AN ANALYSIS OF RISK MANAGEMENT IN THE CLARKSVILLE-MONTGOMERY COUNTY SCHOOL SYSTEM

BY

ORMAN TERRY FORD, JR.

AN ANALYSIS OF RISK MANAGEMENT IN THE CLARKSVILLE-MONTGOMERY COUNTY SCHOOL SYSTEM

A Research Paper

Presented to

the Graduate Council of

Austin Peay State University

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts

in Education

---

by

Orman Terry Ford, Jr.

August, 1970

To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a Research Paper written by Orman Terry Ford, Jr., entitled "An Analysis of Risk Management in the Clarksville-Montgomery County School System." I recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in Education, with a major in Administration and Supervision.

Major Professor

Accepted for the Council:

Dean of the Graduate School

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author wishes to express his deepest gratitude to Dr. Fred Bunger, Chairman of the Department of Education, for his concern, leadership, expertise, and constructive criticisms concerning this manuscript. Sincere appreciation is extended also to Mr. Robert H. Stretcher, Assistant Professor of Marketing, and Insurance Consultant, without whose guidance and suggestions, this paper would not have been possible.

Appreciation is extended to Mr. T. M. Oakley, Acting Director, Clarksville-Montgomery County Schools, and Mr. Thomas McAnulty, Business Manager, for making the data used in this analysis available.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER PAGE

CHAPTER I

NATURE OF THE STUDY

Risk exists whenever the future is unknown, and the calamitous effects of risk have plagued mankind since the beginning of time. Individuals, groups, and societies have developed various methods for managing risks, not really by choice, but by sheer necessity. School systems have recognized the importance of risk concepts for several years, although little attempt has been made to minimize the adverse effects of risk in most of our nation's schools.

The present and growing possibility of substantial loss makes it paramount that school systems adopt some form of analysis and supervision of risk.

I. THE PROBLEM

Statement of the Problem. The purpose of this study was to determine the degree of managerial talent expended on the economic decisions relative to risk management in the Clarksville-Montgomery County School System, and to analyze by structure, the coverage in force.

Importance of the Study. The security afforded by proper degrees of protection for public assets cannot be minimized, whether the risks stem from physical or moral perils. Educators must determine for themselves how they will provide for the risks within their system, or they must seek the advice of a competent risk manager familiar with the techniques of risk supervision.

It was felt that this analysis would provide some insight into the recognition of risk, together with some alternative methods available to the risk manager.

Delimitations of the Study. Analysis was confined to the various real properties whose ownership was vested in Clarksville-Montgomery County School System, and to the contents of other properties not wholly or partially owned by the System.

Limitations of the Study. Analysis was confined to the coverages purchased for fire and extended coverage, both on structures and their contents, and to the coverages for vandalism and malicious mischief. Coverages purchased for liability, casualty, transportation, and similar perils were excluded, since each represents a rather specialized program requiring extensive research, and there is doubt among authors as to how these risks should be treated in practice.

Assumptions. The author assumed the policies examined were valid, properly executed contracts, that the interests and amounts of

coverages stated therein were properly recorded, that the limitations expressed were known to all parties, and that coverages were in force during the period stated.

It was further assumed that the amounts recorded on the ledgers of the Clarksville-Montgomery County School System as costs for the coverages stated above were valid, and in compliance with rates established by the Commissioner of Insurance, State of Tennessee.

II. DEFINITIONS OF TERMS USED

The terms used in this analysis are those in general use throughout the insurance industry. A portion of Chapter II is devoted to terminology in a discussion of methods of risk management.

III. METHOD OF PROCEDURE

Method of Collection. The data used in this analysis were obtained from the business office, Clarksville-Montgomery County Schools. Amounts of coverage for each structure were taken from the Revised Schedule of Coverage, dated July 1, 1969, and from the policies which make up the insurance file for the system.

Amounts paid for coverage were taken from the disbursements ledger for insurance of the accounting records for the school system.

IV. ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY

The first chapter was designed to introduce the reader to the nature of the study, the problem and its importance, delimitations, limitations, assumptions, and a statement regarding terms used. The second chapter was concerned with a comprehensive discussion of pertinent related literature, together with general discussions of the management of risk. Chapter three was a presentation and analysis of the data. The summary and tentative conclusions which resulted from the analysis were discussed in the fourth chapter.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

I. INTRODUCTION

Many of the major advances of mankind would probably not have been achieved were it not for the desire for minor reductions in risk. Banding of persons into tribes, the evolution of agriculture, even the development of religion were attempts to reduce the uncertainty in human affairs. In more recent times, development of social security and Medicare may be regarded as a reflection of man's desire to introduce greater certainty into his life. (4)

Public school systems are beset on every side by risks. The destruction of a school plant is no less traumatic to the public, than is the destruction of a factory to the private sector of our economy.

Risk management is not a new phenomenon, and as early as 1925 attempts were being made by businessmen to isolate, avoid or prevent risk. The transfer of the responsibilities for an adequate program in risk management to an individual or risk manager is relatively new, however. The most recent literature relating to the problems and responsibilities of risk managers was organized in this chapter under the topic headings Methods of Treating Risk,

Methods Employed by Schools, and the Responsibilities of an Insurance Manager.

II. METHODS OF TREATING RISK

There are five basic alternatives available in the treatment of risk: avoidance, ignoring, retention, loss prevention and reduction, and transfer.

Avoidance. Avoidance is the refusal to assume risk. This method has severe limitations because such a choice is not always possible. Buildings being used for instruction cannot be vacated under ordinary circumstances just to avoid the degree of risk involved. It is often advisable, however, to dispose of properties which are idle, and thus avoid the risks. By this method risk is simply not assumed.

Ignoring. Another alternative method in rather common use is simply to do nothing about the risk. This may be done passively in that the risk manager may not be aware that the risk exists, and through ignorance does not attempt to handle it, or it may be done actively, as in the case of noninsurance, where the risk is purposely ignored. Many of the latter are classed as insignificant risks, where the financial loss of their destruction would be irrelevant to normal operations.

Retention. When risk cannot be avoided or ignored, or the advantages of assuming the risk are great, the most commonly used method of handling it is by retention. By retaining the risk, the system is saying in effect that potential losses will be paid out of the system's resources. This decision is often made due to the relative ineffectiveness or cost of the various alternatives.

Self-insurance is actually a special type of retention, and requires a complete and formal plan of operation to be properly described as self-insurance. Programs of self-insurance are not feasible for smaller systems, but it is the opinion of the author that the system under analysis could feasibly self-insure. It is often advisable to self-insure a portion of the risks in a system, since experience has shown that the maximum probable loss is so small the system can safely absorb it from current operating revenues or out of small reserve funds, and that systems consist of so many independent fairly homogeneous exposure units that predictions can be safely made as to what its loss experience will be. In other words, the system is in a financial position to self-insure its losses.

Loss Prevention and Reduction. Loss prevention and reduction differ from other risk treatment methods in that they attempt to reduce the chance that a loss will occur or the severity of the

losses that do occur. This method generally takes architectural or long range planning, and is evidenced by fire resistive construction of buildings, safety programs such as fire evacuation drills, and the installation of fire alarms and automatic sprinkler equipment. These activities have obvious merit, but are usually only available in part to school systems because of economic or legal considerations.

Transfer. Some of the most important risks faced by schools cannot be avoided, ignored, retained, or prevented. The only alternative remaining is transfer of the risk. This may be accomplished in two ways. First the property itself may be transferred to some other person or group, such as the transfer of abandoned school buildings to communities for recreation or meeting places. Second, the risk, but not the property may be transferred in total, or diffused by a partial transfer of risk.

The most popular method of risk transfer is by insurance. In this sense, insurance is a device by means of which the risks of two or more persons or firms are combined through actual or promised contributions to a fund out of which claimants are paid. (30) Insurance has many benefits, the most obvious being indemnification for those who suffer unexpected losses. A more significant and sometimes overlooked benefit is the reduction of uncertainty, the elimination of fear and worry associated with uncertain positions.

III. METHODS EMPLOYED BY SCHOOLS

The basic principle of a school insurance program is the same governing any area of school administration. Does the investment made benefit the educational program?

That insurance is a major financial decision for schools is evidenced by the fact that fire and allied perils premiums alone have averaged over thirty-five million dollars each year for the last ten years. (22)

The school superintendent must ask many questions and consider a great number of impinging factors to determine which risks he should indemnify for an efficient and economical system.

The most popular methods of risk treatment by school systems involve some combination of retention and transfer, with limited emphasis on loss prevention and reduction.

Recent attempts at loss prevention have centered around construction of fire resistive buildings, and this has been found to be the most important factor in determining final premium rates.

In 1966, a national appraisal firm estimated that the average fire resistive building cost $14.17 per square foot to construct, as compared to $12.52 for masonry. As an example, a 65,000 square feet building would have the following cost:

Fire Resistive Construction	$921,105
Masonry Construction	813,800
Additional Cost of Fire Resistive Building	$107,305

At this point, many school boards would choose the masonry construction, either for legal, economic, or political reasons, and fail to see the real significance in cost differences in the long run.

Other factors being equal, the combined fire and extended coverage rate with an eighty percent coinsurance clause would have the following cost:

Fire resistive building - .064 per $100 or $590 yearly

Masonry building - .508 per $100 or $4134 yearly

An annual savings of $3544 on insurance premium alone would amortize the additional cost in 30 years.

There is an additional savings in this type of construction that is often overlooked. Depreciation of fire resistive buildings is estimated to average one-half of one percent a year, or a total of $4600 on the building in question. Masonry buildings average one percent a year, or a total of $8000. One can easily see that the combination of $3544 savings on premiums plus $3400 saved in depreciation for fire resistive construction would save the system $8000 yearly, and would recover the additional cost of construction in just thirteen years. (22) In addition to tangible savings, there is the intangible factor of personal satisfaction which proceeds from

the knowledge that should a catastrophe occur, the initial loss of life and property would undoubtedly be minimized by fire resistive construction.

A new plan which has far-reaching implications for schools was developed by the insurance industry in 1960, and is called the Public and Institutional Property Plan or PIP. It is designed for a specific class of fire insurance risk: Institutions that serve the public such as churches, colleges, hospitals, schools, and municipal or governmental units. These classes of insureds have traditionally been among the preferred risks, but have not always enjoyed the benefits of significantly lowered rates.

The PIP plan has now been adopted by forty-six states. It was first adopted by Ohio on May 2, 1960, with Cook County, Illinois following shortly thereafter. (26,29) The PIP plan has three significant advantages: consolidation of all related fire policies, much greater coverage, and lower premiums. One company and one policy cover all buildings and contents with one premium-due date and one expiration date.

According to Frank R. Spence, Assistant City Manager, Pensacola, Florida there are twelve basic advantages of the PIP plan in his city:

1. The plan is designed specifically for the institutional-type property.

2. The plan is flexible. The rating structure permits buildings and contents to be insured separately or together.

3. Complete replacement cost coverage is provided.

4. The plan provides broad protection for buildings. Multiple exposures can be covered under one policy.

5. It covers contents of nearly every description.

6. It eliminates the coinsurance clause by use of an Agreed Amount of Insurance Provision--the institution annually provides a sworn statement of values.

7. It provides for inspection service.

8. The plan is adjusted annually to new values, virtually eliminating overinsurance or underinsurance.

9. It automatically provides insurance on newly acquired property for up to 180 days subject to a $100,000 limitation.

10. It provides coverage on property away from the premises up to $5,000.

11. It provides coverage on the personal property of employees not covered by other insurance while on the premises up to $500.

12. The plan permits administrative savings to be passed on to the insured institutions in the form of lower operating costs. (29)

An ever increasing number of schools and municipalities are adopting the PIP plan, and this may well become the most important method of risk treatment by schools.

IV. THE RESPONSIBILITIES OF AN INSURANCE MANAGER

As the expectations of an insurance manager vary so widely, it is difficult to draw generalizations. There are ten basic activities or responsibilities, however, which seem to apply generally to those systems employing risk managers:

1. The insurance manager should be thoroughly familiar with the risks of the system.

2. The insurance manager should obtain appropriate and thorough insurance protection or coverage for those risks which, by virtue of their nature or size, require such protection.

3. The insurance manager should constantly be on the alert for risks the system can safely assume or against which it can appropriately self-insure.

4. The insurance manager should keep informed of developments in the insurance field which might afford his system better coverage. (Such as PIP)

5. The insurance manager should take advantage of every reasonable occasion to negotiate aggressively with carriers, rating bureaus, or commissions to secure better coverage at better rates.

6. The insurance manager should maintain insurance protection for the amount that would be considered recoverable in the event of loss.

7. The insurance manager should be thoroughly familiar with sources from which insurance coverages of unusual types or amounts can be obtained.

8. The insurance manager should be familiar with claims procedures.

9. The insurance manager should develop and maintain a comprehensive insurance manual as a reference for other administrative personnel interested in insurance.

10. The insurance manager should work closely with those responsible for safety, or be responsible for safety himself. (1, 3)

Few school systems are large enough to afford the services of a full time risk and insurance manager, and this responsibility is most often part of business management. In a few instances, the superintendent or board of education has taken this responsibility, or it has been transferred to some local insurance agent. None of these methods is as satisfactory as having this facet of operations individually managed, and in systems with many exposure units the insurance manager could well save the equivalent of his salary in reduced rates and efficiency.

V. SUMMARY

This review of the related literature may best be summarized by quoting a statement from the American Risk and Insurance Association: "The underlying conditions giving intellectual substance to risk and insurance are twofold: (1) an ignorance on the part of mankind about the future and even about much of the past and present, and (2) preference by man as of any point in time for some things over other things. . . given some degree of ignorance and preference, risk becomes a dominant element in the behavior of man." (19, 28, 30)

There is little agreement regarding the best method by which risk is handled, and the more complex life becomes, the greater are both the range of uncertainties and the number of situations in which choices must be made. Hopefully, increased awareness of risk will produce more satisfactory treatment by school systems in the future.

CHAPTER III

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

I. INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this chapter was to present data concerning the degree of managerial talent expended on the economic decisions relative to the management and treatment of risk in the Clarksville-Montgomery County School System, and to analyze coverages in force on school property.

II. MANAGEMENT OF RISK

The Director of Schools has delegated the responsibility for insurance management, and thereby the management of risk, to the business manager. Once each year, usually in March or April, a complete review is made of existing coverages on all school property by the business manager. He is frequently aided by one or more of the agents representing companies writing coverage for school property. At this time, coverages are increased or decreased as considered appropriate, prior to the school board's submission of an annual budget.

Coverage is secured on new properties during the year as completed. Vacant or abandoned structures are deleted at the

annual review.

Builder's Risk insurance, providing coverage against fire, vandalism, and an assortment of other perils, is secured on all structures under construction. This coverage is terminated upon final acceptance of the building by the school board.

Appraisal of structures for coverage is made by James Holleman, copartner in the firm of Conroy, Marable and Holleman. During 1969-1970 this agency wrote $2,116,380 of the total protection afforded, or 12.6 percent.

Fourteen locally owned agencies share in writing the coverages deemed necessary by the business manager. The proportion of the total written by each is an arbitrary ratio agreed upon among the parties. The agency represented by Mr. Holleman receives a greater share of the business in payment for his services as appraiser.

During 1969-1970 total coverage was $16,858,080, purchased at a cost to the system of $44,613.95. A list of agencies and insurance underwriters doing business with the system, together with the amounts of coverage written by each is contained in Appendix B of this study.

Rates for coverage purchased are established by the State Department of Insurance, and are influenced by such factors as location, construction, fire prevention equipment, and sprinkler

systems. Since the coverages are for widely scattered, relatively homogeneous units, the rates are based on an average drawn between high risk and low risk structures. Fire resistive buildings enjoy low rates compared to wooden frame buildings, so the over-all rate charged is the mean rate between the two types of structures, with all construction types between receiving consideration in final rate setting.

Rates during 1969-1970 are $.224 for real property, and $.025 for contents coverage.

Policies issued by the underwriting firms are filed in the office of the business manager, Clarksville-Montgomery County Schools. A separate file lists the amounts of scheduled coverage for each structure and its contents. A copy of this schedule is contained in Appendix A.

Policies are written for a three year period (which is standard in Tennessee) subject to the annual review mentioned above.

Underwriters doing business with the system have secured the services of the General Adjustment Bureau, a loss appraisal and adjustment firm, which is empowered to make immediate appraisal and adjustment of any loss up to and including $10,000 on behalf of the insurance companies. This Bureau, which maintains a Clarksville office, submits an annual invoice to each of the companies it represents, listing a retainer fee for its services, together with each underwriter's

pro rata share of all losses sustained during the year and paid by the GAB. No cost to the system is involved in this service.

One fire has been adjusted by this firm during the current policy period, a $500 loss to a portable classroom at Burt High School.

III. TREATMENT OF RISK

Of the five basic alternative methods of treating risk explained in Chapter II, Risk Transfer, and Loss Prevention and Reduction, were the means found most frequently in use in this community.

Substantial improvements have been made during the last three years in both the evaluation of structures for coverage, and in the amounts of coverage purchased from underwriters. Coverage which totaled $16,858,080 in 1969-1970, will receive a projected increase of some $5 million in 1970-71, due in part to the inclusion of two new buildings, and increased amounts of coverage on several others.

All buildings now under construction, and those erected during the last decade are of the finest in fire resistive materials and architectural design. Many feature separated instructional and gymnasium areas, connected only by walks or passages, which underwriters may consider as separate structures for rating

purposes. Over fifty percent of the schools have some form of central alarm system, and all are within reach of modern fire fighting equipment.

Fire evacuation drills are held at regular intervals during the school year, closely supervised by both administration and faculty, and periodic inspections are made by fire department officials of hazardous areas at each school site. All buildings within this system received such an inspection during the last year.

At least once during the year, children in the elementary grades are permitted to inspect a fire engine, and are given informal talks about the hazards of fire.

Some portion of risk is transferred by means of insurance on every school property as evidenced by the schedule of coverage contained in Appendix A.

It is essential that protection of school property against loss by means of adequate insurance coverage be provided, but definition of the term "adequate" will differ in practice. School fires are the subject of considerable publicity, and good public relations are next to impossible if taxpayers are subjected to substantial loss through a lack of insurance or maintaining improper coverage. (1, 23)

In considering what is adequate coverage, there are three major types of values placed on real property with which the

administrator must be concerned. Replacement value represents the cost of replacing the damaged structure with one of similar kind and quality at current construction costs, and takes into consideration many intangible factors other than physical damage. Actual cash value represents the reproduction cost new less depreciation, or the sound value at the time of the loss. The third type of value is replacement cost, which covers the amount actually and necessarily expended in repairing or replacing the damaged property. Replacement cost most frequently ignores the insurable value attached to items such as foundations, walks, and certain underground utilities.

Fifty-seven structures used by this school system are insured under replacement cost endorsements designed to protect public and institutional property. The amounts of coverage have been developed by reference to such records as original cost, utilization of the structure, and the costs necessary to repair or replace a major portion of the building, should a catastrophe occur.

Nineteen structures owned by this school system are insured at actual cash value. These structures are fully depreciated, several years old, and in some instances abandoned. The decision to insure at actual cash value was made with the consideration that loss of all or part of any one of these buildings would not substantially affect the educational program offered by the system, nor would the

insurance recovery necessitated by a loss be greater than the value of the structure immediately prior to the loss.

The largest coverage afforded in this category is that obtained for Roosevelt Elementary School in the amount of $242,000, followed by Sango Elementary School at $121,000, and Palmyra Elementary School at $95,700. Most of the remaining coverages do not exceed $20,000.

Coverage is maintained on the contents of five additional structures all of which are leased by the system for a variety of uses. Included in this category are the Central Offices at $60,000, and the Area Technical School at $100,000. Amounts of coverage in this instance were based on the cost of furniture, fixtures, and equipment in use within the structure.

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Alexander Smith has said, "Everything is sweetened by risk," and the uncertainty of our affairs as individuals and school administrators has led to various methods by which we may blend this "sweetness" with some measure of security. In an attempt to learn more generally about the administrative management of risk in the Clarksville-Montgomery County School System, and specifically what coverages are in force on school property, this analysis was devised as an aid to anyone charged with the responsibility of risk management.

An examination was made of insurance files at the business offices of the school system, together with accounting records of disbursements made for the purchase of fire, extended coverage, contents coverage, and for vandalism and malicious mischief coverages purchased on real property whose ownership was vested in Clarksville-Montgomery County School System.

Numerous on-site inspections were conducted by the author to determine the extent of hazard, the possible abatement of risk,

the presence of alarm and fire prevention equipment, and the steps taken at each site to avoid or prevent risk.

Five basic alternative methods are available in the treatment of risk: Avoidance, ignoring, retention, loss prevention and reduction, and transfer. Of these five alternatives, risk transfer, and loss prevention and reduction were the means found most frequently in use by this system.

Risk is transferred by the securing of insurance policies from fourteen locally owned agencies, the total amount of which is $16,858,080. The cost of this underwriting service to the system was $44,613.95 during 1969-1970, based on rates of $.224 for real property, and $.025 for contents coverage. These rates are based on an average drawn from all construction classes with the fire resistive buildings and wooden frame buildings at the extremes.

Policies are subject to an annual review, at which time additions or deletions may be made to the coverages extant. The amount of insurance written by each agency mentioned above is an arbitrary ratio agreed upon among the agencies themselves. One agency predominates with 12.6 percent of the total protection afforded. Policies are written for a three year period, subject to annual review.

The General Adjustment Bureau has been retained by the underwriters to appraise and adjust any loss sustained by this system up to and including $10,000. One fire was adjusted by this firm during the current policy period, a $500 loss to a portable classroom at Burt High School.

A comprehensive loss prevention and reduction program has been in progress during the last decade, through both the design of new buildings with fire resistive materials, and the education of students in fire preventive methods.

Amounts of coverage have been steadily increased to reflect the inclusions of new property, and the rising trend in costs of materials necessary to replace an existing structure damaged by fire.

Of the three major types of values placed on real property for purposes of insurance, fifty-seven structures were found to be underwritten by replacement cost endorsements. Amounts of coverage secured reflected a reasonable degree of care in estimating property values.

Nineteen structures were underwritten at actual cash value, due in most instances to the age, type of construction, and utilization of the building. Some of these structures are no longer in use by the system.

Five additional properties are insured only to the extent of their contents, since these sites are leased by the system, and coverage is maintained on the real property by the legal owner.

During the course of this study, four possibilities have been explored which could lead to substantial savings in rate for the system, and which could be instituted within the foreseeable future by a conscientiously devised program of risk management.

The first deals with the services of a risk manager or consultant. A competent, well trained risk manager could not obviously be hired at this time for economic reasons. It should be possible for some individual under the jurisdiction of the business manager to have this as his primary responsibility. Insurance is dynamic, and no program will remain up to date for long unless close evaluation is given every phase of the expenditure for coverage.

The second deals with insurance of high risk properties. Since rates are based on an average of structural types, the elimination of insurance on abandoned properties, wooden frame buildings, portable classrooms, and storage facilities would result in a lowering of the mean rate paid by the system. Abandoned properties could either be sold to private purchasers, or donated to the communities in which they are situated for public recreation or meeting places.

Since a large number of high risk properties can neither be sold or donated, and many are still in use, the third possibility concerns the establishment of a self-insurance fund. This fund could be developed and entered into gradually, considering past loss experience and the degree of risk the system is willing to assume. In order to be truly self-insurance, reserve funds must be restricted and used only for payment of losses under this plan. A beginning fund of $30,000 gradually increased in yearly increments would permit the cancellation of all policies covering high risk properties, and thereby afford substantial savings in rates for the properties on which risk transfer is a necessity.

The final possibility would arise as a result of the reducation in rates effected by the third, namely that savings involved through elimination of the transfer of risk for hazardous properties, be used to purchase additional amounts of coverage for properties on which insurance must be maintained. This would result in no overall reduction in the amount of insurance written for the system, and could lead to increased efficiency in appraisal techniques.

Whatever is done in behalf of public education should be done with skill and care befitting the fiduciary position in which administrators find themselves. In the present instance, risk transfer costs the equivalent of $3.18 per pupil, based on a school population

of 14,000, and for an expenditure of this magnitude, students are entitled to the best possible program of management.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

AMOUNTS OF COVERAGE BY STRUCTURE

Item	Property Description	Structure	Contents
R 1	Barksdale Elementary	$ 812,000	$ 93,000
R 2	Barksdale Phys. Educ.	76,000	1,000
R 3	Burt High	860,000	201,000
R 4	Byrns Darden Elementary	812,000	115,000
R 5	Byrns Darden Portable Class	13,000	2,000
R 6	Central Elementary	364,000	104,000
R 7	Central Elementary Gym	235,000	12,000
R 8	Central Cafeteria-Home Ec.	70,000	24,000
R 9	Central Vocational Ag	18,000	8,000
R 13	Greenwood Annex (Old CHS)	1,288,000	160,000
R 14	Greenwood Annex Man. Trng.	43,000	16,000
R 15	Greenwood Annex Portable Class	7,000	1,000
R 16	Cobb Elementary (1001 Franklin)	363,000	33,000
R 17	Cobb Elementary (1007 Franklin)	304,000	44,000
R 18	Cumberland Heights Elementary	258,000	29,000
R 19	Cumberland Heights Gym	126,000	
R 20	Cumberland Heights Library	58,000	4,500

Item	Property Description	Structure	Contents
R 21	Greenwood Junior High	$ 702,000	$ 111,000
R 22	Greenwood Junior High Gym	258,000	19,000
R 23	Howell Elementary	560,000	44,000
R 24	Howell Elementary Gym	80,000	40,000
R 25	Howell Elementary Boiler Room	33,000	
R 26	Moore Elementary	501,000	82,000
R 27	Moore Elementary Library	59,000	12,000
R 28	Oak Street Elementary	190,000	19,000
R 29	Ringgold-Main	248,000	30,000
R 30	Ringgold Cafeteria & Clsrms.	219,000	33,000
R 31	Ringgold-New Classrooms	112,000	9,000
R 32	Ringgold Library	57,000	12,000
R 33	Ringgold Portable Classrooms (2)	12,500	2,000
R 34	Ringgold Portable Classrooms (1)	6,800	1,000
R 35	Ringgold Portable Classrooms (3)	25,800	3,000
R 36	Norman Smith Elementary	512,000	80,000
R 37	Norman Smith Annex	105,000	6,000
R 38	Norman Smith Portable Clsrm.	13,000	2,000
R 39	St. Bethlehem Bldg. No. 2	534,000	73,000
R 40	St. Bethlehem Bldg. No. 3	69,000	6,000
R 41	St. Bethlehem Bldg. No. 4	13,000	2,000

Item	Property Description	Structure	Contents
R 42	St. Bethlehem Portable Clsrm.	$ 8,600	$ 1,000
R 43	Woodlawn School and Gym	530,000	113,000
R 44	Woodlawn Boiler Room	8,000	
R 45	Woodlawn Vocational Ag	15,000	4,000
R 47	New Providence Jr. High	1,645,000	296,000
R 48	Clarksville High School	3,158,000	440,000
R 49	Byrns Darden Portable Clsrm.	7,000	2,000
R 50	Byrns Darden Portable Clsrm.	8,100	
R 51	Moore Elementary Portable Clsrm.	7,600	1,000
R 52	Norman Smith Portable Clsrms. (3)	21,000	3,000
R 53	New Montgomery Central	1,828,862	250,000
R 54	New Montgomery Central Cafeteria	146,138	70,000
R 55	New Montgomery Central Science	146,138	75,000
R 56	New Montgomery Central Theatre	139,813	25,000
R 57	New Montgomery Central Food Storage	19,162	7,500
A 1	Burt High-Kellogg Street	8,500	1,000
A 2	Burt High-Kellogg Street	7,300	1,000
A 3	Burt High-Kellogg Street	6,000	1,000
A 4	Central-Lone Oak Elementary	39,600	5,000

Item	Property Description	Structure	Contents
A 5	Greenwood Annex-Lumber Stge.	$ 1,500	$ 3,000
A 6	Greenwood Annex-Clsrms.	11,000	1,300
A 7	Greenwood Clsrms.	13,200	1,600
A 8	Greenwood Clsrms.	15,400	
A 9	Palmyra Elementary	95,700	11,000
A 10	Roosevelt Elementary	242,000	48,000
A 11	Sango Elementary	121,000	20,000
A 12	Greenwood Supply Storage No. 1	22,000	25,000
A 13	Greenwood Supply Storage No. 2	3,300	4,000
A 14	Greenwood Supply Storage No. 3	3,300	3,000
A 15	Bus Shop	19,800	15,000
A 16	Bus Shop Garage and Storage	3,300	2,000
A 17	Bus Shop Filling Station	600	
A 18	Bus Garage	2,200	
A 19	Maintenance Shop	18,700	20,000
	Central Offices		60,000
	Cohn School		2,000
	Area Technical School		100,000
	Automotive School		25,000
	Automotive Body Shop		20,000

APPENDIX B

Agency	Underwriter	Amount
Allison, Rubel & Halliburton	Royal Indemnity Company	$1,356,000
	Aetna Insurance Company	700,000
Barker Insurance Agency	Home Insurance Company	718,000
Biggers Insurance Agency	Royal Indemnity Company	851,000
Buckner Insurance Agency	New Hampshire	817,500
	Glens Falls	817,500
Byers and Harvey, Inc.	Commercial Union	1,132,000
Conroy, Marable & Holleman	Royal Insurance Company	1,400,000
	Home Insurance Company	716,380
Goodlett Insurors	Continental	1,387,000
Howard A. Gossett	American Fire & Casualty	747,000
Wade Hadley, Jr.	Tenn. Farmers Mutual	762,000
Kendrick and Rogers	Continental	1,003,000
King, Northington & Frost	US Fire & Casualty	325,000
	Newark	627,000
	Federal	325,000
Mann and Smith, Inc.	Globe Indemnity	1,300,000
	Aetna Insurance Company	383,000
Frank Norris Agency	Continental	784,000
H. D. Pressler	Westchester	706,700

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Allen, Clifford H. School Insurance Administration, New York: The MacMillan Company, 1965.

2. Allen, C. H. "How to Manage a School Insurance Program," American School and University, 37:41-42, June, 1965.

3. American Management Association, Inc. The Growing Job of Risk Management, New York: American Management Association, Inc., 1962.

4. Denenberg, Herbert S., and others. Risk and Insurance. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1964.

5. Edwards, L.F. "Insurance Costs: Up and Almost Away," Nation's Schools, 85:51-55, February, 1970.

6. Elliott, L.P. "Plan Ahead for Low Cost Insurance," American School Board Journal, 153:49-50, December, 1966.

7. Foraker, T.V., and J. Hart, "School Insurance Programs," School and Community, 54:28-29, October, 1967.

8. "Guidelines to Better Insurance Management," American School and University, 36:29-31, August, 1964.

9. Hirsch, P. "Fire Insurance: How to Get More Protection for Less," School Management, 6:39-41, August, 1962.

10. "How to Check Your Insurance," Nation's Schools, 73:58, June, 1964.

11. Insurance Institute of America, Principles of Risk Management, Bryn Mawr, Pennsylvania: Insurance Institute of America, 1968.

12. Insurance Institute of America, Educational Program in Risk Management, Bryn Mawr, Pennsylvania: Insurance Institute of America, 1968.

13. Katzenmeyer, R.G. "How to Save Money on Fire Insurance," School Management, 5:114-115, May, 1961.

14. Levensohn, A., "Schoolman's Guide to Insurance Management, Property, Liability, Personnel," School Management, 9:83-96, February, 1965.

15. Magee, John H., and David L. Bickelhaupt, General Insurance, Homewood, Illinois: Richard D. Irwin, Inc., 1964.

16. Marmion, H.A., "Does Your District Follow Good Insurance Practices?" Nation's Schools, 78:71-72, September, 1966.

17. Martland, T.H., "Effective Ways to Reduce the Cost of Insurance Coverage," American School and University, 39:40-41, July, 1967.

18. Mayerson, Allen L., Introduction to Insurance, New York: The Macmillan Company, 1962.

19. Mehr, Robert I., and Bob A. Hedges, Risk Management in the Business Enterprise, Homewood, Illinois: Richard D. Irwin, Inc., 1963.

20. _____ and Emerson Cammack, Principles of Insurance, Homewood, Illinois: Richard D. Irwin, Inc., 1966.

21. Mowbray, Albert H., Ralph H. Blanchard, and C. Arthur Williams, Jr., Insurance, New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1969.

22. Parry, A. E., "Choosing School Insurance for Total Protection," American School and University, 39:38-40, September, 1966.

23. "PIP Insurance Plan and the Bellport School Fire," American School Board Journal, 147:25-26, December, 1963.

24. Purcell, F.X., "Fire Insurance and Wood School Buildings," American School Board Journal, 146:31, March, 1963.

25. Riegel, R., and J.S. Miller, Insurance Principles and Practices, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1966.

26. "Round Table Tells How to Buy, Save on School Insurance," Nation's Schools, 69:71-80, January, 1962.

27. Schaerer, R. W., "Package Plan Cuts Insurance Costs," Nation's Schools, 73:64, February, 1964.

28. Snider, H. Wayne (ed.), Risk Management, Homewood, Illinois: Richard D. Irwin, Inc., 1964.

29. Spence, F. R., "New Plan for Institutional Fire Insurance," American School Board Journal, 144:23, February, 1962.

30. Williams, C. Arthur, Jr., and Richard M. Heins, Risk Management and Insurance, New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1964.