PERCEIVED ENHANCEMENTS AND IMPEDIMENTS TO SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT IN TEACHER CONTRACTS

By

Judith Dorsch Backes

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Educational Administration

1987

ABSTRACT

PERCEIVED ENHANCEMENTS AND IMPEDIMENTS TO SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT IN TEACHER CONTRACTS

By

Judith Dorsch Backes

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose was to determine the perceptions of building principals and teacher association representatives on the impeding and/or enhancing aspects of a typical teacher contract on school improvement. In this study, the researcher examined the perceived rather than the real effect of the contract.

RESEARCH DESIGN

A stratified sample of 35 Michigan school districts was selected. Fourteen contract domains reflecting the seven correlates of effective schools were identified as a result of a review of these contracts. Typical contract language was selected from these contracts for each of the fourteen domains to create a generic contract for the survey.

One hundred and ninety-seven buildings were selected to represent the three levels: high school, junior high, and elementary. The principal and building teacher representative from each of these buildings was sent a copy

of the survey. The respondents were asked to indicate whether each contract domain either impeded, enhanced, both impeded and enhanced, or neither impeded nor enhanced school improvement. They were also asked to indicate which of the correlates of effective schools was affected by each provision.

FINDINGS

From the analysis of the teacher contracts, it appears that efforts to implement school improvement plans along the lines of safe and orderly environment, monitoring of student progress, and home-school relations will not be affected by the typical provision in a majority of teacher contracts. School improvement plans that include efforts in the areas of instructional leadership, clear and focused mission, and opportunity to learn may find teacher contract provisions that may enhance or impede implementation of the plan.

The data from this study reveal that at the building level teacher contracts are perceived a having no effect on a school improvement plan or some enhancing qualities. Principals had more of a tendency to perceive the contract as having no effect, or some impeding effects as compared to teachers. Teachers tended to perceive the contract as an enhancer. Teachers and principals agreed more than they disagreed on the effects of the contract provisions.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author wishes to thank Dr. Lawrence Lezotte, Committee Chairman, for his expert guidance in the completion of this study. His willingness to offer direction and answer question after question, was most appreciated. Special thanks are extended to Dr. Daniel Kruger for his inspiration and constant encouragement during this project. His friendship is deeply appreciated. The author wishes to thank both Dr. Samuel Moore and Dr. Charles Blackman for their interest in this study and the challenges they offered to make the most of this study.

For their special assistance in the statistical area, the author wishes to thank Dr. Sami Alam of Tecumseh Public Schools, and Dr. William Veitch of Oakland Intermediate School District. Their advice and assistance with the format of the survey and the handling of the data was deeply appreciated. For their assistance in the word processing are, the author wishes to thank Chuch McKinnon and Larry Heath. Special thanks to Dr. Ruth Nathan of Oakland University and Miriam Weberman of Walled Lake Consolidated Schools, for their willingness to serve as editors on this dissertation.

The author wishes to thank all of her family, friends, and colleagues for their ongoing support and encouragement. Their good wishes and prayers were with me always. Finally, and most of all, the author wishes to thank her husband Jim, son Aaron, and baby for all the love and support they gave and the sacrifices they made.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER PAGE

CHAPTER PAGE

APPENDIX

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE PAGE

TABLE PAGE

TABLE PAGE

TABLE PAGE

TABLE PAGE

CHAPTER I

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

INTRODUCTION

The staffs of schools are expected to make changes to improve themselves and the quality of instruction. One way schools have sought improvement is through the school improvement model based on effective schools research. There are two basic assumptions on change that affect the workplace inherent in the school improvement model based on effective schools research. The first assumption is that if schools are to improve, people are going to have to change. Secondly, the organization and structure of schools is going to have to change. Since collective bargaining agreements contain language that can affect the change process there is potential conflict between school improvement plans and collective bargaining agreements.

The collective bargaining agreements of teachers determine not only their wages and hours, but their working conditions, as well. In altering the organization and structure of the school for school improvement, the teacher contract provisions may be impacted. For example, in

an effort to improve the quality of instruction as part of a school improvement plan, the language of the teacher contract on teacher evaluation may impede or enhance that effort. In altering the organization of schools, this may mean having variable class sizes for students needing more intensive instruction. Class size is typically found in teacher contracts and therefore provisions on class size may impede or enhance that school improvement plan. For many educators the question is how do we improve schools in light of the teacher contracts within which we must live?

School improvement models contain seven steps. These steps are staff orientation, school improvement team selection, goal setting, needs assessment, identification of effective practices, dissemination of the plan, and implementation of the plan. (Lezotte and Bancroft, 1985) In each of these steps active participation and collaboration among staff and administators is required. School improvement is a process that takes time and commitment. This process can be enhanced or impeded by teacher contracts. In examining the impeding aspects of teacher contracts on an improvement model, contractual issues such as teacher release time for planning and training, teacher pay for after school meetings, and accountability issues as they relate to teacher evaluations may present obstacles.

On the other hand some aspects of the contract may

enhance school improvement. Most, if not all, teacher contracts contain provisions for planning time for teachers "on company time." In terms of effective teaching and school improvement, proper planning and classroom management are essential. Contract language that provides for time to do these activities contributes favorably to the improvement of schools.

Unfortunately, many educators will be frustrated or blocked in their attempts to bring about improvement because of contract language. (Lieberman, 1984) Teacher unions may cry out that there is a change in working conditions or that the contract is violated. In many cases the strength of the union and the contract itself force many administrators to keep the status quo rather than face a grievance.

> Collective bargaining has, many authors conclude, increased the formal authority of teachers and restricted the formal authority of principals, centralized and standardized school practices, redefined and reduced teachers' work obligations, and increased job protections.
> (Johnson, 1984,p.5)

Myron Lieberman, an experienced negotiator in the educational field states,"Public sector bargaining poses insuperable obstacles to the educational reform movement." (Lieberman, 1984, p. 54) These obstacles include the reduction of flexibility for administrators, a decrease in the amount of teacher-student contact time, a limitation on the number of faculty meetings and inservice days, to name

a few.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The researcher's purpose in this study is to determine to what extent provisions in teacher contracts create situations that are perceived as impeding or enhancing programs of school improvement based on the effective schools research. A sampling of Michigan teacher contracts will be examined to find representative language that reflects the seven correlates of effective schools and school improvement. These contract provisions then will be reviewed by building principals and teacher association representatives to determine how they perceive the language in terms of school improvement.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

The call for reform in schools has been pervasive. However, in the many studies that call for school improvement none mentions how its recommendations should be dealt with in terms of teacher contracts. The reports do not take into account the obstacles to reform that teacher unions and their contracts present. (Lieberman, 1984) According to Lieberman, the National Commission on Excellence in Education, in their examination of the

issues, funded 40 studies and yet failed to examine the relationship of teacher bargaining and educational reform. Lieberman also states,"teacher unions and teacher bargaining either frustrates most reforms or would be sufficient to frustrate them, regardless of the presence or absence of other barriers to reform." (Lieberman, 1984, p.54)

The number of studies done regarding the effects of teacher contracts on educational quality has been very few. Geisert (1984) found that from 1978-1983 only six studies had been done on the impact of unions on curriculum and instruction. The variables of administrative constraint, teacher perceptions of their work, and policy provisions in contracts are difficult to measure and have only recently been examined. (Mazzarella, 1984) According to Eberts and Stone (1984), literature on collective bargaining has moved in three directions. Initially the relationship between management and labor in the public sector was discussed. What should it be? Secondly, the nature of the bargaining process in public schools, (i.e. scope of bargaining, determinants of the appearance of certain provisions in contracts, and the impact of bargaining by examining contracts) was the issue. Currently, the discussion centers around the actual effects of collective bargaining on the educational process.

The actual effects of collective bargaining on school

improvement will not be examined in this study. Rather how teacher contracts are perceived in terms of their creating certain conditions for school improvement will be the focus. How contract provisions are perceived by building principals and teacher association representatives in light of their impact on school improvement will be described. As a result of this study, building principals and teachers will have a better sense of the importance of the teacher contract relative to school improvement. The perceptions of the respondents in this study will help those conducting school improvement to recognize the aspects of typical teacher contracts that may impede and/or enhance their efforts.

LIMITATIONS

This study will be limited to a representative sampling of respondents from respresentative school districts across the state of Michigan. The number of contracts analyzed will be limited to those from this representative sampling. This study will be limited to contract provisions that can be found in the contracts reviewed. The analysis of the data will consist of frequency distributions and chi-square analyses.

The data from this study will be based on the responses of teacher association representatives and

building principals in the sample. This data will not be analyzed according to comparisons of paired responses of the principal and teacher representative from the same building. Although a generic set of contract language will be used, the biases the respondents bring to the questions from their experiences with their own contract will not be controlled.

DELIMITATIONS

The study will be limited to teacher contracts in Michigan school districts serving students in grades kindergarten through grade twelve. This study will be limited to school improvement models based on effective schools research and its correlates. The subjects selected to respond to the survey will be building principals and teacher union representatives. These subjects are selected because they deal with teacher contract issues on a daily basis. Teacher union representative and building principals are also selected to respond because the effective schools research has as its focus on building level school improvement.

Personal growth experiences by individuals, such as coursework for college credit that may receive tuition reimbursement and have contract language associated with them, are not included as one of the contract domains. The

reason for this is that the professional development contract provisions selected are those associated with school improvement and are managed by the administration or through the joint management of teachers and administration. The contract domains included are those that affect all or most of the teaching staff. Professional development contract provisions included in this study are those that are sponsored by the administration and/or a recognized school improvement group within a district that includes administration and teachers.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The following questions will be answered in this study.

1. Do typical teacher contracts contain language which practicing administrators and teacher association representatives tend to perceive as creating conditions which impede or enhance school improvement?

2. Are there differences between the perceptions of teacher association representatives and building administrators relative to the enhancing or impeding effects of contract provisions on school

improvement?

3. Are the differences between the perceptions of teacher association representatives and building administrators for the enhancing or impeding effects of contract provisions on school improvement a function of their affiliation (Michigan Education Association or Michigan Federation of Teachers) or district type?

4. Which contract provisions are perceived as most enhancing, and which provisions are perceived as most impeding in terms of school improvement?

5. If a provision is perceived as impeding or enhancing or both, which of the correlates of effective schools are perceived as affected?

DEFINITIONS

The following definitions and abbreviations are provided:

Correlates of effective schools - the seven characteristics of Safe and Orderly Environment, Climate of High Expectations for Success, Instructional Leadership,

Clear and Focused Mission, Opportunity to Learn and Time on Task, Frequent Monitoring of Student Progress, and Home-School Relations

Professional development - inservice activities for teachers which may include workshops, conferences, professional release days, curriculum study days, etc.

Public Employment Relations Act (PERA) - provisions of Act 336 of Public Acts of 1947 (Michigan), as amended by Act 379 of Public Acts of 1965, whereby public employees,including teachers, may organize and engage in collective bargaining.

Rural district - a remote area, populated sparsely (under 10,000) that is not closely accessible to a major urban area.

School improvement - the organized efforts of a building staff to change their school for the better based on a programmatic, deliberate, collaborative, school wide, and publicly shared plan.

Scope of bargaining - the subject matter of negotiating

Suburban district - a mid-sized region (10,000 to 99,000) which is densely-populated and is within the "metropolitan core" of an urban region. It is comprised of a commuter-type population and is dependent upon its neighboring urban region.

Town district - a small-to-medium sized population center (10,000 to 99,000) which is not in the vicinity of an

urban area. It is a "center" within itself, usually being the focused economic area for outlying rural areas.

Typical teacher contracts - representative contract language as selected by the researcher to reflect teacher contracts across the state of Michigan

Urban district - a heavily populated area (usually over 150,000) that is considered a "center" within the state. It comprises within its borders a major economic area which spans across a large, densely-populated region.

SUMMARY AND OVERVIEW

In this study the researcher will be examining the perceptions of building principals and building teacher representatives on the effect of typical contract provisions on school improvement. The differences in the perceptions of principals and teacher representatives will be examined for each of the provisions. Any differences between the perceptions of the subgroups within the study, Michigan Education Association (MEA) afffiliated or Michigan Federation of Teachers (MFT) affiliated, and the location subgroups of Urban/Suburban and Rural/Town will be examined. In this study, how the correlates of effective schools are perceived to be affected by teacher contract

provisions will be discussed.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

In this study of the perceptions of building principals and building teacher association representatives on the impeding or enhancing aspects of teacher contract language, the researcher is attempting to bridge the gap between labor relations and school improvement. As the researcher will show in this review of the literature, there has been much research in the two respective fields but little on the effect of one upon the other.

This review of literature will begin with a brief overview of the effective schools research and the school improvement model based upon this research. Following this discussion there will be a brief overview of the history of collective bargaining for teachers. The studies of the impact of collective bargaining on education and specifically on school improvement will be discussed next.

EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS RESEARCH AND SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT

The effective schools research began in the early

'70's as a reaction to the Coleman report of 1966 which popularized pupil cognitive gain as a measure of school effectiveness. Earlier studies had focused on pupil access to educational resources. The reaction to Coleman's finding that how well children did in school had little to do with schools themselves, was to find schools that shouldn't be achieving but were. Weber(1971) did just that and found that there were school characteristics that were the principal determinants of instructional effectiveness. Weber(1971) found strong leadership; high expectations; an orderly, quiet, pleasant atmosphere; a strong emphasis on pupil acquisition of reading skills; additional reading personnel; emphasis on phonics and individualization of instruction.

In 1974, the Office of Education Performance Review of the State of New York published a report on two inner-city New York public schools. The findings of this report supported many of Weber's conclusions. The differences between the achievement in the high achieving school and the low achieving school were attributable to administrative behavior, policies and practices; an administrative team that was balanced with management and instructional skills;and teachers who were not skeptical of their impact on students.

Brookover and Lezotte (1977) found the following characteristics in their study of improving schools in

Michigan: an emphasis on reading and math objectives;a belief by staff that all students can master objectives; a climate of high expectations;teachers who assumed the responsibility for teaching basic skills;more time spent in reading instruction;a principal who was an instructional leader and disciplinarian;a principal who assumed the responsibility for evaluating the achievement of basic objectives;a staff who accepted their accountability; teachers who were less satisfied with the status quo;parent initiated involvement; and less emphasis on paraprofessional or compensatory education programs.

Edmonds' (1978) Model Cities Neighborhood study found that pupil family background neither causes nor precludes a school's instructional effectiveness. Edmonds found seven correlates of effective schools which have been commonly accepted in the literature on effective schools. These correlates are:1) a safe and orderly environment;2) a climate of high expectations for success; 3) instructional leadership; 4) a clear and focused mission; 5) the opportunity to learn and student time on task; 6) frequent monitoring of student progress; and 7) home-school relations.

There are three distinctive attributes of an Effective Schools Research (ESR) based program of school improvement acoording to Lezotte and Bancroft (1985). The first attribute is that of quality of education and equality of

educational opportunity for all students. The second attribute is that ESR-based programs center on research from the three interdependent bodies of research:effective staff development, effective development in education, and effective planned change programs.

The definition of effective schools is based on five major premises according to Lezotte and Bancroft (1985). The first premise is that "the primary function of schooling is teaching and learning". Although schools may be be asked to perform the functions of sorting and selecting students for different careers, their focus should be teaching and learning. Premise two is that "the primary basis for assessing the increased effectiveness of the school is in terms of students' outcomes". In contrast to assessing schools on inputs and processes, ESR emphasizes assessment through outcomes. The third premise is that "the way in which a local school district chooses to monitor student outcomes is indicative of the educational outcomes that the district cares about". The fourth premise is "an effective school is one which demonstrates both quality and equity in its program outcomes". This means that the overall level of achievement must be sufficiently high to signify acceptable mastery of the essential curriculum and the distribution of achievement must not vary significantly across the major subsets of the student population. (Lezotte,1985) The final

premise is that quality and equity are achieved and maintained only when the school improvement effort has been designed to accrue benefits for 'all' students".

A HISTORICAL OVERVIEW OF TEACHER COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

In 1965, the Public Employment Relations Act (PERA) was passed by the Michigan Legislature guaranteeing public employees the right to form unions and bargain collectively with employers. PERA also established procedures for selection of employee representatives and defined unfair labor practices of unions and employers.

"From the time teacher bargaining became recognized legally in Michigan, teachers there have negotiated some of the most comprehensive contracts in the country." (Eberts and Stone,1984, p.24) According to Eberts and Stone, Michigan teachers have maintained one of the strongest bargaining positions in the country. This is a result of the fact that there are no sanctions on strikes in Michigan thereby broadening the scope of bargaining.

By the fall of 1983, 36 states had enacted legislation providing bargaining rights for teachers. (Lieberman, 1984) It is estimated that 86% of public school teachers are covered by collective bargaining agreements. (Lieberman, 1984) Teachers are not only the largest single group of public employees, but they have also bargained collectively

longer than almost any other public employee group. (Cresswell,1980)

Teacher unions initially grew out of informal teacher professional associations during the 1960's. As a result of changes in population and socioeconomic composition that resulted in changes in local politics, changes in teachers' perceptions of their economic and professional status, and new educational problems such as increased school bureaucracy and a decrease in accessibility to administration, teacher associations began to function as unions. (Jessup, 1985) Collective bargaining grew as a result of teachers' dissatisfaction with their salaries and their prestige. (Cole,1969) Jessup, however, states that the "frustration over the larger administrative issues were of equal if not greater importance". (Jessup,1985,191.)

Eberts and Stone (1984) note that teacher contracts evolved as a result of the preference and attitudes of teachers, the attitudes of school boards and administration, state bargaining legislation, and the national affiliation of the local teacher organization. Teachers organized, state Eberts and Stone, as a result of the passage of state laws that protected the rights of teachers to seek bargaining recognition. Secondly, the issues of economic well being and professional well being influenced teachers to organize. Teachers wanted an access to and an influence over educational policy to maintain a

sense of professionalism. The economic well being of teachers was threatened by declining enrollments and inflation. The discontent of the public threatened their job security as well as diminished teachers' self esteem. Thirdly, changes in demographics and social conditions increased teacher militancy and an awareness of changes in society. Finally, teacher unions grew as a result of the rivalry of the AFT and the NEA. (Eberts and Stone, 1984)

Teacher unions began their bargaining with the basic 'bread and butter' issues of wages, hours, and conditions of employment. There were small union gains in salary during the early 1970's, but by the late 1970's there were substantial gains in salaries. (Eberts and Stone, 1984) In 1977, the unionization of teachers had increased their wages, compared to those of similar non-union workers by 12 to 21 percent. (R&D Perspectives,1981)

Geisert states that when teachers bargained over wages and fringe benefits they were often charged with being unprofessional. (Geisert,1984) Instead, teachers were told to bargain over instruction and curriculum matters, the things they know best. Subsequently, school boards and administrators took a hard line on curriculum and instruction as management prerogatives. (Geisert,1984) Teachers first sought increases in wages and benefits, then work conditions and job securty and finally educational policy. (McDonnell and Pascal, 1979) According to McDonnell

and Pascal, teachers influence school and classroom operations, regulate class size and play a major role in educational policy and personnel decisions.

Steele (1969) found that there were significantly more instructional provisions in Michigan teacher contracts in 1967-68 than in 1966-67. During the four years 1972-76 the number of contracts with provisions relating to curriculum and instruction increased by 130%. (Geisert, 1984) In a study conducted by the National School Boards Association, 26 out of 61 urban districts included clauses in teacher contracts on instructional items. (Geisert, 1984)

The issue of who should determine the curriculum and how instruction should take place continues to be debated. Jessup found that teacher union members have a difficult time agreeing on the inclusion of educational issues in their negotiations. (Jessup, 1985) There is a lack of solidarity on such issues and they therefore get less priority because economic issues provide a clearer basis for concensus and success. (Jessup,1985) Farber (1981) examined 34 teacher contracts in the years 1971-72 through 1978-79 and found that both economic and educational provisions increased during this time period. However, the increase was proportionally greater for the economic variables.

Collective bargaining for teachers has increased both in the number of teachers bargaining and in scope of their

bargaining. Teacher unions continue to emphasize economic issues and issues relating to hours and working conditions. Provisions relating to educational issues are present in teacher contracts.

In the state of Michigan there has been a particularly large amount of growth in the scope of bargaining for teachers. According to Rynecki (1984), the Michigan courts take a more liberal approach than federal courts in determining negotiability of subjects because public employees are forbidden to strike under PERA. One recommendation of the Michigan Blueprint for Action (1984) is that the teaching profession be strengthened through professional development opportunities and the development of policies on middle school teacher certification. These issues are also mandatory subjects for bargaining. Faced with these calls for reform, many schools are turning to school improvement programs based on the effective schools research. (Olson,1986) The Education Commission of the States estimates that at least 20 states have school improvement projects, many of which are based on the effective schools research. (Olson,1986)

Prior to discussing the impact of collective bargaining on education and school improvement, the researcher will discuss the literature on how collective bargaining has affected contract provisions contained within teacher contracts.

COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AND CONTRACT PROVISIONS

Eberts and Stone found a clear hierarchy in contract provisions. There are five major categories within which various provisions occur:arbitration and grievance, reduction in force, dismissal procedures, classroom policy, and inservice and continuing education. (Eberts and Stone, 1984) The grievance procedure is the most frequent provision of contracts, it is the 'heart' of the contract. (McDonnel and Pascal, 1979) The next most frequently occurring contract provision in the Michigan contracts examined by Eberts and Stone (1984) was personnel matters relating to such things as class size and reduction in force. In Nichols' (1975) study, all of the twenty-one contracts studied from New York and Pennsylvania, had a provision limiting the number of faculty meetings which the principal can hold and most of these contracts limited the length of the faculty meetings.

In Bieber's (1974) study of teacher contracts he found that medium sized school districts (200-500 teachers) mentioned salaries more than any other item followed by grievance procedures, provisions for professional organization, transfer, leave and promotion policies. In large districts (5000 or more teachers), transfer policies were mentioned most often, followed by teacher evaluation, grievance procedures, provisions for professional

organization, and staff participation in policy determination.

THE IMPACT OF COLLECTIVE BARGAINING ON EDUCATION

"Interest in the impact of teacher negotiations has been heightened by current fiscal constraints and the emphasis on student achievement." (R&D Perspectives, 1981,p.2) In most school districts 50-75% of district revenues are spent for teacher salaries and benefits which are negotiated. (Lieberman, 1984) While school budgets are continuing to be constrained by state and federal regulations, collective bargaining has created its own sets of mandates. (Sizer,1983) As Eberts and Stone (1984) noted, the concern is that teacher unions have not only caused increased costs to school districts and a decrease in quality but they have diverted the attention of teachers and administration away from the classroom and into the bargaining room. Whatever the actual costs of contracts to a district, Eberts and Stone's study of contracts show that contract language influences resource allocation within a district. The number of contract items has a positive effect on the level of per pupil expenditure within a district. "Districts with collective bargaining agreements spend, on average, about 15% more than districts without such agreements to produce the same level of student

achievement." (Eberts and Stone,1984, p.170)

In their survey of the literature on collective bargaining and education, Cresswell and Spargo (1980) found a disproportionately small amount of research on the direct impact of collective bargaining on either costs or student achievement. Eberts and Stone (1984) state that the empirical studies on collective bargaining show that it 'significantly' influences the compensation and working conditions of teachers. Perry (1979) found that the primary effect of collective bargaining is on salaries and working conditions. As noted in the previous section, however, the number of curriculum issues included in contracts has been on the increase.

One area that has received attention is the effect of collective bargaining on school governance. In the initial bargaining with teachers, many superintendents acted as 'go-betweens' to recommend to their boards changes or the adoption of contract language. Many of these superintendents were naive regarding the true meaning of much of the language in proposals. (Kennedy,1984) Likewise many boards incorporated the model contract language of the NEA. (DiRicco,1977) Arbitrators, as well, have removed many management prerogatives as a result of the collective bargaining process. (Kennedy, 1984)

On the contrary, Perry and Wildman (1970) in their study found that there were few cases where collective

bargaining had actually forced a significant shift in school district policy on a 'reluctant,unwilling board' or their being blocked from initiating change on a policy as a result of teacher negotiations. Perry and Wildman (1970) state that there has not been a "wholesale restructuring of the traditional control patterns" because board and administrative discretion has been protected by their insistence that a subject is not negotiable, that some subjects bargained are exempt from the grievance and arbitration processes, and their referring of subjects and issues to study committees. Perry and Wildman (1970) do suggest that there is much potential for and increase in teacher involvement in school district policy making as a result of the power of "local school district teacher collective action". (Perry and Wildman, 1970,p.189) The factors that predict this are the expanding definition of bargainable subject matter, political imperatives of the teacher union which demand and increased scope of action and concern, and the desires of teachers interested and knowledgeable about school operations. (Perry and Wildman, 1970)

Goldschmidt (1983), in his study of the impact of collective bargaining on educational policy, found that traditional matters of educational policy are being bargained to a degree not previously recognized or predicted. According to Goldschmidt, bargaining over

educational policy had not peaked by 1975 as some researchers had originally thought, but continued until 1981 and even then showed no signs of slowing down. Mazzarella (1984) states that because contract provisions are more rigid and specific than policy statements,they make schools less adaptable and less able to respond to new demands or situations.

> Many of the bargained policies (Goldschmidt) discovered may effect those characteristics the effective schooling literature has identified as important to achievement: school site management, adminstrative leadership, staff stability, curriculum articulation and organization, staff development, parental involvement and support, school-wide recognition of academic success, maximized learning time, and district support.
> (Mazzarella,1984,p.7)

The loss of adaptability that comes with collective bargaining is a result of a reduction in the autonomy of administrators. (Mazarella,1984) Cresswell and Spargo (1980) found that in general collective bargaining has had the perceived effect of controlling and diminishing administrative authority. Perry and Wildman (1970) state that collective bargaining assumes that there will be compromise and accommodation which thereby gives teachers a partial veto over management decisions.

Trost (1969) studied the effect of negotiations on Michigan secondary principals and found no perceptible increase in the amount of constraint on the principal's role. King (1969) studied the effect of negotiations on

elementary principals in Ohio and found that they had retained authority in performing their role. Chasteen (1972) and Robertson (1971) also examined the effects of negotiations on the elementary principal's role and found that their ability to function was significantly hampered by collective bargaining. Nichols (1975) in his study of elementary and secondary principals found that they perceived significantly more constraint in those school districts with collective bargaining agreements than in those with no collective bargaining agreements. The concern expressed by Applegate (1984) is that collective bargaining is creating a situation in which administrators do not have the power to make decisions on the basis of educational value but on the basis of the dictates of the contract.

Johnson's (1984) study of how teacher unions and administrators function at the building level concluded that while the principals' formal authority had been restricted and teachers' formal authority increased, building administrators could still manage their schools well because the organization of the school provided them with the opportunity to achieve sufficient autonomy and influence. Johnson's most significant finding was that labor contracts were implemented differently from building to building within the same district based on administrative style, union assertiveness, contract

prominence, and the level of teacher services.

> The interdependence of teachers and principals, the breadth of teacher concerns, and teachers' ambivalence about their union membership all provided principals with the opportunity to avoid or moderate labor relationships that were formal and adversarial and thus to promote cooperation and elicit high levels of service from their staff.
>
> Johnson (1984,p.153)

According to Johnson, collective bargaining has made the principal's position more important, as well as making the principal's role more difficult. In working with teacher contracts, the principal must understand the teacher's priorities, a familiarity with contract provisions, a judgment about school-wide needs, and a capacity to compromise.

According to Johnson (1984), the widespread introduction of stipends in teacher contracts emphasized the concept that teachers' professional obligations were defined rather than diffuse and that teachers, not principals, should have the right to determine when and if they would participate outside their classrooms. "Teachers were regularly said to seek control over their noninstructional time and to limit their obligations to those related to classroom instruction." (Johnson, 1984, p.95)

Rigidly enforced class size limits that include no allowances for subject or ability groupings, make it much more difficult for schools to respond to student needs.

(Johnson, 1984) Similarly, when a teachers' workday coincides with the students' instructional day it interferes with opportunitites for after-school tutoring, emergency conferences, or inservice training. Johnson (1984) further states that layoff and transfer provisions that authorize frequent bumping of junior teachers or permit a teacher with no experience in a particular subject to displace someone less senior, the students' continuity of instruction is sacrificed.

Jessup (1985) found that the amount of flexibility that administrators felt they had depended upon mutual informal agreements between them and union leaders on how strictly contracts were to be interpreted.

> Furthermore, principals who understood the spirit of the contract - that is, those who balanced consideration for teachers' needs with school management needs - generally found their staff allowed them considerabley more freedom in reading the contract than those who showed little regard for teachers' needs.
>
> Jessup (1985, p.209)

Kerchner (1984) also found that different schools operating under the same union contract varied greatly in the way the contract was implemented and interpreted by teachers. Teachers engaged in forms of local or fractional bargaining with their principal and as a result the 'real rules' or expected behavior varied from building to building. For this reason, Kerchner states that the school, not the district, be the unit of analysis for labor

relations research. Kerchner has found that studies of teacher contracts as documents only give a partial glimpse of what the actual contract provisions mean. The researcher must go to the building level to get the true picture of the interaction of the contract, the teachers, and the principal. (Kerchner,1984)

THE IMPACT OF COLLECTIVE BARGAINING ON SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT

With the increased interest in reforming American schools, how then does collective bargaining impact on school improvement efforts? Lieberman (1984) states that public sector bargaining poses 'insuperable obstacles' to the reform movement regardless of other barriers to reform. The problem, states Lieberman, is that collective bargaining is the primary means of revising personnel policies that affect teachers and revising such policies is an essential condition for reform. As noted earlier, some of the reforms mentioned include increased teacher-student contact time, increased teacher work year, merit pay, inservice training, changes in teacher certification and qualification, and changes in teacher evaluation systems.

Rynecki and Pickering (1984) suggest that one of the best ways for schools to improve themselves, in light of teacher contracts, is through the improvement of teaching methodology through the teacher evaluation system. "Most

districts have reserved the right to evaluate their teaching staff and this right can be a central force in achieving improved teacher excellence as well as attaining higher educational output to students." (Rynecki and Pickering, 1984,p. 507)

It is especially difficult to address these reform issues when you cannot even raise the issues for two or three years in which the current contract is in effect. With the methods for resolving negotiation impasses (e.g. fact finding, mediation), teacher unions can legally prevent implementation of reforms that affect the terms and conditions of their employment for a substantial period of time, states Lieberman. Finally, Lieberman states that school board members have a shorter term of office than it takes to get most reforms through the gauntlet of the political bargaining process and thus most board members opt for the status quo rather than a long fight.

Kratz (1977) studied six Michigan school districts to determine the effect of collective bargaining on the quality of education. Kratz found that all of the groups interviewed agreed that there were contract provisions that interfered with successfully improving the quality of education. The teacher group identified the greatest number of provisions interfering with the quality of education. Central office administrators on the other

hand, identified the greatest percentage of contract language for improving the quality of education.

Bieber (1974) found 1382 citations of characteristics, factors, and conditions purported to improve educational programs in the sixty-five contracts reviewed for an average of 21 citations per contract. Bieber concluded that such conditions, factors, and characteristics for improving schools are normal and usual provisions of negotiated contracts.

In their study of the effect of unions on the educational process in the states of Michigan, New York, and Wisconsin, Eberts and Stone (1984) state that there are five determinants of student outcomes:student characteristics, teacher characteristics, time spent by teachers and students at performing various tasks, modes of instruction, and administrative characteristics. Collective bargaining has no effect on student characteristics but does impact the other four determinants. In terms of teacher characteristics, collective bargaining affects teacher mobility through transfers and layoffs. Teacher attitudes are also affected by collective bargaining and their attitude toward their work conditions. The degree of teacher input into decisions also affects their attitudes. (Eberts and Stone,1984)

Gains in student achievement are positively correlated with time spent by teachers on instruction and

preparation. (Eberts and Stone, 1984) Teachers in districts covered by collective bargaining agreements spend less time on instruction, but more time on preparation and administration than their non-union counterparts. The mode of instruction is affected by collective bargaining in terms of class size.

As noted previously, studies have found that instuctional leadership is affected by collective bargaining, and Eberts and Stone (1984) support this in their study. Collective bargaining affects administrative characteristics, also, by impacting the decisions that are made regarding the internal allocation of resources. (Eberts and Stone, 1984) Eberts and Stone cite many of the same characteristics of principals that can improve educational programs as the effective schools research, those being: maintaining order, acting as an agent of change, setting clear objectives, conveying high expectations of student achievement, offering support and guidance to teachers, providing rewards and incentives, and spending time in the classroom.

Eberts and Stone (1984) found that teachers with collective bargaining agreements receive higher salaries, teach smaller classes and spend slightly less time instructing students but more time preparing for classes than their non-union counterparts. The average amount of time taken from instruction is 10 minutes with 3.1 of the

minutes given to preparation, 5.3 minutes to administrative duties, and 1.6 minutes given to meetings with parents. Eberts and Stone state that since collective bargaining reduces instruction more than it increases preparation time, it is possible that collective bargaining reduces test scores.

Eberts and Stone (1984) summarize the effects of collective bargaining by stating that union and non-union schools on the average appear to be equally effective in producing student achievement. However,"union districts appear to work best for students near the average and less well for students well above or below average". (Eberts and Stone, 1984,p. 170) As noted earlier, collective bargaining affects resource allocation according to Eberts and Stone. Therefore, students in non-union districts are exposed more often to specialized instructional modes and resources.

CONCLUSION

In this review of literature, the researcher has discussed the growth of collective bargaining for teachers. As a result of the increase in the scope of teacher bargaining, there has been an increased impact on education. At the same time that concerns have been expressed over the loss of local control of education to the teacher contract and the impact on such areas as

the allocation of resources within a district, there has been a push for schools to improve themselves. In planning for school improvement, many of the means for such improvement are constrained by language in teacher contracts. In this study, the researcher has looked at whether the language in the teacher contracts creates conditions which are perceived by teachers and principals to be impeding or enhancing. In order for schools to move forward with school improvement, it will be important for them to have the data from this study to encourage their efforts and not feel restricted.

This review of literature has included the effective schools research and school improvement based on effective schools research. The seven correlates of an effective school are: 1) a safe and orderly environment, 2) a climate of high expectations for success, 3) instructional leadership, 4) a clear and focused mission, 5) the opportunity to learn and student time on task, 6) frequent monitoring of student progress, and 7) home-school relations.

The history of the development of collective bargaining for teachers was discussed. Teacher unions initially bargainined over wages, hours, and conditions of employment in the 1960's. By the early 1970's, teacher unions had turned to bargaining over educational policy issues and curriculum.

A discussion of collective bargaining and contract provisions found those contract items commonly found in teacher contracts. Teacher contracts follow a hierarchy of the same contract provisions. The researcher used the information from this discussion to identify the areas of the contract most likely to affect school improvement.

With the call for reform in education, educators began to seek ways of improving their schools. Teacher contracts contain some provisions for improving schools. They also contain provisions that impede school improvement. Teacher contracts have increased the autonomy and power of teachers, while at the same time decreasing the flexibility and control of principals.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH DESIGN AND PROCEDURE

This study consisted of five phases. The first phase of the study was to examine the correlates of effective schools and those contract provisions which reflected the correlates. The second phase was sample selection and development of the survey instrument. In the third phase, a pilot study of the survey was conducted to test the instrument itself. The fourth phase consisted of making a random selection of buildings from the district sample, and distribution of the survey. In the final phase, the data from the surveys were analyzed statistically.

PHASE 1: THE CORRELATES OF EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS AND RELATED CONTRACT PROVISIONS

The first phase of this study was to select the contract domains that most reflect the correlates of effective schools and ESR school improvement programs. Initially, the researcher studied the definitions of the correlates of effective schools which are discussed below.

According to the research on effective schools, there

are seven correlates or characteristics that effective schools exemplify. These correlates are:

1. Safe and Orderly Environment- In the effective school there is an orderly, purposeful, businesslike atmosphere which is free from threat of physical harm. The school climate is not oppressive and is conducive to teaching and learning.

2. Climate of High Expectations for Success- In the effective school there is a climate of expectation in which the staff believes and demonstrates that all students can attain mastery of the essential school skills and they believe that they have the capability to help all students attain mastery.

3. Instructional Leadership- In the effective school the principal acts as an instructional leader and effectively and persistently communicates that mission to staff, parents and students. The principal understands and applies the characteristics of instructional effectiveness in the management of the instructional program.

4. Clear and Focused Mission- In the effective school there is a clearly articulated school mission through which the staff shares an understanding of and a commitment to the instructional goals, priorities, assessment procedures and accountability. Staff accept responsibility for students' learning of the school's essential curricular goals.

5. Opportunity to Learn and Time on Task- In the effective school teachers allocate a significant amount of classroom time to instruction in the essential skills. For a high percentage of this time, students are engaged in whole class or large group planned, teacher directed, learning activities.

6. Frequent Monitoring of Student Progress- In the effective school, student academic

progress is measured frequently. A variety of assessment procedures are used to improve individual student performance and also to improve the instructional program.

7. Home-School Relations- In the effective school parents understand and support the school's basic mission and are given the opportunity to play an important role in helping the school to achieve this mission. (Lezotte and Bancroft, 1985)

In order to select the contract domains that reflected these seven correlates, the researcher used the information found in the review of literature. Eberts and Stone (1984) identified five major categories: arbitration and grievance; reduction in force; dismissal procedures; classroom policy; and inservice. The researcher then took a sample contract and identified all those areas which reflected the five categories of Eberts and Stone and reflected the seven correlates. For example, no provision pertaining to grievance and arbitration was selected, even though it is a major category, for none of these provisions reflected the correlates of effective schools. The researcher then met with representatives of the Michigan Association of School Boards (MASB) and the Michigan Education Association (MEA) to get their opinions on which areas of typical teacher contracts reflect school improvement. Those areas of the contract such as grievances, salaries, rights of the association, etc. that did not have perceived relationship to the correlates of

effective schools, according to the researcher and the representatives of MASB and MEA were not included.

Based on the definitions of the seven correlates, the research on effective schools, and the consultation with the MEA and MASB consultants, the following fourteen contract domains were selected: 1) student discipline, 2) teacher autonomy, 3) class size, 4) student assessment, 5) teacher evaluation, 6) teacher transfer, 7) teacher meetings, 8) professional development, 9) teacher preparation time, 10) curriculum input, 11) teacher workday, 12) teacher work year, 13) classroom aides, 14) home-school relations.

PHASE 2: SAMPLE SELECTION AND INSTRUMENT DEVELOPMENT

In this second phase, the researcher sought a representative sampling of school districts across the state of Michigan. The stratifications were districts affiliated with MEA and the Michigan Federation of Teachers (MFT). There were also stratifications by size and location of districts. The first category was Urban/Suburban districts that were more influenced by unions in their communities as a whole, as well as the problems associated with large districts. The second category was that of Rural/Town that may have large or small student populations but were geographically removed

from the influence of large metropolitan centers. Finally, large and small districts of each category were sought.

Twenty MEA districts, eight fitting the Urban/Suburban category and twelve fitting the Rural/Town category were selected from the Michigan Education Directory. A listing of all MFT affiliated districts was obtained. Eight Urban/Suburban districts and seven Rural/Town districts were selected.

A letter requesting a current teacher contract from each of these districts was sent to the district superintendent. Follow up letters were sent requesting a sample contract. From the total sample of thirty-five districts, twenty-nine contracts were received. (see Table 1 and Table 2)

These contracts were then analyzed according to the fourteen contract domains. The number of contracts that contained language on each of the fourteen domains is listed in Table 3. The domain of teacher autonomy was found in less than half of the contracts. The domains of teacher aides, student assessment, and home-school relations all had less than twenty-five percent.

TABLE 1 SCHOOL DISTRICT SAMPLE - MEA AFFILIATES

NAME	CTY	#TCH	#STU	U/S	R/T
Grand Rapids	Kent	1052	31551	374,678	
Saginaw	Saginaw	916	18085	146,485	
Ann Arbor*	Washtenaw	950	14000	208,931	
Kalamazoo	Kalamazoo	750	12037	155,124	
Bay City	Bay	475	10890	77,573	
Traverse City	Gr.Traverse	406	9206		15,515
Southfield	Oakland	640	9000	75,568	
Holly*	Oakland		8890		4,874
Ypsilanti	Washtenaw	389	7843	24,031	
Monroe	Monroe	364	7194	23,531	
Davison	Genesee	206	4867	6,087	
Niles	Berrien	245	4610		13,115
S.Lyon	Oakland	182	3842		5,214
Durand	Shiawasee	128	2722		4,241
Ithaca	Gratiot	86	1750		2,950
Michigan Ctr.	Jackson	67	1415		5,244
Comstock Park	Kent	66	1293		5,506
Bellevue*	Eaton	60	1094		1,289
Hesperia	Newaygo	52	1024		876
Reading*	Hillsdale	49	926		1,203

*CONTRACT NOT RECEIVED

**SCHOOL DISTRICT INFORMATION FROM THE 1985 MICHIGAN EDUCATION DIRECTORY

***POPULATION STATISTICS FROM THE 1980 CENSUS OF POPULATION GENERAL SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS, (CHAP. C,PART 24), ISSUED BY U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE, AUGUST 1983.

CTY - county
#TCH - number of teachers in district
#STU - number of students in district
U/S - Urban/Suburban district; population statistics
R/T - Rural/Town district; population statistics

TABLE 2 SCHOOL DISTRICT SAMPLE - MFT AFFILIATES

NAME	CTY	#TCH	#STU	U/S	R/T
Dearborn	Wayne	787	12,391	90,660	
Taylor	Wayne	680	13,785	77,568	
Highland Park	Wayne	408	5,844	27,909	
Oak Park	Oakland		3,574	31,537	
Roseville	Macomb	337	7,570	54,311	
Inkster	Wayne	185	3,420	35,190	
Hamtramck	Wayne	129	1,459	21,300	
Ecorse	Wayne	105	2,218	14,447	
Hemlock	Saginaw	89	1,901		
Imlay City	Lapeer	81	1,959		1,980
Lake City*	Missaukee		1,084		704
Brown City	Sanilac	54	1,071		1,142
Kingsley	Gr Traverse	41	870		632
Hale*	Iosco	40	723		
Glen Lake	Leelanau	37	583		

*CONTRACT NOT RECIEVED

**SCHOOL DISTRICT INFORMATION FROM 1985 MICHIGAN EDUCATION DIRECTORY

***POPULATION STATITICS FROM 1980 CENSUS OF POPULATION, GENERAL SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS (CHAP. C, PART 24), ISSUED BY U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,AUGUST 1983

CTY - county
#TCH - number of teachers in district
#STU - number of students in district
U/S - Urban/Suburban district; population statistics
R/T - Rural/Town district; population statistics

In analyzing the contracts with regard to student discipline, twenty-eight of the twenty-nine contracts

TABLE 3 FREQUENCY OF CONTRACT DOMAINS

CONTRACT DOMAIN	FREQUENCY*	PERCENTAGE
Discipline	28	97
Teacher Autonomy	14	49
Class Size	29	100
Evaluation	25	86
Teacher Transfers	28	97
Staff Meetings	23	79
Professional Development	24	83
Preparation Time	29	100
Curriculum Development	23	79
Workday	26	90
Work Year	29	100
Teacher Aides	7	24
Student Assessment	5	17
Home-School Relations	6	21

*out of 29 contracts reviewed

contained language on student discipline. Two examples of language relating to student discipline are cited here.

> A teacher may send pupils from a class to the office when the grossness of the offense, the persistence of the misbehavior or the disruptive effect of the violation makes the continued presence of the student in the classroom intolerable. In such cases, the teacher will furnish the principal, as promptly as his teaching obligations will allow, full particulars of the incident. Final disposition of the case will be discussed with the teacher.
> (Niles,Art.XXII,p.31)

> . . . a teacher may exclude a pupil from one (1) class when the grossness of the offense, persistence of the misbehavior or the disruptive effect of the violation make the continued presence of the student in the classroom intolerable. In such cases the teacher will

> furnish to the principal full written particulars of the incident, as defined above, as promptly as his/her teaching obligations will allow, but no later than the end of the school day, if at all possible, but no later than the morning of the following day. The principal, within twenty-four (24) hours of receipt of such communication, shall communicate his/her disposition of the problem or indicate an intent to act on the matter, in writing.
> (Southfield,Art. XIX,Sec.B,p.48)

The second domain for which the contracts were analyzed was that of teacher autonomy. Fourteen of the twenty-nine contracts contained language on teacher autonomy. Two examples of this contract language are cited here.

> Teachers shall be free to present instructional materials which they consider pertinent to the subject and level taught and consistent with the course objectives as long as controversial issues are presented in a scholarly manner. They shall also be entitled to freedom of discussion within the classroom on all matters which they consider relevant to the subject under study if it is within their area of professional competence.
> (Imlay City,Art. IV,Sec.L,p.7)

> The parties seek to educate people in the democratic tradition, to foster a recognition of individual freedom and social responsibiltiy, to inspire meaningful awareness of and respect for the Constitution and the Bill of Rights and to instill appreciation of the values of individual personality. It is recognized that these democratic values can best be transmitted in an atmosphere which is free from censorship and artificial restraints upon free inquiry and learning and in which academic freedom for employees and students is encouraged.
> (Grand Rapids, Art. IV, Sec.J, Item 1,p.13)

In all twenty-nine contracts, class size language was found. Class size provisions are important to teachers for

these provisions not only help to set the instructional environment in which they teach but are also related to job security. There is much variation on contract provisions on class size. Two representative examples are cited here:

> ... class size shall be lowered whenever possible to the specified goal and every effort shall be made to keep class size within the following maxima:
>
> | Grades | Goal | Maximum |
> |---|---|---|
> | 1. Kindergarten and Grade 1 | 20 | 27 |
> | 2. Elementary Grades 2-6 | 25 | 31 |
>
> 3. Class sizes in the high school, excluding music and physical education, are not to exceed thirty-two (32) pupils without the consent of the teacher ...
>
> (Davison, Art. VI, Sec.A, p.18)

> Realizing that the pupil-teacher ratio is an important aspect in an effective program, the parties agree that class size should be lowered wherever possible, The following shall be maximum class sizes:
>
> A. Elementary Schools - 25 pupils per regular class not to exceed 30.
> B. Middle School - 30 pupils per regular class not to exceed 35.
> C. Senior High School - 30 pupils per regular class not to exceed 35.
>
> (Hamtramck,Sec. 29,p.20)

Teacher evaluation provisions were included in twenty-five of the twenty-nine contracts reviewed. These provisions, in general, lay down the procedures that administrators must follow when evaluating staff. In some of the contracts reviewed, this procedure was extensive. In other districts, the provisions were less extensive. Two examples of these provisions are cited here:

> Tenured teachers will be observed for the purpose of evaluation at least once every two (2) years.

> A written evaluation will be executed within five (5) working days of the observation. A copy of the evaluation shall be given to the teacher and personal conference will be held between the teacher and the evaluator within six (6) days of the observation. All evaluations must indicate the evaluator's observation of the teacher's particular strengths and those areas needing assistance. Furthermore, whenever a particular deficiency is noted the evaluator must indicate the specific way in which the teacher is to improve and what assistance will be provided by administration. Subsequent evaluation reports must note the progress or lack of progress of previously noted deficiencies.
> (Hemlock,Art.VIII, Sec. C,F,H, p.19)

> Classroom evaluation shall be by formal observation and by the immediate supervisor or other qualified administrator as designated by the Board or its agent. Each observation shall be for not less than the duration of a particular class activity or lesson. In no event shall an observation be for less than thirty (30) minutes. All classroom evaluations shall be reduced to writing and a copy given to the teacher within five (5) working days of the evaluation. The evaluator shall also within five (5) working days of written evaluation include a conference on said evaluation with the teacher.
> (Hesperia,Art. 7, Sec. B,H,p.10)

The next area for which the contracts were analyzed was that of teacher transfer provisions. Those provisions that related to qualifications and certification for transfer were of particular interest for these provisions affect staff stability and the level of teaching experience to which students are exposed. All but one of the contracts examined had provisions for teacher transfer. Two examples of the provisions are cited here:

> B. The following requirements shall apply only to voluntary transfers, involuntary transfers, and recalls ...

> 2. ELEMENTARY SCHOOL (Grades K-6): Valid elementary certification.
> 3. MIDDLE SCHOOL (Grades 7 and 8): Elementary or secondary certification and:
> a. a major or minor in the subject area to which the employee is to be assigned,or
> b. twelve (12) semester hours in the subject area, or
> c. three (3) years successful teaching experience in the subject area, during the preceding five (5) year period.
> 4. SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL (Grades 9-12): Secondary certification and either a major or minor in the subject area or a sufficient number of credit hours to meet the requirements of the North Central Association of Secondary Schools and Colleges ...
>
> (Grand Rapids,Art.IX,p.18)
>
> A. Teachers shall teach within the scope of their teaching certificates, such as their major and minor as provided by the Michigan Department of Education, except for emergencies. In the event of such emergencies, the Federation will be notified by the administration.
>
> C. Assignment of individual teachers to class schedules within a building is the responsibility of the building administrator. In making the assignments the building administrator shall base his assignments on the following criteria:
> 1. Certification
> 2. Preparation
> 3. Experience in level or subject area
>
> (Hemlock,Art. XIV,p.32)

Teacher meetings can be an opportunity for teachers and administrators to meet and discuss building concerns and conduct some professional development activities. In analyzing the contracts, the researcher found contract provisions that specifically limit the time frame and the scope of faculty meetings. Twenty-three of the twenty-nine contracts contained language on teacher meetings. Two examples of these provisions are cited here:

> Each teacher shall be required to participate in staff meetings which will be limited to ten (10) per school year except in case of emergency and excluding pre-school conferences. In no case shall a meeting last longer than one and one-half hours. Each teacher recognizes attendance as an obligation of his employment and shall attend unless excused by the building principal.
> (Hemlock,Art. XVI, Sec.C,p.34)

> Two meetings per month, September through May, except one staff meeting in December and one in June, shall be held with the administrative option of calling a district-wide meeting once per semester if a district problem or need of major significance arises. Meetings shall last no more than one hour. Teachers should receive meeting agendas 24 hours in advance of a scheduled meeting.
> (Monroe, Art.7, Sec. h,Item 5,p.33)

Provisions for the professional development of teachers are commonly found in teacher contracts. Such provisions may provide for release time for teachers and/or financial support for such professional development. In the twenty-nine contracts analyzed, twenty-four contained some language on professional development. As noted in the delimitations section of Chapter I, language relating to tuition reimbursement of teachers was not included in this study. Examples of the provisions of two contracts is cited here:

> There will be a full inservice day within the month of October, followed by two one-half inservice days within the school year. The District shall encourage teachers to attend selected professional conferences with expenses paid by the School District. A teacher's request to attend conferences shall be presented to the building principal or other supervisory officers and to the Superintendent of schools.
> (Hamtramck, Sec. 25,43,p.18,24)

> A. The Board recognizes the desirability of professional improvement and shall continue to make funds available to provide for conferences and other programs which may contribute to this end.
> B. Upon the request of the teaching staff, the Board shall provide in-service programs or materials for experimental programs in curriculum development in accordance with funds budgeted for this purpose.
> C. School Business Days may be provided to teachers who elect to attend conferences, in-service and other such activities at their own expense.
>
> (Roseville, Art. V., Sec. 15, p.22)

Teacher preparation time is one of the domains for which the contracts were analyzed. The amount of "time away from students" is spelled out in the contract provisions on preparation time. All of the contracts analyzed had provisions for preparation time. Two examples of contract language on preparation time are cited here:

> The normal weekly teaching load in the junior and senior high school for all full-time teachers will be twenty-five (25) teaching periods and five (5) assigned preparation periods. The District will provide planning time to every elementary teacher. Such time will be scheduled during the art, music and physical education classes. These special classes will be a minimum of thirty (30) consecutive minutes in length. Such time is to be in addition to the fifteen (15) minutes before and after regular student time.
>
> (Kalamazoo, Art. VI, Sec. B, Item 4, p. 9)

> In a normal work week or the prorata part thereof, elementary teachers shall have a minimum of two-hundred (200) minutes of preparation and conference time, one hundred percent (100%) which shall be in periods of not less than thirty (30) minutes each. Middle School and High School teachers shall have at least five (5) full unassigned daily and continuous preparation and conference periods per week of at least

> forty-five (45) minutes each.
> (Southfield,Art. VII,Sec. A,p.15)

Teachers are interested in having input into the curriculum as noted in twenty-three of the twenty-nine contracts reviewed. As noted in Chapter 2, more curriculum provisions have been bargained into teacher contracts. Cited here are two examples of contract language on curriculum input.

> Curriculum development is the responsibility of teachers and administrators working together. Therefore, all system-wide curriculum committees will have combined membership of teachers and administrators.
> A Curriculum Council consisting of committee chairpersons (section 19.1 above) and administrators shall be established. This shall be a continuing committee which shall meet on a regular basis to consider curriculum problems and to recommend methods of improving the South Lyon Education Program.
> (South Lyon,Art.XIX,Sec. 19.1,19.2,p.45)

> Curriculum development is the responsibility of all teachers and all administrators working together. Therefore, all systemwide curriculum committees will have combined membership of teachers and administrators. Systemwide committee appointments, coordination of curriculum committee activities, and the implementation of curriculum committee recommendations will be the responsibility of the appropriate administrator.
> (Dearborn,Art. VI, Sec. B,p. 7)

The amount of time teachers spend with students is important. The teacher workday is bargained as hours of employment. Twenty-six of the twenty-nine contracts analyzed had language on the teacher workday. Two examples of that language are cited here.

> The regular duty hours of classroom teachers at school shall be as follows: Grades K-12 -- 7 hours 5 minutes, including lunch. Teachers shall not be assigned more than 300 minutes of student instruction each student instruction day. Teachers are expected to be at their classroom duty stations during the regular duty hours, except for lunch periods and non-classroom assignments. Teachers shall be subject to hallway and restroom supervision duty during their regular duty hours. Teachers shall have the responsibility to respond to emergency situations at any time to maintain order in the schools.
>
> (Imlay City, Art. VI, Sec. E, p.14)

> The regular school day for teachers covered by this Agreement shall start fifteen (15) minutes before the first bell in the morning admitting regularly-scheduled students to school and end fifteen (15) minutes after the bell rings dismissing regularly-scheduled students from school.
>
> (Kalamazoo, Art. 6,Sec. A,p. 8)

In many of the calls for educational reform, there has been a call for more student/teacher contact time particularly as it relates to the school year. In the contracts analyzed, the work year provisions generally took the form of a specific number of teacher work days and student days. Two examples of contract provisions are cited here:

> The Board agrees that the work year shall not be longer than 190 duty days as defined below nor less than 185 duty days. Under no circumstances shall pupils be scheduled for fewer than 180 attendance days. The beginning date of the school year shall be Labor Day.
>
> (Ecorse, Art.XI, Sec.11.6, p.27)

> 180 student days, 183 teacher days
>
> (Taylor)

In analyzing the twenty-nine contracts for language

that speaks to classroom aides, the researcher found seven contracts that included some reference to aides. In three of the seven contracts, the aides were designated as relief for class size violations.

Student assessment language was found in five contracts. The provisions were generally in response to the district testing program. One contract's language spoke to the teacher's ultimate right to grade and evaluate students without interference from the administration.

The final domain for which the contracts were analyzed was that of home-school relations. Six contracts contained language relating to this domain. The contracts contained a variety of provisions relating to teachers' rights to meet with parents, public relations, and the obligations teachers have for extra-curricular activities.

PHASE 3: PILOT STUDY

In order to test the survey instrument, the researcher selected four teachers who were, or had been, building teacher representatives, and four building principals to respond to the survey prior to sending the survey out to the selected sample. In conducting this pilot, the researcher was seeking to determine if the survey directions were clear and approximately how long the survey took to complete.

The principals stated that they were able to complete the survey in fifteen to twenty minutes. The teachers related that it took them thirty to forty-five minutes to complete. Some directions needed clarification and those corrections were made prior to the distribution of the survey to the sample group.

PHASE 4: SURVEY DISTRIBUTION AND SAMPLE SELECTION

The third phase of this study was to ask building administrators and building teacher association representatives to examine representative contract language to determine if the language is perceived to create conditions which 1) impede school improvement, 2) enhance school improvement, 3) impede and enhance school improvement, or 4) neither impede nor enhance school improvement. Secondly, they were asked that if the language is perceived as creating conditions that impede and/or enhance school improvement, to state which effective school correlate is affected.

A listing of all elementary, middle or junior high, and high schools within each district was made. There were 385 buildings in the total universe. It was determined for the universe size and a 95% reliability factor, 197 buildings would have to be surveyed. A representative sampling from each level- elementary, middle or junior

high, and high school - was sought. A listing of the number of buildings for each category and the random number of buildings that needed to be surveyed is found in Table 4. A random generation of numbers using an Apple computer was done to obtain the buildings to be surveyed.

TABLE 4 BUILDING SAMPLING

Category	No.	% of Universe	No. Selected
Secondary-AFT	24	6.2	12
Middle/Jr. High-AFT	18	4.7	9
Elementary-AFT	72	18.2	36
Secondary-MEA	35	9.1	18
Middle/Jr. High-MEA	37	9.6	19
Elementary-MEA	201	52.2	103
Total	385	100	197

The survey containing the fourteen representative contract provisions reflecting the contract domains was then sent in April, 1986 to the representative building association representative and to the building principal. A return stamped envelope was sent with each survey. Each return envelope and survey contained the coded number for the building in order to track the return of the surveys.

A reminder postcard was sent within the week of the survey mailing to each of the teachers and principals asking them to return the survey. One week after the survey was sent a follow up letter was also sent. Three weeks after the initial mailing, a second survey was sent

to all those in the sample who had not returned their survey by that time.

The respondent were also asked questions on the survey relating to his/her experience in actual contract negotiation, his/her familiarity with effective school research, those provisions that they see as most enhancing and those most impeding.

PHASE 5: DATA ANALYSIS

The first part of the data analysis was the coding of the computer scan forms with the data from the surveys. Each answer on the survey was assigned a number on the scan form. These scan forms were coded manually. A program for analyzing these data was written using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences-X (SPSS-X). The program and data were run on the IBM mainframe computer at Oakland Schools. The data were analyzed using chi-square analysis and frequency distributions according to the subgroups of the study - principals/teachers, MEA/MFT, and urban/suburban// rural/town.

In analyzing the data, the researcher first determined the comparability of the response rate for the principals and teachers, as well as for the subgroups of MEA, MFT, urban/suburban, and rural/town. The background of the respondents was also analyzed.

The perceptions of the respondents to the questions of most impeding and most enhancing were analyzed by their frequency distribution and percentage. Finally, the selection of affected correlates by the respondents was analyzed according to their frequency.

The following research questions will be answered as a result of this study:

1. Do typical teacher contracts contain language which practicing administrators and teacher association representatives tend to perceive as creating conditions which impede or enhance school improvement?

2. Are there differences between the perceptions of teacher association representatives and building administrators' relative to the enhancing or impeding effects of contract provisions on school improvement?

3. Are there differences between the perceptions of teacher association representatives and building administrators for the enhancing or impeding effects of contract provisions on school improvement a function of their affiliation (MEA or MFT) or district type?

4. Which contract provisions are perceived as most enhancing, and which provisions are perceived as most impeding in terms of school improvement?

5. If a provision is perceived as impeding or enhancing or both, which of the correlates of effective schools are perceived as affected?

CHAPTER IV

DATA ANALYSIS

RESPONSE PROFILE

One hundred and ninety-seven building principals and 197 building teacher association representatives from the district sample were mailed the surveys in April, 1986. One hundred and eighty-seven (187) surveys of the 394 sent were returned for a return rate of 47.5%. The random selection of the buildings was done by level so as to have an exact representation of the number of elementary, junior high, and secondary buildings present in the district sample. The random selection was also done by affiliation so as to have an exact representation of the MEA and MFT buildings. The return rate for principals by MEA, MFT, and level are

TABLE 5 RESPONSE RATE - PRINCIPALS (MEA/MFT)

	ELEMENTARY	JR. HIGH	SR. HIGH	TOTAL
MEA	47/103 45.6%	11/19 57.9%	7/17 41.2%	65/139 46.8%
MFT	18/37 48.7%	3/9 33.3%	5/12 41.7%	26/58 44.8%
TOTAL	65/140 46.4%	14/28 50%	12/29 41.4%	91/197 46.2%

listed in Table 5. The return rate for teachers by MEA, MFT, and level are listed in Table 6.

TABLE 6 RESPONSE RATE - TEACHERS (MEA/MFT)

	ELEMENTARY	JR. HIGH	SR. HIGH	TOTAL
MEA	45/103 43.7%	14/19 73.7%	7/17 41.2%	66/139 47.5%
MFT	24/37 64.9%	3/9 33.3%	3/12 25%	30/58 51.7%
TOTAL	69/140 49.3%	17/28 60.7%	10/29 34.5%	96/197 48.7%

An examination of the data in Tables 5 and 6 reveals a response rate that overall is comparable for both teachers and principals. The return rate for MEA principals (57.9%) at the junior high level was somewhat higher than that of the MFT principals (33.3%). Similarly, the return rate for MEA teachers (73.7%) at the junior high level was almost fifty percentage points higher than the return rate for MFT teachers at the junior high level. The MFT rate for teachers at the elementary level (64.9%) was somewhat higher than that of the MEA teachers (43.7%) On the other hand, the high school MFT teachers had only a 25% return rate as compared with 41.2% of the MEA teachers.

The return rate was also analyzed according to the categories of urban/suburban and rural/town. In Table 7 the listing of the return rates for principals can be found. Contained in Table 8 are the return rates for

teachers according to urban/suburban and rural/town.

TABLE 7 RESPONSE RATE - PRINCIPALS

URBAN/SUBURBAN//RURAL/TOWN

	ELEMENTARY	JR. HIGH	SR. HIGH	TOTAL
U/S	48/107 44.9%	8/20 40%	9/22 40.9%	65/149 43.6%
R/T	17/33 51.5%	6/8 75%	3/7 42.9%	26/48 54.2%
TOTAL	65/140 46.4%	14/28 50%	12/29 41.4%	91/197 46.2%

TABLE 8 RESPONSE RATE - TEACHERS

URBAN/SUBURBAN//RURAL/TOWN

	ELEMENTARY	JR. HIGH	SR. HIGH	TOTAL
U/S	46/107 43%	12/20 60%	9/22 40.9%	67/149 45%
R/T	23/33 69.7%	5/8 62.5%	1/7 14.3%	29/48 60.4%
TOTAL	69/140 49.3%	17/28 60.7%	10/29 34.5%	96/197 48.7%

The overall response rates for teachers and principals were comparable for the urban/suburban and rural/town categories. The random selection of buildings was not stratified by the categories of urban/suburban and rural/town. However, in looking at the return rate by this breakdown the researcher found a higher return rate for elementary and junior high principals from rural/town areas. For teachers, there was also a higher return rate

for elementaries in the rural/town areas. The lowest return rate was for senior high teachers from the rural/town areas. The overall return rates for teachers and principals were comparable for the urban/suburban and rural/town categories.

In summary, the researcher received responses from 47.5% of the sample. The response rate of principals and teachers was comparable between the two groups, as well as within the groups of MEA/MFT and urban/suburban and rural/town.

BACKGROUND OF RESPONDENTS

Six questions were asked of the respondents regarding their experience with the negotiating of teacher contracts, their familiarity with effective schools research and their involvement in a school improvement project. Question fifteen (15) asked the respondents to state whether they had sat at the table and negotiated at least three (3) teacher contracts. The majority of principals (65.9%) and teachers (87.9%) had not negotiated three (3) teacher contracts. Of the principals, 34.1% said that they had negotiated three (3) contracts and 12.1% of the teachers stated that they had, as well. In completing a chi-square analysis on these responses, the results indicated that there was a significant difference (.0009) in the two

groups, with a chi-square value of 11.05. (see Appendix E, Table 28)

In response to question sixteen (16), which asked the respondents to state whether they had ever done actual negotiating of teacher contracts, the majority of principals (61.8%) stated that they had while only 35.6% of the teachers had had the same experience. The majority of teachers (64.4%) did not have experience in negotiating contracts compared with 38.2% of the principals. The chi-square analysis of the responses once again was significant (.0013) with a chi-square value of 10.39. (see Appendix E, Table 29)

Almost the entire group of principals (98.9%) stated that they had read and were familiar with effective schools research. The majority of the teachers (68.9%) stated that they had read and were familar with effective schools research. Only 1.1% of the principals and 31.3% of the teachers had not read and were not familar with the research. The significance level of the chi-square analysis was .0000 with a chi-square value of 27.47. (see Appendix E, Table 30)

Question eighteen (18) asked the respondents to state whether they were currently or had been involved in a formalized school improvement project. The majority of principals (81.8%) stated that they had been as compared with 69.9% of teachers. Of the principals surveyed, 18.2%

said they had not been involved in a formalized project and 30.1% of the teachers had not. The chi-square analysis revealed no significant difference (.0899) between the two groups. (see Appendix E, Table 31)

The respondents were also asked if they had a formal school improvement plan in the last three years. The majority of the principals (70.6%) and teachers (55.6%) stated that they had a formal plan. Of the principals, 29.4% stated that they had not had a formal school improvement plan. Slightly less than half of the teachers (44.4%) stated that they did not have a plan. The chi-square analysis revealed no significant difference between the two groups. (see Appendix E, Table 32)

The final question of the survey asked the respondents that if they had a formal school improvement plan did the provisions of the district's teacher contract impede, enhance, both, or neither in respect to the implementation of the plan. In Table 90 in Appendix E the frequencies and percentages of the responses are listed. There was no significant difference between the two groups according to the chi-square analysis. The largest percentage for both principals (41.7%) and teachers (54.5%) indicated that the teacher contract neither impeded nor enhanced the implementation of the plan. A smaller percentage for principals (25%) and teachers (30.9%) stated that the contract had enhanced the implementation of their plan.

RESEARCH QUESTION 1

Do typical teacher contracts contain language which practicing administrators and teacher association representatives tend to perceive as creating conditions which impede or enhance school improvement?

From the analysis of the data, the answer to this first research question is both yes and no. From the chi-square analyses described in the subsequent sections, the researcher found that there were some provisions that were perceived as enhancing and some that were perceived as impeding by each group. Some of the respondents marked neither impeding nor enhancing. However, the overwhelming majority of responses was in the areas of impeding, enhancing, or both. In order to more fully explain the reactions of the groups, it is best to examine the data for the subsequent research questions.

RESEARCH QUESTION 2

Are there differences between the perceptions of teacher association representatives and building administrators relative to the enhancing or impeding effects of contract provisions on school improvement?

DIFFERENCES IN PERCEPTIONS: PRINCIPALS/TEACHERS

The responses of principals and teachers were analyzed using chi-square analysis. In examinining the responses on the fourteen contract provisions, on eight of the fourteen contract provisions, there were no significant differences between principals and teachers at the .05 level. These were the provisions of discipline, evaluation, transfers, inservice, curriculum development, workday, teacher aides, and home-school relations. These tables are listed in Appendix F as Tables 34-41.

On the remaining six provisions there were significant differences. These provisions were teacher autonomy, class size, staff meetings, teacher preparation time, work year, and student assessment.

In Table 9 the chi-square value (17.57) for the contract provision on teacher autonomy was at the .0005 significance level. The frequencies and percentages for the responses are also listed. Whereas, 72.8% of the teachers saw this provision as enhancing school improvement, 46.7% of the principals saw it as enhancing school improvement. Twenty percent of the principals saw this provision as neither enhancing nor impeding as compared with 4.3% of the teachers. A greater percentage of principals (16.7%) perceived this provision as impeding as compared with 7.6% of the teachers.

TABLE 9 TEACHER AUTONOMY - PRINCIPALS/TEACHERS

		IMPEDE	ENHANCE	BOTH	NEITHER	TOTAL
PRINCIPAL	NO.	15	42	15	18	90
	%	16.7	46.7	16.7	20.0	49.5
TEACHER	NO.	7	67	14	4	92
	%	7.6	72.8	15.2	4.3	50.5
TOTAL	No.	22	109	29	22	182
	%	12.1	59.9	15.9	12.1	100

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE
17.57	3	0.0005

The perceptions of the respondents on the provision on class size when analyzed had a chi-square value of 16.48 and a significance level of .0009 for teachers vs. principals. Sixty-five percent of the principals saw this contract provision as enhancing school improvement. Two-thirds of the teachers (69.9%) also saw this provision as enhancing school improvement. However, 19.4% of the teachers, compared with only 7.9% of the principals, saw this language as impeding school improvement. (see Table 10)

On provision number six, staff meetings, there was a chi-square value of 17.88, significance level of .0005. Almost half of the principals (46.2%), and 40.4% of the teachers saw this provision as enhancing school improvement. Just over one half (51.1%) of the teachers

rated this provision as both impeding and enhancing or neither compared with only 27.5% of the principals. Nearly one-quarter (26.4%) of the principals saw this provision as

TABLE 10 CLASS SIZE - PRINCIPALS/TEACHERS

		IMPEDE	ENHANCE	BOTH	NEITHER	TOTAL
PRINCIPAL	NO.	7	58	10	14	89
	%	7.9	65.2	11.2	15.7	48.9
TEACHER	NO.	18	65	9	1	93
	%	19.4	69.9	9.7	1.1	51.1
TOTAL	NO.	25	123	19	15	182
	%	13.7	67.6	10.4	8.2	100

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE
16.48	3	0.0009

TABLE 11 STAFF MEETINGS - PRINCIPALS/TEACHERS

		IMPEDE	ENHANCE	BOTH	NEITHER	TOTAL
PRINCIPAL	NO.	24	42	15	10	91
	%	26.4	46.2	16.5	11.0	49.2
TEACHER	NO.	8	38	19	29	94
	%	8.5	40.4	20.2	30.9	50.8
TOTAL	NO.	32	80	34	39	185
	%	17.3	43.2	18.4	21.1	100

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE
17.88	3	0.0009

impeding school improvement as compared with 8.5% of the teachers. (see Table 11)

Teacher preparation time is one of the most commonly occurring provisions in teacher contracts. An overwhelming majority of teachers (84.4 %) saw this provision as enhancing school improvement. Although a majority (58.9%) of principals also saw this provision as enhancing, 37.7% of them saw it as both impeding and enhancing and neither. The chi-square value for this provision was 22.25, significance level of .0001. (see Table 12)

The perceptions of principals and teachers were analyzed on the contract provision on workyear for teachers with a resulting chi-square value of 11.06 with a significance level of .0114. The majority (58.4%) of principals saw this provision as being both and neither in

TABLE 12 PREPARATION TIME - PRINCIPALS/TEACHERS

		IMPEDE	ENHANCE	BOTH	NEITHER	TOTAL
PRINCIPAL	NO.	3	53	13	21	90
	%	3.3	58.9	14.4	23.3	48.4
TEACHER	NO.	4	81	9	2	96
	%	4.2	84.4	9.4	2.1	51.6
TOTAL	NO.	7	134	22	23	186
	%	3.8	72.0	11.8	12.4	100

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE
22.25	3	0.0001

TABLE 13 WORKYEAR - PRINCIPALS/TEACHERS

		IMPEDE	ENHANCE	BOTH	NEITHER	TOTAL
PRINCIPAL	NO.	18	19	8	44	89
	%	20.2	21.3	9.0	49.4	49.4
TEACHER	NO.	4	26	7	54	91
	%	4.4	28.6	7.7	59.3	50.6
TOTAL	NO.	22	45	15	98	180
	%	12.2	25.0	8.3	54.4	100

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE
11.06	3	0.0114

terms of school improvement. Teachers similarly rated this provision as both and neither (67%). However, 20.2% of principals saw this provision as impeding school improvement compared with 4.4% of teachers. (see Table 13)

In Table 14 the frequencies and percentages for the contract provision on student assessment are listed. A significance level of .0141 was achieved with a chi-square value of 10.60. Whereas, 19.1% of the principals saw this provision as impeding, only 4.4% of the teachers did.

In summary, there were no significant differences between the perceptions of principals and teachers on eight of the contract provisions regarding their effect on school improvement- discipline, evaluation, transfers, inservice, curriculum development, workday, teacher aides, and home-school relations. On six of the fourteen - teacher

TABLE 14 STUDENT ASSESSMENT - PRINCIPALS/TEACHERS

		IMPEDE	ENHANCE	BOTH	NEITHER	TOTAL
PRINCIPAL	NO.	17	28	10	34	89
	%	19.1	31.5	11.2	38.2	49.7
TEACHER	NO.	4	41	9	36	90
	%	4.4	45.6	10.0	40.0	50.3
TOTAL	NO.	21	69	19	70	179
	%	11.7	38.5	10.6	39.1	100

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE
10.60	3	0.0141

autonomy, class size, staff meetings, teacher preparation time, work year, and student assessment - there were significant differences between the perceptions of principals and teachers at the .05 level.

RESEARCH QUESTION 3

Are there differences between the perceptions of teacher association representatives and building administrators for the enhancing or impeding effects of contract provisions on school improvement a function of their affiliation (MEA or MFT) or district type?

PERCEPTION DIFFERENCES:AFFILIATION - PRINCIPALS

Chi-square analysis was done for MEA principals versus MFT principals for the fourteen contract provisions. On eleven out of the fourteen contract provisions there were no significant differences between these two groups. (see Tables 42-52 in Appendix F). On three of the fourteen significant differences were found. These were teacher autonomy, workday, and work year.

The responses of the principals on the contract provision on teacher autonomy resulted in a chi-square value of 10.59 with a significance level of .0141. In Table 15 the frequencies for the two groups can be found. Seventy-two percent (72%) of the MFT principals found this provision enhancing as compared with 36.9% of the MEA principals. On the other hand, 46.1% of the MEA principals perceived that this provision was both impeding and enhancing and neither as compared with only 12% of the MFT principals. (see Table 15)

There was also a significant difference between the perceptions of MEA and MFT principals on the provision on workday. The significance level was .0392 with a chi-square value of 8.36. The majority (76.9%) of the MFT principals saw this language as being enhancing. (see Table 16) Once again the main difference between the groups was 37.6% of the MEA principals seeing this provision as being both and neither as opposed to only 7.6% of the MFT principals.

TABLE 15 TEACHER AUTONOMY - MEA PRINCIPALS/MFT PRINCIPALS

		IMPEDE	ENHANCE	BOTH	NEITHER	TOTAL
PRINCIPAL MEA	NO.	11	24	14	16	65
	%	16.9	36.9	21.5	24.6	72.2
PRINCIPAL MFT	NO.	4	18	1	2	25
	%	16.0	72.0	4.0	8.0	27.8
TOTAL	NO.	15	42	15	18	90
	%	16.7	46.7	16.7	20.0	100

CHI-SQUARE	D.F	SIGNIFICANCE
10.59	3	0.0141

TABLE 16 WORKDAY - MEA PRINCIPALS/ MFT PRINCIPALS

		IMPEDE	ENHANCE	BOTH	NEITHER	TOTAL
PRINCIPAL MEA	NO.	9	31	12	12	64
	%	14.1	48.4	18.8	18.8	71.1
PRINCIPAL MFT	NO.	4	20	1	1	26
	%	15.4	76.9	3.8	3.8	28.9
TOTAL	NO.	13	51	13	13	90
	%	14.4	56.7	14.4	14.4	100

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE
8.36	3	0.0392

For the contract provision on teacher work year, there was a chi-square value of 7.74, significance level of .0516 between the perceptions of MEA and MFT principals. Almost one-third of the MFT principals (30.8%) saw this provision as enhancing as compared with 17.5% of the MEA principals. Two-thirds of the MEA principals (66.7%) saw this provision as being both and neither as compared with only one-third of the MFT principals (38.5%). (see Table 17)

TABLE 17 WORK YEAR - MEA PRINCIPALS/ MFT PRINCIPALS

		IMPEDE	ENHANCE	BOTH	NEITHER	TOTAL
PRINCIPAL MEA	NO.	10	11	8	34	63
	%	15.9	17.5	12.7	54.0	70.8
PRINCIPAL MFT	NO.	8	8	0	10	26
	%	30.8	30.8	0	38.5	29.2
TOTAL	NO.	18	19	8	44	89
	%	20.2	21.3	9.0	49.4	100

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE
7.74	3	0.0516

DIFFERENCES IN PERCEPTIONS: AFFILIATION - TEACHERS

Chi-square analyses were completed for MEA teachers versus MFT teachers. There were no significant differences

between the responses of the two groups. (see Tables 53-66 in Appendix F)

DIFFERENCES IN PERCEPTIONS:LOCATION - PRINCIPALS

There were no significant differences between the perceptions of urban/suburban principals and rural/town principals on twelve of the fourteen contract provisions. (see Tables 67-78 in Appendix F) The chi-square analysis of urban/suburban principals compared with rural/town principals resulted in two contract provisions having significant differences, those being discipline and home-school relations.

In Table 18 the reader will note the chi-square value for the contract provision on discipline was 14.64, significance level of .0022. Over three-fourths of the urban/suburban principals, as compared with nearly two-thirds of the rural/town principals, perceived this provision as enhancing. Thirty-six percent (36%) of the rural/town principals perceived this contract provision as being both enhancing and impeding, and neither enhancing nor impeding. Whereas, only 6.1% of the urban/suburban principals perceived it in that way.

There was also a difference between the responses of the two groups of principals on the contract provision on home-school relations. The chi-square value was 6.13 with

a significance level of .0468. Almost the entire group of

TABLE 18 - DISCIPLINE

URBAN/SUBURBAN PRINCIPALS // RURAL/TOWN PRINCIPALS

		IMPEDE	ENHANCE	BOTH	NEITHER	TOTAL
PRINCIPAL U/S	NO.	5	56	3	1	65
	%	7.7	86.2	4.6	1.5	72.2
PRINCIPAL R/T	NO.	0	16	5	4	25
	%	0	64.0	20.0	16.0	27.8
TOTAL	NO.	5	72	8	5	90
	%	5.6	80.0	8.9	5.6	100

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE
14.64	3	0.0022

urban/suburban principals (93.5%) perceived this provision as enhancing. Three-fourths (76%) of the rural/town principals saw this provision as enhancing. Once again, more of the rural/town principals perceived this provision as being both and neither (24%) as compared with the urban/suburban principals (6.4%). (see Table 19)

DIFFERENCES IN PERCEPTIONS: LOCATION - TEACHERS

Chi-square analyses were completed on urban/suburban teachers as compared with rural/town teachers for the

fourteen contract provisions. On twelve of the fourteen

TABLE 19 - HOME-SCHOOL RELATIONS

URBAN/SUBURBAN PRINCIPALS // RURAL/TOWN PRINCIPALS

		IMPEDE	ENHANCE	BOTH	NEITHER	TOTAL
PRINCIPAL U/S	NO.	0	58	1	3	62
	%	0	93.5	1.6	4.8	71.3
PRINCIPAL R/T	NO.	0	19	3	3	25
	%	0	76.0	12.0	12.0	28.7
TOTAL	NO.	0	77	4	6	87
	%	0	88.5	4.6	6.9	100

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE
6.81	3	0.0005

contract provisions there were no significant differences. There were two contract provisions for which there was a significant difference in the responses of the two groups - transfers and aides.

The chi-square value of the perceptions of the teachers on transfers was 8.35 with a significance level of .0394. As seen in Table 20, the majority (86.2%) of rural/town teachers perceived this provision as enhancing as compared with 60.3% of the urban/suburban teachers. Twenty-seven percent of the urban/suburban teachers responded that this provision was neither impeding nor

enhancing as compared with only 3.4% of the rural/town teachers.

TABLE 20 - TRANSFERS

URBAN/SUBURBAN TEACHERS // RURAL/TOWN TEACHERS

		IMPEDE	ENHANCE	BOTH	NEITHER	TOTAL
TEACHER U/S	NO.	3	38	5	17	63
	%	4.8	60.3	7.9	27.0	68.5
TEACHER R/T	NO.	2	25	1	1	29
	%	6.9	86.2	3.4	3.4	31.5
TOTAL	NO.	5	63	6	18	92
	%	5.4	68.5	6.5	19.6	100

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE
8.35	3	0.0394

The responses of the teachers to the contract provision on teacher aides showed a significant difference in the perception of the two groups. Although the majority of both groups saw this provision as enhancing, 19.7% of the urban/suburban teachers saw this provision as both and neither. None of the rural/town teachers saw this provision as both and neither. (see Table 21)

TABLE 21 AIDES

URBAN/SUBURBAN TEACHERS // RURAL/TOWN TEACHERS

		IMPEDE	ENHANCE	BOTH	NEITHER	TOTAL
TEACHER U/S	NO.	0	53	10	3	66
	%	0	80.3	15.2	4.5	69.5
TEACHER R/T	NO.	1	28	0	0	29
	%	3.4	96.6	0	0	30.5
TOTAL	NO.	1	81	10	3	95
	%	1.1	85.3	10.5	3.2	100

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE
8.61	3	0.0349

RESEARCH QUESTION 4

Which contract provisions are perceived as most enhancing, and which provisions are perceived as most impeding in terms of school improvement?

PERCEPTIONS OF MOST ENHANCING/IMPEDING PROVISIONS

The respondents were asked on question 19 of the survey to list the contract provisions that they would perceive as enhancing their ability to develop a school improvement plan for their school. In Table 22 the

percentages for the provisions for principals and teachers are listed. The number of principals that responded to this question was 59 out of the 91 total or 66.15 %. The number of teachers that responded to this question was 51 out of the 96 teachers or 53.13%. Curriculum development was perceived as most enhancing by both principals and teacher. Forty-four percent of the principals selected this provision as being enhancing and 31.2% of the teachers did.

TABLE 22 MOST ENHANCING PROVISIONS PRINCIPALS/TEACHERS

PRINCIPAL			TEACHER		
PROV. #	PROVISION	%	PROV. #	PROVISION	%
9	Curr. Devel.	44	9	Curr. Devel.	31.2
7	Inservice	33	7	Inservice	29.2
6	Staff Mtgs.	26.4	8	Prep Time	21.9
14	Home-School	23.1	1	Discipline	15.6
1	Discipline	22	3	Class Size	14.6
3	Class Size	22	6	Staff Mtgs.	14.6
12	Aides	20.9	12	Aides	14.6
4	Evaluation	19.8	2	Autonomy	13.5
2	Autonomy	15.4	4	Evaluation	11.5
5	Transfers	11.0	10	Workday	10.4
8	Prep Time	9.9	14	Home-School	10.4
10	Workday	8.8	13	Testing	7.3
13	Testing	7.7	11	Work Year	7.3
11	Work Year	5.5	5	Transfers	6.2
No. of responses		59/91	No. of responses		51/96

Professional development had the second highest percentage for both principals and teachers. Thirty-three percent of the principals selected this provision, and 29.2% of the teachers did the same. The contract provisions on discipline, class size, and staff meetings were all in the

top five selections of both principals and teachers.

The principals and teachers were asked on question 20 of the survey to list the provisions that they perceived as being the most impeding to developing a school improvement plan for their school. (see Table 23) A total of 53/91 principals (58.24%) responded to this question and 25/96

TABLE 23 MOST IMPEDING PROVISIONS PRINCIPALS/TEACHERS

PRINCIPAL			TEACHER		
PROV. #	PROVISION	%	PROV. #	PROVISION	%
6	Staff Mtgs.	26.4	3	Class Size	8.3
10	Workday	16.5	10	Workday	7.3
11	Work Year	13.2	8	Prep Time	6.2
2	Autonomy	13.2	6	Staff Mtgs.	6.2
7	Inservice	9.9	2	Autonomy	4.2
8	Prep Time	9.9	13	Testing	4.2
13	Testing	8.8	5	Transfers	3.1
4	Evaluation	8.8	11	Work Year	3.1
5	Transfers	7.7	4	Evaluation	2.1
3	Class Size	7.7	9	Curr. Devel.	2.1
1	Discipline	5.5	12	Aides	2.1
9	Curr. Devel	3.3	14	Home-School	1.0
12	Aides	3.3	1	Discipline	0.0
14	Home-School	3.3	7	Inservice	0.0
No. of responses		53/91	No. of responses		25/96

teachers (26.04%). One-fourth of the principals selected the provision on staff meetings as being the most impeding. (26.4%) Staff meetings was selected as the teachers' third choice as the most impeding provision. (6.2%) The provision that received the greatest percentage as most impeding according to the teachers was class size. (8.3%) Workday was the second choice for both the teachers (7.3%)

and the principals (16.5%).

RESEARCH QUESTION 5

If a provision is perceived as impeding or enhancing or both, which of the correlates of effective schools are perceived as affected?

CORRELATES OF EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS AFFECTED

One of the important aspects of the survey was to determine the perceptions of principals and teachers in terms of which of the correlates of effective schools was affected by the contract provisions. After marking whether the contract provision impeded, enhanced, impeded and enhanced, or neither impeded nor enhanced, the respondents were to mark which of the correlates was affected. Tables 24 and 25 are a listing of the number of principals and teachers, respectively, that saw a relationship between each of the contract provisions and the seven correlates. An asterisk marks those provisions for which a majority of the principals and teachers saw a relationship between the provision and the correlate. In each of these cases the relationship they saw was one in which the provision enhanced school improvement.

On nine of the contract provisions there was a

relationship seen by principals to the correlates of effective schools. There was a relationship perceived on discipline, class size, teacher evaluation, staff meetings, professional development, curriculum development, workday, teacher aides, and home-school relations. For the contract provision on discipline, over three-fourths of the principals saw the correlate of safe and orderly environment being enhanced. For the contract provision on class size, over half of the principals saw the correlates of opportunity to learn, and frequent monitoring of progress as enhanced. Over half of the principals saw the correlates of climate of high expectations and clear and focused mission as being affected by the contract provision on teacher evaluation. Over three-fourths of them saw this same provision as enhancing the correlate of instructional leadership.

In terms of the contract provision on staff meetings, over half of the principals saw the correlates of instructional leadership and clear and focused mission as being affected. For the contract provision on professional development, there was a relationship seen by the principals to three of the correlates. Over half of the principals saw the correlates of climate of high expectations, instructional leadership, and clear and focused mission being affected by the contract provision.

TABLE 24 PERCEIVED RELATIONSHIPS TO EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS

CORRELATES - PRINCIPALS

	Safe Order Envir.	Climate High Expect.	Instr. Ldrsh.	Clear Focus Miss.	Oppor. to Learn	Mont. Stud. Prog.	Hom Sch Rel
Stud. Dis.	80/90*						
Tch. Auton.							
Class Size					62/89*	51/89*	
Tch. Eval.		57/91*	77/91*	52/91*			
Tch. Tran.							
Tch. Mtgs.			66/91*	67/91*			
Prof. Dev.		52/90*	62/90*	58/90*			
Prep Time							
Curr. Dev.		56/89*	71/89*	73/89*			
Workday	51/90*						
Work Yr.							
Clsr. Aide		56/91*			63/91*	55/91*	
St. Asses.							
Hm-Sch Rel				46/87*			72/87*

* Over fifty percent of the responses perceived as enhancing

For the contract provision on curriculum development, over half of the principals saw the correlate of climate of high expectations affected. Three-fourths of the principals saw the correlates of instructional leadership and clear and focused mission being affected. Half of the principals saw

the correlate of safe and orderly environment affected by the contract provision on teacher workday.

Over half of the principals saw the correlates of climate of high expectations, opportunity to learn, and frequent monitoring being affected by the contract provision on teacher aides. Half of the principals saw the correlate of clear and focused mission being affected by the contract provision on home-school relations. Three-fourths of the principals saw the same contract provision affecting the correlate on home-school relations.

The teachers saw the correlates of effective schools being affected by twelve of the fourteen contract provisions. All of the provisions, except work year and testing, had at least one of the correlates for which fifty percent or more of the teachers saw a relationship. For the contract provision on student discipline, almost 100% of the teachers saw the correlate of safe and orderly environment affected. Over half of the teachers saw the correlate of opportunity to learn affected by the provision on discipline.

For the contract provision on teacher autonomy, over half of the teachers saw the correlates of clear and focused mission and instructional leadership being affected. Over half of the teachers saw a relationship between the contract provision on class size and the correlates of safe and orderly environment, climate of high

expectations, and opportunity to learn. Three-fourths of the teachers saw a relationship between this provision and frequent monitoring.

Half of the teachers saw a relationship between the correlate clear and focused mission and the provision on teacher evaluation. Three-fourths of the teachers saw the correlate of instructional leadership affected by this provision. The contract provision on teacher transfers was perceived by the teachers to affect the correlate of clear and focused mission by half of the teachers. Half of the teachers saw the provision on staff meetings affecting the correlate of instructional leadership. Three correlates were seen as having a relationship to the provision on professional development by half of the teachers. These correlates were climate of high expectations, instructional leadership, and clear and focused mission.

The provision on preparation time for teachers was perceived by half of the teachers as affecting the correlates of climate of high expectations and frequent monitoring of student progress. The contract provision on curriculum development was perceived as having a relationship to three of the correlates. Half of the teachers saw a relationship to the correlate of climate of high expectations and three-fourths saw a relationship to instructional leadership and clear and focused mission.

TABLE 25 PERCEIVED RELATIONSHIPS TO EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS

CORRELATES - TEACHERS

	Safe Order Envir.	Climate High Expect.	Instr. Ldshp	Clear Focus Miss.	Oppor. to Learn	Mont. Stud. Prog.	Home Sch. Rel.
Stud. Dis.	88/95*				57/95*		
Tch. Auton.			51/92*	51/92*			
Class Size	60/93*	58/93*			67/93*	70/93*	
Tch. Eval.			74/92*	48/92*			
Tch. Tran.				52/92*			
Tch. Mtgs.			47/94*				
Prof. Dev.		48/94*	54/94*	55/94*			
Prep Time		49/96*				51/96*	
Curr. Dev.		49/95*	62/95*	71/95*			
Workday	52/93*						
Work Yr.							
Clsr. Aide		71/95*		51/95*	65/95*	70/95*	
St. Asses.							
Hm-Sch Rel							70/95*

* Over fifty percent of responses perceived as enhancing

For the correlate of safe and orderly environment, half of the teachers saw a relationship to the provision on workday. For the provision on classroom aides, four correlates were seen as affected. Over half of the teachers saw the correlates of clear and focused mission

and opportunity to learn affected. Over three-fourths saw the correlates of climate of high expectations and frequent monitoring of student progress affected. Over three-fourths of the teachers saw the correlate of home-school relations being affected by contract provisions containing language on home-school relations.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study was to determine the perceptions of building principals and teacher association representatives on the impeding and/or enhancing aspects of a typical teacher contract on school improvement. Although there has been a large amount of research on effective schools and on teacher collective bargaining, there has been little research on the impact of collective bargaining on school improvement. In this study the researcher examined not the effect of contracts themselves, but rather, the perceived effect of the contract.

RESEARCH DESIGN

A stratified sample of 35 Michigan school districts was selected that included a representative sampling of MEA and MFT districts from both urban/suburban and rural/town settings. A copy of the teaching contract from each of these districts was requested. From the review of literature and consultation with MEA and MASB

representatives, those areas of teacher contracts which most reflect the seven correlates of effective schools - safe and orderly environment, climate of high expectations for success, instructional leadership, clear and focused mission opportunity to learn and time on task, frequent monitoring of student progress, and home-school relations - were examined.

Fourteen contract domains were identified as a result. These domains were student discipline, teacher autonomy, class size, teacher evaluation, teacher transfers, teacher meetings, professional development, teacher preparation time, curriculum development, workday, work year, classroom aides, student assessment, and home-school relations. From the twenty-nine contracts reviewed, contract language was selected for each of the fourteen domains to create a generic contract for the survey.

From the total universe of 385 buildings, 197 were selected to represent the three school levels: high school, junior high, and elementary. The principal and building teacher representative from each of these 197 buildings was sent a copy of the survey. Reminder letters and follow up letters were sent to insure a favorable return.

The respondents were asked to indicate whether each contract domain either impeded, enhanced, impeded and enhanced, or neither impeded nor enhanced school improvement. If they selected impeded, enhanced, or both,

for the contract domain they were to then indicate which of the seven correlates of effective schools was affected by this domain. In the survey, the respondents were asked to indicate which provision or provisions they saw as the most enhancing to school improvement and which were the most impeding. The respondents were also to answer several questions on their experience in negotiating teacher contracts, and their experience with effective schools research. The data were analyzed using chi-square analysis and frequency distributions.

FINDINGS

As part of the development of the survey, teacher contracts were requested from the 35 districts in the sample. Twenty-nine contracts were received and reviewed in light of the fourteen contract domains that reflected the effective schools correlates. The researcher identified fourteen contract domains that reflected the seven correlates of effective schools. Ten of the fourteen domains were found in three-fourths of the contracts reviewed. The contract domain of teacher autonomy was found in just under half of the contracts. The provisions for teacher aides, student assessment, and home-school relations were found in less than one-fourth of the contracts. On the other hand, all contracts had provisions

on class size, work year, and teacher preparation time.

The majority of both principals and teachers had not negotiated at least three teacher contracts. However, the majority of principals had done some actual bargaining of teacher contracts. Slightly over one-third of the teachers had done some actual negotiating.

Almost the entire group of principals had read and were familiar with effective schools research. A majority of teachers had done the same. However, it was noted that nearly one-third (31.3%) of the teachers had not read nor were familiar with effective schools research. The majority of both groups had been involved in a formalized school improvement project.

As indicated on the matrix in Table 26, the majority of teacher contract provisions were perceived as relating to or affecting the correlates of instructional leadership, clear and focused mission, and opportunity to learn. For all of the other correlates only two contract provisions could be found that related to each correlate.

The results of this study regarding research question one, are that typical teacher contracts do contain language that building administrators and teacher representatives perceive as creating conditions that impede or enhance school improvement. Although the principals had more of a tendency to perceive the contract as impeding, the principals and teachers both perceived parts of the teacher

TABLE 26 - EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS CORRELATES/CONTRACT DOMAIN

	Safe Order Envr	Climate High Expect.	Instr. Ldshp.	Clear Focus Miss.	Oppor. to Learn	Mont. Stud. Prog.	Hom Sch Rel
Stud. Disc.	X	-	-	-	X(T)	-	-
Tch. Auton.	-	-	X(T)	X(T)	-	-	-
Class Size	X(T)	X(T)	-	-	X	X	-
Tch. Eval.	-	X(P)	X	X	-	-	-
Tch. Tran.	-	-	-	-	X(T)	-	-
Tch. Mtgs.	-	-	X	X(P)	-	-	-
Prof. Dev.	-	X	X	X	-	-	-
Prep Time	-	X(T)	-	-	X(T)	-	-
Curr. Dev.	-	X	X	X	-	-	-
Workday	X	-	-	-	-	-	-
Work Yr.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Clrm. Aide	-	X	-	X(T)	X	X	-
St. Asses.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hm-Sch Rel	-	-	-	X(P)	-	-	X

X - both principals and teachers

X(P) - principals only

X(T) - teachers only

contract as enhancing school improvement.

In many cases the principals did not perceive the contract as impeding but rather as both impeding and enhancing or neither. For example on the provision on teacher preparation time, there was a significant difference between the perceptions of the principals and teachers. The majority of teachers (84.4%) saw this provision as enhancing. A majority of principals (58.9%) also saw this provision as enhancing. Where they differed was in selection of both impeding and enhancing and neither by the principals. Over one-third (37.7%) of the principals made the choice of both and neither. From the comments made by the principals, those that chose both and neither did so because they felt that preparation time could be enhancing or impeding depending on how the teachers used it. Examples of some of the comments made were:"if planning time is used wisely;depends upon how that time is used"; "enhances IF the time is spent on one of the above correlates; in some cases it is simply 'free' time."

Teachers, on the other hand, tended to perceive the contract generally in a very favorable light in terms of school improvement. From this study, it appears that because the language of teacher contracts is familiar to them and they have more ownership for teacher contracts, their perception of the contract is more favorable. Those

teachers involved in the pilot study spoke of the time it took to complete the survey because they studied the language carefully as a result of their negotiating and representative experiences. They stated that this was language that was very familiar to them and had meaning for their day to day work experiences. Secondly, it was found that 54.2% of the teachers made at least one comment on the contract provisions. This was in comparison to 47.3% of the principals who made comments. There was a total of 182 comments by teachers as compared to 140 by principals. Finally, those comments made by teachers tended to be lengthier. (see Appendices G,H,I,and J)

The second question of this study was to determine if there were differences in the perceptions of teacher association representatives and building administrators relative to the enhancing or impeding effects of the the contract provisions. The researcher found that there were no significant differences between the perceptions of principals and teacher representatives on eight of the fourteen contract provisions. (see Table 27) From the chi-square analyses of the contract provisions,as perceived by the principals as compared with the teachers, the researcher found no significant differences between the two groups on discipline, evaluation, transfers, inservice, curriculum development, workday, teacher aides, and home-school relations. There were significant differences

TABLE 27 - DIFFERENCES IN PERCEPTIONS ON CONTRACT DOMAINS*

Cont. Domain	Prin/ Tch	Affl Prin	Affl Tch	Locat Prin	Locat Tch
Stud. Disc.	-	-	-	X-RTBN	-
Tch. Auton.	X-TE	X-MEABN	-	-	-
Class Size	X-TI	-	-	-	-
Tch. Eval.	-	-	-	-	-
Tch. Tran.	-	-	-	-	X-USN
Tch. Mtgs.	X-PI	-	-	-	-
Prof. Dev.	-	-	-	-	-
Prep Time	X-PBN	-	-	-	-
Curr. Input	-	-	-	-	-
Workday	-	X-MEABN	-	-	-
Work Year	X-PI	X-MEABN	-	-	-
Clrm. Aide	-	-	-	-	X-USBN
St. Asses.	X-PI	-	-	-	-
Hm-Sch Rel	-	-	-	X-RTBN	-

*at a significance level of .05

Aff - Affiliation (MEA or MFT)
Locat - Location (Urban/Suburban or Rural/Town)

Selections accounting for significant differences:

TE - teachers selecting enhancing
TI - teachers selecting impeding
PI - principals selecting impeding
PBN- principals selecting both and neither
MEABN - MEA affiliated selecting both and neither
RTBN- Rural/Town located selecting both and neither
RTN - Rural/Town located selecting neither
USBN - Urban/Suburban located selecting both and neither

between the two groups on teacher autonomy, class size, staff meetings, teacher preparation time, work year, and student assessment.

The perceptions of principals and teachers were different on the effect of six of the contract provisions - teacher autonomy, class size, staff meetings, prep time, work year, and student assessment. On teacher autonomy, the majority of teachers perceived this provision as enhancing school improvement. The principals, on the other hand, seemed to indicate that this provision made no difference. The responses of the principals were spread across all four choices - impede, enhance, both, and neither. One of the principal's comments gives an indication as to why the principals would see this provision as making no difference - "the leadership of the building has to have the ability to provide instructional leadership; this section could impede dependent on other contract provisions or board policy".

Nearly two-thirds of the principals (65.2%) saw the provision on class size as enhancing school improvement. Over two-thirds of the teachers (69.9%) saw this provision as enhancing. However, a significant percentage of teachers (19.4) saw this provision as impeding school improvement. From the comments made by the teachers, they felt the maximum numbers (30 - elementary, 35 - middle, 35 - secondary) to be too high for school improvement,

particularly at the elementary level.

On the provision on staff meetings, there was a difference between the perceptions of the principals and teachers. Approximately one-fourth (26.4%) of the principals saw this provision as impeding school improvement. Their comments indicated that the restrictions on the length of the meetings, and particularly, the number of meetings were impeding to school improvement. Teachers, on the other hand, perceived this language as being neither enhancing nor impeding by 30.9%. From their comments the teachers felt that the effect of staff meetings on school improvement depended on what was on the agenda of the meeting and how the administrator used those meetings. The teachers also felt that the maximum time of an hour and a half was too long. Examples of their comments were: "depending on how the principal conducts the meetings"; "meetings are important, but too many are needless and poorly run, staff morale is negatively impacted."

Although the majority of the principals (58.9%) and teachers (84.4%) saw the provision of teacher preparation time as being enhancing, there was a difference between the perceptions of principals and teachers as to the provision being neither enhancing nor impeding. Almost one-fourth of the principals (23.3%) saw this provision as neither impeding nor enhancing because there was a question as to

whether teachers truly used this time wisely for instructional purposes. Only 2.1% of the teachers marked the neither category.

One-fifth (20.2%) of the principals perceived the provision of workyear as being impeding compared with only 4.4% of the teachers. The principals noted in their comments that they felt more teacher work days for planning and inservice time were necessary.

There was a difference in perception regarding the provision on student assessment between the principals and the teachers. Once again, the principals felt that this provision impeded school improvement. (19.1%) Only 4.4% of the teachers perceived this as impeding. From the comments made by the principals it appears that they feel this provision is too prohibitive and does not ask enough of teachers in terms of monitoring student progress.

For research question three the researcher found that there are a few differences between the perceptions of teachers and principals for the enhancing or impeding effects of contract provisions that are a function of their affiliation or district type. The perceptions of MEA and MFT principals were compared. There were no significant differences on eleven of the fourteen provisions. There were no significant differences between the perceptions of urban/suburban principals as compared to rural/town principals on twelve of the fourteen provisions. Similarly,

there were no significant differences between the urban/suburban teachers and the rural/town teachers on twelve of the fourteen contract provisions. There were no significant differences between the perceptions of the MEA teachers as compared to the MFT teachers. (see Table 27)

In the chi-square analysis perceptions of the MEA principals as compared to the MFT principals, there were no significant differences on eleven of the fourteen contract provisions. There were, however, differences in their perceptions on the provisions on teacher autonomy, teacher workday and work year. (see Table 27)

From the comments made by the principals, the MEA principals felt the provision on teacher autonomy could affect school improvement both negatively and positively depending on the teacher group and district policies. The MFT principals saw this provision as more enhancing for it provides for the professionalism of the teachers.

Similar to the provision on teacher autonomy, the MEA principals and MFT principals differed on their perceptions on teacher workday. The MEA principals indicated that the teacher workday as designated does not have enough time. However, one of the MEA principal stated, "depends on how teachers use the available time they now have; there is never enough time for teachers to do everything they need to do unless they budget their time and make the best use of it." From their comments it also appears that the MEA

principals see this provision as being contract language that is a necessary part of any contract and not having any particular effect on school improvement.

There was a difference of perception between the MEA principals and the MFT principals on the provision on teacher work year. Almost one-third of the MFT principals (30.8%) saw this provision as enhancing as compared with 17.5% of the MEA principals. The majority of MEA principals (66.7%) perceived this provision as being both enhancing and impeding and neither. It appears the MEA principals see this provision as having no particular effect on school improvement, whereas the MFT principals saw it as more enhancing.

In comparing the perceptions of the urban/suburban principals with those of the rural/town principals, the researcher found that there were no significant differences between the two groups on twelve of the fourteen contract provisions. The two provisions for which there were significant differences were the provisions of student discipline and home-school relations. (see Table 27)

The urban/suburban principals overwhelmingly saw the provision on student discipline as being enhancing. (86.2%) This compares with nearly two-thirds of the rural/town principals.(64%) From the comments made by the urban/suburban principals they feel that this provision is very important to school improvement in order that the

majority of students do not suffer as a result of the disruptive behavior of the minority.

On the provision on home-school relations, whereas one-fourth of the rural/town principals saw this provision as being both and neither (24%), almost the entire group of urban/suburban principals (93.5%) perceived this provision as enhancing. The urban/suburban principals see this provision as one that can affect school improvement in a positive way.

In the chi-square analysis of the MEA teachers as compared to the MFT teachers there were no significant differences on any of the fourteen contract provisions. The comparison of the urban/suburban teachers and the rural/town teachers revealed no significant differences on twelve of the fourteen contract provisions. There were differences in the perceptions of the urban/suburban teachers and those of the rural/town teachers on the provisions on teacher transfers and teacher aides. The majority of the rural/town teachers saw the provision on teacher transfers as being enhancing as compared to just over half of the urban/suburban teachers. Nearly one-third of the urban/suburban teachers perceived this provision as being neither enhancing nor impeding. From the comments made by the urban/suburban teachers it appears that they would prefer more clarification for the middle school teachers. Concern was also expressed over how and by whom

the reference to three years of successful experience would be measured.

The overwhelming majority of both the urban/suburban and rural/town teachers saw the provision on teacher aides as being enhancing. However, for some of the urban/suburban teachers the question was raised in the comment section on the quality of the teacher aides and their knowledge of the subject area. From their comments, school improvement is dependent on these two factors - quality of aide and knowledge of subject.

From the results of this study, the researcher found similarities between those contract provisions that were perceived as most enhancing by the teachers and principals. Similarities were also found between the provisions they found most impeding. The teachers and principals were in agreement on their top two enhancers - curriculum development and teacher inservice. Student discipline was also in the top five choices for both groups. Class size was in the top six choices for both groups. Thus, teacher inservice, student discipline, and class size are all perceived by principals and teachers as being the most enhancing contract provisions from the fourteen selected by the researcher.

The respondents were also asked to list the most impeding contract provisions for the development of a

school improvement plan. Both the principals and the teachers selected the following provisions in their top six choices of the provisions that would impede a school improvement plan: staff meetings, workday, teacher autonomy, and preparation time.

The final question of the study was to determine which of the correlates of effective schools were perceived as affected by those provisions selected as impeding or enhancing. On nine of the fourteen contract provisions, the principals surveyed perceived an effect on the correlates of effective schools. The provisions of discipline, class size, teacher evaluation, staff meetings, professional development, curriculum development, workday, teacher aides, and home-school relations were perceived as affecting the correlates of effective schools. In each case, the principals saw the correlates being enhanced. The teachers perceived twelve of the fourteen provisions affecting the correlates. All of the provisions except work year and student assessment were seen as enhancing the correlates.

In Table 26 the combined responses of the principals and teachers to the correlates are listed. The correlates of instructional leadership and clear and focused mission were perceived as being most affected by the contract provisions. The correlates of climate of high expectations and opportunity to learn received six and four responses,

respectively, from the principals and teachers. The contract provisions that were most frequently cited were the provisions on class size and teacher aides. The provisions on teacher evaluation and curriculum development received the next highest number of citations (3).

CONCLUSIONS

In this study, the researcher examined the perceptions of building principals and building teacher association representatives concerning how teacher contracts affect school improvement. From the analysis of the teacher contracts, it appears that efforts to implement school improvement plans along the lines of safe and orderly environment, monitoring of student progress, and home-school relations will not be affected by the majority of teacher contracts. School improvement plans that include efforts in the areas of instructional leadership, clear and focused mission, and opportunity to learn may find teacher contract provisions that may enhance or impede the impelementation of the plan.

Several significant conclusions were drawn from the data on the background of the respondents. In general, principals have more experience with the negotiating of contracts than building teacher representatives. Almost all of the principals had read and were familiar with

effective schools research. Although a majority of teachers had read the research and were familiar with it, nearly one-third had not. This means that a significant amount of inservice needs to be done with teachers on making them familiar with this research, particularly when they are involved in a school improvement plan. There is also a question raised as to what constitutes a school improvement project and how legitimate some of these projects are for over three fourths of the principals and nearly three-fourths of the teachers stated that they had been involved in such projects. (see Appendix E, Table 32)

Although teacher contracts are often cited as barriers to school improvement, the data from this study in fact show that at the building level teacher contracts are perceived as having no effect on a school improvement plan or some enhancing qualities. When asked about the effect of their teacher contract on the implementation of a formal school improvement plan, forty percent of the principals and over fifty percent of the teachers stated that it had neither impeded nor enhanced the implementation of their plan. One fourth of the principals and nearly one-third of the teachers stated that the contract had actually enhanced the implementation of their plan. (see Appendix E,Table 33)

In this study it was found that there are some contract provisions that are perceived as impeding school improvement, some that enhance, and some that are perceived

as having no effect. In examining the responses of the principals and teacher representatives, it was found that principals had more of a tendency to perceive the contract as having no effect or some impeding effects as compared to the teachers. On the whole the teachers tended to perceive the contract as an enhancer of school improvement.

Teachers and principals agreed more than they disagreed on the effects of the specific contract provisions. There were no significant differences between the responses of the principals and the teachers on eight of the fourteen contract domains. On the eight domains for which there were no significant differences it is important to note that over eighty percent of both the teachers and principals perceived the provisions of student discipline, professional development, curriculum input, teacher aides, and home-school relations as being enhancing to school improvement. Over half of both groups saw the provisions on teacher evaluation, teacher transfer, and workday as being enhancing.

It should be emphasized once again that teachers and principals are generally in agreement on the enhancing the contract on school improvement efforts. The principals and teachers in this study, were more congruent in viewing the contract as enhancing than they were incongruent. Where in some cases teachers and principals may appear to be adversaries, particularly when it comes to working with the

teacher contract, the results of this study indicate that when it comes to school improvement and the teacher contract, many of their differences are not significant.

However, there was a significant percentage of the principals who perceived the provisions on teacher autonomy, staff meetings, work year, and student assessment as impeding. They also perceived the provision on teacher autonomy, and teacher preparation time as being both impeding and enhancing and neither impeding nor enhancing. A significant number of teachers perceived the provision on class size as impeding, and staff meetings as being both and neither. For the most part, these same provisions were cited as the most impeding by the principals and teachers in the survey.

There were a few differences between the perceptions of the MEA and MFT principals. On the three provisions on teacher autonomy, workday, and work year, the MEA principals tended to perceive these provisions as being both impeding and enhancing and neither impeding and enhancing as compared to the MFT principals. There were only two provisions for which the location of the principal was a factor - discipline and home-school relations. In both instances, a greater percentage of rural/town principals viewed these provisions as being both and neither as compared to their urban/suburban counterparts. The researcher concludes that the MEA principals and the

rural/town principals see the effects of these provisions dependent on local situations, more so than do the MFT and urban/surburban principals.

There were only two provisions for which the location of the teacher representative made a difference. These provisions were teacher transfers and home-school relations. A greater percentage of the urban/suburban teachers perceived the provision on teacher transfers as being neither impeding nor enhancing compared with the majority of their rural/town counterparts who viewed this provision as enhancing. The urban/suburban teachers saw the provision on teacher aides as being both and neither whereas, none of the rural/town teachers perceived this provision as both and neither. The researcher concludes that teacher transfers may be more of an issue in the smaller outlying districts for the rural/town teachers. Similarly, the assistance of classroom aides is more likely to be available in the urban/suburban districts and therefore may be more taken for granted by the those teachers.

The teachers and principals both chose the provisions on input on curriculum development and teacher inservice as the top two enhancers of school improvement. Certainly, the opportunities for professional development are important to not only the development of a school improvement plan but its ongoing efforts as well. When a

staff is working on developing a school improvement plan, the mission of the school and the climate of high expectations would both be examined carefully. One of the ways the staff might go about making changes is to examine the curriculum and how it is taught within the school. Therefore, this provision on curriculum input could also be very important to school improvement.

The most impeding contract provisions have been discussed to some extent already. What appears to be the common thread among the comments on the impeding aspects of staff meetings, workday, teacher autonomy, and preparation time, is in how the language is interpreted and the professional use of these provisions. In order to enhance school improvement efforts, or at least not impede them, the respondents in this survey suggest that principals run effective, efficient and focused staff meetings; that teachers use their workday and preparation time for instructional purposes rather than as 'relief' time; and that teachers make responsible, professional decisions about what they teach and how they teach it.

Twelve of the fourteen contract provisions were perceived by the principals and teachers as affecting the correlates of effective schools. Only work year and student assessment did not receive over fifty percent of the responses of either group. All twelve provisions were perceived as enhancing school improvement. The correlate

that appeared to be most enhanced by the contract provisions was clear and focused mission. The correlate of climate of high expectations and instructional leadership were the next two correlates to receive the most responses. It would appear that cooperative efforts by teachers and principals to work with the teacher contract provisions that enhance these two areas would assist a school improvement project.

The correlates that received the fewest responses were monitoring of student progress and home-school relations. It should be noted that these were the two contract domains that had the lowest frequencies in the original review of the twenty-nine sample contracts. It appears that efforts to improve schools along the lines of these two correlates must be enhanced and developed without the aid of the teacher contract.

In this study, the researcher examined the perceptions of building principals and building teacher association representatives in terms of how teacher contracts affect school improvement. From the results, it appears that typical teacher contract provisions are not perceived as impeding school improvement efforts, but in fact are perceived as enhancing. When examined from a school improvement perspective, typical teacher contracts tend to have provisions that fall mainly in the correlate areas of instructional leadership, clear and focused mission,

climate of high expectations, and opportunity to learn. These correlates are perceived as affected by the contract provisions in an enhancing manner.

RECOMMENDATIONS

FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

In considering future research as a result of this study, the researcher recommends replication of this study in other states. It is suggested that one of the replications be conducted in a state that does not have a collective bargaining law for school employees. The researcher recommends a replication of this study within the state of Michigan. It is also recommended that a study be conducted that examines the effect of individualized professional development projects, incentive programs, and their perceived affect on the correlates of effective schools. It is also suggested that a replication of this study be completed which matches paired responses of the principal and teacher association representative from the same building. Finally, it is suggested that a replication of this study be completed which surveys teachers who have not been actively involved in their association or served as an association representative for their building.

For researchers completing a study of this kind in

which data will be manually transferred to computer scan sheets, it is recommended that scan sheet code numbers be included on the actual survey in parentheses next to the item number for ease in coding. Although this survey was sent in late April, it is recommended that an even earlier mailing be considered.

All surveys and envelopes were numbered for follow-up purposes. The researcher found that numbering the survey was sufficient. When considering the mailing and printing of a survey such as this, it is suggested that the survey be one that can fit a No. 9 business envelope. In this way the mail out can be done in a No. 10 envelope with the No. 9 being included for the return mailing.

FOR ADMINISTRATORS

As a result of this study, those working on school improvement projects should consider the contract provisions noted as enhancing to support their school improvement plan. Similarly, those provisions perceived as most impeding should be examined in light of school improvement efforts. Where possible, the effects of these impeding provisions should be minimized in order to enhance the improvement plan.

In the process of negotiating collective bargaining agreements, it is recommended that those provisions

perceived as most enhancing be included in the contract. The perceived impact of language on the correlates of effective schools and school improvement should be considered when analyzing the demands of both parties. Where possible, the provisions perceived as most impeding should be carefully considered in terms of their effect on school improvement efforts. The comments made specifically on the impeding provisions should be especially noted. The areas for which there were disagreement between principals and teachers should be looked at in the context of each particular district's situation.

It is recommended that schools and their staff who are involved in a formal school improvement program should examine collective bargaining and how it affects the fourteen contract domains. In looking at the similarities and differences in the perceptions of teachers and principals and their comments on the provisions, it is recommended that principals and teachers work closely together on managing their contract in order that it enhance their school improvement project and that impediments be minimized.

Where outside negotiators are used, it is important that they be familiar with effective schools research and the results of this study. When negotiating new contracts, those involved in negotiations should take into account the effective schools research and those provisions perceived

as enhancing and impeding to school improvement.

FOR THE CONTINUING EDUCATION OF TEACHERS

It is recommended that teachers be made aware of the results of this study and as a result work with their administrators to eliminate the perceived impeding aspects of teacher contracts. One-third of the teachers in this study had not read and were not familiar with the effective schools research. It is therefore recommended that teachers receive inservice on effective schools research and its meaning for their classroom and school.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

PERIODICALS

Applegate, C. (1984). When Collective Bargaining First Came to Education: A Teacher's Viewpoint. Government Union Review, 5:6-13.

Di Ricco, A. P. (1977). To Succeed at Bargaining, Learn the Language of the Teacher. American School Board Journal, 164, pp. 36-38.

Geisert, G. (1984). The Effect of Collective Bargaining on Curriculum. Government Union Review, 5: 35-40.

Kennedy, J. D. (1984). When Collective Bargaining First Came to Education: A Superintendent's Viewpoint. Government Union Review, 5:14-26.

Lieberman, M. (1984). Educational Reform and Teacher Bargaining. Government Union Review, 5: 54-75.

Mazzarella, J. (1984). The Collective Bargaining Mystery: Some New Clues. R & D Perspectives, Spring, 1984, p.2-9.

Olson, L. (1986). Effective Schools. Education Week, January 15, 1986, p.11-22.

Perry, C. R. (1979). Teacher Bargaining: The Experience in Nine Systems. Industrial Labor Relations Review, 33(No. 1), 3-17.

R & D Perspectives (1981). Collective Bargaining: What Are the Effects on Schools? Fall, 1981.

Rynecki, S. B., & Pickering, W. C. (1984). Educational

Reform and Its Labor Relations Impact from a Management Perspective. Journal of Law and Education, 13, No. 3, p.477-507.

Snyder, D. P. (1985). The Strategic Context of Education in America, 1985-1995. Eugene, OR:Snyder Family Enterprises, Inc.

BOOKS

Cole, S. (1969). The Unionization of Teachers: A Case Study of the UFT. New York:Praeger Publishers.

Cresswell, A. M., Murphy, M. J., & Kerchner, C. T. (1980). Teachers, Unions and Collective Bargaining in Public Education. Berkley, Calf.:McCutchan Publishing Corporation.

Eberts, R. W. & Stone, J. A. (1984). Unions and Public Schools. Lexington, MA:Lexington Books.

Jessup, D. K. (1985). Teachers, Unions and Change: A Comparitive Study. New York:Praeger Publishers.

Johnson, S. M. (1984). Teacher Unions in Schools. Philadelphia:Temple University Press.

McDonnell, L. & Pascal, A. (1979). Organized Teachers in American Schools. Santa Monica, Calf.:The Rand Corporation.

Perry, C. R., & Wildman, W. A. (1970). The Impact of Negotiations in Public Education, The Evidence from the Schools. Worthington, OH: Charles A. Jones Publishing Co.

Sizer, T. R. (1983). A Review and Comment on the National Reports. Reston, VA:National Association of Secondary Principals.

RESEARCH REPORTS

Bieber, F. (1974). Provisions for Improving Educational Programs in Selected Negotiated Contracts. (Doctoral dissertation, Arizona State University, 1974). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1974, 35,(University Microfilms No. 74-16,710)

Brookover, W. B., & Lezotte, L. W. (1977). Changes in school characteristics coincident with changes in student achievement. East Lansing: Michigan State University, College of Urban Development.

Chasteen, F. O. (1972). The Effects of Professional Negotiation on the Leadership Activities of Elementary Principals in the St. Louis Suburban Elementary Principals Association. (Doctoral dissertation, Southern Illinois University, 1972).Dissertation Abstracts International, 1972,33, (University Microfilms No. 72-24,352)

Edmonds, R. R., & Frederikson, J. R. (1978). Search for effective schools: The identification and analysis of city schools that are instructionally effective for poor children. Cambridge:Harvard University, Center for Urban Development.

Farber, S. F. (1981). A Longitudinal Analysis of Negotiated Teacher Contract Language of Selected School Districts In Southeastern Lower Michigan. (Doctoral dissertation, Wayne State University, 1981). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1981, 42,(University Microfilms No. 82-09,294)

Goldschmidt, S., Bowers, B., Riley, M., & Stuart, L. (1983). The Extent and Nature of Educational Policy Bargaining. Eugene, OR:Center for Educational Policy and Management.

Kerchner, C. T. (1984). Labor Policy in School Districts: Its Diffusion and Impact on Work Structures. Eugene, OR:Center for Educational Policy and Management.

King, J. C. (1969). The effects of Negotiations Upon the Role of Selected Elementary School Principals in Ohio. (Doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, 1969). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1970,

31,(University Microfilms No. 70-11,697)

Kratz, C. L. (1977). The effects of Collective Bargaining on the Quality of Education. (Doctoral dissertation, Wayne State University, 1977). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1978,38, (University Microfilms No. 78-05,193)

Nichols, H. O. (1975). A Comparison of Perceived Constraints on the Role Performance of Selected Elementary and Secondary Principals in Urban and Suburban School Districts with Different Collective Bargaining Contract Status. (Doctoral dissertation, Duke University, 1976). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1976,37, (University Microfilms No. 76-18,962)

Robertson, R. G. (1971). The Effects of Professional Negotiations on the Leadership Role of the Elementary Principal as Perceived By Elementary Principals in Selected Schools in Texas. (Doctoral dissertation, Texas Technological University, 1971). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1971, 32,(University Microfilms No. 71-25,634)

Steele, M. H. (1969). Has Collective Bargaining Contributed To Instructional Improvement in Michigan Schools? (Doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1969). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1969,30, (University Microfilms No. 69-20,937)

Trost, J. R. (1969). The Effects of Negotiations upon the Role of Selected Michigan Secondary School Principals. (Doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, 1969). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1970, 31,(University Microfilms No. 70-07,996)

Weber, G. (1971). Inner city children can be taught to read:Four successful schools. Washington, D.C.:Council for Basic Education.

GOVERNMENT REPORTS

Better Education for Michigan Citizens:A Blueprint for Action (1984). The Michigan State Board of Education. Lansing, MI.

Coleman, J. S., Campbell, E. Q., Hobson, C. J., McPartland, J., Mood, A. M., Weinfeld, F. D., & York, R. L. (1966). Equality of educational opportunity. Washington, D.C.:U.S. Office of Education, National Center for Educational Statistics.

Cresswell, A. M., & Spargo, F. (1980). Impacts of Collective Bargaining Policy in Elementary and Secondary Education: A Review of Research and Methodology: Recommendations for New Research. Denver:Education Commisssion of the States.

State of New York, Office of Education Performance Review (1974). School factors influencing reading achievement: A case study of two inner city schools.

UNPUBLISHED MATERIALS

Lezotte, L. W. & Bancroft, B. A. (1985). School Improvement Based on Effective Schools Research: A Promising Approach for Economically Disadvantaged and Minority Students. Michigan State Universtiy. (Mimeographed)

APPENDIX A

APPENDIX A

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT AND TEACHER CONTRACT PROVISIONS

This survey contains fourteen teacher contract provisions. First read the definitions of the effective school correlates. (Section I) Then read the contract provisions and make a decision as to whether you see the language as creating conditions that affect school improvement. (Section II) Finally, choose the correlate or correlates of effective schools that are affected by these conditions.

Please add any comments you would like regarding your decisions.

I. CORRELATES OF EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS

1. Safe and Orderly Environment

In the effective school there is an orderly, purposeful, businesslike atmosphere which is free from threat of physical harm. The school climate is not oppressive and is conducive to teaching and learning.

2. Climate of High Expectations for Success

In the effective school there is a climate of expectation in which the staff believes and demonstrates that all students can attain mastery of the essential school skills and they believe that they have capability to help all students attain mastery.

3. Instructional Leadership

In the effective school the principal acts as an instructional leader and effectively and persistently communicates that mission to staff, parents, and students. The principal understands and applies the characteristics of instructional effectiveness in the management of the instructional program.

4. Clear and Focused Mission

In the effective school there is a clearly articulated school mission through which the staff shares an understanding of and a commitment to the instructional goals, priorities, assessment procedures and accountability. Staff accept responsibility for students' learning of the school's essential curricular goals.

5. Opportunity to Learn/Time on Task

In the effective school teachers allocate a significant amount of classroom time to instruction in the essential skills. For a high percentage of this time, students are engaged in whole class or large group planned, teacher directed, learning activities.

6. Frequent Monitoring of Student Progress

In the effective school, student academic progress is measured frequently. A variety of the assessment procedures are used to improve individual student performance and also to improve the instructional program.

7. Home-School Relations

In the effective school parents understand and support the school's basic mission and are given the opportunity to play an important role in helping the school to achieve this mission.

II. PLEASE CIRCLE YOUR CHOICE

1. "A teacher may send pupils from a class to the office when the grossness of the offense, the persistence of the misbehavior or the disruptive effect of the violation makes the continued presence of the student in the classroom intolerable. In such cases, the teacher will furnish the principal, as promptly as his teaching obligations will allow, full particulars of the incident. Final disposition of the case will be discussed with the teacher."

a. Impedes school improvement

b. Enhances school improvement

c. Impedes and enhances school improvement

d. Neither impedes nor enhances school improvement

If a, b, or c circle the correlate(s) affected:

1. Safe and Orderly Environment

2. Climate of High Expectations for Success

3. Instructional Leadership

4. Clear and Focused Mission

5. Opportunity to Learn/Time on Task

6. Frequent Monitoring of Student Progress

7. Home-School Relations

Comments-

2. "Teachers shall be free to present instructional materials which they consider pertinent to the subject and level taught and consistent with the course objectives as long as controversial issues are presented in a scholarly manner. They shall also be entitled to freedom of discussion within the classroom on all matters which they consider relevant to the subject under study if it is within their area of professional competence."

a. Impedes school improvement

b. Enhances school improvement

c. Impedes and enhances school improvement

d. Neither impedes nor enhances school improvement

If a, b, or c circle the correlate(s) affected:

1. Safe and Orderly Environment

2. Climate of High Expectations for Success

3. Instructional Leadership

4. Clear and Focused Mission

5. Opportunity to Learn/Time on Task

6. Frequent Monitoring of Student Progress

7. Home-School Relations

Comments-

3."Realizing that the pupil-teacher ratio is an important aspect in an effective program, the parties agree that class size should be lowered wherever possible. The following shall be maximum class sizes:

A. Elementary Schools- 25 pupils per regular class not to exceed 30.
B. Middle School- 30 pupils per regular class not to exceed 35.
C. Senior High School- 30 pupils per regular class not to exceed 35."

a. Impedes school improvement

b. Enhances school improvement

c. Impedes and enhances school improvement

d. Neither impedes nor enhances school improvement

If a, b, or c circle the correlate(s) affected:

1. Safe and Orderly Environment

2. Climate of High Expectations for Success

3. Instructional Leadership

4. Clear and Focused Mission

5. Opportunity to Learn/Time on Task

6. Frequent Monitoring of Student Progress

7. Home-School Relations

Comments-

4. "Tenured teachers will be observed for the purpose of evaluation at least once every two years. A written evaluation will be executed within five (5) working days of the observation. A copy of the evaluation shall be given to the teacher and a personal conference will be held between the teacher and the evaluator within six (6) days of the observation. All evaluations must indicate the evaluator's observation of the teacher's particular strengths and those areas needing assistance. Furthermore, whenever a particular deficiency is noted the evaluator must indicate the specific way in which the teacher is to improve and what assistance will be provided by administration. Subsequent evaluation reports must note the progress or lack of progress of previously noted deficiencies."

a. Impedes school improvement

b. Enhances school improvement

c. Impedes and enhances school improvement

d. Neither impedes nor enhances school improvement

If a, b, or c circle the correlate(s) affected:

1. Safe and Orderly Environment

2. Climate of High Expectations for Success

3. Instructional Leadership

4. Clear and Focused Mission

5. Opportunity to Learn/Time on Task

6. Frequent Monitoring of Student Progress

7. Home-School Relations

Comments-

5. "The following requirements shall apply only to voluntary transfers, involuntary transfers, and recalls.

A. Elementary School (Grades K-6):Valid elementary certification.
B. Middle School (Grades 7 and 8): Elementary or secondary certification and:
1. a major or minor in the subject are to which the employee is to be assigned, or
2. twelve (12) semester hours in the subject area, or
3. three (3) years successful teaching experience in the subject area, during the preceding five (5) year period.
C. Senior High School (Grades 9-12): Secondary certification and either a major or minor in the subject area or a sufficient number of credit hours to meet the requirements of the North Central Association of Secondary Schools and Colleges."

a. Impedes school improvement

b. Enhances school improvement

c. Impedes and enhances school improvement

d. Neither impedes nor enhances school improvement

If a, b, or c circle the correlate(s) affected:

1. Safe and Orderly Environment

2. Climate of High Expectations for Success

3. Instructional Leadership

4. Clear and Focused Mission

5. Opportunity to Learn/Time on Task

6. Frequent Monitoring of Student Progress

7. Home-School Relations

Comments-

6. "Each teacher shall be required to participate in staff meetings which will be limited to ten (10) per school year except in case of emergency and excluding pre-school conferences. In no case shall a meeting last longer than one and one-half hours. Each teacher recognizes attendance as an obligation of his employment and shall attend unless excused by the building principal."

a. Impedes school improvement

b. Enhances school improvement

c. Impedes and enhances school improvement

d. Neither impedes nor enhances school improvement

If a, b, or c circle the correlate(s) affected:

1. Safe and Orderly Environment

2. Climate of High Expectations for Success

3. Instructional Leadership

4. Clear and Focused Mission

5. Opportunity to Learn/Time on Task

6. Frequent Monitoring of Student Progress

7. Home-School Relations

Comments-

7. "There will be a full inservice day within the month of October, followed by two one-half inservice days within the school year. The District shall encourage teachers to attend selected professional conferences with expenses paid by the School District. A teacher's request to attend conferences shall be presented to the building principal or other supervisory officers and to the Superintendent of schools."

a. Impedes school improvement

b. Enhances school improvement

c. Impedes and enhances school improvement

d. Neither impedes nor enhances school improvement

If a, b, or c circle the correlate affected:

1. Safe and Orderly Environment

2. Climate of High Expectations for Success

3. Instructional Leadership

4. Clear and Focused Mission

5. Opportunity to Learn/Time on Task

6. Frequent Monitoring of Student Progress

7. Home-School Relations

Comments-

8. "In a normal work week or the pro rata part thereof, elementary teachers shall have a minimum of two-hundred (200) minutes of preparation and conference time, one hundred percent (100%) which shall be in periods of not less than thirty (30) minutes each. Middle School and High School teachers shall have at least five (5) full unassigned daily and continuous preparation and conference periods per week of at least forty-five (45) minutes each."

a. Impedes school improvement

b. Enhances school improvement

c. Impedes and enhances school improvement

d. Neither impedes nor enhances school improvement

If a, b, or c circle correlate(s) affected:

1. Safe and Orderly Environment

2. Climate of High Expectations for Success

3. Instructional Leadership

4. Clear and Focused Mission

5. Opportunity to Learn/Time on Task

6. Frequent Monitoring of Student Progress

7. Home-School Relations

Comments-

9. "Curriculum development is the responsibility of teachers and administrators working together. Therefore, all system-wide curriculum committees will have combined membership of teachers and administrators. A Curriculum Council consisting of committee chairpersons and administrators shall be established. This shall be a continuing committee which shall meet on a regular basis to consider curriculum problems and to recommend methods of improving the educational program."

a. Impedes school improvement

b. Enhances school improvement

c. Impedes and enhances school improvement

d. Neither impedes nor enhances school improvement

If a, b, or c circle the correlate affected:

1. Safe and Orderly Environment

2. Climate of High Expectations for Success

3. Instructional Leadership

4. Clear and Focused Mission

5. Opportunity to Learn/Time on Task

6. Frequent Monitoring of Student Progress

7. Home-School Relations

Comments-

10. "The regular duty hours of classroom teachers at school shall be as follows: Grades K-12 -- 7 hours 5 minutes, including lunch. Teachers shall not be assigned more than 300 minutes of student instruction each student instruction day. Teachers are expected to be at their classroom duty stations during the regular duty hours, except for lunch periods and non-classroom assignments. Teachers shall have the responsibility to respond to emergency situations at any time to maintain order in the schools."

a. Impedes school improvement

b. Enhances school improvement

c. Impedes and enhances school improvement

d. Neither impedes nor enhances school improvement

If a, b, or c circle the correlate(s) affected:

1. Safe and Orderly Environment

2. Climate of High Expectations for Success

3. Instructional Leadership

4. Clear and Focused Mission

5. Opportunity to Learn/Time on Task

6. Frequent Monitoring of Student Progress

7. Home-School Relations

Comments-

11. work year of "180 student days, 183 teacher days"

    a. Impedes school improvement

    b. Enhances school improvement

    c. Impedes and enhances school improvement

    d. Neither impedes nor enhances school improvement

If a, b, or c circle the correlate affected:

    1. Safe and Orderly Environment

    2. Climate of High Expectations for Success

    3. Instructional Leadership

    4. Clear and Focused Mission

    5. Opportunity to Learn/Time on Task

    6. Frequent Monitoring of Student Progress

    7. Home-School Relations

Comments-

12. "Responsibility for day-to-day instructional activities shall rest with certificated teachers. Teacher aides may be assigned to assist in instructional related activities. Such activities, under the direction of the teacher are:

1. Complementing instruction (i.e., assisting the teacher during the lesson by helping pupils who may be having difficulty in understanding or in keeping up with the class).
2. Supplementing instruction (i.e.,assisting the teacher by working with individuals or small groups of pupils on follow-up activities specified by the teacher)
3. Reinforcing instruction (i.e., assisting the teacher by administering under supervision and direction, remedial or drill activities for individuals or small groups."

a. Impedes school improvement

b. Enhances school improvement

c. Impedes and enhances school improvement

d. Neither impedes nor enhances school improvement

If a, b, or c circle the correlate(s) affected:

1. Safe and Orderly Environment

2. Climate of High Expectations for Success

3. Instructional Leadership

4. Clear and Focused Mission

5. Opportunity to Learn/Time on Task

6. Frequent Monitoring of Student Progress

7. Home-School Relations

Comments-

13. "The two basic standardized tests given in the elementary schools during the school year shall be machine scored. Elementary teachers shall only be responsible for recording grades and attendance on CA 60's and report cards."

a. Impedes school improvement

b. Enhances school improvement

c. Impedes and enhances school improvement

d. Neither impedes nor enhances school improvement

If a, b, or c circle the correlate(s) affected:

1. Safe and Orderly Environment

2. Climate of High Expectations for Success

3. Instructional Leadership

4. Clear and Focused Mission

5. Opportunity to Learn/Time on Task

6. Frequent Monitoring of Student Progress

7. Home-School Relations

Comments-

14. "The Federation and the teachers recognize their responsibility to keep themselves informed concerning school programs, and to interpret the school and its program to the community to the best of their ability."

a. Impedes school improvement

b. Enhances school improvement

c. Impedes and enhances school improvement

d. Neither impedes nor enhances school improvement

If a, b, or c circle the correlate(s) affected:

1. Safe and Orderly Environment
2. Climate of High Expectations for Success
3. Instructional Leadership
4. Clear and Focused Mission
5. Opportunity to Learn/Time on Task
6. Frequent Monitoring of Student Progress
7. Home-School Relations

Comments-

Yes No 15. I have sat "at the table" and negotiated at least three teacher contracts.

Yes No 16. I have never done actual negotiating of teacher contracts.

Yes No 17. I have read and am familiar with the effective schools research.

Yes No 18. I currently am or have been involved with a formalized school improvement project.

19. If you were directed by your superintendent to develop a school improvement plan for your school, which of the previously listed contract provisions would you perceive as enhancing your ability to meet this responsibility?

20. Which contract provision(s) would you see as impeding your ability to meet this responsibility?

Yes No 21. During the last three years has your school had a formal improvement plan?

22. If yes, has the implementation of the plan been enhanced or impeded by any of the provisions in the district's teacher contract?

a. Impedes school improvement

b. Enhances school improvement

c. Impedes and enhances school improvement

d. Neither impedes nor enhances school improvement

If a, b, or c please describe the provision(s).

APPENDIX B

APPENDIX B

BUILDING TEACHER REPRESENTATIVE SURVEY

The survey for the building teacher representative was exactly the same as that of the building principal's except for the last page of background information. (see Appendix A for comparison) The last page for the teacher representative is reproduced here.

Yes No 15. I have sat "at the table" and negotiated at least three teacher contracts.

Yes No 16. I have never done actual negotiating of teacher contracts.

Yes No 17. I have read and am familiar with the effective schools research.

Yes No 18. I currently am or have been involved with a formalized school improvement project.

19. If you were asked by your principal to serve on a school improvement team for the purpose of developing an improvement plan for your school, which, if any, of the contract provisions previously listed would you perceive as enhancing your ability to complete this task?

20. Which contract provision(s) would you see as impeding your ability to complete this task?

Yes No 21. During the last three years has your school had a formal improvement plan?

22. If yes, has the implementation of the plan been enhanced or impeded by any of the provisions of the district's teacher contract?

a. Impedes school improvement

b. Enhances school improvement

c. Impedes and enhances school improvement

d. Neither impedes nor enhances school improvement

If a, b, or c please describe the provision(s).

APPENDIX C

APPENDIX C

COVER LETTER AND FOLLOWUP LETTER - PRINCIPALS

Dear Principal:

Despite the pervasive calls for school improvement and the numerous reports extant addressing the issue, it appears that few, if any, reports describe how teacher contracts might impede or enhance school improvement efforts. As researchers, we hope to discover how building principals perceive teacher contracts as creating conditions that affect school improvement.

You have been selected from a random sampling of school districts in the state of Michigan for this study. Your building was drawn froma sample of urban/suburban, rural/town, and a sampling of MEA and MFT-affiliated districts. An identical survey had been mailed to the Building Teacher Representative of your building. As is common in the development of dissertation research, complete confidentiality is assured regarding personal, school, district or any identifying names.

A stamped, addressed envelope is enclosed for your reply. And if you would be interested in a summary of these findings, please so indicate on the form below and enclose it with your completed survey. Thank you for your assistance with this interesting and important study.

Sincerely,

Lawrence W. Lezotte, Professor

Judith Dorsch Backes

I am interested in receiving a summary sheet of the findings of the study of teacher contracts and school improvement.

NAME _____

ADDRESS _____

CITY _____ ZIP CODE _____

Dear Building Principal:

As part of the selected sample for the study on teacher contracts and school improvement, your completion of the survey you received is very important. As you know, the many calls for school improvement have not addressed how teacher contracts affect such efforts. The completion of the survey will help to answer some of these questions.

If you have already completed the survey, thank you for your assistance. If you have not, won't you please take the time to complete it and put it in the mail today.

Sincerely,

Lawrence W. Lezotte

Judith Dorsch Backes

APPENDIX E

APPENDIX E

BACKGROUND OF RESPONDENTS:FINDINGS

TABLE 28 NEGOTIATED THREE CONTRACTS

		YES	NO	TOTAL
PRINCIPAL	NO.	30	58	88
	%	34.1	65.9	49.2
TEACHER	NO.	11	80	91
	%	12.1	87.9	50.8
TOTAL	NO.	41	138	179
	%	22.9	77.1	100

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE
11.05	1	0.0009

TABLE 29 NEVER NEGOTIATED

		YES	NO	TOTAL
PRINCIPAL	NO.	29	47	76
	%	38.2	61.8	45.8
TEACHER	NO.	58	32	90
	%	64.4	35.6	54.2
TOTAL	NO.	87	79	166
	%	52.4	47.6	100

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE
10.39	1	0.0013

TABLE 30 READ/FAMILIAR WITH EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS RESEARCH

		YES	NO	TOTAL
PRINCIPAL	NO.	88	1	89
	%	98.9	1.1	49.7
TEACHER	NO.	62	28	90
	%	68.9	31.1	50.3
TOTAL	NO.	150	29	179
	%	83.8	16.2	100

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE
27.47	1	0.0000

TABLE 31 INVOLVED IN SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROJECT

		YES	NO	TOTAL
PRINCIPAL	NO.	72	16	88
	%	81.8	18.2	48.6
TEACHER	NO.	65	28	93
	%	69.9	30.1	51.4
TOTAL	NO.	137	44	181
	%	75.7	24.3	100

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE
2.88	1	0.0899

TABLE 32 SCHOOL HAD A FORMAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

		YES	NO	TOTAL
PRINCIPAL	NO.	60	25	85
	%	70.6	29.4	48.6
TEACHER	NO.	50	40	90
	%	55.6	44.4	51.4
TOTAL	NO.	110	65	175
	%	62.9	37.1	100

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE
3.61	1	0.0574

TABLE 33 IF HAD PLAN - EFFECT OF TEACHER CONTRACT

		IMPEDE	ENHANCE	BOTH	NEITHER	TOTAL
PRINCIPAL	NO.	11	15	9	25	60
	%	18.3	25.0	15.0	41.7	52.2
TEACHER	NO.	4	17	4	30	55
	%	7.3	30.9	7.3	54.5	47.8
TOTAL	NO.	15	32	13	55	115
	%	13.0	27.8	11.3	47.8	100

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE
5.56	3	0.1350

APPENDIX F

APPENDIX F

DIFFERENCES IN PERCEPTIONS:FINDINGS INSIGNIFICANT

TABLE 34 STUDENT DISCIPLINE - PRINCIPALS/TEACHERS

		IMPEDE	ENHANCE	BOTH	NEITHER	TOTAL
PRINCIPAL	NO.	5	72	8	5	90
	%	5.6	80.0	8.9	5.6	48.6
TEACHER	NO.	1	86	6	2	95
	%	1.1	90.5	6.3	2.1	51.4
TOTAL	NO.	6	158	14	7	185
	%	3.2	85.4	7.6	3.8	100

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE
5.38	3	0.01481

TABLE 35 TEACHER EVALUATION - PRINCIPALS/TEACHERS

		IMPEDE	ENHANCE	BOTH	NEITHER	TOTAL
PRINCIPAL	NO.	4	70	9	8	91
	%	4.4	76.9	9.9	8.8	49.7
TEACHER	NO.	3	66	10	13	92
	%	3.3	71.7	10.9	14.1	50.3
TOTAL	NO.	7	136	19	21	183
	%	3.8	74.3	10.4	11.5	100

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE
1.50	3	0.6827

TABLE 36 TEACHER TRANSFER - PRINCIPALS/TEACHERS

		IMPEDE	ENHANCE	BOTH	NEITHER	TOTAL
PRINCIPAL	NO.	6	59	9	13	87
	%	6.9	67.8	10.3	14.9	48.6
TEACHER	NO.	5	63	6	18	92
	%	5.4	68.5	6.5	19.6	51.4
TOTAL	NO.	11	122	15	31	179
	%	6.1	68.2	8.4	17.3	100

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE
1.49	3	0.6846

TABLE 37 PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT - PRINCIPALS/TEACHERS

		IMPEDE	ENHANCE	BOTH	NEITHER	TOTAL
PRINCIPAL	NO.	3	78	6	3	90
	%	3.3	86.7	6.7	3.3	48.9
TEACHER	NO.	1	75	7	11	94
	%	1.1	79.8	7.4	11.7	51.1
TOTAL	NO.	4	153	13	14	184
	%	2.2	83.2	7.1	7.6	100

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE
5.62	3	0.1315

TABLE 38 CURRICULUM INPUT - PRINCIPALS/TEACHERS

		IMPEDE	ENHANCE	BOTH	NEITHER	TOTAL
PRINCIPAL	NO.	1	79	6	3	89
	%	1.1	88.8	6.7	3.4	48.4
TEACHER	NO.	5	76	9	5	95
	%	5.3	80.0	9.5	5.3	51.6
TOTAL	NO.	6	155	15	8	184
	%	3.3	84.2	8.2	4.3	100

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE
3.63	3	0.3039

TABLE 39 WORKDAY - PRINCIPALS/TEACHERS

		IMPEDE	ENHANCE	BOTH	NEITHER	TOTAL
PRINCIPAL	NO.	13	51	13	13	90
	%	14.4	56.7	14.4	14.4	49.2
TEACHER	NO.	4	58	11	20	93
	%	4.3	62.4	11.8	21.5	50.8
TOTAL	NO.	17	109	24	33	183
	%	9.3	59.6	13.1	18.0	100

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE
6.82	3	0.0779

TABLE 40 CLASSROOM AIDES - PRINCIPALS/TEACHERS

		IMPEDE	ENHANCE	BOTH	NEITHER	TOTAL
PRINCIPAL	NO.	4	77	4	6	91
	%	4.4	84.6	4.4	6.6	48.9
TEACHER	NO.	1	81	10	3	95
	%	1.1	85.3	10.5	3.2	51.1
TOTAL	NO.	5	158	14	9	186
	%	2.7	84.9	7.5	4.8	100

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE
5.39	3	0.1454

TABLE 41 HOME-SCHOOL RELATIONS - PRINCIPALS/TEACHERS

		IMPEDE	ENHANCE	BOTH	NEITHER	TOTAL
PRINCIPAL	NO.	0	77	4	6	87
	%	0	88.5	4.6	6.9	47.8
TEACHER	NO.	3	79	4	9	95
	%	3.2	83.2	4.2	9.5	52.2
TOTAL	NO.	3	156	8	15	182
	%	1.6	85.7	4.4	8.2	100

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE
3.28	3	0.3504

TABLE 42 STUDENT DISCIPLINE - MEA PRINCIPALS/MFT PRINCIPALS

		IMPEDE	ENHANCE	BOTH	NEITHER	TOTAL
PRINCIPAL MEA	NO.	3	50	7	4	64
	%	4.7	78.1	10.9	6.3	71.1
PRINCIPAL MFT	NO.	2	22	1	1	26
	%	7.7	84.6	3.8	3.8	28.9
TOTAL	NO.	5	72	8	5	90
	%	5.6	80.0	8.9	5.6	100

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE
1.64	3	0.6512

TABLE 43 CLASS SIZE - MEA PRINCIPALS/MFT PRINCIPALS

		IMPEDE	ENHANCE	BOTH	NEITHER	TOTAL
PRINCIPAL MEA	NO.	4	38	9	12	63
	%	6.3	60.3	14.3	19.0	70.8
PRINCIPAL MFT	NO.	3	20	1	2	26
	%	11.5	76.9	3.8	7.7	29.2
TOTAL	NO.	7	58	10	14	89
	%	7.9	65.2	11.2	15.7	100

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE
4.70	3	0.1949

TABLE 44 TEACHER EVALUATION - MEA PRINCIPALS/MFT PRINCIPALS

		IMPEDE	ENHANCE	BOTH	NEITHER	TOTAL
PRINCIPAL MEA	NO.	3	47	7	8	65
	%	4.6	72.3	10.8	12.3	71.4
PRINCIPAL MFT	NO.	1	23	9	0	91
	%	3.8	88.5	7.7	0	28.6
TOTAL	NO.	4	70	9	8	91
	%	4.4	76.9	9.9	8.8	100

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE
4.03	3	0.2579

TABLE 45 TEACHER TRANSFERS - MEA PRINCIPALS/MFT PRINCIPALS

		IMPEDE	ENHANCE	BOTH	NEITHER	TOTAL
PRINCIPAL MEA	NO.	3	41	6	12	62
	%	4.8	66.1	9.7	19.4	71.3
PRINCIPAL MFT	NO.	3	18	3	1	25
	%	12.0	72.0	12.0	4.0	28.7
TOTAL	NO.	6	59	9	13	87
	%	6.9	67.8	10.3	14.9	100

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE
4.32	3	0.2290

TABLE 46 STAFF MEETINGS - MEA PRINCIPALS/MFT PRINCIPALS

		IMPEDE	ENHANCE	BOTH	NEITHER	TOTAL
PRINCIPAL MEA	NO.	18	28	12	7	65
	%	27.7	43.1	18.5	10.8	71.4
PRINCIPAL MFT	NO.	6	14	3	3	26
	%	23.1	53.8	11.5	11.5	28.6
TOTAL	NO.	24	42	15	10	26
	%	26.4	46.2	16.5	11.0	100

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE
1.17	3	0.7610

TABLE 47 PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

MEA PRINCIPALS/MFT PRINCIPALS

		IMPEDE	ENHANCE	BOTH	NEITHER	TOTAL
PRINCIPAL MEA	NO.	1	56	4	3	64
	%	1.6	87.5	6.3	4.7	71.1
PRINCIPAL MFT	NO.	2	22	2	0	26
	%	7.7	84.6	7.7	0	28.9
TOTAL	NO.	3	78	6	3	90
	%	3.3	86.7	6.7	3.3	100

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE
3.38	3	0.3369

TABLE 48 PREPARATION TIME - MEA PRINCIPALS/MFT PRINCIPALS

		IMPEDE	ENHANCE	BOTH	NEITHER	TOTAL
PRINCIPAL MEA	NO.	3	34	11	16	64
	%	4.7	53.1	17.2	25.0	71.1
PRINCIPAL MFT	NO.	0	19	2	5	26
	%	0	73.1	7.7	19.2	28.9
TOTAL	NO.	3	53	13	21	90
	%	3.3	58.9	14.4	23.3	100

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE
3.89	3	0.2740

TABLE 49 CURRICULUM INPUT - MEA PRINCIPALS/MFT PRINCIPALS

		IMPEDE	ENHANCE	BOTH	NEITHER	TOTAL
PRINCIPAL MEA	NO.	0	56	5	2	63
	%	0	88.9	7.9	3.2	70.8
PRINCIPAL MFT	NO.	1	23	1	1	26
	%	3.8	88.5	3.8	3.8	29.2
TOTAL	NO.	1	79	6	3	89
	%	1.1	88.8	6.7	3.4	100

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE
2.90	3	0.4065

TABLE 50 CLASSROOM AIDES - MEA PRINCIPALS/MFT PRINCIPALS

		IMPEDE	ENHANCE	BOTH	NEITHER	TOTAL
PRINCIPAL MEA	NO.	4	52	4	5	65
	%	6.2	80.0	6.2	7.7	71.4
PRINCIPAL MFT	NO.	0	25	0	1	26
	%	0	96.2	0	3.8	28.6
TOTAL	NO.	4	77	4	6	91
	%	4.4	84.6	4.4	6.6	100

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE
4.19	3	0.2417

TABLE 51 STUDENT ASSESSMENT - MEA PRINCIPALS/MFT PRINCIPALS

		IMPEDE	ENHANCE	BOTH	NEITHER	TOTAL
PRINCIPAL MEA	NO.	12	18	9	24	63
	%	19.0	28.6	14.3	38.1	70.8
PRINCIPAL MFT	NO.	5	10	1	10	26
	%	19.2	38.5	3.8	38.5	29.2
TOTAL	NO.	17	28	10	34	89
	%	19.1	31.5	11.2	38.2	100

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE
2.36	3	0.5014

TABLE 52 HOME-SCHOOL RELATIONS

MEA PRINCIPALS/MFT PRINCIPALS

		IMPEDE	ENHANCE	BOTH	NEITHER	TOTAL
PRINCIPAL MEA	NO.	0	54	3	5	62
	%	0	87.1	4.8	8.1	71.3
PRINCIPAL MFT	NO.	0	23	1	1	25
	%	0	92.0	4.0	4.0	28.7
TOTAL	NO.	0	77	4	6	87
	%	0	88.5	4.6	6.9	100

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE
0.50	3	0.7779

TABLE 53 STUDENT DISCIPLINE - MEA TEACHERS/MFT TEACHERS

		IMPEDE	ENHANCE	BOTH	NEITHER	TOTAL
TEACHER MEA	NO.	1	58	6	1	66
	%	1.5	87.9	9.1	1.5	69.5
TEACHER MFT	NO.	0	28	0	1	29
	%	0	96.6	0	3.4	30.5
TOTAL	NO.	1	86	6	2	95
	%	1.1	90.5	6.3	2.1	100

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE
3.60	3	0.3079

TABLE 54 TEACHER AUTONOMY - MEA TEACHERS/MFT TEACHERS

		IMPEDE	ENHANCE	BOTH	NEITHER	TOTAL
TEACHER MEA	NO.	4	45	11	3	63
	%	6.3	71.4	17.5	4.8	68.5
TEACHER MFT	NO.	3	22	3	1	29
	%	10.3	75.9	10.3	3.4	31.5
TOTAL	NO.	7	67	14	4	92
	%	7.6	72.8	15.2	4.3	100

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE
1.21	3	0.7506

TABLE 55 CLASS SIZE - MEA TEACHERS/MFT TEACHERS

		IMPEDE	ENHANCE	BOTH	NEITHER	TOTAL
TEACHER MEA	NO.	15	42	6	1	64
	%	23.4	65.6	9.4	1.6	68.8
TEACHER MFT	NO.	3	23	3	0	29
	%	10.3	79.3	10.3	0	31.2
TOTAL	NO.	18	65	9	1	93
	%	19.4	69.9	9.7	1.1	100

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE
2.78	3	0.4277

TABLE 56 TEACHER EVALUATION - MEA TEACHERS/MFT TEACHERS

		IMPEDE	ENHANCE	BOTH	NEITHER	TOTAL
TEACHER MEA	NO.	1	49	8	8	66
	%	1.5	74.2	12.1	12.1	71.7
TEACHER MFT	NO.	2	17	2	5	26
	%	7.7	65.4	7.7	19.2	28.3
TOTAL	NO.	3	66	10	13	92
	%	3.3	71.7	10.9	14.1	100

CHI-SQUARE	D.F	SIGNIFICANCE
3.39	3	0.3353

TABLE 57 TEACHER TRANSFERS - MEA TEACHERS/MFT TEACHERS

		IMPEDE	ENHANCE	BOTH	NEITHER	TOTAL
TEACHER MEA	NO.	2	44	6	13	65
	%	3.1	67.7	9.2	20.0	70.7
TEACHER MFT	NO.	3	19	0	5	27
	%	11.1	70.4	0	18.5	29.3
TOTAL	NO.	5	63	6	18	92
	%	5.4	68.5	6.5	19.6	100

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE
4.80	3	0.1871

TABLE 58 STAFF MEETINGS - MEA TEACHERS/MFT TEACHERS

		IMPEDE	ENHANCE	BOTH	NEITHER	TOTAL
TEACHER MEA	NO.	3	28	15	19	65
	%	4.6	43.1	23.1	29.2	69.1
TEACHER MFT	NO.	5	10	4	10	29
	%	17.2	34.5	13.8	34.5	30.9
TOTAL	NO.	8	38	19	29	94
	%	8.5	40.4	20.2	30.9	100

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE
5.16	3	0.1607

TABLE 59 PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

MEA TEACHERS/MFT TEACHERS

		IMPEDE	ENHANCE	BOTH	NEITHER	TOTAL
TEACHER MEA	NO.	1	49	5	9	64
	%	1.6	76.6	7.8	14.1	68.1
TEACHER MFT	NO.	0	26	2	2	30
	%	0	86.7	6.7	6.7	31.9
TOTAL	NO.	1	75	7	11	94
	%	1.1	79.8	7.4	11.7	100

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE
1.72	3	0.6323

TABLE 60 PREPARATION TIME

MEA TEACHERS/MFT TEACHERS

		IMPEDE	ENHANCE	BOTH	NEITHER	TOTAL
TEACHER MEA	NO.	2	58	5	1	66
	%	3.0	87.9	7.6	1.5	68.8
TEACHER MFT	NO.	2	23	4	1	30
	%	6.7	76.7	13.3	3.3	31.3
TOTAL	NO.	4	81	9	2	96
	%	4.2	84.4	9.4	2.1	100

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE
2.02	3	0.5686

TABLE 61 CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT

MEA TEACHERS/MFT TEACHERS

		IMPEDE	ENHANCE	BOTH	NEITHER	TOTAL
TEACHER MEA	NO.	2	53	7	3	65
	%	3.1	81.5	10.8	4.6	68.4
TEACHER MFT	NO.	3	23	2	2	30
	%	10.0	76.7	6.7	6.7	31.6
TOTAL	NO.	5	76	9	5	95
	%	5.3	80.0	9.5	5.3	100

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE
2.46	3	0.4828

TABLE 62 WORKDAY - MEA TEACHERS/MFT TEACHERS

		IMPEDE	ENHANCE	BOTH	NEITHER	TOTAL
TEACHER MEA	NO.	1	42	9	12	64
	%	1.6	65.6	14.1	18.8	68.8
TEACHER MFT	NO.	3	16	2	8	29
	%	10.3	55.2	6.9	27.6	31.2
TOTAL	NO.	4	58	11	20	93
	%	4.3	62.4	11.8	21.5	100

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE
5.52	3	0.1375

TABLE 63 WORK YEAR - MEA TEACHERS/MFT TEACHERS

		IMPEDE	ENHANCE	BOTH	NEITHER	TOTAL
TEACHER MEA	NO.	2	18	5	38	63
	%	3.2	28.6	7.9	60.3	69.2
TEACHER MFT	NO.	2	8	2	16	28
	%	7.1	28.6	7.1	57.1	30.8
TOTAL	NO.	4	26	7	54	91
	%	4.4	28.6	7.7	59.3	100

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE
0.74	3	0.8630

TABLE 64 AIDES - MEA TEACHERS/MFT TEACHERS

		IMPEDE	ENHANCE	BOTH	NEITHER	TOTAL
TEACHER MEA	NO.	1	57	5	2	65
	%	1.5	87.7	7.7	3.1	68.4
TEACHER MFT	NO.	0	24	5	1	30
	%	0	80.0	16.7	3.3	31.6
TOTAL	NO.	1	81	10	3	95
	%	1.1	85.3	10.5	3.2	100

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE
2.18	3	0.5361

TABLE 65 STUDENT ASSESSMENT - MEA TEACHERS/MFT TEACHERS

		IMPEDE	ENHANCE	BOTH	NEITHER	TOTAL
TEACHER MEA	NO.	2	30	7	22	61
	%	3.3	49.2	11.5	36.1	67.8
TEACHER MFT	NO.	2	11	2	14	29
	%	6.9	37.9	6.9	48.3	32.2
TOTAL	NO.	4	41	9	36	90
	%	4.4	45.6	10.0	40.0	100

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE
2.27	3	0.5184

TABLE 66 HOME-SCHOOL RELATIONS

MEA TEACHERS/MFT TEACHERS

		IMPEDE	ENHANCE	BOTH	NEITHER	TOTAL
TEACHER MEA	NO.	2	54	3	6	65
	%	3.1	83.1	4.6	9.2	68.4
TEACHER MFT	NO.	1	25	1	3	30
	%	3.3	83.3	3.3	10.0	31.6
TOTAL	NO.	3	79	4	9	95
	%	3.2	83.2	4.2	9.5	100

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE
0.10	3	0.9921

TABLE 67 TEACHER AUTONOMY

URBAN/SUBURBAN PRINCIPALS // RURAL/TOWN PRINCIPALS

		IMPEDE	ENHANCE	BOTH	NEITHER	TOTAL
PRINCIPAL U/S	NO.	12	33	8	12	65
	%	18.5	50.8	12.3	18.5	72.2
PRINCIPAL R/T	NO.	3	9	7	6	25
	%	12.0	36.0	28.0	24.0	27.8
TOTAL	NO.	15	42	15	18	90
	%	16.7	46.7	16.7	20.0	100

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE
4.24	3	0.2366

TABLE 68 CLASS SIZE

URBAN/SUBURBAN PRINCIPALS // RURAL/TOWN PRINCIPALS

		IMPEDE	ENHANCE	BOTH	NEITHER	TOTAL
PRINCIPAL U/S	NO.	5	39	7	12	63
	%	7.9	61.9	11.1	19.0	70.8
PRINCIPAL R/T	NO.	2	19	3	2	26
	%	7.7	73.1	11.5	7.7	29.2
TOTAL	NO.	7	58	10	14	89
	%	7.9	65.2	11.2	15.7	100

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE
1.87	3	0.6008

TABLE 69 TEACHER EVALUATION

URBAN/SUBURBAN PRINCIPALS // RURAL/TOWN PRINCIPALS

		IMPEDE	ENHANCE	BOTH	NEITHER	TOTAL
PRINCIPAL U/S	NO.	3	49	7	6	65
	%	4.6	75.4	10.8	9.2	71.4
PRINCIPAL R/T	NO.	1	21	2	2	26
	%	3.8	80.8	7.7	7.7	28.6
TOTAL	NO.	4	70	9	8	91
	%	4.4	76.9	9.9	8.8	100

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE
0.32	3	0.9557

TABLE 70 TEACHER TRANSFERS

URBAN/SUBURBAN PRINCIPALS // RURAL/TOWN PRINCIPALS

		IMPEDE	ENHANCE	BOTH	NEITHER	TOTAL
PRINCIPAL U/S	NO.	5	40	4	12	61
	%	8.2	65.6	6.6	19.7	70.1
PRINCIPAL R/T	NO.	1	19	5	1	26
	%	3.8	73.1	19.2	3.8	29.9
TOTAL	NO.	6	59	9	13	87
	%	6.9	67.8	10.3	14.9	100

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE
6.54	3	0.0882

TABLE 71 STAFF MEETINGS

URBAN/SUBURBAN PRINCIPALS // RURAL/TOWN PRINCIPALS

		IMPEDE	ENHANCE	BOTH	NEITHER	TOTAL
PRINCIPAL U/S	NO.	18	31	11	5	65
	%	27.7	47.7	16.9	7.7	71.4
PRINCIPAL R/T	NO.	6	11	4	5	26
	%	23.1	42.3	15.4	19.2	28.6
TOTAL	NO.	24	42	15	10	91
	%	26.4	46.2	16.5	11.0	100

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE
2.54	3	0.4675

TABLE 72 PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

URBAN/SUBURBAN PRINCIPALS // RURAL/TOWN PRINCIPALS

		IMPEDE	ENHANCE	BOTH	NEITHER	TOTAL
PRINCIPAL U/S	NO.	2	55	4	3	64
	%	3.1	85.9	6.3	4.7	71.1
PRINCIPAL R/T	NO.	1	23	2	0	26
	%	3.8	88.5	7.7	0	28.9
TOTAL	NO.	3	78	6	3	90
	%	3.3	86.7	6.7	3.3	100

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE
1.32	3	0.7247

TABLE 73 PREPARATION TIME

URBAN/SUBURBAN PRINCIPALS // RURAL/TOWN PRINCIPALS

		IMPEDE	ENHANCE	BOTH	NEITHER	TOTAL
PRINCIPAL U/S	NO.	2	39	7	16	64
	%	3.1	60.9	10.9	25.0	71.1
PRINCIPAL R/T	NO.	1	14	6	5	26
	%	3.8	53.8	23.1	19.2	28.9
TOTAL	NO.	3	53	13	21	90
	%	3.3	58.9	14.4	23.3	100

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE
2.37	3	0.5055

TABLE 74 CURRICULUM INPUT

URBAN/SUBURBAN PRINCIPAL // RURAL/TOWN PRINCIPAL

		IMPEDE	ENHANCE	BOTH	NEITHER	TOTAL
PRINCIPAL U/S	NO.	1	56	5	2	64
	%	1.6	87.5	7.8	3.1	71.9
PRINCIPAL R/T	NO.	0	23	1	1	25
	%	0	92.0	4.0	4.0	28.1
TOTAL	NO.	1	79	6	3	89
	%	1.1	88.8	6.7	3.4	100

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE
0.86	3	0.8351

TABLE 75 WORKDAY

URBAN/SUBURBAN PRINCIPALS // RURAL/TOWN PRINCIPALS

		IMPEDE	ENHANCE	BOTH	NEITHER	TOTAL
PRINCIPAL U/S	NO.	6	37	11	10	64
	%	9.4	57.8	17.2	15.6	71.1
PRINCIPAL R/T	NO.	7	14	2	3	26
	%	26.9	53.8	7.7	11.5	28.9
TOTAL	NO.	13	51	13	13	90
	%	14.4	56.7	14.4	14.4	100

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE
5.36	3	0.1472

TABLE 76 WORK YEAR

URBAN/SUBURBAN PRINCIPALS // RURAL/TOWN PRINCIPALS

		IMPEDE	ENHANCE	BOTH	NEITHER	TOTAL
PRINCIPAL U/S	NO.	12	11	6	35	64
	%	18.8	17.2	9.4	54.7	71.9
PRINCIPAL R/T	NO.	6	8	2	9	25
	%	24.0	32.0	8.0	36.0	28.1
TOTAL	NO.	18	19	8	44	89
	%	20.2	21.3	9.0	49.4	100

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE
3.40	3	0.3339

TABLE 77 AIDES

URBAN/SUBURBAN PRINCIPALS // RURAL/TOWN PRINCIPALS

		IMPEDE	ENHANCE	BOTH	NEITHER	TOTAL
PRINCIPAL U/S	NO.	3	56	3	3	65
	%	4.6	86.2	4.6	4.6	71.4
PRINCIPAL R/T	NO.	1	21	1	3	26
	%	3.8	80.8	3.8	11.5	28.6
TOTAL	NO.	4	77	4	6	91
	%	4.4	84.6	4.4	6.6	100

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE
1.46	3	0.6907

TABLE 78 STUDENT ASSESSMENT

URBAN/SUBURBAN PRINCIPALS // RURAL/TOWN PRINCIPALS

		IMPEDE	ENHANCE	BOTH	NEITHER	TOTAL
PRINCIPAL U/S	NO.	13	21	7	22	63
	%	20.6	33.3	11.1	34.9	70.8
PRINCIPAL R/T	NO.	4	7	3	12	26
	%	15.4	26.9	11.5	46.2	29.2
TOTAL	NO.	17	28	10	34	89
	%	19.1	31.5	11.2	38.2	100

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE
1.12	3	0.7730

TABLE 79 DISCIPLINE

URBAN/SUBURBAN TEACHERS // RURAL/TOWN TEACHERS

		IMPEDE	ENHANCE	BOTH	NEITHER	TOTAL
TEACHER U/S	NO.	0	60	4	2	66
	%	0	90.9	6.1	3.0	69.5
TEACHER R/T	NO.	1	26	2	0	29
	%	3.4	89.7	6.9	0	30.5
TOTAL	NO.	1	86	6	2	95
	%	1.1	90.5	6.3	2.1	100

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE
3.18	3	0.3646

TABLE 80 TEACHER AUTONOMY

URBAN/SUBURBAN TEACHERS // RURAL/TOWN TEACHERS

		IMPEDE	ENHANCE	BOTH	NEITHER	TOTAL
TEACHER U/S	NO.	6	46	11	3	66
	%	9.1	69.7	16.7	4.5	71.7
TEACHER R/T	NO.	1	21	3	1	26
	%	3.8	80.8	11.5	3.8	28.3
TOTAL	NO.	7	67	14	4	92
	%	7.6	72.8	15.2	4.3	100

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE
1.33	3	0.7216

TABLE 81 CLASS SIZE

URBAN/SUBURBAN TEACHERS // RURAL/TOWN TEACHERS

		IMPEDE	ENHANCE	BOTH	NEITHER	TOTAL
TEACHER U/S	NO.	13	44	7	0	64
	%	20.3	68.8	10.9	0	68.8
TEACHER R/T	NO.	5	21	2	1	29
	%	17.2	72.4	6.9	3.4	31.2
TOTAL	NO.	18	65	9	1	93
	%	19.4	69.9	9.7	1.1	100

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE
2.68	3	0.4438

TABLE 82 TEACHER EVALUATION

URBAN/SUBURBAN TEACHERS // RURAL/TOWN TEACHERS

		IMPEDE	ENHANCE	BOTH	NEITHER	TOTAL
TEACHER U/S	NO.	3	43	7	10	63
	%	4.8	68.3	11.1	15.9	68.5
TEACHER R/T	NO.	0	23	3	3	29
	%	0	79.3	10.3	10.3	31.5
TOTAL	NO.	3	66	10	13	92
	%	3.3	71.7	10.9	14.1	100

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE
2.16	3	0.5400

TABLE 83 STAFF MEETINGS

URBAN/SUBURBAN TEACHERS // RURAL/TOWN TEACHERS

		IMPEDE	ENHANCE	BOTH	NEITHER	TOTAL
TEACHER U/S	NO.	6	24	13	23	66
	%	9.1	36.4	19.7	34.8	70.2
TEACHER R/T	NO.	2	14	6	6	28
	%	7.1	50.0	21.4	21.4	29.8
TOTAL	NO.	8	38	19	29	94
	%	8.5	40.4	20.2	30.9	100

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE
2.17	3	0.5381

TABLE 84 PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

URBAN/SUBURBAN TEACHERS // RURAL/TOWN TEACHERS

		IMPEDE	ENHANCE	BOTH	NEITHER	TOTAL
TEACHER U/S	NO.	0	54	6	6	66
	%	0	81.8	9.1	9.1	70.2
TEACHER R/T	NO.	1	21	1	5	28
	%	3.6	75.0	3.6	17.9	29.8
TOTAL	NO.	1	75	7	11	94
	%	1.1	79.8	7.4	11.7	100

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE
4.57	3	0.2064

TABLE 85 PREPARATION TIME

URBAN/SUBURBAN TEACHERS // RURAL/TOWN TEACHERS

		IMPEDE	ENHANCE	BOTH	NEITHER	TOTAL
TEACHER U/S	NO.	3	54	8	2	67
	%	4.5	80.6	11.9	3.0	69.8
TEACHER R/T	NO.	1	27	1	0	29
	%	3.4	93.1	3.4	0	30.2
TOTAL	NO.	4	81	9	2	96
	%	4.2	84.4	9.4	2.1	100

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE
2.85	3	0.4155

TABLE 86 CURRICULUM INPUT

URBAN/SUBURBAN TEACHERS // RURAL/TOWN TEACHERS

		IMPEDE	ENHANCE	BOTH	NEITHER	TOTAL
TEACHER U/S	NO.	3	52	7	4	66
	%	4.5	78.8	10.6	6.1	69.5
TEACHER R/T	NO.	2	24	2	1	29
	%	6.9	82.8	6.9	3.4	30.5
TOTAL	NO.	5	76	9	5	95
	%	5.3	80.0	9.5	5.3	100

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE
0.81	3	0.8482

TABLE 87 WORKDAY

URBAN/SUBURBAN TEACHERS // RURAL/TOWN TEACHERS

		IMPEDE	ENHANCE	BOTH	NEITHER	TOTAL
TEACHER U/S	NO.	4	38	7	17	66
	%	6.1	57.6	10.6	25.8	71.0
TEACHER R/T	NO.	0	20	4	3	27
	%	0	74.1	14.8	11.1	29.0
TOTAL	NO.	4	58	11	20	93
	%	4.3	62.4	11.8	21.5	100

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE
4.67	3	0.1975

TABLE 88 WORK YEAR

URBAN/SUBURBAN TEACHERS // RURAL/TOWN TEACHERS

		IMPEDE	ENHANCE	BOTH	NEITHER	TOTAL
TEACHER U/S	NO.	2	19	5	39	65
	%	3.1	29.2	7.7	60.0	71.4
TEACHER R/T	NO.	2	7	2	15	26
	%	7.7	26.9	7.7	57.7	28.6
TOTAL	NO.	4	26	7	54	91
	%	4.4	28.6	7.7	59.3	100

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE
0.95	3	0.8130

TABLE 89 STUDENT ASSESSMENT

URBAN/SUBURBAN TEACHERS // RURAL/TOWN TEACHERS

		IMPEDE	ENHANCE	BOTH	NEITHER	TOTAL
TEACHER U/S	NO.	3	28	8	24	63
	%	4.8	44.4	12.7	38.1	70.0
TEACHER R/T	NO.	1	13	1	12	27
	%	3.7	48.1	3.7	44.4	30.0
TOTAL	NO.	4	41	9	36	90
	%	4.4	45.6	10.0	40.0	100

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE
1.82	3	0.6097

TABLE 90 HOME-SCHOOL RELATIONS

URBAN/SUBURBAN TEACHERS // RURAL/TOWN TEACHERS

		IMPEDE	ENHANCE	BOTH	NEITHER	TOTAL
TEACHER U/S	NO.	2	53	3	9	67
	%	3.0	79.1	4.5	13.4	70.5
TEACHER R/T	NO.	1	26	1	0	28
	%	3.6	92.9	3.6	0	29.5
TOTAL	NO.	3	79	4	9	95
	%	3.2	83.2	4.2	9.5	100

CHI-SQUARE	D.F.	SIGNIFICANCE
4.27	3	0.2337

APPENDIX G

APPENDIX G

PRINCIPAL COMMENTS - MEA

CONTRACT PROVISION 1 - DISCIPLINE

MEA - U/S

-principal will need information at once in order to help solve the problem and work with the teacher
-a process for creating correlates 1,2,5,&7
-enhances if a school has an effective discipline plan agreed to by staff and principal; neither if a school does not have a plan it will neither impede nor enhance
-extremely important - a cornerstone of school improvement and common sense

MEA - R/T

-helpful if used infrequently, the teachers must assert his/her control
-does not belong in master contract!
-impedes is a negative statement;enhances if "grossness" and "persistence" are properly defined by teachers

CONTRACT PROVISION 2 - TEACHER AUTONOMY

MEA - U/S

-the leadership of the building has to have the ability to provide instructional leadership; this section could impede dependent on other contract provision or board policy

MEA - R/T

-as an administrator, I am uncomfortable with the phrase "which they consider pertinent"; there appears to be nothing that we could do in the unlikely event of inappropriate resources

CONTRACT PROVISION 3 - CLASS SIZE

MEA - U/S

-I don't think this class size section should impede; we're always going to have some class size limits
-we need to decide what the optimum class size is for a given class; all classes are individual and different from one another; there are assumptions made in this class size language which may or may not be true; depends on the minimum number and the particular class
-class size should not be the burning issue- but make-up of class some situations, 10 students can be too many, and sometimes 32 or more can be dealt with
-depends on directionality - if classes are going down in size then enhances, if up then impedes
-class size alone is not the determining factor for a student's success; it depends on how the teacher views the number (too high or just right!)
-pupil-teacher ratio should be predicated on the basis of the kinds of students, not just numbers
-for some areas 30 is too high
-the class sizes are too high at each grade school level
-I feel the maximum number is too high
-the 35 maximum is too high

MEA - R/T

-however, no direct correlation has been determined between class size and class performance
-if this is the only statement re:class size then impedes; needed is protection for upper and lower level small classes

CONTRACT PROVISION 4 - EVALUATION

MEA - U/S

-every three years would be better if a large school and only one administrator
-teachers look upon all classroom visits by principal as being somehow connected with evaluations
-need evaluation section- frequent monitoring of instructional focus is needed
-enhances only if proper follow-up is made
-clinical supervision more productive
-which of the correlates depends on the particular observations for any given teacher
-formal evaluation may impede school improvement if it is

anything other than a growth/reinforcement conference

MEA- R/T

-provision calling for one observation every year is more to my liking
-most evaluation programs do not contribute towards insturctional improvement
-this statement includes no observations/growth conferences without the threat of formal evaluation; teachers should be given the chance to use latest research without this threat

CONTRACT PROVISION 5 - TRANSFER

MEA - U/S

-enhances based on appropriate qualification
-more to effective teaching than certificate to teach
-depends on individual
-in the past several years I am sure our requirements have been much more rigorous
-requirements need to be further delineated,i.e. early childhood K-1, although the statement does enhance the probability of school improvement it does not insure any of the correlates will occur

MEA - R/T

-there is a greater difference between kindergarten and 6th, than 5th and 8th; experience and qualifications are important for K-2
-needs to be more restrictive - i.e. NCA requirements plus recent classes, seminars, workshops, etc.

CONTRACT PROVISION 6 - STAFF MEETINGS

MEA - U/S

-eight staff meetings would be necessary and more if needed
-limitations on time and number may impede, but obligation to attend meetings enhances
-"all of the above", a limit that is restrictive on teacher meetings is unproductive towards school improvement; if teachers would all volunteer thats fine, but this language would impede
- all correlates could be in jeopardy with such

restrictions on meetings
-there is very limited time to in-service teachers on school improvement; we need more time not less
-time limits and maximum numbers are problems
-if there were only 10 staff meetings a year - nothing would be accomplished, we now average 3/month
-depending on which subject is on agenda; 20 is insufficient - I can't imagine being effective with 10!
-I think the number 10 should be at least 15
-10 staff meetings certainly provide time for the correlates indicated, however, it is questionable if it provides enough time
-should not be limited to ten meetings
-correlate 6 as written, does not allow for extended planning; further, it detracts from any type of collegial relationship
-should be at least 18 meetings
-depends on what is discussed at these meetings!
-teachers are required to meet with their administrator only once a month per agreement; limiting such meetings to 90 minutes contractually is absurd

MEA - R/T

-meetings must be effective

CONTRACT PROVISION 7 - INSERVICE

MEA - U/S

-all of the above, inservice is vital to school improvement
-all of the above could be affected depending upon the topic of the inservice
-enhances providing the conference has something to do with the stated school improvement plan
-needs to be a systematic inservice program with training opportunities for professional growth in skills of effective teaching throughout the year
-depends on what happens at inservice
-again, which correlate depends on subject of inservice
-if the professional conferences deal directly with a building level goal it could be definitely of value; however if it does not the loss of student instruction time impedes school improvement
-could additional inservice days and/or short sessions
-yes, enhances, if the correlates are part of the inservice activity

MEA - R/T

-can affect all of above;specific dates in contract could be restrictive

CONTRACT PROVISION 8 - PREP TIME

MEA - U/S

-if conference time provides opportunity for communication between staff members and between principal and staff; planning time is needed for recording student assessments and altering programs where necessary
-this section provides for a good deal of planning time which should be helpful
-if planning time is used wisely great; depends upon how that time is used
-this sounds good especially to elementary teachers, something found ONLY at secondary levels
-enhances IF the time is spent on one of above correlates; in some cases it is simply "free" time
-providing preparation periods are used for instructionally related purposes!

CONTRACT PROVISION 9 - CURR. DEV.

MEA - U/S

-depends on how the committe is directed, this process could be a plus to school improvement, as it is participative; it also could become a blocking element to school improvement if allowed
- when this is done it works (teacher and administrators); teachers need to have ownership in any program if it is to be successful and effective; not nearly enough real teacher involvement occurs in most school systems
-lets not forget parents and students! each should provide input, and given an opportunity to participate

MEA - R/T

-does not belong in contract!

CONTRACT PROVISION 10 - WORKDAY

MEA - U/S

-time too short
-teachers should have some continuous responsibility for maintaining order in school, not just emergency situations
-need to work through working hours in any contract
-a safe and orderly environment is brought about by clearly defined and observed rules and procedures with staff working together
-depends on how teachers use the available time they now have; there is never enough time for teachers to do everything they need to do unless they budget their time and make the best use of it
-necessary contract language

MEA - R/T

-teachers need more time with students - day is too short to accomplish everything
-impedes - establishes minimums which become standards; enhances as limitations are necessary

CONTRACT PROVISION 11 - WORK YEAR

MEA - U/S

-education is considered a part-time vocation by far too many
-requires 3 extra days, but also could limit same; need a commitment from staff to volunteer
-we need to take a new view of the work year - we really need a longer student learning year; the present "summer off" plan allows too much time for students to retrogress
-not the length or number of days but the "quality" of on task engaged time and direct instruction
-in our present calendar we have two more student days and 3 more teacher days;I would like to see even more
-should be more than 180 days
-necessary contract language
-can use more inservice time
-more planning time is needed
-the length of the school year does not determine school improvement; quality of teaching and commitment is crucial regardless of the total number of days

MEA -R/T

-what kind of quality time is there?
-teachers need more time with students - day is too short to accomplish everything
-does not belong in master contract

CONTRACT PROVISION 12 - AIDES

MEA - U/S

-poor aides could upset child's growth
-most teacher aides come from the school community
-if a district has aides-great
-time is provided

CONTRACT PROVISION 13 - TESTING

MEA - U/S

-lack of clerical help for teachers is understood by this statement
-this limits the monitoring process too much
-teachers need to spend less time in clerical tasks and more time on instruction
-no doubt correlate 6 is looked for, but the two are hardly related
-the last sentence above is prohibitive - teachers need to insert more information sheets in the folder
-should be more responsibility use of test info

MEA -R/T

-whole paragraph need not and shouldn't be in contract
-does not belong in master contract

CONTRACT PROVISION 14 - HOME-SCHOOL

MEA - U/S

-union have to stop backing poor teachers and encouraging the growth of better teachers

MEA - R/T

-can be harmful if "interpreting" is done negatively
-should do without being in contract
-if they would do it - some will but most will not

APPENDIX H

APPENDIX H

PRINCIPAL COMMENTS - MFT

CONTRACT PROVISION 1 - DISCIPLINE

MFT - U/S

-by removing persisitently disruptive students the message is conveyed that the integrity of the learning environment will not be compromised; support of teachers by administration is critically important

CONRACT PROVISION 2 - TEACHER AUTONOMY

MFT - U/S

-grade level would be a factor on controversial issues
-this provides a level of profesionalism that should enhance a teachers perception of their professional role

CONTRACT PROVISION 3 - CLASS SIZE

MFT - U/S

-even less pupils in early grades 25-30; 30 gets too many in some classes
-30+ pupils in a middle school class is ludicrous for a quality learning environment to exist;at this age positive teacher/ pupil relationships are often critical to success

CONTRACT PROVISION 4 - EVALUATION

MFT -U/S

-correlate 2 includes staff mastery of skills also
-administrators need to be trained to be effective evaluators!

CONTRACT PROVISION 5 - TRANSFERS

MFT - U/S

-I question whether preparation to teach on a secondary level enhances or contributes to the development of a "middle school philosophy"

MFT - R/T

-depends on the staff person involved

CONTRACT PROVISION 6 - STAFF MEETINGS

MFT - U/S

-10 meetings is too few; 1 1/2 hours is way too long for all but some special meetings
-staff meetings should not be limited to a number
-staff meetings are essential, the limit is not essential

MFT - R/T

-may be too formal to be effective- meetings should be held as NEEDED, for as long as NEEDED

CONTRACT PROVISION 7 - PROFESSIONAL DEV.

MFT - U/S

-if teachers would REALLY attend; many teachers and administrators did not use day HONESTLY
-quota for inservice should be established; such inservice session should emanate from percieved needs, as long as minimum days of school (180) permit, within established calendar
-contributes to professional growth of staff which should enhance the morale and thus the ambiance in the classroom

MFT - R/T

-definite need for planned inservice; however, definition of time may be limiting

CONTRACT PROVISION 8 - PREP TIME

MFT - U/S

-teachers should teach six hours and prepare at home; pay should reflect added work load; good teachers become administrators because they want to earn more money

CONTRACT PROVISION 9 - CURR. DEV.

MFT - U/S

-administrators should be involved with curriculum; advisory input from staff when requested; in periods of declining enrollments and tight money, the teacher dominated curriculum councils became too self-serving

CONTRACT PROVISION 10 - WORKDAY

MFT - U/S

- this would make the day too short, 6 hrs. 15 min. is ideal; any thing longer diminished productivity
-teachers should be able to teach longer and earn additional money if they so desire

CONTRACT PROVISION 11 - WORKYEAR

MFT - U/S

-180 too short a time, as is 183 for teachers
-its not how long the school year, its how much quality goes during the school day
-state minimum is fixed; other additional days need to be "built in" for "snow days" and curricular inservice
-180 student days, OK; teachers should work 185-190 days
-recognizes time is needed for essential planning and clerical tasks; administration must make sure the time is used effectively

CONTRACT PROVISION 12 - AIDES

MFT - U/S

CONTRACT PROVISION 13 - TESTING

MFT - U/S

-sometimes a teacher needs to put more than just grades and attendance; yes it must be kept to a minimum, but not this minimum
-contract need not deal with such prescription

CONTRACT PROVISION 14 - HOME-SCHOOL

MFT - U/S

- the Federation needs to tell its teachers to do their best; I have never heard that motivation, only their "rights" not their "responsibilities"

APPENDIX I

APPENDIX I

TEACHER COMMENTS - MEA

CONTRACT PROVISION 1 - DISCIPLINE

MEA - U/S

-enhances in respect if the student is a habitual "gross" offender other students have rights to learn; negative could be (coorelate 2) the message sent to student is we know this child isn't going to succeed
- the final decision must be mutually agreed upon, otherwise how can the teacher truly lead in the classroom?

MEA - R/T

-no. 7 (correlate) if offense occurs often
-students who continually interrupt or cause interruptions are impeding opportunities for other students to have effective experiences!
-too many teachers over react to student behavior and send specific students to office continually; this (last) quote needs to be more concrete
-the student is removed but the teacher ends up spending time on documentation and meetings

CONTRACT PROVISION 2 - TEACHER AUTONOMY

MEA - U/S

- I don't think the definition of school improvement is relevant to this but w/o this many teachers cannot teach in a directed teaching method and must do some of their teaching in a different manner
- enhancement depends very much on experience and background of teacher; this area is vital to maintaining teaching as a "profession;" when decisions as to what and how to teach are no longer under a teacher's decision making power, then teaching is no longer a profession;however, school improvement as

defined by ESR may be impeded if what teacher decides to teach does not match instructional leader or the mission of the school
-variety is the spice of life, how boring just to stick to the textbook
-the community needs to be taken into consideration when choosing outside materials
-enhances if follows course objectives/curriculum and is not dwelled on too long

MEA - R/T

-not necessarily appropriate at elementary level
-may enhance if pertinent to subject within the goals and guidelines of the grades within the school

CONTRACT PROVISION 3 - CLASS SIZE

MEA - U/S

-30-35 is too many students for middle school
-if the numbers were lower it would enhance school improvement
-elementary sfchool should never exceed 25 pupils/regular class
-class size too large for each level (A.24-26, B.26-29, C.28-30)
-these highs are too high for elementary school, a high should not exceed 25 if we are to do what is expected
-pupil ratio should be lower than 30 at the elementary level, would rather see - not to exceed 25 pupils/class
-boards have a tendency to go with larger # when given option; 25 at elem. should be max.- too many students impede instruction and monitoring progress successfully
-the lower numbers should be the maximums
-this too many students in an inner city school to do an effective job in school and with parents
-30 is definitely too high!
-in K-3 class size needs to be no more than 20 and at all other levels the number of special needs students should be a consideration
-numbers in B and C are too high when considered as part of a 5-6 class load- especially in relation to correlates 6 & 7
-max's are too high
-our maximums are already lower than this, your statement should have stopped after the first sentence

MEA - R/T

-A & B 30 is too many, so is 25;C some classes, 30 is OK, 35 usually too many
-A- 25 maximum, not 30
-class sizes too large
-these are TOO large

CONTRACT PROVISION 4 - EVALUATION

MEA - U/S

-it is important to note that the person evaluating should know what to look for - personality conflicts are not good evaluations
-it depends on who does the evaluations and if planned or not
-instead of formal "evaluation" I would rather see ongoing supervision;it is less threatening and encourages continual improvement; the strengths of the evualations lie entirely with the competency of the evaluator
-evaluations should be used to help teachers strengthen their skills; teachers in difficulty should receive assistance and plans of assistance not just shuffled to another building
-too infrequent- informal non-evaluative instructional assistance should be a part of effective schools
-I feel that if administrators were thoroughly trained in the area of observation and evaluation and spent more time in a classroom before making an evaluation, we'd get better teachers & get rid of those that don't belong
-teachers who are unable to improve in critical weak areas should be documented and dismissed by the administration or a more appropriate assignment must be found based on strengths; this presumes competent administrators! - what is affected depends upon many things
-teacher evaluation is weak; its is shuffled off to the side because no parent complains if it isn't done; only in the rare case of dismissal does it receive attention; administrators fear and avoid useful supervision and evaluation

MEA - R/T

-clear picture cannot be seen in that length of time; for many teachers, nervousness impedes naturalness; some

principals have closed mind as to good teaching and expects all to fit their narrow definition of good
-nice to be recognized in the teaching profession
-this is dependent upon the principal and the evaluation tool
-I feel that more frequent observation would be better

CONTRACT PROVISION 5 - TRANSFER

MEA - U/S

-this should also apply to new hires; teachers should not be placed in an area for which they don't feel comfortable; certification should not be the only criteria
-how are the "3 years of successful experience" measured and by whom? careful evualation is essential
-need firmer clarification and direction for middle schools

MEA - R/T

-approriate material would be presented
-I believe elementary certification should also include a teachable major as defined by secondary certificates

CONTRACT PROVISION 6 - STAFF MEETINGS

MEA - U/S

-meetings should be held only when pertinent matters need to be discussed
-one must see the principal sometimes in this role
-a staff needs an opportunity to get together to work out planning, keep abreast of district's policies, and abe to air concerns
-depending on how the principal conducts the meetings
-meetings should be as pertinent and useful as any other aspect of the school day; if the administrator can take care of it in a memo- he/she should, that way when there is a staff meeting, there is a real reason, this in now the exception not the rule
-many times faculty meetings do not focus on the school's educational "mission"; they are merely perfunctory information-disseminating sessions; in that respect they are often frustrating to faculty members who would like to address real educational issues
-limit on frequency may impede; limit on length enhances -

no one is much good 1 1/2 hours after a full day of teaching!
-one hour max! causes morale problems

MEA - R/T

-some principals like to hear themselves talk so they have meetings when there is nothing to say, or they need the meetings to feel important
-1 1/2 hours for meetings is ridiculous!
-meeting time should be used effectively- not just for the sake of meeting, no more than one per month
-meetings should be pertinent
-I would need a definition of "staff meetings", what about curriculum meetings, dept. meetings, IEPC's,MET's, etc.; teachers of some students or classes have meetings 2 or 3 times a week after school and not just special ed teachers
-meetings are important, but too many are needless and poorly run staff morale is negatively impacted

CONTRACT PROVISION 7 - PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

MEA - U/S

-to learn ways of teaching
-district wide inservices tend to turn teachers off; however if well planned they give teachers opportunities to update & rejunvenate skills; the encouragement of conferences is even more beneficial; the motivation is present because teachers want to go; the likelihood of carryover to classrooms is higher than at a staff wide inservice
-we all need to be aware of the new directions in education however, many inservice presentations are random, not connected to what we all WANT OR NEED to happen for ourselves and children; inservice should not be a punishment but a reward for caring; there does need to be some limitation on the frequency of "professional conferences" too many times, they are merely an excuse not to teach or to further one's own political or educational status
-ideally, they should enhance school improvement, it is essential that the teachers have a direct and dominant voice in selecting inservice programs!

MEA - R/T

-inservice can be so important if it is relevant to those in attendance,I've been to some that are a complete waste of time, teacher input is important
-and just where is the average school district going to get the money to pay for all these conferences?!
-time should be used effectively!!
-should be required, more inservice and teacher input
-if the conference is meaningful and practical - easily related to classroom!
-like a field trip for kids, if there isn't a value for instruction, an educational reason, why have it?
-I don't think inservices and conferences should be in the same paragraph

CONTRACT PROVISION 8 - PREP TIME

MEA - U/S

-elementary teachers need longer blocks of time than 30 minutes
-elementary teachers need more planning time for their students; the elementary classrooms are self-contained, all subjects taught
-elementary teachers need planning time daily - some teachers have two 30 minute planning times on the same day and none on others
-I do not believe middle and high school teachers should have more time than elementary teachers, we have much more preparation and many more items to correct.
-30 minutes a day isn't enough time for elementary planning time because we have found we aren't getting a full 30 minutes and on some days there is not time scheduled, depending on a teacher's planned specials
-our board does not recognize the neeed for more planning time at the elementary level
-has an indirect effect on all teaching, adequate preparation is a must
-we currently have 290 minutes/week
-why does secondary need more time than elementary, I teach to individuals, I teach 8 subjects, they teach a group!! one subject
-these minimums are needed to support adequate planning, preparation, and evaluation, in reality much more time is needed

MEA - R/T

-I love your "minimum" of 200 minutes for elementary; I'd like to see a school that actually has that!
-200 minutes is inadequate for effective planning at elementary level; 60 minutes per day
-would allow for proper time to plan effective teaching segments

CONTRACT PROVISION 9 - CURR. DEVELOPMENT

MEA - U/S

-teachers put in many hours only to feel that their recommendations are not followed with due consideration
-much this depends on relationships between administration & teachers, unions can have an adverse affect in this if animosity is high;however,curr. dev. does not need to be a joint effort to develop ownership and staff commitment
-administrators do not teach nor have they necessarily taught in the past; teachers are in a better position to determine curriculum;reading educational journals does not guarantee competence
-I often think development of curriculum would be most appropriate if teachers only were involved
-this can be positive but committee and understanding of leadership is necessary; a series of meaningless meetings wastes time and fosters negative reactions!

MEA - R/T

-committees must be voluntary,mandatory attendance achieves very little
-often teachers are not as "up" on curriculum as administrators
-curriculum review needs to be on-going forever...

CONTRACT PROVISION 10 - WORKDAY

MEA - U/S

-maintaining order in the schools is up to all personnel
-teachers should not have bus duty and door duty, we need relief from these tasks and allowed to spend this time in our classrooms

-depending on scheduling, # of "pull-out" classes in elementary the time may or may not be adequate; optimum use of time should be developed; more is not necessarily better

MEA - R/T

-safety/liability questions arise regarding language (not included) re:duty hours
-sometimes too long; most times, just fine
-it is too bad professionalism has to be spelled out; fortunately most are able to do all of the above w/o it being spelled out

CONTRACT PROVISION 11 - WORK YEAR

MEA - U/S

-five snow days should be allowed to every school district in the state of Michigan w/o the penalty of making the five days up
-we should not be expected to make up snow days unless they exceed one week of the school year
-what about pre and post school year days? days for semester grades? what do these come out of? if we have 2 days of inservice that leaves 1 day for the rest
-increased time is not desirable to parents (determined by survey); less time does not seem desirable; change within an accepted framework is effected more easily

MEA - R/T

-our school district is broke, trying to find solutions - a 4 day work week was suggested, 180 days prohibits that; the community is unwilling to vote millage to support the school
-people, students and teachers, "burnout"
-how did "180 days" become "sacred"? who said learning takes that long or ends there?
-teachers are only required by law to be in school 180 days; some will do more, some wouldn't do more with 190 days
-I believe teachers should have more work days- first and last day, and at report card time, I know all the arguments about grades but so much can be accomplished otherwise when students aren't in attendance; I would like to see a national trend toward 200 student days and a comparable pay increase for teachers

-the 3 "extra" days have to be meaningful days - good inservice, record keeping...

CONTRACT PROVISION 12 - AIDES

MEA - U/S

-teacher aides can be a useful tool - if there is a clear understanding as to the job they are expected to do
-having a teacher aide would enhance a teacher's room
-the quality of the aide affects whether improvement is enhanced or impeded;some aides are more work than none at all and takes time away from learning
-teacher aide must be knowledgeable in subject

MEA - R/T

-who has aides besides special ed people?

CONTRACT PROVISION 13 - TESTING

MEA - U/S

-not much time if one has to hand score these
-I think 2 standarized tests are too many;I think the fact that they are machined scored does save some teacher time
-the tests are not suppose to measure whether a teacher can can fill in bubbles; if someone is interested in standardized scores, let them do it; I have my own monitoring devices which I gladly score
-teacher should not score the test but should know the results; teacher could record the results in the CA60
-teacher time should be reserved for non-clerical tasks
-let the professional make the test; standardized tests ruin good teaching

MEA -R/T

-marking CA60's takes precious time away from proper planning
-we still hand score Gates-MacGinitie reading tests
-while student progress needs to be monitored, a secretary can handle the paper work, also 2 test are not enough

CONTRACT PROVISION 14 - HOME-SCHOOL

MEA - U/S

-this sounds wonderful, but it is definitedly cryptic, its like telling a child to "be good" it needs definition
-if it happens, good; otherwise it's throwaway language
-not enforceable, are you going to fire a teacher because she tells a parent that the Latin course is bad

APPENDIX J

APPENDIX J

TEACHER COMMENTS - MFT

CONTRACT PROVISION 1 - DISCIPLINE

MFT - U/S

CONTRACT PROVISION 2 - TEACHER AUTONOMY

MFT - U/S

-education is more an art than a science, not everything can always be exactly focused; good faith and good intentions are valuable
-I have come across teachers I would not want discussing certain issues with my children because of bigotry and bias
-have some doubts on correlate 2, some teachers may not use good judgement
-do not agree that all teachers are able to this

CONTRACT PROVISION 3 - CLASS SIZE

MFT - U/S

-the single most important ingredient to effective instruction, too many so called "educational" problems are so called financial problems!
-the above ratio is too high
-elementary school should not exceed 24 in a class, especially in lower elementary
-class size in middle school is too large; smaller class size in lower elementary
-sizes should be smaller with multi levels of English proficiency
-the numbers do not show a realization that low pupil-teacher ratio is important; at least a number is given
-middle and senior high school classes of 35 is too large

MFT - R/T

- the concept of limiting class sizes enhances as indicate; the limits given, however, could be said to impede because of their overly large size

CONTRACT PROVISION 4 -EVALUATION

MFT - U/S

-teacher evaluation should be performed by teachers; as currently constructed most "administrators" are afraid, unprepared, too lazy, hide from responsibility, hide behind union contract
-I don't believe this evaluation is valid; I think the results a teacher produces are the best evaluation, peer evaluation
-depends on ability and objectivity of administrator,could be very bad with wrong administrator such as one who feels a quiet room is the most important criteria of a good teacher
-this could be effective or very detrimental depending upon the evaluator
-clearly defined and fair on its face
-it surely depends on the abilty of the evaluator and his/her instrument of evaluation
-lot of variables would affect my answer here; peer evaluation and support would be most helpful- then I would check b (enhances)

MFT - R/T

- correlates 1 and 5 could be seen to enhance if that were an area of weakness

CONTRACT PROVISION 5 - TRANSFER

MFT - U/S

MFT - R/T

-am uncomfortable with word "only," concept is extremely beneficial
-one should be well versed in his/her subject field
-I've seen many teachers who are very good teachers at various levels; I think having been involved in the educational process at various levels has made me a

much better teacher

CONTRACT PROVISION 6 - STAFF MEETINGS

MFT - U/S

-1 1/2 hours is too long; 1/2 hour usually enough to cover the subject
- 1/2 hour is long enough; meetings should be called when needed, not for the sake of having a meeting
-depends on leader of meetings or need or purpose of meetings!
-I feel none of the correlates apply; the success of the meetings depends upon their purpose or relevance
-too few since all of the above areas need to be addressed; primary use for staff inservice and discussion
-dependent upon the administrator and effectiveness of staff meetings
-the wording is not conducive to creating a positive attitude toward productive meetings; it does clearly identify expectations; this item potentially affects all correlates and staff communications are essential to school improvement
-meetings should be held only as necessary
-staff meetings vary so much from one building to the next that one shouldn't generalize about length of time needed and frequency of meetings; need not be a contract item, except perhaps the last sentence
-ten staff meetings would be excessive

MFT - R/T

-could also affect remaining if problems were in evidence dealing with that particular issue and a staff meeting is deemed as a remedy
- some principals migh abuse this part of the contract; I've seen a principal excuse one teacher but require another teacher to attend such meetings; most teachers felt his decision was based on personality and not on the teachers reasons for not attending; these meetings have caused a lot of hard feelings in my district

CONTRACT PROVISION 7 - PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

MFT - U/S

-date agreed upon by staff

-some conferences are very beneficial; inservice days should be only for immediate problem solving and not as vacation days away from children

CONTRACT PROVISION 8 - PREP TIME

MFT - U/S

-really creates problems when we have activities during the school day which involves the entire school; teachers need planning time, provisions needed for previous statement

MFT - R/T

-correlate 3 indirectly as it allows time to meet with principal

CONTRACT PROVISION 9 - CURR. DEVELOPMENT

MFT - U/S

-the recommmendations ought to be implemented - too often they get tied up in administrative log jams!
-in this system the teacher's ideas are ignored so there is no point in their being on any committee

MFT - R/T

-our curriculum development committee has done very little

CONTRACT PROVISION 10 - WORKDAY

MFT - U/S

-duty-free lunch
-teaching is a profession and not an hourly job where minutes are dictated by contract; spend as much time as you need to to do the job well

CONTRACT PROVISION 11 - WORK YEAR

MFT - U/S

-quality not length of time
-when the state set the minimum the teachers negogiated to that level; we lost days
-a school year has to be determined

CONTRACT PROVISION 12 - AIDES

MFT - U/S

MFT - R/T

CONTRACT PROVISION 13 - TESTING

MFT - U/S

-bogged down with paper work
-too confining!
-I believe this discourages the intended purpose of testing
  -that the teacher should have direct knowledge of specific objectives not being met by students; this seems to separate the testing program from teacher responsibility
-why bother with such minute details; do the job the best way possible

MFT - R/T

CONTRACT PROVISION 14 - HOME-SCHOOL RELATIONS

MFT - U/S

-frequently found in teacher contracts, I don't hink it really means a great deal!, "window dressing"
-professional responsibility of all of us
-know what you are trying to do and do it