisory Councils of the Victoria and Albert Museum and the Science Museum, which were established in 1913.

* There are several precedents for imposing on Ministers a statutory obligation to consult certain bodies for specific purposes, e.g. that of the Police Act of 1919, the Education (Scotland) Act of 1918, and the Ministry of Health Act of 1919. The position of the Consultative Councils under the latter Act is very similar to that of the Board's Consultative Committee.

Juvenile Organisations Committee

The "Juvenile Organisations Committee" is rather more than an advisory committee. It is an active agency for stimulating and organising voluntary effort to supplement the State system of education and make the expenditure on it more fruitful. In 1916 a Central Committee was established by the Home Office to assist it in dealing with the war problem of juvenile delinquency, for the prevention of which the services of voluntary bodies working through social and recreational clubs and the organisations of boy scouts, boys' brigades, etc., were of great value. The recognition, in Section 17 of the Education Act, 1918, of "social and physical training," provided by voluntary agencies in the day or evening for children and young persons, as an object which Local Education Authorities might assist, led naturally to the transfer of the Central Committee in 1919 to the Board of Education. It consists of twenty-eight persons qualified to represent all kinds of social and recreational organisations, and includes representatives of the Board (whose Parliamentary Secretary acts as its Chairman), the Home Office and the Ministry of Labour. The Board provides it with a Secretary. One of its main functions was to reproduce itself in local committees, who would secure the co-operation of local voluntary agencies and enlist the sympathy and support of Local Education Authorities; and at one time some 130 of these local Juvenile Organisation Committees were at work. Development was severely checked by the financial stringency after the war, and the

Central Committee itself went into "winter quarters" from 1922 to 1924. It had been successful in obtaining relief from excess profits duty for employers subscribing to the local work, relief in respect of entertainments duty, and concessions in respect of railway fares for young persons travelling to camps. From September, 1924, to March 31st, 1927, the Board were authorised to pay grant on Local Education Authorities' contributions to local committees at a rate temporarily increased from 50 per cent. to 75 per cent.

Adult Education Committee

An "Adult Education Committee" was established in 1921 to promote the development of liberal education for adults, and in particular to bring together national organisations concerned with the provision of adult education, so as to secure mutual help and prevent overlapping and waste of effort; to further the establishment of local voluntary organisations for the purpose and of arrangements for co-operation with Local Education Authorities; and to advise the Board of Education upon any matters which the Board might refer to the Committee. Every University, the principal voluntary organisations, and three associations of Local Education Authorities, nominate representatives for appointment by the President, who also makes several personal appointments. Assessors are appointed on behalf of the Board of Education, the War Office and the Air Ministry.

The Committee has prepared a number of papers,

which have been published by the Stationery Office,* and various memoranda for the use of the Board. A sub-committee was appointed, which discussed in detail the draft of the Adult Education Regulations with officers of the Board.

The Committee has also done much work of a miscellaneous character. It initiated, for instance, a scheme of adult education classes taken by voluntary teachers in prisons. In the third year of the scheme the number of classes was 600 and the number of prisoners attending 8,500.

Secondary Schools Examinations Council

"The Secondary Schools Examinations Council" was constituted in 1917 to assist the Board in giving effect to their scheme for concentrating the examination of pupils in secondary schools in the hands of examining bodies for whom the universities would take responsibility. In order to secure the necessary equality of standard, and the acceptance of the examination certificates by university and professional bodies as exempting the holders from certain other examinations, and to provide machinery for enabling the scheme to be improved from time to time, the Board proposed to act as a "Co-ordinating Authority" with the help of a Council. All matters falling within the functions of the

* "Local Co-operation between Universities, Local Education Authorities and Voluntary Bodies," "The Recruitment, Training and Remuneration of Tutors," "Adult Education in Rural Areas," "Adult Education for Women," "British Music," "The Drama in Adult Education."

Co-ordinating Authority stand referred to the Council, which conducts on the Board's behalf all ordinary business, correspondence and conferences connected with the co-ordination of examinations; but the Council are directed to consult the Board before committing themselves on questions of principle or policy which are controversial or specially important.* This Council is peculiar in that executive powers are delegated to it, and the members are appointed on the nomination of universities, associations of Local Education Authorities, and the Teachers Registration Council. It reports to the Board, and the Board's officers may attend its meetings and speak, but not vote. It has proved itself a most useful and effective instrument of delegated administration. It conducts periodic scrutinies of the papers worked in the examinations, with a view to detection of weaknesses and standardisation. Perhaps the changes which are contemplated in the system of training colleges, and the substitution of university examinations for the Board's examinations of candidates for the teaching profession, will lead to the constitution of a similar Council for that branch of education.

Burnham Committees

It is perhaps permissible to refer in this connection to the Standing Joint Committees representative of Local Education Authorities and groups of teachers, known as the "Burnham Committees," the work of which is described in Chapter XI. They date from

* Circular 1002 of June, 1917.

1919, and were established at the instance of the Board to find an "orderly and progressive solution of the salary problem" by agreement on a national basis, they and their sub-committees meet at the Board's office and receive clerical assistance, but in their deliberations they are independent of the Board, and are guided by their own Chairman, Lord Burnham. It is difficult to over-estimate the public service which he has rendered in undertaking the conduct of so long, laborious and difficult a business. The agreed recommendations of the Committees are reported to the President of the Board, and in their financial and administrative aspects require the Board's concurrence before they can have operative effect. The field which the committees cover is so large, and the subject matter is so complex, that even when the main lines of the Board's action have been settled there is a large residue of incidental and subsidiary questions which require detailed discussion. The committees and their sub-committees are in this respect a most important and valuable element in the apparatus of consultation.

Departmental Committees, etc.

It is very difficult to construct Standing Committees which shall not be unwieldy in size and yet shall have a personnel capable, in virtue of variety of experience, interest and point of view, of dealing with a large variety of topics. New topics constantly arise or become prominent or urgent in the field of education, and a Standing Committee with

a membership which changes only at stated intervals is sometimes at a disadvantage in this respect. The Board have, therefore, like all other Departments, had frequent recourse to *ad hoc* Departmental or inter-Departmental Committees.* Towards the end of the war a series of committees was appointed by the Prime Minister to inquire into the position of various subjects of the educational curriculum and their teaching, and valuable reports were made on Natural Science, Modern Languages and Classics.

It has also been the practice of the Board to consult extensively and frequently Associations of Local Education Authorities and their officers, Associations of Teachers, and, particularly in the sphere of Technology, scientific and professional bodies, on matters relating to the Board's regulations and ordinary administration.

The value of liberal consultation, and of the personal discussions to which it gives rise, is very great, and indeed is essential to the easy and effective working of the English system. The range of consultation is very wide, and if it is to be effective the methods must be varied. Some subjects are best treated by prolonged formal inquiry and deliberation by standing committees, or by

* Among the reports of recent Departmental Committees mention may be made of those on the Organisation of Secondary Education in Wales (1920, Cmd. 968); on Scholarships and Free Places, (1920, Cmd. 968); on the Teaching of English in England (1921), and on the Training of Teachers for Public Elementary Schools (1925, Cmd. 2409). A Departmental Committee on the System of Public Libraries, in which the Board had acquired an interest under the Public Libraries Act of 1919, was appointed in 1924.

ad hoc committees representing many different interests, others by direct consultation of existing bodies or groups of bodies representing sectional interests, others by direct consultation of individuals or groups of individuals, such as chairmen or officials who are recognised authorities on the subjects. Sometimes expedition is essential, and there is no time for anything but the most summary procedure.

Office of Special Inquiries and Reports

In 1894 there was created within the establishment of the Education Department an Office of Special Inquiries and Reports to serve generally as an intelligence department and to collect information for the Board's assistance relating to education from all sources. The functions of the Office when first established were described by Mr. Arthur Acland, who as Vice-President of the Committee of Council was responsible for its creation, as follows:—

"There is a large number of matters affecting education as to which the Department lives merely from hand to mouth, failing to record the knowledge it obtains for future use, and unable to obtain information as to what is being done elsewhere, whether at home or abroad, in an efficient manner. There is now much waste of power through this deficiency, and the appointment of an officer with a limited amount of help, whose duty it shall be to collect and supply information, and to make occasional reports on special matters under the direction of his chiefs, has become essential if the Education Department, including the Science and Art Depart-

ment, whose field of work is now so large, is to do its work efficiently."

The first Director of the Office was Mr. (now Sir) Michael Sadler, who during his tenure of office was responsible for the issue of some eleven volumes of "Special Reports on Educational Subjects." This series now runs to twenty-eight volumes, and is supplemented by a series of "Educational Pamphlets." A considerable number of the earlier Reports were written by Mr. Sadler himself, and by the late Sir Robert Morant. Mr. Sadler was also successful in enlisting the services of a large number of other persons. The Reports not only made available for English readers a large amount of useful information otherwise difficult to get at, but served an even more valuable purpose in the way of suggestion and inspiration.*

The Reports naturally are of unequal value. Some of them in their exposition of principle and illustration of its application to common problems

* They deal with such large topics as Elementary Education in Belgium; French Higher Elementary Schools; Realschulen and Oberrealschulen in Prussia; the Universities of France, Modern Language Teaching in Belgium and Holland; Secondary Education in Germany; Technical and Commercial Education in Central Europe; Rural Education in France; Education in Norway, Sweden, Holland, Hungary and Switzerland; the Training of Elementary School Teachers in Prussia; Higher Commercial Education in Germany; Education in the United States of America. They also contain accounts of the educational systems of the Dominions and chief Crown Colonies. Scattered through the volumes are a large number of memoranda on the treatment of particular problems such as Domestic Instruction, School Hygiene, manual instruction, "Ecoles Maternelles," and children under compulsory school age.

are important contributions to the philosophy and permanent literature of education. Others are descriptive rather than critical, and descriptions soon become out of date. Of course when systems and the principles on which they are framed are very different, it is hazardous to infer that a particular way of adjusting educational means to ends which is effective under one system will be equally effective if it is adopted into another. But since the war the same kind of problem in educational organisation has become insistent in many countries, and a study of the different attempts to solve them might be very instructive.*

The functions of the Office have naturally changed since its establishment, when it had before it a large unexplored field of inquiry and rich opportunities of pioneer work. Since then the public system of education in England and Wales has become much larger and more highly organised; the Local Education Authorities have enlisted in its service many persons of wide and expert knowledge, the inspectorate and its functions has been developed, the educational Press has become more educational, the greatest English newspaper issues a weekly educational supplement, and educational problems are abundantly discussed in periodical conferences, the programmes of which are generous. There is not now the same need for the same kind of official information bureau as there was thirty years ago, but in any case the limitation of the Office staff

* "L'Ecole unique" in France and the "Einheit Schule" in Germany present problems similar to those discussed in the Consultative Committee's Report of 1926 on "The Education of the Adolescent."

restricts its capacity for work of the same kind and on the same scale as formerly.

The Office, however, has always had other duties besides those of issuing Reports. It has been responsible for the preparation of memoranda on educational questions of all kinds for the use of the Board itself and for other Government Departments such as the Colonial Office and through the Foreign Office for foreign Governments. It is responsible for the work under the Convention between the French Ministry of Public Instruction and the Board for the exchange of young teachers of modern languages between the secondary schools and training colleges of the two countries. It also assists the Colonial Office in the selection of teachers for educational appointments in the Crown Colonies, and used to give the same assistance to the India Office until, as a result of the report of Lord Lee's Commission, education in India became a matter for the provincial Governments.

Having special relations with the Dominions, Colonies and foreign countries it has also come to perform the functions of foreign correspondent for the Board. Inquiries from educational authorities all over the world seeking information with regard to educational matters in England and Wales come to the Office. Foreign visitors desirous of studying English methods of education and educational organisation are furnished with information, advice and letters of introduction by the Office; and similar assistance is given to British persons travelling abroad for educational purposes. In addition miscellaneous inquiries relating to matters outside the

Board's normal administration are referred to the Office, and the number of inquiries from private individuals is great.

Within the Office of Special Inquiries and Reports, and indeed its focus (below the ground level), is the Board's library. This library, which now contains over 57,000 volumes, was formed by the amalgamation of the greater part of the educational works formerly kept by the Science Library at South Kensington and the Library of the Education Department. The largest section of the library consists of books and official publications (reports and statistics) relating to the organisation and administration of education in all parts of the world; other sections are theories of education, special methods of education, psychology, school hygiene, physical education and school architecture, and there are also sections for histories of education and biographies of eminent teachers and educational administrators. The library does not make any attempt to collect school text-books.

Imperial Education Conference

The Office is intimately concerned with the arrangements for the periodical Imperial Education Conferences, and for this purpose has to keep in touch with the Education Departments overseas and with the Advisory Committee of the Conference, which consists of the representatives in London of the self-governing dominions and officers of the Dominions Office, Colonial Office, India Office, Scottish Education Department and the Education

Ministry of Northern Ireland, and preparing the agenda for the Conference and the material necessary for the discussions.

The Imperial Education Conference grew out of a conference arranged in 1907 by the League of the Empire. That conference was attended by a considerable number of representatives from overseas education departments, who expressed a wish that the Imperial Government should arrange for a periodical conference to be attended by official delegates from the Government Education Departments of the self-governing Dominions and Crown Colonies. The first of these official conferences was held in 1911. Arrangements were in train for the second meeting to take place in 1915, but the war prevented this, and it was not until 1923 that the second meeting was held. The third meeting is to be held in 1927.

The Imperial significance of the Conference is much larger than that of the departmental or administrative problems discussed. But there is great value in the personal exchange of information and opinion between officials of widely different experience, particularly on matters which involve reciprocal action on the part of the Governments of the Empire, such as the interchange of teachers, recognition of teachers' qualifications, and arrangements to avoid loss of superannuation benefits.

Reports, Statistics, Returns, etc.

The Board endeavours to impart as much information as possible in its Annual Reports, Statistics, Returns, Circulars, Lists and "White Papers," and

this is sometimes usefully supplemented by Answers to Questions in Parliament which are, if they are of administrative interest, circulated by the Board to Local Education Authorities in a series of "administrative memoranda."

The series of the Board's Reports presented to Parliament (the sale of which in recent years has more or less covered the cost of their printing and publication) contains year by year an account of the principal changes, occurrences and developments, and a statement of the principal facts. Since 1908, moreover, with a break occasioned by the war, it has contained a special chapter reviewing historically some particular branch or aspect of the educational service, and some of them have been republished separately.* The Annual Report of the Board's Chief Medical Officer also traces year by year from its beginning the development of the School Medical Service and the other services grouped for administrative purposes as health services of education.†

* 1908-9, General Survey of changes and progress in education of all grades, including review of elementary school premises; 1909-10, Staffing of Public Elementary Schools; 1910-11, The Curriculum of the Public Elementary School; 1911-12, The Passage from the Elementary to the Secondary School; 1912-13, History of the Training of Teachers for Elementary Schools; 1913-14, Inspection of Secondary Schools by the State: its history and character; 1922-23, Some account of the origin and growth of the Board's Inspectorate; 1923-24, Some account of the recent development of Secondary Schools; 1924-25, Survey of the Provision made for Technical and Further Education.

† *See* particularly the Reports for 1908 (Cmd. 4986 of 1910) and 1917 (Cmd. 9206 of 1918), and Circulars 596 and 728 of 1908 and 1909.

On the financial side, the information afforded by the Board's estimates and the notes on them has, since 1922-1923, been supplemented by annual memoranda presented to Parliament, which display in simple form the considerations which determine the expenditure of Parliamentary funds, and incidentally deal with the facts relevant to particular branches of expenditure selected for special exposition. A study of these memoranda might dissolve some popular misconceptions.

It is true that the statistical information disseminated by the Board is only too often belated. Financial returns are not usually available for some time after the financial year is completed, and the resources of the Board for the extraction and appropriate tabulation of administrative data are not unlimited. There are limits, moreover, to the demands which the Board can prudently make on Local Education Authorities for statistical information. The Board, however, whatever fault may be found with its output, either on the ground of insufficiency or slowness, fully recognises the great value of live statistics for intelligent administration, and its statistical volumes compare favourably with those of other countries. The increased cost of printed statistics is, of course, inimical both to their production and consumption.*

* In 1913-14 two volumes of about 500 pages were priced for sale at 2*s.* 2*d.*, whereas in 1920-21 a volume of 282 pages was priced at 10*s.* 6*d.* The last volume of educational and financial statistics for 1924-25, containing 218 pages, was published in 1926 at 7*s.* 6*d.*

Chapter X

THE DENOMINATIONAL QUESTION

A CHARACTERISTIC and embarrassing feature of the English system of education is the distinction between two classes of elementary schools, namely schools built out of the rates by the Local Education Authorities or their predecessors the School Boards, now usually known as "Council" or "provided" schools, and schools built by voluntary agencies, with or without the aid of building grants, now usually known as "voluntary" or "non-provided" schools. The voluntary schools were first in the field, and till 1870 supplied the whole of the elementary education of the people, with aid from the State given in the form of building grants and later on of maintenance grants. The relation of the voluntary schools to the public system of education was greatly changed by the Act of 1902, but the survival of the two classes of schools side by side under the administration of Local Education Authorities is characteristic of the capacity of Englishmen to make a compromise work, though it is open to attack from many sides by those who think in terms of principle or system.

The first class is under the complete control of the Local Education Authority, subject to statutory provisions, of which the most important is the "Cowper Temple" clause of 1870, which forbids

the teaching of any "religious catechism or religious formulary which is distinctive of any particular denomination." The second class is, in respect of secular instruction and expenditure necessary to maintain and keep them efficient, under the control of the Local Education Authority, but in respect of religious instruction is under the control of local bodies of managers, who as regards appointment of teachers, repair of buildings and other matters, have rights and duties which are elaborately defined in the Act of 1902.

In this class of schools responsibility and control are divided between the Local Education Authority and the managers. This arrangement for dual control is full of compromises and has behind it a long history of denominational, inter-denominational, anti-denominational and secularist controversy.

1833–1870 *Voluntary Schools Alone*

It is impossible in this book even to summarise this controversy, which till 1870 defeated all attempts at general legislation. From 1833, when the State first intervened by making grants in aid of building elementary schools, till 1870, all elementary schools were "voluntary," provided mainly by the two great Societies, the National Society and the British and Foreign Schools Society, between which the original building grants were divided. From 1839 the Committee of the Privy Council, which distributed grants, made it a condition that religious instruction should be given in schools to which grants were made. They endeavoured also without

much success to secure the use of a conscience clause. In 1870 such a clause appeared only in 205 out of the 6,700 Trust Deeds of Church of England Schools.*

In 1871 there were 8,798 voluntary elementary schools, of which 6,724 were Church of England schools, 381 Roman Catholic and 1,691 "British," Wesleyan, Undenominational, etc. The number of scholars on the registers was 1,802,419, of whom 282,295, or over 15½ per cent., were under 5, and 6,687 were under 3 years of age. The voluntary subscriptions for the maintenance of these schools amounted to £437,401, and the annual grant paid was £639,660, or 10*s.* 1¾*d.* per scholar in average attendance.

1870–1902 *Voluntary and Board Schools Side by Side*

The Bill of 1870, as introduced, permitted School Boards to aid voluntary schools out of the rates, but this provision was dropped. It also permitted School Boards to pay the fees of poor children attending voluntary schools, but in 1873 this power was transferred to the Guardians.† The Act closed the conscience clause controversy by making the use of a "time table" conscience clause,‡ if

* H. of C. Return 178 of 1906, pp. 94-99.

† Its financial provisions had the effect of not merely supplementing but reinforcing the voluntary schools, and, as John Bright declared, a Conservative Government could have proposed but could never have passed it. Life—G. M. Trevelyan, pp. 406-9.

‡ It was called a "time table conscience clause," because it required that religious instruction should be given only at the beginning or end of a school meeting, so as to facilitate withdrawal of children from it if their parents desired.

religious instruction was given, a condition of Parliamentary grants, but it did not require that such instruction should be given, and it provided that no grant should be given in respect of it, and that it should be no part of the duty of H.M. inspectors to include it in their inquiries or examinations.

As regards the character of religious instruction in Board schools, the compromise of the "Cowper Temple Clause" gave equally little satisfaction to the advocates of "definite" religious instruction and their adversaries. It was admitted that while the clause forbade the teaching of catechisms and formularies it did not forbid the teaching of doctrines distinctive of particular denominations. To one party this appeared extremely dangerous, as leading, through sectarian domination of School Boards, to sectarian teaching in Board schools. To the others the clause, coupled with the liberty of School Boards to fall back on their discretion to give no religious instruction at all, offered the prospect of indefinite, colourless and ineffectual religious instruction. The apprehensions of the first party have been allayed, though in 1894 the action of the London School Board again excited them, and to them the Cowper Temple clause is now the charter of religious liberty and peace in the Council schools. To the second party the clause and the discretion to give no religious instruction is still in principle a stumbling-block and an obstacle to unification of control, though in practice they have willingly co-operated to make the religious instruction actually given under it as good as possible, and to secure its

Christian character. The Act contained elaborate provisions empowering the managers of voluntary schools to transfer them to School Boards, and these provisions are still applicable.

The Act of 1902

The Act of 1902 placed the duty of maintaining* and keeping efficient all public elementary schools, whether voluntary or Board schools, on the Local Education Authorities, thereby relieving what was described as the "intolerable strain" on the voluntary schools. It gave the Authorities the control of secular instruction, of the expenditure necessary to maintain and keep the schools efficient, and the determination of the number and educational qualifications of the teachers.

The managers of voluntary schools were to be appointed as to two-thirds under the provisions of the Trust Deed by order of the Board of Education having regard to the trusts or usage, and as to one-third by Local Authorities including Parish Councils. These managers were by the "Kenyon-Slaney clause" given the control of religious instruction,

* In 1902 there were on the list of public elementary schools 5,878 Board schools with an accommodation for 2,958,000 scholars and an average attendance of 2,344,000. There were at the same time 14,275 voluntary schools with an accommodation for 3,723,000 scholars and an average attendance of 3,074,000. The cost of maintenance per child was in Board schools £3 0*s.* 9½*d.* and in voluntary schools £2 5*s.* 4½*d.*, towards which Government grants provided £1 10*s.* 8*d.* and £1 15*s.* 5*d.*, or about 50 per cent. and 78 per cent. respectively. For voluntary schools 6*s.* 10½*d.* was contributed by voluntary subscribers, or about 17 per cent.

which, as regards its character, was to be in accordance with the provisions of the Trust Deed, if any.

The managers have "the exclusive power of appointing and dismissing teachers" in voluntary schools, but the consent of the Local Education Authority, which can be withheld only "on educational grounds," is required to their appointment.* On the other hand, the Authority can, as in their own schools, give directions as to the number and educational qualifications of teachers to be employed in voluntary schools, and can require their dismissal "on educational grounds." The consent of the Authority to their dismissal by the managers is necessary, unless the dismissal is "on grounds connected with the giving of religious instruction." The Authority has the control of expenditure required for their salaries as for other purposes. Disputes between the Authority and managers arising under this section (Section 7) of the Act have unhappily to be determined by the Board of Education.

The managers are required to provide the school house (except the teacher's dwelling-house, if any) free of charge, and keep it in good repair and make alterations and improvements reasonably required by the Authority, but the Authority is to make good damage which it considers to be due to fair wear and tear in the use of any room for the purpose of a public elementary school. The repair of the playground falls upon the managers.

In one respect the Act of 1902 was undoubtedly

* It cannot be withheld on the ground only that the best teachers available among the candidates have not been selected.

defective, inasmuch as it left the managers of a voluntary school free to close it at any time (except so far as they could be restrained under the law of Charitable Trusts, or by the obligation to repay building grants) and thus cause a deficiency of school accommodation which might be serious. This was remedied by Section 30 of the Act of 1918, which requires eighteen months' notice of intention to close a school, and gives the free use of the buildings to the Local Education Authority for that period if the managers do not carry it on themselves.

Notice has to be given of the proposed provision of a new school of either class, and on appeal or in case of dispute the Board of Education has to decide whether it is necessary or whether a "voluntary" or "provided" school is best suited "to meet the wants of the district," regard being had to "the interest of secular instruction, to the wishes of parents as to the education of their children and to the economy of the rates." In case of dispute an existing school is not to be considered unnecessary if the number of scholars in average attendance is not less than thirty.

Denominational Instruction Controversy

The Act of 1902 terminated the "dual system" of Board schools and voluntary schools standing side by side, in the sense that it made municipal Local Authorities responsible for the maintenance of both classes of schools. But it set up a "dual control" of the voluntary schools, dividing it between Local Authorities and local bodies of

managers. The measure gave rise to great controversy inside and outside Parliament. It was debated on fifty-nine days in the Commons and nine days in the Lords, and at one time opposition from the denominational as well as from the undenominational side threatened to be serious. The "dual control" of voluntary schools was offensive to those who held that the maintenance of schools out of the rates should carry with it complete public control, that children should not be compelled to attend schools which aimed at maintaining a religious "atmosphere" adverse to their parents' views and in which escape from distasteful religious instruction could be obtained only at the cost of making a child disagreeably conspicuous,* and that rates levied on persons of all denominations should not be applied to the support of instruction in the tenets of one denomination. ("Rome on the rates" was a war cry of that period.) It was also offensive to those who resented the preference shown to "Cowper Temple Instruction" in provided schools ("the Christianity of the County Council" or "protoplasmic Christianity"), and the burden imposed on those who advocated "definite" religious instruction of having to find and repair school buildings in which it was given and also to pay rates for provided schools in which it could not be given.

* The "Anson bye-law," introduced in 1905 and now adopted in some 129 areas, permits a parent not only to withdraw his child from actual religious instruction in school, but also to keep his child out of school during the period of such instruction. In some six areas it is provided that this right can only be exercised in order that the child may receive such instruction elsewhere.

The "Kenyon-Slaney" clause, which gave the control of religious instruction to the managers of voluntary schools instead of the vicar, was resented; the parish clergyman, it was said, would enter the new educational system "with a rope round his neck." A good deal of apprehension was also felt as to the effect which the provisions of the Act relating to management and the control of secular instruction by the Local Authorities would have on the conduct of voluntary schools.

The controversy remained acute for about ten years; a number of "conscientious objectors" refused to pay rates for denominational schools, and the duty of giving effect to the provisions of the Act and determining disputes arising under it which was assigned to the Board of Education involved it in many acrimonious controversies, some of which were taken into the Courts.

1906–8 *Attempts to Revise the Settlement of* 1902

The Liberal Government which came into power in 1905 made, under three successive Presidents of the Board, Mr. Birrell, Mr. McKenna and Mr. Runciman, attempts to revise the settlement of 1902 by Bills of 1906 and 1908.

The object of all these Bills was to bring all voluntary schools under complete and unified public control. They all provided that no aid from the rates should be given to schools not provided by or transferred to the Local Authorities, that there should be no tests for teachers and that teachers should not be required to give religious instruction.

They provided for the transfer of voluntary school buildings to the Local Education Authority by agreement, or failing agreement, by compulsion. The additional expense to the Local Authorities of maintaining and improving the buildings was to be met by additional grants amounting to a million or more pounds. They all allowed payment to be made in certain cases to the Trustees of transferred schools or other bodies (to enable them to provide for purposes of the Trusts other than those of secular instruction), but they varied in the arrangements for such payments and assessed them in different ways, according to the situation of each school, the nature of its trusts,* and the conditions attached to its transfer. All the Bills provided that "facilities" should be given in transferred schools for "special" (denominational) religious instruction, but it was not to be given at the cost of the rates, and the Bills differed as regards the arrangements for giving it by the teachers or otherwise. Mr. McKenna's and Mr. Runciman's Bills provided in certain cases that schools might "contract out," i.e. might continue to receive State aid in grants but no rate aid. Under Mr. Runciman's Bill these grants were to be pooled and paid to Associations representing denominations. Mr. Birrell's Bill did not allow "contracting out."

Mr. Birrell's Bill was a measure of first-class politi-

* In 1906-7 a colossal return was made, running to nearly 2,000 folio pages and based on an examination of over 14,000 deeds, of the tenure and trusts of voluntary schools. The general introduction to it illustrates the early history of elementary education. (H. of C. Return 231 of 1907.)

cal importance. It was, between April and December, 1906, debated in the House of Commons on thirty-four days, and on twenty-three days in the House of Lords, where it was drastically amended. The Government, in the Commons, refused to discuss the Lords' amendments in detail, and the Bill was abandoned. Mr. McKenna ceased to be President after the first reading of his Bill, and it did not go beyond the second reading stage. The Government promised to amend it in accordance with any settlement subsequently reached, and it was regarded as foreshadowing an agreed Bill. It was, however, described by Mr. Balfour as answering to the previous announcement of "not an olive branch but a sword." In March, 1908, the Bishop of St. Asaph introduced a Bill in the Lords, following up a previous Bill of 1904.

In May, 1908, Mr. Runciman opened negotiations with the Primate, and representatives of the Roman Catholic and Free Churches, with a view to an agreed settlement, and in November the Government considered that sufficient progress had been made to justify the hope that a Bill would have a fair chance of acceptance as a "concordat" measure. The Bill was read a first and second time on November 20th and 26th, and went into Committee, subject to the new "guillotine" procedure on November 30th. This summary procedure was obviously adopted in order to reduce the risk of wrecking agitation by extremists. The abandonment of the Bill was announced on December 7th, and the correspondence with the Primate was published as a Command paper (1908, Cmd. 4421).

The failure of the Bill was due partly to the absence of previous agreement as to the financial terms on which voluntary schools could contract out or be transferred, and which would enable the trustees either to maintain them without rate aid or defray the cost of special religious instruction. The Primate declared that they failed to make good a previous statement of the Prime Minister "that contracted-out schools should be given a reasonable chance of existence, leaving, however, a substantial burden to be borne by the denomination," and he urged that the question of terms was not one of "mere financial detail," but inherent in the structure of a balanced settlement. Mr. Runciman announced his willingness to increase the proposed scale of payments to be made to the owners of transferred schools, doubling them in most cases, but refused to increase the grants to contracted out schools, except for providing that they should increase if the ordinary grants increased. The question from his point of view was one of principle. It had always been agreed that contracting out should be the exception and not the rule, applying to perhaps 500 out of 5,200 schools in the class to which contracting out was confined, and if the payments were so increased as to make contracting-out easy and attractive, the number of such schools might be largely increased and the general object of the Bill, to bring the great majority of voluntary schools under complete public control, would be defeated. Each side treated the matter as one of principle, and each side reproached the other with not having prepared and submitted trustworthy figures. The

Church Party said that an increase of the proposed payment to contracted-out schools (which was taken as round about 50*s*.) by 6*s*. or 7*s*. a child was essential to give reality to the settlement. But the decisive blow was given to the Bill by the action of the Representative Church Council on December 3rd, when the rank and file carried the day against their leaders. A resolution rejecting the compromise was moved, and the best the supporters of compromise could do was to move an amendment recognising that the Bill represented an advance towards a reasonable settlement. Twenty-one Bishops voted for the amendment, which was defeated. This incident was taken by the Government to indicate a complete change in the situation and that there was no hope that the settlement proposed by the Bill would be accepted by the Church as an agreed compromise. The Prime Minister announced the Bill's withdrawal, paying a tribute to the Primate as worthy of the title "pastor pastorum ecclesiæ," and saying that he had never experienced "a more heavy and thorough disappointment."

There can be no doubt that, in spite of the failure of these endeavours, there was a very strong and authoritative body of opinion in favour of settlement by compromise. It is true that both in the Free Churches and the Anglican Church there were many laymen as well as clerics who could see in any practical compromise nothing but an abandonment of principle, and concessions which might be accepted by the Anglican Church would not go far to satisfy the Roman Catholics.

It is also true that among those who were generally favourable to compromise there were many inconvenient cross-currents of opinion as to the particular form which it should take. And the period was one of fierce political controversy on other issues. But although the efforts to effect a settlement were not renewed and no Government ventured to revive them for twelve years,* they did produce on the whole a better atmosphere. All parties to the controversy were disposed, partly out of weariness, to make the best of the existing arrangements, and being relieved from the fear that concessions on minor points and mutual consideration in the actual working of the existing system might be treated as signs of weakness and lead to renewed attacks on it, or prejudice resistance to fundamental changes in it, they tended to come together and co-operate for the good of the service, relegating controversial questions of principle to the background. This tendency became very marked in the Councils of Local Authorities as time went on. It is even more true perhaps of the period subsequent to 1908 than before, that "the religious difficulty does not exist in the schools."

In the field of higher education there was in 1902 no heritage of denominational controversy (except as regards Training Colleges) comparable with that which afflicted elementary education. The Act of 1902 contemplated that Local Education Authorities would both provide new schools,

* In 1912 Sir G. Croydon Marks introduced a Bill relating to voluntary schools in single school areas which did not go beyond a second reading.

colleges and hostels for higher education and aid existing schools, etc., and for both classes of schools it required observance of a conscience clause. In schools provided by them it authorised the Authorities to allow the giving of denominational religious instruction, at the request of parents or scholars, but otherwise than at the cost of the Authorities. It stipulated that no unfair preference should be shown to any denomination and that no pupil should on the ground of religious belief be placed in an inferior position. In schools aided by the Authorities they were not to require that any particular form of religious instruction or worship should or should not be taught or practised. Although under this provision conditions relating to religious instruction could not be attached to the aid given by Authorities, discretion to refuse aid altogether on denominational grounds was in some areas claimed and exercised, in the years following the Act. On the other hand, recourse was had by the Board of Education to administrative measures for the emancipation of grant-aided secondary schools and training colleges from certain features of their control by governing bodies which were regarded as impairing their accessibility to all classes of the people, irrespective of denominational or other non-educational considerations (p. 166). The provisions relating to training colleges gave rise to a good deal of difficulty. Although the life of secondary schools has not been much disturbed by religious controversy, the municipal training colleges are much in the minds of those who desire to secure more ample and effective provision for

religious instruction in all State-aided schools and institutions.

As regards the actual practice in the giving of religious instruction, Parliament has shown its interest by ordering numerous returns, since religious instruction was withdrawn from the purview of H.M. Inspectors in 1870. Thus between 1875 and 1894 there were no less than eight returns showing the provision made for it in Board Schools and one relating to its provision in voluntary schools. A return of 1888 to an order of the House of Lords is printed as an Appendix to the Report of the Cross Commission and shows that there were then twenty-one school districts in England and seventy in Wales in which no provision was made for religious teaching, reading or observance. At the present time there may be one or two Local Education Authorities which do not profess to make provision for religious instruction in Council schools. The extent and content and effectiveness of that provision no doubt varies a good deal.

In 1906 a return of the regulations or syllabuses of religious instruction issued by Local Education Authorities for use in Council schools was made to the House of Lords. It is impossible to summarise this Return accurately but from an analysis made by the National Society at the time it appears that out of 293 Authorities possessing Council schools, 225 issued schemes or regulations for religious teaching. Some of the syllabuses were meagre and ineffective, some were full and good, particularly that adopted by the London County Council and inherited by it from the London School Board. It was adopted

in Mr. Birrell's Bill of 1906 as providing a standard for religious instruction under the Cowper Temple Clause. Since then it is generally admitted that great progress has been made. Ministers and laymen of all Protestant denominations have co-operated, even in areas in which the denominational controversy was formerly most acute, to frame syllabuses of instruction in the Scriptures and in the principles of Christianity. There are not very many who now stigmatise instruction given on these lines as worthless or claim that the parents are, actively or passively, dissatisfied with it. There are many, on the other hand, who believe that it satisfies the desires of the great majority of parents so far as they have any desires on the subject. The difficulty of seeing that the instruction shall be efficiently given remains, and this difficulty is as fully realised by active members of the Church of England in respect of its voluntary schools and indeed in respect of its secondary schools. Great efforts have been made by the National Society to secure improvement.

1920 *Proposals for Concordat*

In 1920 Mr. Fisher, the President of the Board, took steps by consultation with persons representing different views to ascertain whether there was a prospect of such general agreement as would justify the Government in attempting a revision of the settlement of 1902, and in March of that year he indicated certain principles on which new arrangements might be based.

He pointed out that the Act of 1918 had given new emphasis to the problem of advanced and practical instruction in elementary schools, the solution of which required the most effective and economical use of school buildings, and to the problem of the organisation of the teaching profession so as to secure the systematic selection, appointment, promotion and distribution of teachers. In these respects the system of dual control involved embarrassments and hindrances which it was important to remove. He suggested that an agreed resettlement might be effected on the following lines: the appointment, promotion and dismissal of all teachers in public elementary schools to be in the hands of the Local Education Authority; no teacher to be required to give religious instruction, unless specially appointed for that purpose only, or to be in a better or worse position by reason of giving or not giving religious instruction; the Local Education Authority to have the free use of voluntary school premises for any of their educational purposes, with the obligation to maintain and the right to alter them for school purposes: the Local Education Authority to be under an obligation to make adequate provision in all public elementary schools for religious observance and instruction differentiated as far as practicable in relation to religious tenets, to be given in school hours by teachers suitable and willing to give it, subject to a conscience clause and provision for withdrawal of scholars for religious observance or instruction elsewhere; no privilege of "standing out" of these arrangements to be conceded to one

denomination which was not open to other denominations.

He recognised that the training-college system would have to be modified to secure sufficient opportunities for training in the giving of religious instruction to those who desired them, and that the trustees of existing voluntary schools should continue to have some representation on their management.

On November 1st, 1921, Mr. Thomas Davies introduced into the House of Commons a Bill drawn on the lines suggested by Mr. Fisher. It was read a second time but was not proceeded with.

On July 8th, 1922, the National Assembly of the Church of England adopted a report by its Education Committee arising out of Mr. Fisher's proposals and suggesting terms of settlement.

At that time, as previously, there was a disposition to argue that the problems of the system of dual control would be eliminated and the unification of the elementary school system effected by the processes of time and attrition. This argument was generally used by those who thought that *any* change in the law relating to Council schools should be ruled out. The proportion of voluntary schools was becoming smaller, the burden of maintaining and improving their buildings greater, and in the Anglican, if not the Roman Catholic communion, the collection of money for their maintenance more difficult. Economic pressure would accelerate this tendency to abandon or transfer voluntary schools under the existing law. Within a reasonable time,

therefore, it might be expected that voluntary schools would, whether by closure or transfer, be replaced by schools provided by the Local Authority. Figures, however, did not and still do not favour that argument. In the seventeen years ending July, 1918, the number of "Council" schools had increased by 2,678 and the number of voluntary schools decreased by 2,030. In the years immediately following 1902 the number of closures and transfers of voluntary schools was considerable, but of those which disappeared 637 were not denominational; most of them were privately owned, and 293 were Wesleyan schools. The net decrease in Anglican schools in the seventeen years (allowing for the opening of about 160 new schools) was 1,140, or an average of sixty-seven a year. Even if the rate of closure or transfer were increased to 100 a year it would take 105 years to eliminate them by attrition.

In 1924-1925 there were 11,698 voluntary schools and 15,461 departments, as against 9,038 Council schools and 15,592 departments. The voluntary schools are mostly small, as their average attendance was 1,759,998 in 1924-1925, as against 3,180,463 in Council schools. The argument from attrition is obviously much stronger in respect of the relative number of scholars in the two classes of schools than it is in respect of the number of schools, particularly in rural areas.

Since 1920 attention has been chiefly directed to two features of the dual system—the difficulty of obtaining the improvement of old voluntary school buildings which, as judged by modern standards,

are defective and prejudicial to the health or efficient instruction of the children, and the difficulty of organising advanced or practical instruction for the more advanced or older scholars.

On three occasions during the last thirty years the Education Department and the Board have undertaken a systematic review of school buildings—in 1893, in 1907-1908, and in 1924-1925 (Chapter III, p. 33). On each occasion a large proportion of school buildings were found seriously unsatisfactory, the majority of which were naturally, owing to the limited resources of the managers, the buildings of voluntary schools. The Board has sometimes been reproached with pressing too hardly on voluntary schools, but on the whole its impartiality in this matter as between the two classes of schools has been well recognised.

In many cases the necessary improvements both in voluntary and provided schools are long overdue, having been postponed owing to the war and the financial difficulties and high prices which followed it. It is difficult for the supporters of voluntary schools to raise money for capital expenditure. The alternatives to improvement are closure or transfer to the Local Education Authority. The enforced closure of voluntary schools throws on Local Education Authorities an unwelcome burden, while under the existing law they cannot spend money on improving voluntary school buildings and cannot accept transfer of schools on terms which will secure the continuance of denominational religious instruction.

As regards the second point there is a general

agreement that the present system of elementary education is less effective and yields a smaller return for the expenditure upon it in respect of the children between the ages of 11 + and 14 + and offers too little inducement, to those who do not proceed to secondary schools, to pursue their education beyond the age of 14. In this period, which should be the most fruitful period, there is too much "marking time," too little differentiation of curriculum and too little opportunity for practical instruction. To find a remedy for these defects is largely a problem of organisation,* and quite apart from financial and geographical considerations, it is not easy for the local education authority to organise a system of advanced and practical instruction unless it can include in it the accommodation, staff and scholars of all the schools in its area or in convenient subdivisions of its area. It is extremely difficult to bring into such a system small or medium-sized voluntary schools which insist on their right to be treated as independent units.

In large, conveniently planned and well-staffed and equipped schools the organisation of senior departments or "higher tops" for advanced instruction may be effective, but even in large centres of population there is a considerable residue of schools in which this method is impracticable. A good deal may be done under Section 34 of the

* The Consultative Committee's Report of 1926 on "The Education of the Adolescent" proposes an entire reorganisation of "post primary" education from the age of 11+ to 15+, to complete which would involve a change in the existing system of Local Education Authorities and in the system of Council and voluntary schools. *See* pp. 160-8.

Act of 1921 by redistributing the children attending voluntary schools of the same denomination, though parochial and other considerations present obstacles. But both in urban and rural areas there is a large field in which the effective and economical organisation of instruction for the older or more advanced scholars cannot be secured without the establishment of central schools or classes, and cutting to some extent across the line which separates Council from voluntary schools.

It is not surprising, therefore, that recently both among Local Education Authorities and supporters of voluntary schools, minds have turned in the direction of some modification of the dual system, if not by a general and obligatory measure, at all events under a permissive and enabling measure.* A considerable number of proposals for this purpose have been tentatively made by Local Authorities. The movement marked by the resolution of the Church Assembly in 1922 has been carried on, and the question of modifying the present system has been under its continuous consideration. In 1925 the President of the Board of Education intimated that the Government would be prepared to proceed on the lines of an "Enabling Bill" if there was sufficient agreement to justify it. In June, 1926, the Conference of the Association of Education Committees informed the Church Assembly that it would support an Enabling Bill, and it also made

* In Wales, where a "concordat" movement began as long ago as 1904, a comprehensive scheme was prepared by the authorities of the Church and other Protestant denominations and submitted to the Local Education Authorities.

arrangements for its representatives to discuss the matter with the National Union of Teachers. The third Report of its Education Commission was discussed by the Church Assembly in November, 1926, with a result which the Association of Education Committees regarded as discouraging.

On the side of the Local Authorities there is a general desire to have a wide discretion to make terms with those responsible for voluntary schools, whether individually or collectively, either for their transfer or for giving them financial assistance, coupled with modifications in their management, or for facilitating the redistribution of scholars. Individual agreements have the advantage of providing object lessons in the experimental reconciliation of interests, and of paving the way, if successful, for a more general settlement. On the side of the Church of England there is a reluctance to countenance agreements which are not collective and a disposition to press not only for special arrangements regarding religious instruction in transferred voluntary schools, but also for statutory provisions to secure adequate and effective provision for it in all State-aided schools and institutions. On the side of the teachers there is a disposition to look less at the advantages which would accrue to some 15,000 head and 46,000 assistant teachers now serving in voluntary schools, if they were placed on the same footing as teachers in Council schools in respect of their employment and promotion by a public authority, than at the risk that new arrangements for religious instruction might lead to a system of "tests," implicit if not explicit, which

would affect their employment or promotion, or trench on the province of conscience, and might complicate the life and work of the schools and disturb their harmony.

It is common ground that the efficiency of religious instruction depends, if not exclusively at all events mainly, on the willingness and competence of the ordinary teachers to give it and on their sincerity (though this is beyond the reach of any "tests" or any inspection) in giving it. "Right of entry" may afford a means of meeting particular difficulties, but is ineffectual for general or extensive use; the words awake ominous echoes of old controversy. It is necessary therefore for any large modification of the dual system to secure the willing co-operation of the teachers. That they should approach the matter with caution or hesitancy is not unnatural, even though the atmosphere is now milder and more favourable to constructive co-operation than it has been for a hundred years. There is a general reluctance to reopen, whether in Parliament or in the Council Chambers of Local Authorities, the controversies which agitated the period between 1902 and 1909. The animosities, suspicions and asperities of that period have abated, co-operation between advocates of conflicting principles has become more frequent and cordial, and there is a tendency to go as far as possible in the adjustment of rights and privileges to the common end of making elementary education better and more responsive to the needs of the people. It would be hazardous, however, in view of the history of elementary education in England and Wales, to

prophesy that any large or general measure to modify the existing system in respect of religious instruction would not lead to a recrudescence of old controversies. The history of Scotland in this respect has been happier.

Chapter XI

TEACHERS

In this chapter no attempt is made to review all the features of the teaching service in State-aided schools. That would require a large volume, and the subject has been dealt with in many books and in many public documents, both historically and constructively. The main problem of any service of public education is to provide an adequate staff of well-educated and skilful teachers, working under conditions favourable to the effective and zealous performance of their duties towards their scholars, and incidental problems cluster thickly round it. The corps of teachers occupies the key position in the strategy of Education, and till recently the Board kept a firm hold on it.

The body of teachers makes up, in Mr. Lowe's phrase, a "respectable army." In 1925 there were about 190,000 full-time adult teachers in State-aided elementary, secondary, technical, etc. schools and training colleges, of whom about 178,000 are pensionable. About 18,000 are graduates and 98,000 have been "trained." In elementary schools there are 165,047 adult full-time teachers,* and some 10,000 student

* These are divided into four classes, (1) "certificated and trained," (2) "certificated and not trained," (3) "uncertificated," and (4) "supplementary." Admission to class (2) by examination has ceased; class (3) is large but not increasing, and is mainly

teachers, pupil teachers and "others." There are also 15,255 students in training.

Training

Teaching is a skilled craft, and teachers must themselves be well educated. Whether and how far they can be taught or trained to teach has been much debated, but the view of the State from the beginning of public education has been that they can and should be trained, at all events for teaching in elementary schools. In 1923 the Board set up a Departmental Committee to review the arrangements for the Training of Teachers in Public Elementary Schools; and its report, issued in 1925, contains the most recent discussion of many problems relating to the teaching service. Chapter I of the Board's Report for 1912-1913 reviews the history of the training of teachers for elementary schools, and reference may be made to the Report of Lord Cross's Commission of 1886-1888.

Some provision of schools or colleges for the training of teachers for elementary schools had been made before the Committee of Council was set up in 1839. It is significant that the very first proposal of the Committee was to establish a State training institution. That proposal raised a first class Parliamentary controversy and was abandoned. From 1835 to 1860 the Committee made building grants to the extent of about £118,000 in aid of the pro-

composed of women; class (4) is confined to women employed in rural areas for the youngest children, and is strictly limited.

vision of training colleges by voluntary effort, a device which was revived in 1904-1905 (on a basis of a State contribution which rose to the high rate of 75 per cent. of the cost, amounting in the aggregate to about £730,000) to assist Local Education Authorities to provide municipal colleges, and subsequently to assist universities and university colleges to provide hostels for students receiving training in the university departments which came on the scene in 1890.

The provision of colleges was made sporadically and unsystematically; and for a considerable period the fact that nearly all the colleges were denominational occasioned a good deal of difficulty.* In 1906 out of 5,201 places in residential colleges 4,142 were open only to candidates belonging or conforming to some particular denomination; and in 1907, at the same time as building grants were instituted to assist the provision of undenominational municipal colleges, the Board revised their regulations and applied to existing colleges the principle that they should be open to all students qualified to profit by the training given in them irrespective of religious creed or social status. The administration of these

* In 1886 there were forty-three colleges, of which thirty were connected with the Church of England, two with the Wesleyan, and three with the Roman Catholic Churches, and only eight were undenominational. At that time 69 per cent. of the elementary schools containing 56.37 per cent. of the scholars were denominational. The Royal Commission of 1888 did not venture to recommend a "conscience clause" for residential denominational colleges, and the "inaccessibility" of colleges mainly supported by public money became a political and educational stumbling block.

regulations gave rise to a good deal of controversy, which died down as the new municipal colleges arrived on the scene, and offered a wider choice between denominational and undenominational institutions. At present Local Authorities provide only thirty out of 103 grant-aided institutions for training teachers, and in 1925 were training about 4,900 students out of 17,000, the remainder being divided between the colleges of voluntary bodies and university institutions.

Apart from its contributions to the cost of providing colleges, the State has always paid a very high proportion of the cost of maintaining them.* The grants to non-municipal colleges are still made on a capitation basis at a rate which compares very favourably with the level rate of 50 per cent. of net expenditure on which grants are (since 1918) made to Local Authorities in respect of higher education. This disparity led to a good deal of discontent on the part of Local Authorities which provide and maintain colleges, and a special super-grant (limited to £70,000) was instituted to meet their complaints, the cost of which was in 1926 charged, by way of deduction from their general grant for higher education, against those authorities for higher education which profit by but do not maintain colleges.

* In 1860 the State grants for maintenance amounted to £62,272, voluntary contributions, etc. provided £22,485, the balance being covered by students' payments. In 1886 the grants amounted to £121,821 and subscriptions and donations amounted to £15,970 In 1910-11 the grants amounted to £355,210, and voluntary contributions, endowments and rates provided only £52,615, or less than 9½ per cent. of the total cost, and less than 13 per cent. of the cost not covered by students' payments.

In the ninety years during which the State has interested itself in training colleges its association with the arrangements for the admission of students, their instruction and examination and the award of their final qualifications to teach, has been very intimate. Its concern for them has been more conspicuously paternal than for any other educational institutions, and through its regulations and inspectors it has exercised control and supervision of them in a high degree. This circumstance no doubt is partly due to the high rate at which the State contributed to their funds, but even more to its realisation of their vital significance for the welfare of the service. It is not possible to tell the story of the Central Authority's doings in this matter, but it may be noted that up to 1926 the Board's regulations still required that all proposed appointments to the principalship or teaching staff of a training college should be submitted to them for approval, and the continued approval of any member of the staff was subject to the Board being satisfied as to his or her efficiency. Even in the revised regulations for 1926, which dispensed with particular regulations, the domestic flavour of the old regulations is preserved in the provision that the principal of a women's college must be a woman.

On the other hand the close touch kept between the Board and their inspectors and the colleges has facilitated rather than impeded arrangements which allow a wide discretion to the college authorities to vary courses of study and methods of training, and also arrangements by which responsibility is shared between the college staffs and the Board's

inspectors and university bodies for the examination of the students and the award of their final qualifications. This feature affords an interesting illustration of the compatibility of close personal control with elasticity. It is no exaggeration to say that the English system of training teachers is the freest in the world, and that this atmosphere of freedom, communicated to the schools, excites the wonder, if not the admiration, of foreign observers.

The Departmental Committee of 1923-1925 considered whether the time had come to give a "new orientation" to the work of training colleges. They had hitherto performed a double function—that of completing the general education of the students, and that of training them professionally to impart their knowledge and perform their duties to the scholars in the schools in which they were going to serve. In early days the students had found in the public system of education little opportunity of carrying their own general education very far; they were relatively ignorant, and the colleges had much ado to equip them on the academic side. And for many years the academic side of the colleges was dominant.

The development of the public system of secondary education however entirely altered the situation, and the Committee of 1923-1925 concluded that the colleges should become "institutions for professional training primarily," their academic work to be undertaken "primarily as a means to professional skill, and less for learning or intellectual development in itself." As to the steps to be taken to give effect to this principle the Committee were divided. The

majority were not prepared to recommend a radically new departure, and desired to retain a substantial academic element in the work of the colleges. A minority urged strongly that the logical consequences of the principle should be accepted and a radical new departure made: that the students should have completed an adequate general education up to a later age tested by appropriate school or university examinations before they entered colleges, and that the colleges should confine themselves to professional training. Courses lasting for three and four years would disappear, and the ordinary courses would be one year courses, not two year courses (on this latter point one member of the minority dissented). In this way intake of the colleges could be easily regulated, their output would be doubled, there would be plenty of room for all candidates, and in view of the reduced cost to the State it might charge itself with the whole cost of the students' training. The Committee's views as regards the arrangements for the previous academic education of the students are referred to below.

Cutting across the main debate as to the dominance of academic or professional considerations, appeal is made to the social effect of colleges on the character of intending teachers. On the one hand there is the risk that they may acquire a "Seminarist" or caste spirit by premature segregation in a "closed" institution where the atmosphere is less lively than in an "open" institution where young people confront each other with all sorts of different ideas, habits and ambitions. On the other hand those who conduct colleges, and particularly residential

colleges, lay great stress on the intensive social training which they give and the sense of "vocation" which they cultivate, and they urge that for this a two years' course of training is none too long.

On the main point of difference between the majority and minority of the Committee the Board ultimately left the decision as to the character and length of courses to the college authorities, confining themselves to defining the maximum length of courses for purposes of grant. The Board agreed with the recommendation of the Committee that the system of central examination of students at the end of their training should be abandoned, and invited proposals for substituting for the Board's examinations examinations conducted with the assistance of university bodies. Considerable use was already made of university examinations in academic subjects, and the proposed arrangement would conduce to that closer association of training college work and the granting of teachers' qualifications with universities which the teaching profession had long desired.

In 1926 the Board's regulations for the training of teachers were recast on the same lines as were followed in respect of other branches (Chapter VII). So far as possible the new regulations are "confined to the statement of the conditions upon which training colleges will be recognised and grants will be paid, and the responsibility for determining the particular means by which these general conditions can best be satisfied is left mainly to the Local Education Authorities and governing bodies of training colleges subject,

when necessary, to the approval of the Board." It may be noted that the same wide discretion as the Board was willing to leave to Local Education Authorities in respect of the conduct of elementary, secondary and technical, etc. schools was here also conferred on the voluntary governing bodies and University bodies which control the majority of the training colleges.

The Board has for many years prescribed no qualifications at all for teachers in schools and institutions for higher education except for principal teachers in schools of art, an exception which disappeared in 1926. Schools and institutions for higher education have been given a free choice of teachers and left to rely on their own attractions to obtain competent teachers. Training of teachers for secondary school work is a modern development, and it was not till 1908 that grants were made in aid of secondary courses.*

Recruitment and Preliminary Education of Teachers

The deficiency of properly qualified adult teachers was in early days the greatest obstacle to the establishment of public education, and it was vital to recruit and educate young people to become teachers.

The old system of employing children as "monitors" to transmit the instruction of the

* In 1913-14 the number of students who followed such approved courses was 180, in 1920-21 it was 260, and in 1924-25 it was 811. The regulations of 1926 do not refer to training for secondary as distinct from training for elementary schools, but only require that all courses must have a "suitable" curriculum.

teachers to the other children broke down hopelessly, and in 1847 selected children were apprenticed to the schoolmasters as pupil teachers. Apprenticeship was abandoned in 1861, but the attempt to combine in the same school the education of an intending teacher with his employment to teach was continued, and it was not till 1880 that the Department recognised the device of giving part-time education to pupil teachers in central classes or institutions.* The Royal Commission of 1886-1888, and a Departmental Committee of 1896-1898, recognised that intending teachers should receive a proper secondary education, but the provision of secondary schools was wholly inadequate. Between 1903 and 1907 the Board did all it could to bring and keep intending teachers inside secondary schools.† Special payments were made during the greater part of this period to help intending teachers, as pupil teachers, bursars or student teachers, to obtain education before they went to training colleges.

The Departmental Committee of 1923-1925 considered whether the process of merging the education of intending teachers in the general educational system of the country could not now be completed. Recruits for the profession have for eighty years

* Early in 1902 the Courts in the case of Dyer *v.* the London School Board declared the provision of these "centres" out of the rates illegal.

† In 1920-21 more than 85 per cent. of the intending teachers had passed or were passing through secondary schools. In 1924 6,853 students admitted to training colleges, or 91.9 per cent. of the total, had been educated in secondary schools. Of these 5,917 had qualified for admission by passing the first or second examinations of secondary schools.

been "earmarked" for it at an early age, and assisted to enter it by special bounties.* Is it possible now to rely on the attractions of the profession itself, enhanced by stabilised salaries and a superannuation system similar to that of the Civil Service, and on the liberal provision of free secondary education and scholarships for those who need assistance, to keep up the supply of good recruits drawn indifferently from all classes? The majority of the Committee thought that after the age of 16 aid from public funds should still be given to intending teachers as such. The minority thought that the Majority Report was "inclined to shy at the consequences of its own logic," and urged that the Board should abandon all special grants for the education of intending teachers at any stage, including the university stage, and if the Local Authorities in the interests of "supply" felt it necessary to continue earmarking and special bounties, the State should take no further responsibility for the continuance of this method. The Board expressed its intention of moving in the direction, indicated by the minority, of not countenancing special aid to intending teachers and of merging their education, previous to the training college stage, in that ordinarily given in secondary schools, though it was willing to consider representations from authorities who had special reasons for continuing existing arrangements.

* The grant for a man student may range from £111 a year in a University Department, to £46 a year in a two-year college. The average grant in all classes of non-municipal colleges is £65 13*s.* for resident students (men and women), and £52 8*s.* for day students.

Local Authorities, apprehensive that their security for a steady supply of new teachers may be diminished, and that the new system may in other respects have disadvantages, are disposed to proceed cautiously.

Supply of Teachers

It is obvious that the later the age at which candidates for the teaching profession are selected, and the shorter the period of their special preparation for it, the easier it is at any given time to regulate their admission to it to meet fluctuations of demand. For many years demand was in excess of supply, and no question arose of restricting the intake so as to avoid the disappointment to individuals or the waste of public money involved in preparing more recruits than could find employment. In 1909 the demand for trained certificated teachers fell off and there was an over-supply and some agitation, but in 1911-1912, 1914 and 1919 the Board anticipated a serious shortage of teachers. In 1921, when the cost of staffing schools had been greatly increased by the new Burnham Scale, the north wind of financial stringency blew hard down Whitehall and induced a "cold fit" of which Circular 1190 was a violent symptom. The staffing of schools was reviewed, though not to the extreme extent advocated by the Geddes Committee. In 1922 trained teachers were finding difficulty in obtaining employment, and the Board foresaw that the capacity of schools for absorbing certificated teachers would be diminished. In 1923 the Board decided to suspend the "acting" teachers' examin-

ation for the certificate, and asked for a 5 per cent. reduction in the number of students admitted to training colleges: this restriction was withdrawn in April, 1924.

The Departmental Committee of 1923-1925 naturally emphasised the difficulty of maintaining a regular and adequate supply of teachers in the face of quick alterations of national policy, to which administration is subservient. Apart from this they found it very difficult to estimate far in advance the demand for teachers, in view of the number and uncertainty of variable factors—economic, social and educational. The Committee recognised that the difficulties of estimating were so great as to "preclude the possibility of making anything but a rough forecast and one of relative usefulness." It could suggest no practicable change of system which would "automatically equate supply and demand." The responsibility for maintaining a supply of teachers was in their view national, and, in accordance with the principles of English administration embodied in the statutes relating to education, must be shared between the Central and Local Authorities in a manner determined by "the circumstances of administrative convenience and efficiency." Each Local Authority has an obvious responsibility for staffing its own schools (excessive regard for which may lead to an undesirable degree of "inbreeding"), but it shares also with all other authorities a collective responsibility for securing teachers to staff all the schools of the country. And the body of teachers also ought to regard it as their duty to take a hand in the business.

The Committee finally recommended the establishment of an Advisory Committee representing the Board, the Local Authorities and the Teachers "to review the whole question of adjusting the supply, and as an immediate question, the question of over-supply."

The Board in 1926 did not adopt this suggestion. It announced its intention of fixing a maximum grant for each training college for three years from August, 1927, based on the number of students "recognised" by the Board for that period, and leaving the admission of "private" students above that number to the discretion of the college authorities. The Board admitted that by this change it was "in a measure relinquishing the function of adjusting the supply of teachers to the demand," but hoped to provide information and assist the Local Authorities and colleges to study the relation between supply and demand so as to prevent "violent oscillations."

Remuneration of Teachers

The salaries of teachers in elementary, secondary and technical, etc. schools are standardised for six years from March 31st, 1925, by awards made by Lord Burnham in April, 1925, in the result of arbitration.

Local Authorities may legally pay salaries at higher rates than those specified in the awards, but if they do so the excess must be paid out of local funds, as the Board will not, generally speaking, recognise such excess expenditure for the calculation

of grants. On the other hand if a Local Authority pays salaries at lower rates, and in the opinion of the Board the efficiency of the provision made for elementary or higher education, as the case may be, in the area is thereby endangered, the Board may, under regulations made in 1926, reduce the grants payable so that the Local Authority will be left to defray out of the rates the same expenditure as it would have to defray if it paid salaries at the full rates.

From 1846 to 1862 the State directly paid or contributed to the salaries of teachers in elementary schools, and, as Mr. Lowe said in 1862, there was a "very respectable army of 38,331 persons all engaging the attention of the Privy Council, and most of them receiving money directly from it." £345,572 was paid to teachers by Post Office orders at a cost of £2,252 in poundage. From 1862 to 1902 their salaries were paid by the Managers or School Boards, and fixed by agreement with the teachers. In many cases, however, the amount of salary depended on the success of teachers in earning grants. In secondary schools they were to a large extent paid by fees, and "farming out" was not uncommon. In 1888 it was made a condition of grant that elementary schools should not be conducted for private profit, and in 1890 that they should not be farmed out. In 1903-1904 these conditions were extended to secondary schools. In 1902 Local Education Authorities took over the payment of salaries in all schools for the maintenance of which they were responsible, and they were generally determined by scales fixed by the authori-

ties. The scales varied greatly from area to area, both in liberality and construction, the poorer areas suffered from the competition of the richer areas, and in some areas the dissatisfaction of the teachers became acute. During the war the grievances of teachers, which they generally refrained from pressing, were met to some extent by war bonuses.

In 1917 the Board introduced a supplementary grant for elementary education related to expenditure. A primary object of the grant was to assist Local Authorities to improve teachers' salaries. A Departmental Committee to inquire into "the principles which should determine the construction of scales of salary" for teachers in elementary schools reported in 1918 (Cd. 8939), and a good many authorities proceeded to revise and improve their scales. The Board's Reports, however, for 1917-1918 and 1918-1919 record a considerable number of disputes between teachers and Local Authorities: some were settled by arbitration, arranged by the Board or the Ministry of Labour, but others were intractable and led to closure of the schools in some areas for considerable periods. In the summer of 1918 the President of the Board began a series of conferences with associations of Local Authorities and teachers, which led in 1919 to the establishment by them of a standing Joint Committee "to secure the orderly and progressive solution of the salary problem in public elementary schools, by agreement on a national basis, and in its correlation with a solution of the salary problem in secondary schools." Lord Burnham became Chairman of the Joint Committee and also of similar Committees formed

to deal with salaries in secondary and technical schools. They produced a series of reports in the course of 1919, 1920 and 1921 embodying agreements as to scales of salary, their allocation among different areas, and the method of bringing them into operation. Unfortunately the period of financial stringency coincided with the consideration of the Committee's Reports, and the Board's acceptance of the scales, and recognition of the expenditure involved by them for the calculation of grant had to be qualified in several material particulars. The result was a good deal of dissatisfaction on the part of teachers and also of Local Authorities, whose administrative labours in bringing the scales into operation were increased by the necessity of satisfying the Board's scrutiny of the expenditure incurred. In 1922-1923 under the general pressure of economy, the teachers, at the request of the Local Authorities, made an abatement of their scale salaries to the extent of 5 per cent. The scales were adopted by the great majority of Local Authorities, but there were exceptions, and disputes led to a good deal of trouble. In one case an authority adopted the scale allocated to its area and afterwards substituted a lower scale, the result being a "strike" of teachers and a grave disturbance of elementary education in spite of the importation of other teachers to carry on the schools. The first term agreed for the currency of the scales was to run out in March, 1925, and the Board in 1924 requested the Joint Committee to consider what arrangements should prevail after that date. The Local Authorities claimed a reduc-

tion of the scales which the teachers' representatives were unwilling to concede. The Committee found themselves unable to agree, and ultimately requested Lord Burnham to act as arbitrator under rather narrowly limited terms of reference. His awards with supplementary recommendations were issued in April, 1925. The new scales were to remain in force for six years, and thereafter from year to year subject to one year's notice from either panel of the Joint Committees. The Board accepted the scales for the purpose of paying grant on the expenditure involved, and in 1926 gave effect to Lord Burnham's recommendation that the grant should be so adjusted that no authority should gain financially by paying salaries on a basis lower than the appropriate scale. Broadly speaking the new scales effect an ultimate reduction of about 7½ per cent. on the total salary expenditure which a continuance of the old scales, subject to the restrictions imposed by the Board, would have involved. There are four scales for teachers in elementary schools corresponding to four different types of area, each area having allocated to it the scale which is supposed to be appropriate to it. The allocation of them is rough and far from scientific, and the principle adopted by the Committees that only one scale shall operate in each area of each Local Authority, irrespective of great differences in character between one part of a country area and another (e.g. the difference between the remotely rural and densely urban parts of Essex, Northumberland and Lancashire) naturally has produced striking disparities and anomalies. But in the majority of cases the allocation of scales

to areas by the Joint Committee followed local agreements made in each area between the Local Authority and its teachers, and Lord Burnham, when he acted as arbitrator, was not empowered to review the whole allocation or its principles but only to determine cases in which the two panels of the Joint Committee disagreed.

Inside each scale the rates are differentiated as between men and women; between teachers with and without and with different periods of college training, and with and without university degrees. For head teachers the rates inside each scale vary with the size of the school.*

For secondary and technical, etc., schools there are two scales (for assistant teachers only) for the metropolitan area and the provinces respectively, differentiated as between men and women and graduates and non-graduates.

Incidental to the main framework provided by the scales there are a great many subsidiary arrangements, which have to be settled by the Joint Committees and the Board.

The attitude of the Board has always been that the settlement of the basis and details of the remuneration of teachers is primarily within the province of the Local Authorities, and should in the first instance be the subject of agreement between them and the teachers for whose employment they are responsible. In other words the Board has adhered to the view that the principle of a decentralised

* The average salary (before deduction of pension contributions) for all teachers in elementary schools taken together, on March 31st, 1924, was £248 as against £97 in 1914.

service of education should be preserved in this respect as far and as long as possible. When the principle was threatened by the disturbance of public education caused by the failure of Local Authorities individually to agree with their teachers, the Board took steps to substitute a machinery of collective settlement or bargaining for individual bargaining. Though the resulting settlement may be full of anomalies and defects, and perhaps very different from that which would have been made under a centralised and autocratic system of administration, it has from the point of view of English administration, which cherishes the idea of responsible Local Government, the merit of being agreed, through their representatives, between Local Authorities and their employees.

On the other hand the Board could not, of course, adopt a disinterested attitude. Apart from the effect of arrangements for the payment of teachers on the working of the schools, their total financial effect was, under a system which relates the amount of Parliamentary grants to the amount of local expenditure, a matter of the greatest importance, and they required the Board's concurrence before they could be operative.

It can easily be shown that scales by which the pay of teachers rises by specified annual increments to specified maxima, have disadvantages as well as advantages in the teaching service as in other public services, but against these must be set the advantage to the profession as a whole that its members, apart from the accidents of promotion, know what they have to look forward to if they do not fail in their duty.

There is little doubt on which side the balance of advantage lies. Some elasticity in scales of salary is certainly desirable, and this has been provided by allowing a "pool" in each area out of which extra allowances can be paid to particular teachers, but to pay every teacher according to his value would require superhuman wisdom in the paymaster.

Superannuation of Teachers

The State provision of retiring pensions for teachers has a history of eighty years,* though it was not till 1918 that teachers in secondary and other institutions for higher education came within its scope.

State pensions for elementary school teachers were somewhat inconsiderately instituted in 1846 by a "Minute" of the Committee of Council containing thirty words. The Minutes relating to the matter were subsequently embodied in the Code, and till 1899 the only pensions were these "Code pensions." In 1857 the Committee of Council told its inspectors that teachers ought not to count entirely on State pensions for support in their old age, but out of their remuneration (averaging for a certificated master £90 and a house, and for a mistress £60) should buy Post Office annuities. At different times the Code pensions were stopped, limited and revived, and they have a long history of grievance, charges of breach of faith and protest

* *See* "Superannuation of Teachers," by W. R. Barker, C.B. Longmans, 1926.

which agitated the teaching profession and soured its relations with the Education Department.

The Royal Commission of 1886-1888 favoured a compulsory scheme of superannuation under which teachers certificated after a certain date would buy Post Office annuities, providing at the age of 55 £30 for men and £20 for women, which would be augmented by the State, also through the Post Office, up to another £15 a year, the Department finding the funds for this purpose by a deduction of 1 per cent. from the annual grants to all schools! In 1891 the London School Board promoted a Bill to establish a local pensions scheme:* this was referred to a Select Committee who favoured a national scheme, a principle which was endorsed by a resolution of the House of Commons in 1893, and led to the setting up of a Departmental Committee. In 1898 an Act was passed, confined to certificated teachers in elementary schools, who were given an option not to accept the Act. Teachers were to contribute annually specific sums (variable periodically in relation to average salaries), each of which purchased an annuity through a special deferred annuity fund. The aggregate of these annuities made up the pensions provided by their own contributions. They were augmented by State allowances based on years of service and calculated at specific rates. The Deferred Annuity Fund and its periodical valuation gave rise to a good deal of

* In 1904 the London County Council took over from the School Board a superannuation scheme for both officers and teachers, which has been amended from time to time. There were in 1918 about nine local schemes set up under local Acts.

dissatisfaction, as did the inadequacy of the State allowance. The average salaries of certificated teachers, £147 for men, £102 for women, did not leave much margin for saving. Consequently between 1898-1912 many local pension schemes were established. In 1912 an Act was passed which increased the benefits prospectively for teachers retiring after that date, the maximum State contribution being £40 for men and women alike. In 1912-1914 a Departmental Committee recommended a scheme for teachers in the service of higher education on lines analogous to that of the Federated Universities' Superannuation Scheme, viz. compulsory insurance with contributions by teachers and their employers, with supplementary benefits to be provided by the State.

In 1918 an Act was passed which placed the superannuation of teachers on an entirely new footing, similar to that of the Civil Service. The whole of the benefits (which included both "lump sums" and annuities calculated on years of service) were provided by the State without contribution by the teacher or his employer. They covered all certificated and uncertificated teachers in elementary schools, and all full-time teachers in other grant-aided schools. About 70,000 teachers were added to the 100,000 who were pensionable under the Act of 1898.

The great rise in salaries after 1918 (from an average of £104 in 1918 to an average of £261 in 1923 for teachers in elementary schools) involved a great increase in the annual vote for education, and a great prospective increase in the vote for the

payment of teachers' pensions. In 1921 the Geddes' Committee recommended that the superannuation of teachers should be placed on a contributory basis, and that in the meantime there should be a 5 per cent. levy on teachers' salaries to relieve the cost of pensions. The latter recommendation was adopted by the Government, a Bill was introduced in 1922 and, after reference to a Select Committee of the House of Commons to consider whether the Bill involved a breach of faith with the teachers, was passed. The "levy" yielded about 2½ millions a year in relief of taxes. In 1922 also a Departmental Committee was set up by the Treasury, with Lord Emmott as chairman, to consider what modifications were desirable in the Act of 1918, "regard being had both to the economy of public funds and to the provision of adequate and suitable benefits for members of the teaching profession." They recommended that pension benefits should be paid out of a fund, the contributions to which would be divided between the teachers to the extent of one-half and their employers and the State to the extent of one-quarter each.*

In 1925 a new Act was passed, which retained the contributions by teachers at the rate of 5 per cent. of their salaries, and imposed on Local Authorities a contribution of 5 per cent (deferred till 1928)

* In 1922 an adoptive Act for the superannuation of Local Government officers was passed, under which benefits would be paid out of a fund fed by contributions of 5 per cent. on salaries from their employees and 5 per cent. from themselves, the cost of benefits in respect of non-contributory "back service" being borne out of the rates.

towards which they would be repaid (or rather credited) in grants rather more than 2½ per cent. on the average. But the contributions were to be applied in relief of taxation, leaving to future generations of taxpayers the burden of paying the benefits as they accrued; the contributions were to be credited to an imaginary fund, which was to be periodically valued with a view to revision of benefits or contributions. The Act retained the lowest pensionable age as fixed by the Act of 1918 at 60, contained provision for the return of contributions in certain cases, for insurance against disablement, and for bringing in, under schemes to be made by the Board, teachers in schools not aided by grant, and linking up the system with that established for University teachers and teachers in Scotland. It also settled an old controversy, by admitting to the pension scheme officers of authorities employed to a substantial extent in the control or supervision of teachers as "organisers."*

Employment of Teachers

The Board has, broadly speaking, no responsibility for the employment of teachers, which rests with the

* There are now about 178,000 teachers in pensionable service. There are 18,100 living pensioners under the Act of 1918, and this number may increase in time to about 60,000. The number of "age" pensions awarded in 1925-26 was 2,439; the average pension (over and above "lump sums") was £160, or 45.6 per cent. of the average salary at date of retirement. These averages represent widely divergent extremes. The pension benefits of all kinds

Local Authorities or managers or governing bodies of schools. It does in the case of elementary schools prescribe and award qualifications by examination (it is in process of handing over the conduct of qualifying examinations to other bodies), and the initial employment of teachers is dependent on the Board's "recognition" of them individually, in their appropriate grades, as suitable for employment. In 1926 a period of probation antecedent to full recognition was instituted. "Recognition" ordinarily continues until it is withdrawn, and the Board reserves to itself the power to withdraw or suspend it "on educational grounds," informing the teacher of the grounds of the proposed action and giving him "an opportunity of making representations on the subject." In the case of secondary and technical, etc. schools no initial "recognition" of a teacher as educationally "suitable" is required before he can be employed, but the Board may at any time declare him to be unsuitable "on grounds of misconduct or grave professional default," first informing the teacher of the charges against him and giving him an opportunity for explanation. Of course if the Board is satisfied that the efficiency of schools is impaired by the "unsuitability" of teachers for their work, it may remonstrate and enforce its remonstrance by reduction of grant.

---

payable were estimated at £3,970,000 for 1926-27, the normal increase in the amount being about £400,000 a year. The ultimate annual amount of pension benefits payable depends on the number and salaries of teachers employed in future years, but on the basis of continuance of the same data as in 1924-25 it may be placed at 10 millions.

The question whether married women should be appointed to schools, or appointed on the condition that their posts shall be vacated by marriage, or dismissed on marriage, is an agitating one on which the Board does not pronounce. In the dark ages of 1862 an unmarried man was under a disability, as he was not allowed to teach an evening school attended by persons of both sexes.*

The Board also requires that teachers shall be employed under written agreements (a provision which dates from 1897 as regards elementary schools) or under minutes of a Local Authority which defines the condition of employment, particularly in respect of part-time or full-time employment, a matter which is material in regard to superannuation. In the case of elementary schools also there is a provision (dating from 1902-1903) protecting teachers against "extraneous duties," and providing that "the teacher shall not be required to perform duties except such as are connected with the work of a public elementary school, or to abstain outside school hours from any occupations which do not interfere with the due performance of his duties." Formerly there were provisions that reduction in the grant of a school must not be "passed on" by reducing a teacher's salary, and that salaries must not be variable with the amount of grant, but such protection is no longer necessary. As regards elementary schools the appointment and dismissal of teachers is complicated by the provision of the Act of 1902, which gave the right of appointing and

* *cf.* Hardy, "Jude the Obscure," ii, v.

dismissing teachers in voluntary schools to the managers* (Chapter X).

Teachers' Associations

Capacity for organisation is an excellent quality in a teacher, and teachers have for many years exercised their abilities in this respect by organising themselves in professional associations, and these have—whether by way of protest or criticism, or of advice and co-operative discussion—exercised considerable influence in the fields both of educational administration and education itself. There are many of these associations: for secondary education the "Head Masters' Conference," dating from 1871, representing some 150 schools, comprising the great "public schools," some schools of high standing in the Dominions, and a number of grant-aided schools; the Incorporated Association of Head Masters, dating from 1890, with over 750 members; the Association of Head Mistresses; the Incorporated Association of Assistant Masters; the Association of Assistant Mistresses. There are also in the field of higher education the Training College Association, the Association of Teachers in Technical Institutions, the Science Masters' Association, and the National Society of Art Masters. There are

* In 1901 Sir J. Gorst introduced a Bill providing that a certificated elementary school teacher might appeal to the Board against dismissal by the managers "capriciously, unreasonably, or under a misapprehension of the facts," and the Board might order the managers to reinstate or retain the teacher, or compensate him. *cf.* Education (Scotland) Act, 1918, § 24.

various associations of specialist teachers, e.g. of Domestic Subjects, Manual Training and Physical Training. The largest association is the National Union of Teachers established in 1870 for teachers in elementary schools, of whom it mainly consists, but expanded in 1889 into an Association open to all teachers. It has about 120,000 members and 621 local associations, an annual income of about £137,000 and an accumulated general fund of £676,000. It conducts a Teachers' Provident Society with funds of over 2¼ millions, it has a Benevolent and Orphan Fund with an income of £45,000 from 108,000 subscribers, and an accumulated fund, which with two orphanages represents assets of over £120,000. The objects of the Union are comprehensive, and not a few of them have been attained. It successfully supports candidates for Parliament, dividing its support impartially as between parties, and it publishes a weekly paper. There are also a number of sectional associations of elementary teachers, which represent views different from, or antagonistic to, those of the National Union. The professional interest of the different classes of teachers are not always identical, and at various periods divergence of interest has arrayed their associations on different sides. Recently, however, the tendency to co-operation has become more marked.

The array of all these associations is considerable. To disregard them for purposes of central or local administration would be not only foolish but contrary to the public interest. In the service of education it is peculiarly necessary for adminis-

tration to carry with it not merely the obedience or acquiescence but the active co-operation of the men and women who do the actual work of the service. It has been said with some truth that a discontented teacher is a national danger. It is true that most of them will go on doing their work faithfully even under disagreeable conditions, because their work has an inherent interest which they cannot resist. If it does not interest them, or only in small measure, they are not worth having.

But progress, on the main lines of administration and educational policy for which the Central and Local Authorities are responsible, is quicker and more certain if the concurrence of the teachers is secured. Concurrence means understanding, and though circulars and memoranda may do much, personal explanation and discussion can do more, for there are few simple questions for those who conduct the service of education. And that is only possible with representative bodies,* and the stronger and more completely representative associations of teachers are, and of minorities as well as majorities, the better for all concerned. Associations of teachers are naturally much concerned with professional interests. Broadly and in the long run professional and educational interests are identical. At particular times they may clash or appear to clash, but

* Except in each individual school there is no hierarchy of teachers, such as there is in the CivilSe rvice or in the Church. One head teacher has no authority over another head teacher, and there are no intermediaries (except organisers and inspectors) between a Local Authority and the whole corps of head teachers in its area.

there is no association of teachers which would not assent to the proposition that when that is so, the educational interest must prevail. There is a temptation to which teachers, as well as persons engaged in other professions or services, sometimes yield, to represent the professional inconveniences or hardships attendant on changes in the system as detrimental to education and injurious to the scholars. Owing to the complexity of the system it is easy to find arguments of this kind. But the better way, and one which of recent years has been more usually followed, is to face frankly any temporary divergence of personal and public interest, and in concert with the administrative bodies devise means of obviating or mitigating professional hardships or difficulties, on the ground that this also is conducive to the public interest.

Although members of teachers' associations look to them for help and protection in matters relating to their employment, and when they find themselves in difficulty, and associations naturally do the best they can for their members, they can exercise great influence in maintaining a high standard of personal and professional conduct. Among so large a body of men and women there are bound to be some who go astray, and the disciplinary functions of the Board are neither agreeable nor easy to perform. In considering its action the Board does not regard itself as punishing offences but as protecting the children, the parents, and the good repute of the service, and they have no doubt that in this respect they can count on the support of the teachers' associations.

There is, indeed, a field in which it is extremely difficult to draw a line between what is legitimate or illegitimate for a teacher. It is clearly illegitimate for a teacher to express political opinions of a controversial or party character in a school, or consciously to let them bias his instruction. In an elementary school which children are compelled to attend such action is obviously and specially unfair to the parents.* And a teacher's value is so much enhanced if he commands the confidence and respect of the parents, that even outside the school the wise teacher will put restraint upon himself. The profession would be slow to claim for its members liberty to do and say anything they like outside the school. Like other public servants teachers draw strength from public esteem, and it is worth their while to gain and retain it at the cost of recognising that some disabilities attach to their office, and that they cannot without detriment to it behave in every way as a private person might behave. The teacher is a citizen, but he is something more than a citizen. No line can be drawn and no rules can be made in such a matter. The

* Parents individually may be vocal, but collectively they are inarticulate. In 1870 Sir W. Harcourt moved an amendment to give them a voice in school management, but Mr. Gladstone objected that "it involved the construction for each school in the country of a complete electoral and representative system. Local Authorities and teachers by organising "education weeks" and "open days" do much to enlist the active interest of parents. Under § 9 of the Act of 1902, the Board, in deciding a dispute as to the necessity of a school or the provision of a new school, are to have regard "to the wishes of parents as to the education of their children."

only rules worth having are those which are self-imposed. In such matters sound professional tradition is the best guide, and to the formation of this, associations of teachers can powerfully contribute.

In England as compared with other countries the appointment and promotion of teachers have been very little influenced by political considerations. This is a most happy feature of our administration, the preservation of which is worth a great deal, especially in periods of political fluctuation. Managers of schools may have had their vagaries, and there are and always will be foolish people who do and say foolish or improper things. The teaching profession rightly protests when they are said or done. There is no fear that its organisations will countenance any attempts, from whatever point of view, whether "reactionary" or "subversive," whether by way of prejudice or preference, to influence their service by political or other considerations irrelevant to a teacher's duty.

Teachers Registration Council

Teachers are combined not only in voluntary associations, but also in a statutory organisation. Provision was made in the Board of Education Act, 1899, for the establishment of a Register of Teachers, and a "Teachers Registration Council," consisting of six persons appointed by the Board and six by bodies representing different groups of teachers, was constituted by Order in Council of March 3rd, 1902. The first regulations for the Teachers' Register provided that it should be kept in two

columns, one for teachers who possessed only the Board's certificate under the Code (whose registration was automatic), and the other for teachers who possessed university degrees or other qualifications. This differentiation gave rise to great dissatisfaction.

The Administrative Provisions Act of 1907 provided for the dissolution of the existing register and Registration Council and for the establishment by further Order in Council of a new Registration Council "representative of the teaching profession, to whom shall be assigned the duty of forming and keeping a register of such teachers as satisfy the conditions of registration established by the Council for the time being, and who apply to be registered." The names of teachers were to be entered in alphabetical order in one column with such "statement as regards their attainments, training and experience" as the Council might from time to time consider desirable to set forth.

A great deal of discussion followed,* and it was not till February 29th, 1912, that a new Council was established by Order in Council. Its constitution was again revised by a new order of December 14th, 1926, and the right of electing members to it was transferred (except as regards universities) from various associations of teachers to the body of registered teachers divided into twenty-three groups according to the type of school or teaching in which they are engaged. This body is entirely independent of the Board. Its accounts are audited by the

* *See* the "White Papers" of 1908, Cd. 4185, 4402, and 1911, Cd. 5726.

Controller and Auditor-General, but no aid is received from public funds. The official statement issued by the Council declares that "Unity is the first condition of progress towards a larger measure of self-government for teachers, and this self-government in its turn begins when teachers themselves have under their control a register of those qualified to practice their calling."

In October, 1926, over 74,000 teachers had been registered, of whom some 45,000 are teachers in elementary schools, 19,000 are teachers in secondary schools, 8,000 are "specialist" teachers, 400 are university teachers, and 2,000 are "private" teachers. The Council also keeps an official list of "Associate Teachers," who cannot for the time being satisfy the conditions of registration.

Before removing a teacher's name from the Register the Council is required to consider the Report of a Committee. It has not attempted to frame a code of professional conduct. The question whether, and if so, how far registration—or the possession of qualifications entitling to registration, should be prescribed by the Board as a condition of recognised service in grant-aided schools, or of service which involves the supervision of other teachers, has frequently been raised, but the Board has not yet moved in that direction. The policy of the Registration Council has been to make, as far and quickly as is practicable, previous "training" an ordinary qualification for registration. The term "registered teacher" has certainly acquired a larger significance since its official use in the first

Code of 1860, when it designated an uncertificated teacher not good enough to receive an "augmentation grant," but registered as "competent to conduct schools receiving the capitation grant."

Chapter XII

EDUCATIONAL ENDOWMENTS

EDUCATIONAL endowments have played a large part in the history of education, and particularly higher education, in England and Wales, and in a period when all attempts at legislation to establish a public service of education failed, the reform of their administration and their better utilisation contributed a good deal to the extension of facilities, particularly for higher education. Lord Brougham's Commission of 1818 to 1837, the Grammar Schools Act of 1840, the Charitable Trusts Acts of 1853 and 1860, the Taunton Royal Commission of 1864-1868, the Public Schools Act of 1868, the Endowed Schools Acts of 1869, 1873 and 1874, and the City Parochial Charities Act of 1883, mark stages in a process which, though it has now been rendered much less important by the great development of public social services, has been highly beneficial and is still fertile, furnishing opportunity to talent in all classes. The Education Department was brought into touch with endowments for elementary education, many of which had been exempted from the operation of the Endowed Schools Acts, by Section 75 of the Act of 1870 which gave the Department a scheme-making power, but only on the application of the governors; the power was little used, and the Department obtained no general

jurisdiction over educational endowments till 1899. The Endowed Schools Commission had up to 1873 dealt by scheme with endowments having an income of £93,635, and had in prospect proposals relating to an income of £85,000 more. In 1876 the gross income of educational endowments known to the Charity Commissioners was stated at £646,882, and in 1892 the income of endowments available for secondary education in England, at £697,132. In 1895 the Bryce Commission put the gross income available for secondary education, or purposes of the Endowed Schools Acts, at £735,000. As regards elementary education, in 1895 an income of £154,242 from endowments was applied to maintenance of public elementary schools.

The Act of 1902 violated, in respect of endowment for elementary education, an old-standing principle of Charity Law. It provided, in Section 13, that where the rates made provision for a purpose of an elementary school, e.g. the payment of a schoolmaster, to which income of an endowment had to be applied under the trusts, the income should not be applied to other educational purposes, but should be paid to the Local Education Authorities and applied by them directly in relief of the rates in the parish or parishes concerned. This provision was of no advantage to the Local Authorities, its administration was very troublesome and difficult, and except in a few parishes the relief to the rates was insignificant. A Departmental Committee of 1911 recommended the repeal of the section.

Mr. Birrell's Bill of 1906 as introduced contained

eleven clauses and a schedule, having the object of "rendering educational endowments as serviceable as possible for the educational purposes of the time." The Board alone was to have full and exclusive power to make schemes, subject to a prescribed procedure and to the consent of the governing body being obtained in the case of endowments founded within thirty years. Schemes for endowments of an annual value of more than £50 were to be provisional and require confirmation by Parliament if petitioned against. In making schemes the Board was "to have regard primarily to the educational advantages to be derived from the scheme." A schedule to the Bill repealed Section 13 of the Act of 1902. The design of this part of the Bill was to make an entirely fresh start with a new jurisdiction over educational endowments, unfettered (except as regards voluntary school buildings) by the rules or practice or *cy près* doctrine of the Court of Chancery, or by the Charitable Trusts and Endowed Schools Acts, and subject to no control except that of Parliament. It also embodied the principle that the application of endowments should be governed by regard to the educational advantage obtainable from it, and that any regard paid to claims of particular classes or areas or denominations under the trusts should be subordinate to the primary object of extracting from the endowment the maximum educational advantage. This part of the Bill (except certain provisions relating to voluntary school buildings) was dropped before it went into Committee.

In 1910-1911 a Departmental Committee, with

Mr. Charles Trevelyan as Chairman, inquired into endowments in rural areas, the application of which presents special difficulties.* It endeavoured to devise means of relieving the Board of work the results of which, under the existing law, were not proportionate to the time and labour expended, to provide a legislative remedy for the general failure of Educational Trusts resulting from the operation of the Education Acts, and to bring Local Education Authorities into closer connection with the endowments for elementary education. Educational endowments, generally speaking, were intended to provide advantages or facilities for particular areas or classes of persons which they would not otherwise enjoy. The continuous extension of the public system of education has provided those advantages and facilities out of public moneys, and the application of endowments to their original purposes has operated in an increasing degree for the benefit not of the beneficiaries but of the ratepayers—a result obnoxious to a fundamental rule of Charity Law. Much ingenuity has been exercised from time to time in finding new objects analogous to the old objects and supplementary to those ordinarily provided for out of public funds, but in each generation many of the new and special objects have in their turn become customary objects of public provision, and the process of devising new objects has had to be renewed. The Committee's list of thirteen special purposes to which endowments might be applied is still a useful one, but some items of it are already out of date for the reason above

* Report of 1911, Cd. 5662

given. The Committee recommended that, with certain exceptions and modifications, the administrative and scheme-making functions of the Board relating to the endowments within the terms of reference should be devolved by orders of the Board on the County Councils as Local Education Authorities for elementary education, that a statutory list of purposes (which might be extended or altered by order of the Board) should be made, to which such educational endowments might be applied, and that the County Councils should be empowered to consent without the formalities of a scheme to their application to any of the authorised purposes. In the case of endowments originally given to non-educational purposes, the Committee recommended that the Board should be empowered to restore them to non-educational purposes as directed by a scheme to be made by the Charity Commissioners.

Diversions of Benefits from "the Poor"

No action was taken on these recommendations, but the last recommendation introduces a topic which at different times has excited lively interest. Before the Act of 1870 many non-educational endowments were devoted to educational purposes, presumably on the ground that at that time elementary education was the greatest need of the poor. Under the Endowed Schools Acts also a good many "dole" charities and other non-educational endowments were appropriated under schemes to purposes mostly of higher education. Cause of grievance was,

however, discovered, not so much in the diversion of non-educational endowments to educational purposes, as in the alleged misappropriation of endowments intended for the benefit of the poor, whether in the form of education or otherwise, for the educational benefit of the rich. The working of the Endowed Schools Acts was investigated by Select Committees of the House of Commons in 1886 and 1887, and they directed their special attention "to the question of the interests of the poor in educational endowments and whether the tendency of the Acts as hitherto administered had in any degree been to withdraw from the poorer classes the benefit of funds upon which those classes had an equitable and customary claim." They concluded that "the tendency of schemes for grammar schools is favourable to the poor" and that "the alleged injustice seems to arise partly from the gaps and imperfections of our educational system, but still more from the imperfect acquaintance with it possessed by the working classes."* No one who has any experience of the administration of old endowments can fail to realise the great difficulty of securing their effective and useful application in modern circumstances without affording any ground of complaint to particular areas or classes, and it is not to be supposed that, in matters where the relevant considerations are so intricate and conflicting, no mistakes have been made and no injustice done. But on the whole there can be little doubt that statutory powers over educational endowments have been exercised, whether by the

* Report No. 120 of 1887

Charity Commissioners or the Endowed Schools Commissioners or the Board, conscientiously and with no kind of indifference to the interests of "the poor" and no kind of preference for the interests of the rich.

The idea, indeed, that there is a large reservoir of money in many cases misappropriated or diverted from the pious founder's original purpose of educating the poor, which might be drawn upon to provide funds for the extension of popular education and increasing the facilities open to the poor, has been very persistent and still survives. It has almost always, however, been expressed in general terms, and it has been difficult to find a *prima facie* case for further inquiry by a Royal Commission, which has sometimes been asked for. The amount of endowment money which has been sunk in sites and buildings of secondary schools has made great inroads upon income and in many cases absorbed it, while on the other hand the schools have been made accessible to "the poor" or at all events to those who have commenced their education in public elementary schools by the system of free places and by the provision out of public funds of scholarships and maintenance allowances. The "highway" of education has become much broader and longer, and at the present time any conceivable measure of "restoration" of endowments would make very little addition to the educational opportunities of the poor.

Powers Transferred under the Act of 1899

The transfer to the Board of functions formerly performed by the Board of Charity Commissioners for England and Wales in relation to endowments held in trust for educational purposes, was authorised by the Board of Education Act, 1899, and was carried out by Orders in Council of the three following years. The performance of those functions is an important though subsidiary activity of the Board.

The work done has mainly fallen under the following heads: Schemes for Endowments applied in connection with Elementary Schools which did not come within the limited scope of Section 13 of the Act of 1902; the revision of schemes for Endowed Grammar Schools and Welsh Intermediate Schools, and their adjustment to new conditions such as those of Mr. McKenna's grant regulations of 1907; schemes for "Public Schools" other than those named in the Public Schools Act of 1868 and a great mass of miscellaneous and estates work.

By far the greater part of the Charitable Trust work of the Board is carried on by ordinary correspondence which may, or may not, result in some formal scheme or order under the seal of the Board. The making of a scheme which is important or controversial or otherwise difficult is commonly the result of months or even years of correspondence, together with interviews at Whitehall or local conferences, and perhaps a local public inquiry. Up to July, 1926, the Board had made in all 3,416 schemes and 14,460 various orders.

APPENDIX

	1906–07.		1914–15.		1926.	
	Nos. of Staff.	Cost of Salaries, Incidental Expenses, etc.	Nos of Staff.	Cost of Salaries, Incidental Expenses, etc.	Nos. of Staff.	Cost of Salaries, Incidental Expenses, etc.
		£		£		£
(1) Administration.	1,113	175,099	1,150	208,120	1,298	435,442
(2) Inspection and Examination.	396	257,733	392	250,201	391	352,978
(3) Royal College of Art.	54	9,457	52	9,938	56	14,127
(4) Victoria & Albert Museum.	413	69,378	414	68,600	411	114,482
(5) Bethnal Green Museum.			26	5,132	30	6,501
(6) Science Museum.			156	17,822	182	51,148
Totals	2,006	511,577	2,190	559,813	2,368	974,678

With regard to (1) Administration, the increase in the numbers of staff is due to the increase of work under the Teachers Superannuation Acts. Apart from numbers the increase in cost of salaries after 1914-1915 is due—

(*a*) To "cost of living bonus" amounting to £60,990 in 1919-1920, to £216,229 in 1921-1922 (the "peak" year), and £123,093 for 1926.

(*b*) To changes in Civil Service scales of salary and reorganisation of higher staff, which increased the salary cost by £46,000 and £16,000 in 1921-1922.

As regard the other heads the increase is due to bonus and improvement of salary scales, to the opening of the new Victoria and Albert building in 1909 and the extension of the Science Museum.

APPENDICES TO SECOND EDITION.

Appendix A

(1) *Administrations and Ministers since* 1870.

		Administration.	*Lord President of the Council.*	*Vice-President of Committee of Council.*
	1870	Liberal	Lord Ripon Lord Aberdare	W. E. Forster
Feb.,	1874	Conservative	Duke of Richmond	Lord Sandon
Apr.,	1880	Liberal	Lord Spencer Lord Carlingford	A. J. Mundella
June,	1885	Conservative	Lord Cranbrook	E. Stanhope Sir H. T. Holland
Feb.,	1886	Liberal	Lord Spencer	Sir Lyon Playfair
Aug.,	1886	Conservative	Lord Cranbrook	Sir H. T. Holland Sir W. Hart Dyke
Aug.,	1892	Liberal	Lord Kimberley	A. H. D. Acland
Mar.,	1894	Liberal	Lord Rosebery	A. H. D. Acland
July,	1895	Conservative	Duke of Devonshire	Sir J. Gorst

Board of Education Act, August, 1899.

			President of the Board of Education	*Parliamentary Secretary.*
Mar.,	1900		Duke of Devonshire	Sir J. Gorst
July,	1902	Conservative	Lord Londonderry	Sir W. Anson
Dec.,	1905	Liberal	A. Birrell	T. Lough
Feb.,	1907		R. McKenna	
Apr.,	1908	Liberal	W. Runciman	McKinnon Wood
Oct.,	1911		J. A. Pease	C. P. Trevelyan C. Addison
May,	1915	Coalition	A. Henderson	
Aug.,	1916		Lord Crewe	J. H. Lewis
Dec.,	1916	Coalition	H. A. L. Fisher	J. H. Lewis

		President of the Board of Education	*Parliamentary Secretary.*
Oct., 1922	Conservative	E. F. L. Wood*	Lord Eustace Percy
May, 1923	Conservative	E. F. L. Wood*	Lord Onslow
Jan., 1924	Labour	C. P. Trevelyan	Morgan Jones
Nov., 1924	Conservative	Lord Eustace Percy	Duchess of Atholl
June, 1929	Labour	Sir Charles Trevelyan	Morgan Jones
Mar., 1931		H. B. Lees Smith	
Aug., 1931	National	Sir Donald Maclean	Sir H. Kingsley Wood
July, 1932		Lord Irwin*	H. Ramsbotham

(2) *Cost of the Board's Establishment* (page 79, 291) *for* 1934-5.

	Nos. of Staff.	*Cost of Salaries, Incidental Expenses, etc.*
		£
(1) Administration	925	317,742
(2) Inspection and Examination ..	358	310,447
(3) Royal College of Art	62	14,882
(4) Victoria and Albert Museum ..	429	105,313
(5) Bethnal Green Museum	31	6,168
(6) Science Museum	274	62,921
Totals	2,079	£817,473

(1) The decrease in the numbers of administrative staff is due mainly to its reorganisation, the simplification of grant regulations, returns and clerical work, the introduction of mechanical appliances and the amalgamation of statistical

* Now Lord Halifax.

work. In addition a large amount of examination work has been transferred to University Boards. The decrease has been effected in spite of additional new work relating to Teachers' Pensions and Salaries.

Increase in cost of salaries since 1914-15 is mainly due to improved Civil Service salary scales and to the "cost of living bonus," amounting to £60,990 in 1919-20, and to £216,229 in 1921-22 (the "peak" year). Since July, 1932, Civil Service remuneration has been stabilised with reference to a cost of living figure of 50. The amount attributable to the additional emoluments in 1934 is £65,969.

(2) The decrease in the number of Inspectors is due mainly to reorganisation.

As regards the other heads, the cost is affected by improved Civil Service salary scales and bonus now included in stabilised pay, and by the extension of the Science Museum.

(3) *The Board's Expenditure on Education.* pages 118-20

The figures as estimated for 1934-5 are as follows: *Total net expenditure* on services within the purview of the Board, £82,183,000, of which £42,088,000 falls on taxes, and £40,095,000 on rates. Direct grants to bodies other than Local Education Authorities amount to about £1,500,000. See Appendix C (13). (Expenditure on University and agricultural education, £2,637,000, is additional to the above amount).

Board's Grants to L.E.As., £37,710,000 in aid

of expenditure of £77,805,000 (£61,490,000 for elementary, £16,315,000 for higher education).

Ratio of grant to expenditure for elementary education ranges in different areas from 6.2% (in Hove) to 77.3% (in Jarrow); average ratio 49.3%. Expenditure on elementary teachers' salaries, £38,575,000, or 62.7% of total expenditure.

Elementary Education (1932-33). *Range of expenditure per child in different areas.*

								Average	
		s.	*d.*		*s.*	*d.*		*s.*	*d.*
Total expenditure ..	from	151	10	to	344	7		242	7
Salaries of teachers ..	from	106	0	to	204	10		153	9
Loan Charges	from	Nil		to	45	6		15	7
Administration and Inspection	from	4	2	to	19	9		10	4
Other Expenditure ..	from	14	2	to	60	7		37	1
Special Services ..	from	3	2	to	43	3		18	3

Product of 1d. rate ranges from 1*s.* 1*d.* to 20*s.* per child in average attendance.

Rate in the pound equivalent to the expenditure of L.E.As. falling on rates ranges for elementary education from 12*d.* to 81*s.* 8*d.*

Salary expenditure in this table as compared with that in 1924-5, has been affected by the 10% "cut" of 1931.

Appendix B

(1) *Economy Measures of* 1931. Pages 103, 105, 106. *The "May" and "Ray" Committees.*

A Treasury Committee, with Sir George May as Chairman, was appointed in March, 1931, at the instance of the Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Philip Snowden), to advise as to possible reductions in National Expenditure on Supply Services, and reported in July, 1931 (Cmd. 3920), recommending *inter alia*, the abolition of the minimum 50% grant for elementary education to Education Authorities, the reduction of the rate of grant in respect of teachers' salaries (elementary education) from 60% to 50%, the reduction of teachers' salaries by 20%, the increase of secondary school fees, and the introduction of a "means test" for remission of fees, and a general postponement of expansion in the services. The reduction in the Board's estimates aimed at was £11,950,000. The National Government, in September, 1931, issued a White Paper (Cmd. 3952), setting out the savings proposed amounting to £9,400,000, assuming a 15% reduction of teachers' salaries and postponement of the proposals relating to secondary school fees. The Government finally decided on a 10% reduction of teachers' salaries and the savings were estimated at £7,123,000 in a full year. The National Economy Act of September, 1931, enabled the Board to effect its economies (explained in Circular 1413) in spite of the obstacles presented

by statutory or contractual obligations, by means of an Order in Council (Statutory Rules and Orders 1 Oct., 1931, No. 11). The actual ultimate saving on the Board's Vote was estimated at £5,873,000, made up of (1) abolition of 50% minimum grant* for elementary education (see page 99), £1,450,000; (2) Reduction of teachers' salaries by 10%, and revision of grant formula for elementary education (50% for teachers' salaries, instead of 60%, qualified by capitation grant of 45*s.* instead of 36*s.* per unit of average attendance), £3,948,000; (3) Reduction of grants for higher education consequent on reduction of teachers' salaries, £475,000. The difference of £1,250,000 between the figures £7,123,000 and £5,873,000, is accounted for by the postponement of the expansion in educational services contemplated for 1932. The question of secondary school fees and remissions was dealt with in September, 1932. (See Appendix B (3)).

In July, 1932, at the instance of the Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. N. Chamberlain), a Committee, consisting of representatives of Local Authorities, with Sir William Ray as Chairman, was constituted to consider reduction in the expenditure of Local Authorities and reported in October, 1932 (Cmd. 4200).

Both of these Committees favoured the extension to the service of education of the fixed "block grant" system of the Local Government Act,

* The May Committee stigmatised this grant as tending to "defeat one of the most important objects of the formula . . . viz., the differentiation of the grant between rich and poor areas," par. 508.

1929*, but recognised the difficulty presented by the statutory division of Local Education Authorities into two classes (see page 176). The Ray Committee (pars. 11-14) repeated the usual protest against the "meticulous, irritating and wasteful supervision" of local expenditure by Government Departments under a percentage grant system, but also, not quite consistently, suggested a more careful check by Government Departments on "wide variations of expenditure on comparable services, administered by different Authorities" (see page 120), and "more effective administration by the proper use of statistical returns and costing systems." It advocated a reduction of the staffs of elementary schools by some 7,500 teachers, and of secondary schools by 1,000 teachers.

The percentage grant formula for elementary education has been simplified by eliminating the 60% rate on expenditure for teachers' salaries and the minimum 50% rate on total expenditure. But the 20% rate on expenditure classified as "other expenditure" covers a large bulk of expenditure (amounting to £9,600,000, or 15.6% of the total expenditure) on various objects, some of which, such as "books, stationery and apparatus," perhaps suffer from the lower rate of aid. It also covers "conveyance" of older children to senior schools, which is an essential element in reorganisation, while its cost to the Authorities is an impediment.

* The percentage grant systems in the 1931-2 period of financial stress certainly showed itself responsive to the demand for economy, a quality which from different points of view may be regarded as a merit or as a defect.

(2) "*Necessitous Areas*" *Grant.* Pages 58, 82, 200.

From 1919-20 to 1929-30, when 29 Authorities shared in it, the "super-grant" to each necessitous authority was one half the amount by which the sum falling on the rates (after receipt of the ordinary grants) exceeded a prescribed rate in the £ (39 pence in 1929-30). As the May Committee pointed out (par. 510), this meant that in these areas additional expenditure, above that covered by the prescribed rate, attracted grant at the rate of 60%, 75%, or 80%, which stimulated high expenditure In 1930-31 and 1931-32, temporary arrangements were made for distribution of an increased total grant, and in 1932-33 a grant amounting to about £420,000 was distributed. The 29 Authorities which qualified for the grant in 1929-30 received the same amounts by way of "stabilised" grant as in that year, and a further grant was paid to those Authorities which qualified under a new formula, viz. 3*d* for each unit by which the average attendance per 1,000 of the population exceeds 100 less the product of a 7*d.* rate.

The grant at present is, therefore, a mixture of "stabilised" or fixed and variable grant. In 1932-33, 50 Authorities benefited, of whom 20 received both the stabilised and variable grant, 21 received the variable grant only, and 9 received the stabilised grant only. It would be more consistent with principle if the whole grant were distributed on a formula similar to that used for the variable grant, but the extinction of the stabilised grant (which amounts to about £250,000) would

naturally be unwelcome to those Authorities (*beati possidentes*) who, under the formula, might receive less or nothing by way of variable grant.

The history of this grant, which dates from 1906-7, illustrates the difficulty of adjusting a grant system to a system of local authorities which comprises a number of small and financially "weak" authorities. The May Committee found the remedy for this difficulty in the merger of small and weak areas in larger and financially stronger areas, but this remedy could only be partial because the list of necessitous areas includes 4 Counties and 14 County Boroughs, which do not lend themselves to merger, except under a system of "Provinces." Moreover, the reluctance of relatively rich areas to take in poor and burdensome areas cannot be disregarded.

(3) *Fees in Secondary Schools. Substitution of "special places" for "free places."* Page 40.

In September, 1932, revised regulations were issued (explained in Circular 1421, and in the Board's Report for 1932, pars. 54-62), modifying the system of fees and "free places." The object was to make the fees more proportionate to the cost of the education provided, and to secure more uniformity in scales of fees between comparable areas. The existing differences in this respect were often arbitrary and corresponded to no ascertainable differences in local conditions. Under the system of "free places," moreover, many children were receiving secondary education free of charge whose parents could, it was considered,

well afford to make some contribution to the cost. Therefore the Board required fees at approved rates to be charged in all schools (£9 a year was taken as the standard minimum) and for "free places" were substituted "special places," carrying total or partial exemption from fees according to need, to be assessed by reference to family income in accordance with approved scales. The ultimate net saving to public funds was estimated at £400,000 a year. Up to a prescribed minimum, usually 25%, "special places" were still to be reserved to pupils from public elementary schools. Remissions of fees, on grounds of special hardship, might still be granted to pupils after admission. This preference for pupils from public elementary schools dates from 1907, when the Board was anxious to "bridge the gap" between the elementary and secondary schools, and to prevent the segregation of ex-elementary school children in a separate class of secondary schools. This object has been attained. In March, 1932, out of 432,061 pupils in grant-aided Secondary Schools, 315,737, or 73.1%, had come direct from public Elementary schools. In 1933, out of 457,594 pupils, 225,927, or 49.37%, were paying no fees, while 231,667 were paying full or partial fees.

There is certainly no evidence that the conversion of "free places" into "special places," with payment of fees according to means, has had the effect of "slamming the door" of the Secondary School in the faces of talented, but poor, applicants for admission, a foreboding expressed in the controversy to which the change gave rise.

(4) *Statutory fixed grants* Pages 111, 114, 117, *cf.* pages 105-6.

The device of fixing by Statute the central contribution to local expenditure on public services, with provision for periodical revision, has been, and still is, so frequently advocated that reference to the leading instance of its actual employment in *The Local Government Act of* 1929 is, perhaps, appropriate. This Act established a consolidated aggregate Exchequer Grant to Counties and County Boroughs amounting to 40 millions and fixed for all time This sum represented the aggregate loss to Local Authorities of 24 millions, arising from change in the Rating System, and of 16 millions from the discontinuance of a number of grants in aid of locally administered services, including Public Health services and Road services. The Act also provided an additional Exchequer contribution of 5 millions by way of "douceur" to allow elbow room in the distribution of the aggregate among the individual Local Authorities, and also to allow for some expansion. (The provision of this "douceur" illustrates the view expressed on page 114.) This additional contribution is open to periodical revision (at first, at intervals of 3 and 4 years, and subsequently 5 years), and it is provided that the proportion of the total Exchequer contribution to the aggregate local expenditure in any future period shall never fall below the original proportion, which was taken at 25%. Thus if the aggregate local expenditure increased by 8 millions, the aggregate Exchequer contribution would be increased by 2 millions.

But the distribution of the aggregate Exchequer contribution among Local Authorities ignores their individual expenditure and is made on a formula of "weighted population" which takes account in each area only of (*a*) the proportion of children under 5 years of age to the total population; (*b*) the rateable value per head; (*c*) the proportion of unemployed insured men to the population; (*d*) the population per mile of public roads.

Thus if at the date of the periodical revision the increased expenditure of some Authorities is offset by decreased expenditure of other Authorities and the aggregate expenditure is stationary, the expansive Authorities will get no additional aid from the Exchequer. If the aggregate expenditure increases only slightly, the Local Authorities, whose expenditure has increased greatly, will get only a slight increase of aid from the Exchequer, and the fixation of the Exchequer grant for periods of five years, throws the burden of increased expenditure within those periods wholly on the rates, and thus acts, as presumably was intended, as a drag on expansion. Conversely, in periods of financial stringency, it prevents the Government of the day from reducing the central contribution. On the other hand, Parliament may, if it thinks fit, at the date of the periodical revision, increase the original ratio of Exchequer contribution to aggregate local expenditure (it can hardly decrease it), and the Act expresses the intention that additional expenditure on new services in the country as a whole shall be met by additional contributions from the Exchequer.

The "May Committee" on National Expenditure (1931—Cmd. 3920) recognised that a scheme on the lines of this Act could not be applied to the service of Education, unless its local administration were concentrated in the hands of the Counties and County Boroughs, and it is obvious that the same formula of "weighted population" would not be suitable for the distribution of an aggregate contribution to the cost of public education.

The device employed by the Act has the merit (or demerit) of neutralising or retarding the effect of oscillations in public opinion, or Government policy, or change in circumstances on administration of public services and on public funds. It protects them for a period at all events, against alternations of expansive and restrictive policy. Parliament, by adopting this device, to some extent ties its own hands as well as those of Government Departments, who are precluded, in the absence of an amending statute (or, on the precedent of 1931, a statute empowering the Government to over-ride existing statutes by the summary procedure of Orders in Council) from spending more or less money through the machinery of annual estimates and regulations. The Local Authorities are still free to spend more money if they are willing to find it themselves, and merit is claimed for the device on the ground that it tends to relieve Local Authorities from that "meticulous interference" with their discretion in which Government Departments are supposed to delight, and deprives the Central Authority of a powerful lever for the

exercise of pressure or influence. (Ray Committee Report, par. 12.)

(5) *The "Dual System" and the Denominational Question.* Pages 241, 244.

Sir Charles Trevelyan's three Bills of 1929 and 1930, proposing to raise the school leaving age from 14 to 15 involved the provision of more and better accommodation for the older children, and raised the question of enabling the voluntary schools (which still outnumber the "Council" schools) to play their part in meeting this demand. In April, 1930, a White Paper (Cmd. 3551) was issued, proposing that Local Education Authorities should be authorised to make capital grants to managers of voluntary schools for the purpose of enlarging or adapting their buildings in order to play their part in the Authorities' plans for reorganisation. In any school for which such a grant was made the Local Authority was to have the right of appointing and dismissing the teachers, subject to certain reservations designed to enable the Managers to secure the continuance of denominational instruction by teachers willing and competent to give it. The second Bill of May, 1930, embodied these proposals, but there was not time to proceed with it, and the third Bill of October, 1930, omitted them. Negotiations, however, continued and in January, 1931, a conference was held at which Sir C. Trevelyan submitted amended proposals (Cmd. 3786). No agreement was reached and ultimately the Free Evangelical Churches, antagonised perhaps by large claims

made in the interests of Roman Catholic schools, reiterated their fundamental objection to anything which did not secure complete public control and did not eliminate all religious tests for teachers (*The Times*, 27th January and 16th February, 1931). The Government did not pursue the proposals and consequently, at the Report stage, an amendment, moved by a private member in the Roman Catholic interest, was carried against the Government, providing that the Bill should not come into operation till a further Act had been passed authorising expenditure out of public funds to enable the Managers of voluntary schools to meet the new requirements. The Bill, as thus amended, was rejected by the House of Lords on second reading in February, 1931.

It is regrettable that this opportunity was missed of making the "dual system" of Council and voluntary schools more elastic and responsive to progressive development of educational facilities

(6) *The Age of obligatory School Attendance.* Page 38.

In January, 1928, the Board issued a Circular (No. 1395) deprecating the proposal, embodied in the Report of the "Hadow Committee," that age of obligatory school attendance should be raised from 14 to 15, as at all events premature. In 1929 and 1930, however, three Bills were introduced by Sir Charles Trevelyan to raise the age up to which children should be required to attend school, from 14 to 15. The third Bill was rejected by the House of Lords on Second Reading in February, 1931, and was followed by Sir Charles Trevelyan's

resignation. The Bills allowed no exemption from obligatory attendance below the age of 15, and contemplated its operation simultaneously and universally in all areas as from April, 1931 (subsequently altered to September, 1932). They provided for the grant of maintenance allowances at the rate of 5*s*. a week for children between the ages of 14 and 15, subject to certain limits related to the parental income and number of dependent children (Cmd. 3701 of 1930). The total cost for England was estimated at £6,250,000 (£4,350,000 borne by the Exchequer and £1,900,000 by the rates), of which £3,750,000 (rising to £5,500,000 in 1935-6) was attributable to maintenance allowances; an additional Exchequer Grant to the Education Scotland Fund was involved, bringing the total ultimate charge on the Exchequer up to £4,900,000, rising temporarily to £6,100,000 in 1935–6.

Although under the Bills a parent was required to cause his child to attend school up to the age of 15, the definition of his duty rather anomalously remained as in the Act of 1876, namely "to cause his child to receive efficient elementary instruction in reading, writing and arithmetic." This was hardly consistent with the avowed object of the Bills to secure "secondary education for all," and thereby, "equal opportunity for all." The provision of "equal opportunity for *all of equal capacity*" is perhaps a more attainable ideal and is consistent with a selective system. The imposition of an obligation also is not quite the same thing as the provision of opportunity; the latter does not involve the former The argument that

the raising of the school age would keep a large number of young persons out of the labour market and thus relieve unemployment (and incidentally pay for itself by a saving of some 9 millions on the cost of relieving unemployment) was advanced, but not pressed. But that argument is recurrent, and at the present time, not unnaturally, is very active.*

Advocates of the measure, on the ground of relieving unemployment or preventing juvenile deterioration consequent upon it, are apt to disregard the considerable differences between boys and girls and between urban and rural areas in this respect.

The Bills were opposed as inopportune and burdensome on financial grounds, and also on the educational ground of prematurity: neither the teachers nor the schools were ready for so large a change, and "reorganisation" on a large scale must precede it. Moreover, the immediate provision of additional accommodation for the new age group would, in view of the prospective fall in the school population, be wasteful.

The history of the statutory "school age" is briefly as follows:—

1870, §74.—School authorities empowered to make bye-laws requiring attendance from 5 to 13, but required to provide for exemption of children between 10 and 13 on reaching a prescribed standard of education.

1876, §5 and Sched. 1 (i).—Employment of children "being of the age of 10 years or upwards"

* See R. H. Tawney. "The School Leaving Age and Juvenile Unemployment," published by the Workers' Educational Association, 1934.

prohibited except on certificate of having reached a prescribed standard or having made 250 attendances in each of 5 previous years.

1880, §2.—School authorities required to make bye-laws.

1893, §1.—Minimum age for total or partial exemption raised to 11

1899, §1.—Minimum age for exemption, if 300 attendances have been made in each of 5 previous years, raised to 12 Special provision for partial exemption of children between 11 and 13 employed in Agriculture.

1900, §6, 7.—Upper age which may be prescribed by bye-laws raised to 14, and 350 attendances in each of five previous years made a condition of exemption.

1902, Sched. iii (4).—Permits a County Council to make different bye-laws for different parts of its area.

1918.—Forbids any exemption before the end of the school term in which the pupil reaches the age of 14, but permits the Authority to raise the leaving age to 15 by bye-law, with power to grant exemption after 14.

If the time-honoured method of gradual advance were followed the next step would naturally be (as in 1880), to *require* the L.E.A's to make bye-laws prescribing 15 as the upper age of school attendance, but *allowing* them to grant exemptions on specified grounds after 14. All bye-laws have to be approved by the Board of Education, and it could thus control the conditions of exemptions and guard against indiscriminate exemptions An Authority might be

empowered to make attendance at day or evening continuation classes (from 14 to say 16) a condition of exemption. (See E. A. 1921, §76-78. See also provisions relating to instruction of unemployed boys and girls in Unemployment Bill, 1934).

The number of Local Authorities who have voluntarily raised the school leaving age to 15, by byelaw under Section 46 of the Act of 1921, is now six, but the number of exemptions granted in those areas is large, and they can hardly be quoted as illustrating the practicability of keeping *all* children at school till 15, or the willingness of the parents to acquiesce in such an arrangement.

As regards *the age of entrance*, Local Authorities have power to admit or refuse admission to children under 5, and in some areas Authorities, owing to pressure on school accommodation, have excluded children under 5. Authorities also are empowered by the Act of 1918 to raise the commencing age of obligatory attendance to 6 by bye-law, and one Authority has made such a bye-law. Few parents, however, have taken advantage of this option to defer sending their children to school. The Ray Committee (paragraph 29) did not think that much saving would be effected by a statutory provision raising the lower age of obligatory attendance to 6 if parents were still allowed the option of sending children to school at an earlier age. On the other hand, the Committee thought that parents would strongly object to being deprived of that option. In 1932 there were, on the register of ordinary public elementary schools, 656,640 children under 6 and 156,795 children under 5.

The "Nursery schools," designed by the Act of 1918, §21, to make provision for the youngest children from 3 to 5, or later, numbered only 55 in 1932 (58 in 1934), with 3,768 children on the register. It is possible that the diminishing pressure on school accommodation will lead to the formation of a larger number of "nursery classes" in ordinary elementary schools. These are a good deal less costly than separate nursery schools. (See Report of Consultative Committee on Infant and Nursery Schools, 1933.)

(7) *"Reorganisation" of Elementary Schools.* Pages 242-3

In May, 1928, the Board issued a Circular (No. 1397) and a pamphlet (No. 60), entitled "The New Prospect in Education," dealing with the reorganisation of elementary schools, advocated by the Consultative Committee's Report of 1926, by grouping the older children, from the age of 11 + in Senior Schools or Departments. Development on this plan was stimulated by increasing the rate of grant in aid of Education Authorities' capital expenditure on buildings required for purposes of reorganisation from 20% to 50% for 3 years. In 1928, the number of "Senior Schools" was 718, accommodating 174,574, or 9.5%, of the pupils over the age of 11, and in 1932 it had risen to 1,915 schools, with 519,151, or 28.1%, of the pupils over 11. In addition, there were some 1,410 "Senior Divisions" of schools with 162,500 pupils over 11, so that about 37% of all the pupils over 11 were grouped together in Senior Schools or

Divisions. In March, 1933, 42.8% of the Senior pupils were in Senior Schools or Divisions, and approximately 50% of the total number of pupils were properly distributed among schools organised as senior and junior schools.

Appendix C

(1) "*Whisky Money*" — *Residue Grant.*
Pages 17, 81.

The Local Government Act, 1929, abolished this extraneous grant to Local Authorities in aid of Higher Education, and placed an equivalent charge on the Board's vote.

(2) *Poor Law Schools.* Page 24.

Under the Local Government Act, 1929, responsibility for these schools passed from the Guardians to the Public Assistance Committees of the Counties and County Boroughs, and their number is steadily diminishing. In 1932, there were only 38 such schools, and in 26 of these administration had been delegated to the Education Committees; the schools are inspected by the Board's Inspectors

(3) *Recent Legislation.* Page 21.

Acts relating solely to Education are the Education (Local Authorities) Act, 1931. Education (Necessity of Schools) Act, 1933; Teachers (Superannuation) Act, 1933 Other Acts affecting the Board's administration are: Mental Deficiency Act, 1927; National Economy Act, 1931; Local Government Acts, 1929 and 1933; Children and Young Persons Act, 1933. Part ii of the last mentioned Act removes most of the matters relating to Employment of Children and Young Persons from the province of the Board.

(4) *Schools not in Receipt of Grants.* Page 24.

Up to March, 1933, returns had been received from 8,910 schools, with 344,370 pupils.

(5) *Unsatisfactory School Buildings.* Pages 33, 241.

By December, 1932, 61% of the 679 schools originally placed in the worst class had been eliminated.

(6) *Building Regulations for Secondary Schools.* Page 34.

These were replaced in 1931 by a pamphlet (No. 86), "Suggestions for Planning New Buildings for Secondary Schools." A Circular (No. 1419) on "Economy in Construction of School Buildings" was issued in 1932.

(7) *Proportion of Secondary School Places to Population.* Page 34.

The present ratio is about 10 places per 1,000. The demand for more places is, to some extent, affected by the extended provision of "Senior" Elementary Schools. The question of the provision of schools offering an alternative to Secondary Schools of the ordinary type, has recently come under discussion.

(8) *Building Grants.* Page 35.

In September, 1929, the Board announced (Circular 1404) that the rate of grant to Local Authorities in aid of expenditure on the provision of elementary school buildings, for purposes of reorganisation and development, would be increased

for the next three years from 20% to 50%. This increase was withdrawn as from September, 1931, but the amount on which grant at this rate will be paid till the end of the loan period is about £925,000.

(9) *Leaving Age in Secondary Schools.* Page 39.
In 1931-32, the percentage of boys leaving at or over the age of 16 was 73.3%, and of girls 70.8%.

(10) *Aid to Students.* Pages 41-2.
The expenditure of Local Authorities on aid to students generally, was estimated for 1934 at £2,420,000.
The number ot State Scholarships to Universities was increased, as from 1930-31, from 200 to 300.

(11) *Departmental Committees.* Page 66.
Committees on Education for Engineering and Education for Salesmanship were set up and reported in 1930 and 1931 respectively

(12) *Staff and Organisation of the Board.*
(*a*) page 73.—The Permanent Secretary has himself been the Accounting Officer since 1928, and is completely responsible for the "regularity" of the Board's expenditure. (*b*) page 75.—The distribution of work between the 3 Principal Assistant Secretaries and Deputy Secretary has been altered and will vary with circumstances. (*c*) page 76.—"Choice of Employment" work is now dealt with by the Ministry of Labour. (*d*) page 76.—There

are now 9 territorial divisions corresponding to the Inspectorial Divisions. (*e*) The Women Inspectorate. Pages 123-4, 156.—The women Inspectors were formerly recruited and maintained as a separate body, subsidiary to the body of men Inspectors, and though they were given the title of H.M. Inspectors, their duties were not generally comparable with those of the men Inspectors. The Royal Commission on the Civil Service, reporting in 1931, recommended a policy of complete "aggregation," to be reached in stages. Some women Inspectors have already taken over the charge of Districts, and the grades of H.M. Inspector and Assistant Inspector are open to both sexes for purposes of recruitment. Women Inspectors will, in future, be recruited as members of a single united Inspectorate. (*f*) page 125.—There is now again a Chief Inspector for Wales, and a Staff Inspector for Art, and the Art Inspectorate has been reorganised on a Divisional basis.

(13) *Direct Grants to Bodies other than Local Education Authorities.* Page 85.

These grants amount to about £1,500,000, mainly for higher education, in Training Colleges (£668,000); in Technical Colleges and Classes for Adult Education, etc. (£125,000); and Secondary Schools (£545,000). A large number (437 out of 676) of independent Secondary Schools not provided by Education Authorities have relinquished "direct grants" since 1926, and receive aid from public funds only through Education Authorities.

(14) "*Standards*" *of Local Expenditure.* Page 108, cf. page 169.

The standards of expenditure on Secondary Schools and Aid to Students were found unsuitable and abandoned in 1928. Limits on expenditure on "Maintenance Allowances" were imposed, but withdrawn in 1929. Expenditure on teachers' salaries recognisable for the calculation of grant has been limited to that incurred on an "approved establishment" of teachers, and the process of scrutinising and approving establishments is still applied.

(15) *National Certificates.* Page 140.

Schemes have also been arranged with the Institute of Builders, the Institution of Naval Architects, and the Worshipful Company of Shipwrights.

(16) "*Efficient*" *Secondary and Preparatory Schools.* Page 144.

The Secondary Schools, which do not receive grants but are inspected and classed as "efficient," numbered 384 in October, 1933, with about 6,000 pupils. Preparatory Schools so classed numbered 283, with nearly 20,000 pupils.

(17) *Secondary School Examinations.* Pages 146-7, 210.

In 1932-3, 56,018 pupils in 1,360 grant-aided schools took the first examination, 73% passing, and 11,131 pupils in 1,206 such schools took the second examination, 69% passing. In addition,

over 12,000 pupils in other schools took the first, and 1,800 the second examination.

(18) *Technical Education.* Page 166.
See "Education for Industry and Commerce." A. Abbott, 1933

(19) *Restriction on Constitution of New Local Education Authorities* Page 185.
The Education (Local Authorities) Act, 1931, was passed to prevent the automatic constitution of new Authorities for elementary education as the result of the creation of new Boroughs or Urban Districts or of the extension of boundaries, following on the review of County districts under the Local Government Act

(20) *Combination of Local Education Authorities.* Pages 190, 195.
The "Yorkshire Council for Further Education" associates 2 County Authorities, 11 County Borough Authorities, 4 Authorities for Elementary Education, 2 Universities and a University College, together with representatives of teachers' organisations and industrial bodies. There is now a definite tendency towards more co-operation, especially in Technical Education.

(21) *The Juvenile Organisations Committee.* Page 207 This Committee was reconstituted after 1928 on a wider representative basis, with the Duchess of Atholl as Chairman (see Educational Pamphlet, 1933, No. 98).

(22) *Secondary Schools Examinations Council.* Page 210.

The last scrutiny was carried out in 1931 by a panel of Investigators. A principal recommendation was that the School Certificate Examination should no longer be accepted by the Universities as alternative to their own Matriculation Examinations (Board's Report for 1932, pages 24-7)

(23) *Educational Pamphlets.* Pages 214-6.

See the Stationery Office "List of the Board's Publications," and particularly Pamphlet No. 94, "Outline of the Structure of the Educational System in England and Wales." Pamphlet No. 100, of 1934, contains historical tables of educational statistics from 1913

(24) *Imperial Education Conference* Page 218.

The last conference was held in 1927. The conference arranged for 1931 had to be postponed on financial grounds.

(25) *Redundant Elementary Schools.* Page 227.

The immunity to closure of a school having 30 or more scholars, was abolished by the Education (Necessity of Schools) Act, 1933; but the Board's power to declare a school unnecessary "in case of dispute," is subject to conditions.

(26) *Number of Voluntary and Council Elementary Schools.* Page 240.

In December, 1933, there were 10,944 voluntary schools with 13,730 departments and 1,624,852

scholars in average attendance; there were 9,932 Council Schools, with 16,231 Departments and 3,424,842 scholars in average attendance.

(27) *The "Respectable Army" of Teachers.* Page 247.
There were, in 1932, about 192,000 full-time adult teachers in Public Elementary and Grant-aided Secondary Schools, and 19,000 students in training.

(28) *Examinations for Teachers* Pages 254, 210
The Board's final Certificate Examination was last held in 1929, and in 1930 the new system of examination by Regional bodies became fully operative. A Central Advisory Committee was constituted to keep the Final Examinations under review and advise the Board on questions arising.

(29) *Teachers' Registration Council.* Page 279.
In 1929, this body received the title of "The Royal Society of Teachers" by Royal Warrant.

(30) *Teachers' Pensions* Page 272.
The Board's estimates for 1934 included £6,785,000 for teachers' pensions, against which receipts from contributions were estimated at £4,862,000.

INDEX

INDEX

INDEX OF NAMES

Acland, A. H. D., 11, 213; Anson, Sir W., 228; Arnold, M., 47, 127, 130, 155; Balfour of Burleigh, Lord, 87; Balfour, A. J., 182, 231; Beaconsfield, Lord, 3, 11; Birrell, A., 183, 230, 284; Blomfield, Bp., 63; Bright, J., 5, 64, 180, 223; Brougham, Lord, 2, 5, 7, 159; Bryce, J., 203, 284; Burnham, Lord, 211, 260, 264; Cockerton, 12, 15, 16; Derby, Lord, 6; Devonshire, Duke of, 15, 17, 203; Farrer, Lord, 90; Fisher, H. A. L., 69, 237; Forster, W. E., 8, 142; Geddes, Sir E., 104, 106, 112, 270; Gladstone, W. E., 2, 3, 7, 82, 278; Gorst, Sir J., 15, 27, 181, 274; Goschen, Lord, 82, 89, 112; Granville, Lord, 10; Hamilton, Lord G., 11; Harcourt, Sir W., 278; Kay-Shuttleworth, Sir J., 6, 126, 128; Lansdowne, Lord, 3; Lloyd-George, D., 95; Lowe, R., 7, 10, 32, 48-49, 64, 129, 261; McKenna, R., 84, 229, 290; Meston, Lord, 107; Morant, Sir R., 19, 214; Pease, J., 95; Peel, Sir R., 2; Runciman, W., 229, 231; Russell, Lord J., 2, 5, 7, 179; Sadler, Sir M., 77, 214; Temple, Archbishop, 155, 204; Trevelyan, Sir C., 286; Whitbread, S., 179; Wyse, 1.

SUBJECTS

Acts of Parliament: 1870, Elementary Education, 7, 27, 32, 84, 180, 220, 223, 283; 1876, Elementary Education, 36; 1888, Local Government, 181; 1889, Technical Instruction, 13, 181; 1889, Welsh Intermediate Education, 72, 181; 1898, Teachers' Superannuation, 268; 1899, Board of Education, 14, 70, 144, 203; 1902, Education, 16, 53, 134, 181, 190, 225-229, 234, 284; 1903, London, 16, 176; 1906, Provision of Meals, 106; 1907, Administrative Provisions, 19, 24, 280; 1910, Choice of Employment, 84; 1911, Administrative Provisions, 19; 1918, Education, 20, 40, 56, 98, 186, 190; 1918, Teachers' Superannuation, 269; 1918, Education (Scotland), 181, 206; 1919, Ministry of Health, 25; 1921, Education Consolidation, 21; 1923, Institution Children,

62; 1925, Teachers' Superannuation, 270; 1926, Economy Provisions, 102
Adult Education, 23, 39, 141, 208
Anson bye-law, 228
Assigned revenues, 82, 87
Average attendance, 36

Bills: 1807-1867, Rating Powers, 179; 1896, Sir J. Gorst, 14, 27, 181; 1901, Education Authorities, 16; 1906, Birrell, 183, 229, 284; 1908, McKenna, 229; 1908, Runciman, 229-231; 1912, Croydon Marks, —; 1921, T. Davies, 239; 1922, Economy Provisions, 102, 105
Board of Agriculture, 14, 24
Board of Education: its predecessors, 1-13; constitution, 14-15, 204-205; jurisdiction, 22-27; as Charity Commissioners, 23, 75, 290; staff and organisation, 18-19, 55, 69-79; cost of administration, 290
Board of Trade, 6
Burnham Committees, 104, 210, 260, 262-265

Charity Commissioners, 14, 205
Circulars: (1002) Examinations, 210; (1119), Schemes, 109; (1190), Economy, 103, 258; (1358), Programmes, 110; (1388), Standards of cost, 108
Cockerton Judgment, 12, 15, 16
Committees of Privy Council, 2-11
Committee, Consultative, 35, 38, 53, 138, 195, 203-206, 242
Committees, Departmental, 211-212; 1910-11, Endowments, 285-286; 1911-14, Local Taxation, 80, 92-95, 98, 114, 178; 1912-14, Superannuation, 269; 1918, Machinery of Government, 27, 28, 204; 1919-20, National Expenditure (Geddes), 104, 106, 112, 270; 1919-20, Welsh Secondary Education, 184; 1920, Scholarships and Free Places, 41, 137; 1922, Superannuation (Lord Emmott), 270; 1922, Grants (Lord Merton), 107; 1923-5, Training of Teachers, 248-260; 1925, School Buildings, 34; 1925, Education for Industry, 66
Committees, Select, 9, 288
Commissions, Royal: 1858-61 (Newcastle), 32, 49, 128, 179; 1864-8, Schools Inquiry, 142; 1886-8 (Cross), 132, 156, 268; 1894-5 (Bryce) Secondary Education, 14, 143, 203-204, 284; 1897-1901, Local Taxation, 86-92, 200; 1905-9, Poor Law, 92
Conscience Clause, 223-224, 249
Consultation, 161, 203-213
"Contracting out," 230, 232
Cowper-Temple Clause, 221, 224
Curriculum, 25-26

Delegation, 192
Denominational Question, 3-4, 166, 221-248; see *Religious Instruction, Voluntary Schools*; 1920, Concordat Proposals, 237-243; 1925, Enabling Bill, 243-246
Devolution, 183-186, 194
Director of Education, 196-197

Education Department, 6, 12, 14
Efficiency, 42-48, 100, 173
Endowments, 32, 283-290; value, 284; Act of 1902, 17; Bill of 1906, 285; Rural, 286; Diversion from poor, 287-289; Schemes and Orders, 290
Examination: in elementary schools, 50, 127, 128, 138; in technical, etc. schools, 139-142; in secondary schools, 61, 143-144, 146-147, 209; of teachers, 254, 272
Ex-service men, 41-42

Finance, 30, 80-120, 162-163, 200-202; see *Grants*
Free Places, 41, 137

Grants: amount, 1, 3-5, 30, 44, 49, 82, 93, 96, 119, 127, 250; "Block," 20, 85, 87, 90, 93, 96, 111-112, 167; building, 1, 8, 31-32, 84, 222, 249; capitation, 135; deficiency, 96, 99; dynamic, 44, 83, 100; expenditure, 20, 81, 88, 94, 97, 107, 109, 114-120; fixed, 87-92, 111, 113; specific, 8, 82, 83-85, 86, 90, 100-101, 107, 131; statutory, 81, 98

Higher Education, definition, 19, 20, 53, 99, 176, 182
Home Office, 207

Imperial Education Conference, 217
Inspection, 50, 51, 55, 121-158, 173; administration, 151-154, 196; constructive or protective, 51, 120-123; criticisms of, 128-129, 148-150; elementary schools, 44, 126-136; secondary schools, 142-147; technical, etc. schools, 139-142; for other departments, 153-154
Inspectors. appointment, 79; recruitment, 154-158; organisation, 55, 123-126, 131; payment, 129; cost of, 291; reports, 128, 130, 151; conferences, 149, 151; women, 123-124, 156; local, 148, 198
Institute of Public Administration, 197

Juvenile Organisations, 207-208

Kenyon-Slaney Clause, 225, 229

Loans, 27, 101
Local Education Authorities, 175-202; areas, elementary and higher education, 19, 53, 176; associations of, 194-196, 243; autonomy and national system, 45, 57-58, 115, 117,

177, 186-188, 199-202; defaulting, 18, 27, 162; delegation, 192; devolution by, 185, 194; disputes, 9, 226-227; Education Committees, 17, 190-194; expenditure, 26, 93, 101-103, 118-120; federations, 190, 195; inspectors, 148; number of, 175; officials, 162, 177, 196-199
London: School Board, 15, 180, 224, 236, 268; Act of 1903, 16, 176; loans, 27; deficiency grant, 98; delegation, 192
Lord President, 10-12

Meals, Provision of, 106
Ministry of Health, 24, 26-28, 60, 74, 101, 111, 113, 206
Museums, 12, 22, 77, 206, 291

National Certificates, 61, 141-142
National Society, 1, 222
Necessitous Areas, 58, 82, 93, 120, 200

Office of Special Inquiries and Reports, 77, 213-217

Parents, 36, 164, 237, 278
Parliamentary Secretary, 10, 69
Partnership, 18, 20, 82, 110, 114-118, 186-188, 199
Payment by results, 13, 48, 86, 128-135
Pooling, 96
Programmes, 110, 111, 113, 117, 189

Rationing, 101, 105-106, 113
Recognition of schools, 172-173; of teachers, 272
Regulations, 98, 100-101, 121, 159-174; building, 33-34, 168; code, 44, 50, 127, 164; Revised Code of 1862, 48, 129, 130, 132; revision of 1904, 19, 135, 164; revision of 1926, 45, 168-170; procedure for making, 8, 12, 99, 160; secondary schools, 40, 55, 165, 235; technical, etc. schools, 166, 172; Training of Teachers; 169, 235, 254
Religious Instruction: in voluntary schools, Anson bye-law, 228; conscience clause, 223-224; inspection of, 236; in council schools, Cowper-Temple clause, 221, 224; extent and character, 236; facilities, 230, 244; in secondary schools, 234-236; in training colleges, 166, 236, 239, 249
Reports of Board, 8, 218-220
Royal College of Art, 12, 22, 77

Schemes, 21, 188
Scholarships, 41, 42, 62, 147, 257
Schools: continuation, 20, 39, 189; efficient, 24, 144; elementary, provision, 1, 8, 27, 31-35, 180, 226-227; closure, 227, 240; defective, 33, 241; number, 225, 233, 240; transfer, 230-232, 240, 244; preparatory, 23; private, 23-24; public, 23, 144, 274; secon-

dary, provision, 34; definition of, 54, 165; special, 58; technical, etc., 139-142, 167
School attendance age, 35-39; offices, 36, 199
School Boards, 8, 13, 17, 83, 180, 182, 223-224
School fees, 39-41
School managers, 17, 126, 182, 222, 225-227, 229, 272, 274
School Medical Service, 24, 58-60, 74, 96, 219
Science and Art Department: origin, 6; administration, 12-13, 16, 166; inspection and examination, 139, 142
Scotland, 11, 12, 53, 181, 206, 246, 274
Standards of cost, 88, 101, 108
Statistics, 65, 220
System, 56-63

Teachers, 247-281; appointment, 25, 226; approved establishment, 169; associations, 204, 274-279; dismissal, 25, 226; employment, 271-274; marriage, 273; number, 246; preliminary education, 255-258; professional conduct, 277, 281; recognition, 272; recruitment, 255-258; registration, 279-282; salaries, 104, 115, 119, 120, 210, 260-267; short courses for, 141, 152; suggestions to, 164, 170; superannuation, 61, 267-271; supply, 253, 258-259; tests, 229, 244-245; training, 62, 248-255
Text-books, 25
Training Colleges, 32, 55, 84-85, 166, 235, 239, 248-255
Treasury, 1, 50, 80, 92, 143

Universities, 22, 62, 143, 146, 254

"Value" for money, 48-52; criticism of, 63-68
Vice-President, 6, 10-12
Voluntary Schools: number, 223, 225, 240; management, 225; closure, 227; transfer, 230; trusts, 223, 225

Wales, 183, 184
Welsh Department, 72, 184; inspectorate, 125; intermediate education, 72, 181; Central Board, 72, 143, 181
Whisky money, 81