

At the present time under the organization of the school system, there is a Superintendent and a Deputy Superintendent and there are a total of about 30—I think I am correct—30 positions, 11 assistant superintendents, I believe a Teachers' College President, every Supervisor, Directors of English, Science and all the different subject matter areas, which are reporting directly to that Deputy Superintendent for guidance on a day-to-day basis.

The Columbia Report says no one can manage a business or organization with this span of control. There just is not that much time.

Mr. SISK. I am inclined to agree with that.

Dr. CARROLL. They recommended that we group the management of the school system under five basic divisions—under a number of basic divisions—and each of these would be headed by an Associate Superintendent who would be above an Assistant but below a Deputy Superintendent. So, in effect, we are introducing another level of administration between the Deputy Superintendent and the Assistant Superintendent for better management of the system (see p. 74).

Mr. SISK. I well appreciate that. As I understand it, the Study has indicated a very strong need for “beefing up” in this area, and this is what I assumed that you had in mind here.

I say this primarily because as one who has long been interested in the educational system I have supported, I think, every proposal that has been presented here to improve and increase funds for schools. I very much enjoyed my relationship with Dr. Hanson over the years and expect to continue sharing concerns with Dr. Manning and yourself. My question concerns a statement made to me recently by one whom I believe to be a very able teacher. She had had many years of experience in the West, in California, and she came into this school system because her husband actually came to the Government. She lasted one year and basically she said to me it is not altogether salary. It is the problem of the school system in Washington. And I am sure you recognize this. This happened to be a lady who had had vast experience in teaching in areas with substantial minority groups. This was not a completely radical change from one type to another, and she did feel she had a contribution to make because she was a dedicated teacher, but I cite her statements because I wanted to come to one question.

Maybe it is a little aside directed from teachers salaries, but I think it is terribly important. It has to do with the emphasis you are placing on so-called problem areas or problem children from the standpoint of getting qualified teachers and isolating them to some extent from, let's say, the average student where special attention is needed. Maybe I am wrong but it seems to me I have heard statements from teachers that this is an area that needs very great consideration. Certainly I, for one, would like to see more money put into that.

This teacher indicated she was actually teaching in, I believe it was, a junior high school; that 80 percent of her students were there and wanted to learn, they wanted to get an education; but about one out of every five was there wasting time; she spent all the time in the world that she could spend on those people—denying the other 80 percent who really did desire to get an education—and still with no apparent progress.