

69-20,921

ROCKHOLD, Jon E., 1938-
A STUDY OF THE INFLUENCE OF THE
MICHIGAN EDUCATION ASSOCIATION AND
SUPERINTENDENTS' ATTITUDE TOWARD
PROFESSIONAL NEGOTIATION AGREEMENT
PROVISIONS IN SELECTED MICHIGAN
SCHOOL DISTRICTS.

University Microfilms, Inc., Ann Arbor, Michigan

69-20,921

ROCKHOLD, Jon E., 1938-

Michigan State University, Ed.D., 1969
Education, administration

University Microfilms, Inc., Ann Arbor, Michigan

A STUDY OF THE INFLUENCE OF THE MICHIGAN EDUCATION ASSOCIATION
AND SUPERINTENDENTS' ATTITUDE TOWARD PROFESSIONAL NEGOTIATION
AGREEMENT PROVISIONS IN SEIected MICHIGAN SCHOOL DISTRICTS

By

Jon E. Rockhold

A THESIS

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

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

Department of Administration and Higher Education

1969

A STUDY OF THE INFLUENCE OF THE MICHIGAN EDUCATION ASSOCIATION
AND SUPERINTENDENTS' ATTITUDE TOWARD PROFESSIONAL NEGOTIATION
AGREEMENT PROVISIONS IN SELECTED MICHIGAN SCHOOL DISTRICTS

By

Jon E. Rockhold

AN ABSTRACT OF A THESIS

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

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

Department of Administration and Higher Education

1969

ABSTRACT

A STUDY OF THE INFLUENCE OF THE MICHIGAN EDUCATION ASSOCIATION AND SUPERINTENDENTS' ATTITUDE TOWARD PROFESSIONAL NEGOTIATION AGREEMENT PROVISIONS IN SELECTED MICHIGAN SCHOOL DISTRICTS

By

Jon E. Rockhold

THE PROBLEM

The problem of the study was twofold: (1) to determine the influence of the Michigan Education Association concerning what was sought for local education association master agreements, and (2) to determine how reasonable local superintendents considered these requests or demands. An additional part of the problem was to attempt to determine anticipated areas of conflict in professional negotiations between local education associations and superintendents.

THE HYPOTHESES

Five null hypotheses were developed and treated in the analysis of data. The intent of the hypotheses was to determine the following:

1. Were local education associations influenced by the Michigan Education Association concerning what was sought for the master agreement?
2. Did local education association leaders and superintendents differ in their perceptions of the reasonableness of negotiation provisions?
3. Did local education association leaders and superintendents differ in their perceptions of MEA influence in professional negotiations?
4. Were there some provisions which local education associations

planned to include in future negotiations?

5. Were there some provisions which would probably never be submitted to negotiations?

When possible, t scores were computed and the null hypotheses were rejected at the .05 level of significance. A different measure was established for those hypotheses which did not lend themselves to statistical analysis.

THE PROCEDURES

The investigator secured a copy of the Michigan Education Association Sample Professional Agreement, which contained the state association's professional negotiation provision recommendations. Two questionnaires were developed, one for superintendents and the other for local education association leaders. Upon selecting a random sample of MEA affiliated local education associations, questionnaires were sent to the school district superintendent and local education association president. Reminder questionnaires were sent to those who did not return the initial one. Completed questionnaires were returned from more than three-fourths of the districts included in the sample.

THE FINDINGS

The analysis of data led to definite conclusions for the hypotheses and other relevant material gathered in the study. These conclusions follow:

1. The Michigan Education Association did exert considerable influence on the scope of local master agreement demands.
2. Superintendents tended to underestimate the influence of the Michigan Education Association, as related to which negotiation demands were made to the board of education.
3. Superintendents tended to perceive that most professional

negotiation items were unreasonable.

4. Local education association leaders appeared to feel that nearly all provisions were clearly negotiable; however, some demands were not made to boards of education because of minimal student enrollment and/or geographic location.
5. No one category of the questionnaire received inordinate amount of consideration; rather, local education associations requested provisions from each section of the instrument.
6. Elementary teachers appeared to receive the least consideration in terms of teaching hours and pupil contact.
7. There was little unanimity in the amounts of salary, insurance benefits, sabbatical leave, and longevity pay demands.
8. Local education association leaders and superintendents did not agree on what provisions were allowed by the board of education prior to the inception of professional negotiations.

Recommendations for further research were included in the final chapter of the study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. Introduction to the study	1
Introduction	1
Statement of the problem	1
Definitions of terms	4
Limitations of the study	5
Significance of the study	6
Procedures of the study	6
Organization of the study	7
II. Review of the literature	8
Introduction	8
Professional negotiation in the public sector	8
Underlying causes for professional negotiation	13
Role of the superintendent	21
The associations and professional agreements	25
Summary	36
III. Design of the study	37
Introduction	37
Design of the instruments	37
Analysis of the instruments	40
Selection of the sample	44
The hypotheses	46
Treatment of the data	47
The bases for accepting or rejecting the null hypothesis	48
Summary	

IV. Presentation of the data	50
Introduction	50
Analysis of the null hypotheses	50
Analysis of the additional data	72
Summary	86
V. Findings, conclusions, and recommendations	87
Introduction	87
The problem	87
The Procedures utilized in the study	89
Findings from the null hypotheses	90
Additional findings	94
Conclusions	96
Recommendations for further research	100
Bibliography	103
Appendices	109

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
3.1	Divisions of the questionnaire	40
3.2	Student population of school districts used in the study	46
4.1	An analysis of the influence of the Michigan Education Association on professional negotiation provisions, showing influence as related by local education association leaders	51
4.2	An analysis of the difference in perception of the degree of influence exerted by the Michigan Education Association by local education association leaders and superintendents, as related to professional negotiation provisions	56
4.3	An analysis of the difference in perception of the reasonableness of professional negotiation provisions as related by superintendents, where the local education association mean and standard deviation were assumed at 2.0 and 0.0, respectively	61
4.4	An analysis of those professional negotiation provisions which local education associations stated would be included in future initial submission agreements	65
4.5	An analysis of those professional negotiation provisions which local education associations stated would be excluded from future initial submission agreements	70
4.6	An analysis of local education association leaders' and superintendents' responses concerning those provisions which were allowed by the boards of education before the passage of Public Act 379	73
4.7	An analysis of local education association leaders' responses concerning those provisions which have been incorporated into professional agreements since the passage of Public Act 379	76
4.8	Additional provisions not listed on the questionnaire, but added by the respondents	78
4.9	Mean salary requests and ranges of requests submitted by the respondents	79
4.10	Mean and range of the amount of annual salary increments at the bachelor's, master's, and master plus thirty hours level	80
4.11	Mean and range of the number of annual salary increments at the bachelor's, masters, and master plus thirty hours level	80

TABLE	PAGE
4.12 Mean and range of the number of weekly unassigned periods at the elementary, junior high, and senior high schools	81
4.13 Mean and range of the number of weekly pupil-teacher contact hours at the elementary, junior high, and senior high schools	81
4.14 Mean and range of the number of weekly teaching periods at the elementary, junior high, and senior high schools	82
4.15 Mean amounts of dollars and number of years of longevity payments to teachers following a prescribed number of years of service in the school district	84
4.16 Mean percentage of salary and number of years of longevity payments to teachers following a prescribed number of years of service in the school district	84

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The production of this thesis would have been a near impossibility except for the counsel and encouragement of many people. The author wishes to acknowledge the assistance of Dr. David C. Smith, the thesis director and major advisor, for knowing the exact time to say yes or no as the circumstances dictated. Dr. Clyde M. Campbell, director of the Mott Internship, gave constant encouragement throughout the entire doctoral program as did Dr. Ernest O. Melby and countless others. A special recognition should be given to my fellow Mott Interns from Michigan State University who shattered and refined my thinking throughout our year together.

My wife, Basilda, must be singled out because of her constant encouragement throughout the entire graduate program. Her understanding has been the key to the completion of the degree. My sons, Brian and Eric, have learned to be almost without a father and have made "dissertation" a household word. No doctoral student could ask for more.

Jon E. Rockhold
October, 1968

CHAPTER 1

THE INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

Professional negotiations are now a significant factor in Michigan public schools. Signed agreements between local boards of education and local education associations have brought a great deal of controversy about requests made to boards of education and how the request evolved. Some have cited the Michigan Education Association as being the chief instigator in determining the requests which were presented to the board of education while others conceived that the requests grew primarily from within local education association. Nearly all school districts in Michigan, however, have adopted professional negotiation agreements.

Professional negotiations and professional agreements are both destined to be a phenomenon which may well spread rapidly throughout the nation. Some states may find that professional negotiations took place locally, but other agreements may have been coordinated from a state education association. Other states may find that either the local association or the state association exerted greater influence concerning the provisions for negotiations. In any event, it seems that state educational associations will have some part in the determination of the content of professional negotiations agreements throughout the nation.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Essentially, the problem was to determine to what extent the Michigan Education Association (MEA), through its Sample Professional Agreement, has influenced local education associations in determining the requests or demands made to boards of education. There seemed to

be a feeling that the Michigan Education Association had considerable influence; nevertheless, there was no quantitative evidence to support the contention. Because the Michigan Education Association issued a proposed sample agreement to all local education association affiliates, it was assumed that there would be a close relationship because of the following:

In order to provide equal and good educational opportunities for all the children of Michigan, this document is provided with the intent of establishing terms and conditions of professional employment that are as nearly uniform as possible for teachers throughout the state. There is little justification for teachers in small communities working under standards less favorable than those recognized as fair which prevail in larger communities.

For this reason, local associations are urged to follow as closely as they can the Recommended Education Association Agreements for 1968-69. While there will necessarily be some variation among school districts because of local conditions, this Sample Agreement should be regarded as a statement of minimum professional goals for negotiations during the school year.¹

An additional part of the problem of the study was to determine superintendents' attitudes concerning the following: (1) what did superintendents perceive to be the influence of the Michigan Education Association concerning what was requested for the professional negotiation agreement, and (2) how reasonable the superintendents considered the requests or demands.

The study attempted to determine what provisions were being sought by the local education association for the next professional agreement; to isolate areas of agreement and conflict; and to measure perceptions of the respondents' concerning the reasonableness of the provisions.

¹Michigan Education Association, MEA Sample Professional Agreement (East Lansing: Michigan Education Association, 1967), no page.

The provisions of the MEA Sample Professional Agreement were considered and provisions contained within it determined the criteria for the type and nature of requests made to local boards of education. The study attempted (1) to determine the degree to which the local education association presidents perceived the extent to which the Michigan Education Association coordinated and/or directed the content and nature of requests made to local boards of education by local education associations, and (2) to determine the degree to which superintendents perceived the extent to which the Michigan Education Association coordinated and/or directed the content and nature of requests made to local boards of education by local education associations. Superintendents also reacted to the reasonableness of the various provisions. This study attempted to respond to the following questions:

1. How closely did local education associations follow the prototype agreement published by the Michigan Education Association? What group, the state or the local education association, was instrumental in determining the requests made to the boards of education?
2. What were the potential areas of conflict common to many school districts?
3. What provisions were likely to be sought for the future professional agreements?
4. What were the major areas of potential agreement and conflict between the local education association and local administrators in regard to the reasonableness of the individual requests or demands?

DEFINITIONS OF TERMS

Several terms relevant to the investigation were used throughout the text of the study. Their definitions follow:

National Education Association (NEA): The National Education Association is the national organization composed of teachers, administrators, and educators in various phases of the profession. Each state has an affiliated organization which works closely with the national organization.

Michigan Education Association (MEA): The Michigan Education Association is the state association affiliated with the National Education Association and composed primarily of teachers and charged by its members to work for the betterment of education and teacher welfare.

Local Education Association: "A type of voluntary organization of teachers in a local district . . . primarily concerned with the improvement of the teachers' economic welfare, but also devoted to improving teaching efficiency, promoting of educational reforms, and conducting programs of social activities."² The Local Education Association is usually affiliated with a State Education Association.

Superintendent: "The chief executive and advisory officer charged with the direction of schools in a local school administrative unit, as in a district, city, town, township . . ."³

Board of Education: "A corporate body legally constituted and authorized, usually chosen by popular election from a district at large,

²Carter V. Good, Dictionary of Education (New York; McGraw-Hill Company, 1959), p. 551.

³Ibid., p. 538

to direct the programs of education within the specified territorial limits of the school districts."⁴

Professional Negotiation: "A set of procedures to provide an orderly method for teachers and school boards through professional channels to negotiate on matters of mutual concern, to reach mutually satisfactory agreement on these matters, and to establish educational channels for mediation and appeal in the event of impasse."⁵

Professional Negotiation Agreement: "The finally agreed-upon document, which contains the terms of the negotiated contract and which binds the parties to certain actions for a specified period of time."⁶ In Michigan, it is generally referred to as the Master Agreement.

Sample Professional Agreement: The document prepared, duplicated and distributed to the local education associations by the Michigan Education Association which explained the type and nature of requests to be made to the local boards of education.

Initial Submission Requests: The listing of items and/or provisions which the local education association delivers to the board of education stating what provisions they seek to negotiate. This was also referred to as the Initial Negotiation Package.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The study was restricted to those Michigan school districts in

⁴Ibid. p. 62.

⁵Office of Professional Development and Welfare, Guidelines for Professional Negotiations (Washington: National Education Association 1963), p. 6.

⁶George B. Redfern and Forrest E. Conner, The School Administrator and Negotiation (Washington: American Association of School Administrators, 1968), p. 77.

which the local education association was affiliated with the Michigan Education Association. It was further delimited to a representative sample of those school districts which were negotiating professional agreements.

No attempt was made to study school districts where professional agreements were negotiated with representatives of another national organization or by an independent organization.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

The study had several bases for significance. First, the local education associations showed its reaction to the provisions of the Sample Professional Agreement, which was distributed by the Michigan Education Association. Second, the data derived suggested the degree to which the Michigan Education Association actually influenced the professional negotiations movement throughout the State of Michigan. Third, the superintendents' responses indicated their perception of the influence of the Michigan Education Association. Fourth, by evaluating superintendents' responses as to the reasonableness of the responses, conflict areas--and to a limited degree, the intensity of conflict--could be investigated. Fifth, the study provided an instrument that might be used in similar studies.

PROCEDURES OF THE STUDY

A random sample from the entire population of Michigan school districts was established for this study. A questionnaire was sent to the president of the local education association and a similar, but not identical, questionnaire was sent to the superintendent of the school district (See Appendices B and D). Names and local education

association data were supplied by the Michigan Education Association while corresponding names of superintendents were taken from a publication of the Michigan State Department of Education. In the event that the questionnaires were not returned, another questionnaire was sent together with a reminder letter.

Completed questionnaires from both parties of a single school district were evaluated to provide a comparative analysis.

ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY

The organization of the study was as follows:

Chapter 1 served as an introduction to the study, explaining the problem and purposes of the study and defining the terms which were relevant to the study.

Chapter 11 presented a review of the literature of professional negotiations as it dealt with the role of the National Education Association and the Michigan Education Association, combined with the writing and research of others which dealt specifically with professional negotiations and the content of negotiation agreements.

Chapter 111 described the development of the two instruments used in the study, the selection of the sample, and the techniques to be employed in the analysis of the data derived from the survey. The hypotheses were also stated.

Chapter 1V contains the presentation and analysis of the data derived from the survey, illustrating the significance of the data by the use of textual material and tables.

Chapter V provides the presentation of the findings, conclusions, and recommendations drawn from the analysis of data. Recommendations for further research were also included.

CHAPTER 11
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE
INTRODUCTION

As urbanization has increased and American society has grown more varied and complex, collective action has become a marked characteristic of our time. Ours has become more and more a society of groups with vested interests. Government is in large measure a product of pressure groups. This is not as bad as it may sound. There are checks and balances in the operation of these groups which tend to keep any group from holding inordinate influence. When one group becomes too powerful, has too great influence upon legislation, or engages in overt acts of monopoly or selfishness, society as a whole tends to control it by counter legislation or collective action against it. Such a system does not work perfectly or invariably to correct abuse. In general, however, it does work.

Such is the case in education. Confrontations between teachers and administrators have occurred with great frequency as teachers demand to be heard through the process of professional negotiation. The scope of this chapter includes reasons for the rise of teacher militancy and the official roles of the National Education Association. The chapter also includes an analysis of provisions which are usually incorporated into professional negotiation agreements and statements concerning the role and position of the superintendent as he relates to professional negotiations.

PROFESSIONAL NEGOTIATIONS IN THE PUBLIC DECTOR

As teachers, administrators, and boards of education have reacted

to the new phenomena of professional negotiations in education, each group has been placed in a divisive stance. This has caused a great deal of concern from several quarters as to its reasonableness.

Discussing the apparent schism between teachers and administrators and/or their respective groups, John Gardner, former Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, issued the following cautionary note:

The cure is not to work against the fragmentation of leadership, which is a vital element in our pluralism, but to create better channels of communication among significant leadership groups, especially in connection with the great issues which transcend any particular group.¹

In like manner, Schmidt, Parker, and Repas stated that organizational collective action was one means whereby better channels of communication could be established. Citing those who felt that negotiations could develop great conflict in some school settings, they countered with the statement that the collective negotiations process was a satisfactory and successful device for the resolution of potential or actual employer-employee conflict in education.² Through this means mutual aims and attitudes were introduced early and steps to eliminate them were enacted more rapidly than through any other means. Wildman and Perry, on the other hand, established that the mere element of introducing collective negotiations into the schools invited a conflict situation. Once negotiations were enacted, both parties had a vested

¹Francis Keppel, The Necessary Revolution in American Education (New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1966), p. 162.

²Charles T. Schmidt, Hyman Parker, and Bob Repas; A Guide to Collective Negotiations in Education (East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1967), p. 8.

right to protect.³ These varied positions continued, however, and both groups indicated that the present movement toward collective action by teachers will continue at a rapid pace.

Schmidt, Parker, and Repas noted that education differed from other public sector collective bargaining as it provided for additional goals such as the enhancement of teaching as a profession, and the advancement of the individual teacher and quality education. They categorized the goals of employer-employee organizations in collective negotiations as follows:

"(1) to survive as an organization and to grow, (2) to improve their members' wages, hours, and conditions of work, (3) to control jobs for the membership of the organization, . . . and (4) to formulate and jointly administer with the management group a system for the adjudication of grievances and the resolution of disputes arising during the term of the collective agreement."⁴

Further analyzing collective negotiations in the public sector, Jensen offered six postulates contributing to greater general understanding of the process:

Postulate 1. A genuine interdependence exists between the two parties . . . It also is a reflection of ideological compatibility. Bargaining takes place within . . . the system and both parties are committed to the support of the system.

Postulate 2. The parties, however, also have diverse or conflicting interests . . . One should not expect a leader to ignore his role as an advocate, and he should not be urged to be a statesman nor to be concerned primarily with the public interest.

Postulate 3. (An employee group) is not a monolithic organization. At least three groups in it may be recognized: the hierarchy or paid staff, the dedicated or core group, and the rank and file. Each of these groups has separate needs. Other internal differences may be division between seniors and juniors,

³ Wesley A. Wildman and Charles R. Perry, "Group Conflict and School Organization," Phi Delta Kappan, XLVII (January, 1966), pp. 244-51.

⁴ Schmidt, Parker, and Repas, Collective Negotiations, pp. 4-5.

or between (specialized) and (unspecialized). Each of these factors may have to be accommodated. Management, too, in addition to having interests which in part are diverse from those of the (employee organization), is characterized by sub-groups, each of which has separate interests and needs.

Postulate 4. The parties to collective bargaining are not completely informed of the precise nature of the position of the other Even when each of the chief negotiators understands the requirements of settlement, the internal bargaining in either the (employer) or the (employee) group may be critical. What may appear to be ritual is a necessary allowance of time to work out serious internal differences.

Postulate 5. Both parties operate within certain internal and external restraints Bylaws and policies, as well as the internal politics of the organization, sets limits for bargainers. The parties (also) must operate within the restrictions and limits imposed by society, whether in the form of laws, customs, economics, politics, or morals.

Postulate 6. It must be assumed that the parties, over time, find some balance of power⁵Power to paralyze is alien to the collective bargaining process.

Wirtz apparently concurred with the above in declaring that a pragmatic doctrine of public employment must evolve. He set forth four elements which were necessary to promulgate its implementation: (1) it must be assumed that bi-lateral relations are ". . . inevitable, proper, and desirable in public employment in this country". (2) the system which evolves must be jointly determined and representative of all those affected by it, (3) serious consideration will necessarily be given to the right of public employees to strike, and (4) employees should provide ". . . maximum practicable participation . . ." In developing and administering their employment relationships. Wirtz established that bi-lateral decision making was mandated in the public sector. However, no mention was made to the degree of codetermination of the inherent

⁵ Vernon Jensen, "The Process of Collective Bargaining the Question of its Obsolescence," Industrial and Labor Relations Review, XVI (July, 1963), pp. 549-50.

purposes governing such determinations.

Issuing a cautionary note about the rise of professional negotiations in education and the public sector, Taylor emphasized that teachers and boards of education must consider what is financially and educationally possible in providing solutions to educational and teacher problems. The public sector is quite different from the private sector in that operating funds must be extracted from political bodies. Generally the school, not being a profit agency can not make decisions to acquire additional monies without prior public approval. Teachers must be cognizant of this in light of the fact that teacher salaries are but one of the many priorities which a board of education must face.⁷

Brown concluded that teachers' and society's goals are sometimes in conflict. He illustrated that teachers desire (1) to earn an adequate and appropriate living and (2) to work in conditions which permit one's abilities and energies to be productive. Society, on the other hand, has as its goal that learning demands in our time are of unprecedented complexity. Teaching skills of a high order are now demanded--and extensively obtained. Having a large cadre of teachers with high instructional abilities, society has not needed to compensate teachers by offering high salaries or enticing working conditions. Brown suggested that greater stress has been given to working conditions

⁶W. Willard Wirtz, "Public Employment and Public Policy," in Readings on Collective Negotiations in Public Education, eds. by Stanley Elam, Myron Lieberman, and Michael H. Koskow (Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1967), p. 8.

⁷George W. Taylor, "The Public Interest in Collective Negotiations in Education," Phi Delta Kappan, XIV111 (September, 1966), pp. 16-22.

and materials then to salaries.⁸

Working conditions and materials appeared to be only part of the problem. Seeming to agree with most referrents, West presented three trends which have brought professional negotiations about into the increasing forefront. They are as follows:

- . The feeling by teachers that they are a part of the educational team, fully able to assume decision-making responsibilities for the scope of a sound school program and to improve policies as they relate to them.
- . The pressures erupting from population growth, social changes, and competition for the tax dollar has made teachers communicate with administrators and boards of education to satisfy the needs, as they are apparent to them.
- . Teachers feel that public service is unique and requires unique methods of negotiation, which are not compatible with those used in the private sector.⁹

UNDERLYING CAUSES FOR PROFESSIONAL NEGOTIATIONS

Professional negotiations in the public sector now seem to be a part of the modus operandi. Teachers and other public employees demand to be included in organizational decision-making concerning the amount of their salaries and the policies which govern their working conditions. Societal changes and organizational philosophy have altered to such a degree that this new phenomenon is now a part of the contemporary scene.

⁸George W. Brown, "Teacher Power Techniques," American School Board Journal, C111 (February, 1966), pp. 11-13.

⁹Allen W. West, "Local Associations Move Toward Professional Negotiation," NEA Journal, L111 (February, 1964), pp. 26-28.

Teachers are accused of being militant. Some have condemned teachers' actions and yearned for the passivity that was once the teachers' mode. Lee suggested that today's American teachers are not the same type as their predecessors; rather, they have different ideologies. He cited their ideological differences as (1) teachers are now concerned about matters of national needs and policies as communications media have brought the public to understand national military and social phenomenon, (2) the academic disciplines are being taught to be mastered, by teachers who know and understand their subject, and (3) learning is now conceived to be a continuous process, ruling out the divisional calibration of grade placement.¹⁰

Miller partially concurred but established a rather different point with his indication that teachers are becoming more professional by their desire to be involved in decision-making, as it affects their teaching. On the other hand, this rise in professionalism has been lessened by the advancement of negotiations and labor techniques. These divergent views presented a polar position which does not work to the betterment of education. Because written agreements specify hours of work, class size, and other items, specialists are at a severe loss to enact any curricular innovation or experimentation. These tasks can be done only by and with teachers, who are as yet unwilling to violate the agreement.¹¹

¹⁰Gordon C. Lee, "The Changing Role of the Teacher," in The Changing American School, ed. by John I. Goodlad, The Sixty-Fifth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part 1 (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, Inc.) , pp. 20-22.

¹¹William C. Miller, "Curricular Implications of Negotiation," Educational Leadership, XXIII (April, 1966), pp. 533-36.

The rise of professional negotiations, however, does not rest solely with the teaching faculty. Redressing administrators and boards of education for their lack of providing reasonable guidance to teachers Boy and Pine stated that teachers have too long been considered all things to all people. While expecting them to accomplish their instructional goals, administrators have done little to help teachers understand their role. Teachers have been burdened with clerical tasks and supervisory duties instead of allowing them teaching time and time to plan effectively. The result has been conflict between the teacher idealized and what he has found to be real. This then has led to fierce negotiations over points which are not or should not be the teachers' responsibility.¹²

As negotiations became more heated and the items more varied, administrators felt the need to determine the reasons for the change in teachers' attitudes. The American Association of School Administrators, sensing the need for co-determination of policies which affect teachers and students, analyzed the reasons, rights, and scope of professional negotiation and summarized them as follows:

1. The Western culture inherently has allowed workers the chance to help determine policies under which they work. This has been one of the marks of a free democratic society.
2. Teachers feel that their participation in the formulation of policy can be highly productive to the school system because they are more cognizant of existing problems.
3. Since schools operate for the benefit of the students, teachers

¹²Angelo V. Boy and Gerald J. Pine, "Needed for Teachers: A Role Description," Clearing House, XXXVIII (September, 1963), pp. 7-12.

have held that anything is subject to negotiation.¹³

Advocating teachers having a strong voice in educational decision-making, West felt that teachers were right and their aims would ultimately prevail. He advised administrators to work closely with teachers because of the following:

...The educational problems in the growing urban and suburban areas are so complex, and the pressures and demands so severe and diverse, that acceptable educational programming and administration is a task that threatens to overwhelm local school boards.¹⁴

West urged that administrators and teachers look upon themselves as peers and mutually work toward the greater ends of education.

Factors leading to staff conflict and the professionalism of teaching developed yet another rationale of understanding teacher militancy. Corwin found that as teachers became more professional, more specialized, and possessing better background of knowledge, differences of opinions among themselves and their administrators increased both in number and intensity. It was their professional devotion that motivated them to differ with administrators.¹⁵

Batchelder seemed to agree with Corwin and others concerning the teachers' rise in professionalism, but noted that teachers have become militant because of economic pressures placed upon them. Teachers

¹³ American Association of School Administrators, School Administrators View Professional Negotiations (Washington: American Association of School Administrators, 1966), p. 27.

¹⁴ Allen W. West, "What's Bugging Teachers?" Saturday Review, XLVIII (October 16, 1965), p. 88.

¹⁵ Ronald G. Corwin, The Development of an Instrument for Examining Staff Conflict in the Public Schools (Cooperative Research Project No. 1934, Office of Education, United State Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1963), pp. 309-11.

search for a dignity which is rightfully theirs because of the social status, but deprived because of their low economic status. Trying to establish education as a profession, they have united behind the professional association to develop procedures and practices to secure dignity, both socially and economically.¹⁶ The highest priority in conflict situations and professional negotiations agreements remained salary provisions, however, various interpersonal relationships contributed to it. Batchelder was upheld in a recent study of the National Education Association Research Division. The NEA survey showed that many factors were directly related to teacher dissatisfaction. It was apparent that teachers, nevertheless had several considerations other than salary.¹⁷

Lieberman, a strong advocate for professional negotiations in education, presented reasoning for professional negotiations in one of his early works. They were as follows:

1. In enterprises employing large numbers of personnel doing the same kind of work, the individual employees doing such work are practically helpless to improve their lot by individual negotiations with their employers.
2. Collective negotiations strengthens an occupation group.
3. Most people, regardless of the type of employment in which they are engaged, wish to have a voice in the determination of their working conditions. Collective bargaining provides a means whereby the employees can choose someone whose job it is to ascertain, express, and advocate the view of the employees.
4. Inasmuch as the status of any occupational group is partially dependent upon the extent to which the group has a voice in the determination of its working conditions, and individual negotiations are not practical as a means of expressing the

¹⁶Richard D. Batchelder, "Today's Militant Teachers," NEA Journal, LIV (September, 1965), pp. 18-19.

¹⁷"Are Teachers Happy?" NEA Research Bulletin, XLVI (May, 1968), pp. 40-41.

views of employees concerning their working conditions, collective bargaining offers the most feasible method of raising the status of the employees.

5. The existence of a large number of people doing the same kind of work inevitably leads to common interests. Common interests lead to joint action to advance those interests.
6. There are grave dangers in any system of employment which relies chiefly upon decisions handed down from the top to determine the conditions of employment. In particular situations there may be no substitute for coercion, but the fact is that there is an increase in employee efficiency and responsibility where employees have a corporate responsibility in the determination of their working conditions.¹⁸

Griffiths concurred that superintendents and boards of education may have inadvertently caused the professional negotiations upsurge in education. He identified specific reasons for the rise and presence of teacher-superintendent-board of education conflict by citing the following:

1. The needs of teachers have not been realized. Teachers have expected administrators to fulfill their needs; however, this fulfillment has not been realized.
2. Superintendents have an outmoded concept of themselves. They are no longer the teacher of teachers and must now look to the expertise of the teaching staff for the solution of problems.
3. Boards of education hold an unrealistic and outmoded concept of their role. They hold too much confidence in their legal and vested power, failing to look upon the teachers as professionals who are capable of conducting their own affairs.¹⁹

Blanke, trying to determine reasons for teachers' collective action, presented a more straightforward listing as he identified the following: (1) the elimination of paternalistic administration, (2) the emasculation

¹⁸Myron Lieberman, Education as a Profession (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1956), pp. 341-42.

¹⁹Daniel Griffiths, "Board-Superintendent-Teacher Relations: Viable Alternative to the Status Quo," in Struggle for Power in Education, eds. by Frank W. Lutz and Joseph J. Azzarelli (New York: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1966), pp. 100-02.

of the teacher's role in large and complex school systems, (3) increased teacher anxiety and insecurity due to organizational complexity, (4) the increasingly difficult task of gaining material resources from public taxes, (5) more teachers who are vitally concerned about controlling their vocational careers, and (6) the membership fight between the National Education Association and the American Federation of Teachers.²⁰

Stinnett, Kleirmann, and Ware--members of the National Education Association staff--presented six causal factors which they had identified as a result of their work within the NEA. Their evaluation corresponded quite closely with those above illustrating and/or administrative viewpoints. Warning that their listing may not exhaust all possibilities they represented the following:

1. A feeling, by teachers, that economic injustice had been perpetrated on them. While other groups were earning more, they were not.
2. Teachers became embittered because the public had allowed the schools to be neglected, which resulted in inadequate facilities and general deterioration throughout the nation.
3. Teachers had lost their identity in the largeness of the school system. They were treated more as a thing, and less as persons.
4. Public employees in general have now earned a new status.
5. Teachers felt they had the right and responsibility to help determine policy which governed their labor.
6. The civil rights movement had a strong psychological effect on teachers. Viewing themselves as second class individuals, they felt analogous to those who were fighting to be freed from oppression.²¹

²⁰Virgil Blanke, "Teachers in Search of Power," The Educational Forum, XXX (January, 1966), pp. 231-35.

²¹T. M. Stinnett, Jack H. Kleinmann, and Martha L. Ware, Professional Negotiations in Public Education (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1966), pp. 4-6.

Lieberman and Moskow concurred with the preceding, but added what they called the "snowball effect" to their listing. They determined that the "snowball effect" was that which followed from teachers copying the actions and attitudes of teachers in adjoining areas and/or states.²²

Redfern and Conner, attempting to determine factors of teacher militancy, presented similar findings to those mentioned above and added some which had not been previously mentioned. Those which were added are as follows: (1) increase in number of new teachers coming from labor union families and background, (2) increased awareness of recent research on personnel practices, and (3) reaction against over-supervision or inappropriate supervision.²³

Birdsell concluded from his study of the status of professional negotiations that a majority of teachers wanted and expected the opportunity to discuss professional problems with their boards of education. This being one of their chief goals, both teachers and superintendents agreed that channels should exist whereby teachers could communicate directly with boards of education. One of his additional conclusions was that superintendents included in the study and nearly all teachers felt that the superintendent should be included in both negotiation procedures and determinations of whom and what appears

²²Myron Lieberman and Michael H. Moskow, Collective Negotiations Teachers: An Approach to School Administration (Chicago: Rand McNally Company, 1966), pp. 55-60.

²³George B. Redfern and Forrest E. Conner, The School Administrator and Negotiation (Washington: American Association of School Administrators, 1968), pp. 22-23.

before the board of education.²⁴

Both Schiff and Kite concluded the major determining factor in cases of teacher strikes was economic. They acknowledged, however, that there may have been other causal factors which contributed to embittered negotiations and probable strikes.^{25,26}

THE ROLE OF THE SUPERINTENDENT

As teachers have organized for professional negotiations, the superintendent of schools has been placed in a severe dilemma. Keppel affirmed that the current and growing conflict between teachers and administrators was a serious one. He noted:

. . . . Only two factors seem clear: education must learn the niques of negotiation and arbitration, and the states will become more important factors in the final decisions on salaries and working conditions. The superintendents, sharing their responsibilities with association and union leaders, have the opportunity to chart the new course.²⁷

One of the greatest dilemmas which confronted superintendents was the lack of a specific role to follow. Stinnett, Kleinmann, and Ware summarized that there were but three postures that a superintendent may assume in professional negotiations: (1) he may refrain from any part

²⁴Donald F. Birdsell, "A Study of the State of Professional Negotiation in Selected School in Twelve Midwestern States" (unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Iowa, 1965), pp. 15-53.

²⁵Albert A. Schiff, "A Study and Evaluation of Teachers' Strikes in the United States," (unpublished doctoral dissertation, Wayne State University, 1953), pp. 110-116.

²⁶Robert H. Kite, "A Study to Determine the Degree of Influence Selected Factors Had in Causing Strikes and to Determine the Degree to Which These Factors Were Present in School Districts in Which Teacher Strikes Were Averted," (unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Mississippi, 1964), pp. 112-117.

²⁷Keppel, The Necessary Revolution., p. 141.

whatsoever, (2) he may negotiate with the teachers as the representative of the board of education, or (3) he may serve as a resource person and act as a neutral third party.²⁸ Wildman, speaking of the role of the superintendent in professional negotiations indicated that superintendents were in an untenable position when acting as an interpreter of both the board of education and the teachers. Few, if any, superintendents can successfully act as the "man in the middle" to evolve meaningful negotiations.²⁹

Campbell, Cunningham, and McPhee, feeling that the superintendents' role was that of a statesman, differed with this reasoning and maintained the following:

In most cases, the superintendent can become the spokesman for neither group. Instead, he may, with good fortune, become an agent to assist each group in understanding the position and reasoning of the other, he may see that relevant facts are made available to both groups, and he may actually evolve some recommended solutions not initially acceptable to either group.³⁰

Stating that the above position was unrealistic, Liberman noted that a superintendent's tenure hinged on how he served the board of education. He indicated that the superintendent was in a dichotomous position. Superintendents cannot serve the board of education and the teachers in professional negotiations. His responsibility must be to the board of education; therefore, it was deemed foolish to consider his

²⁸Stinnett, Kleimann, and Ware, Professional Negotiations., p. 113.

²⁹Wesley A. Wildman, "Teacher Collective Action in the U.S., 1965," in Negotiation in the Schools, eds., R. E. Ohm. and O. D. Johns (Norman, Oklahoma: College of Education, University of Oklahoma, 1965), pp. 25-26.

³⁰Raold F. Campbell, Luvern L. Cunningham, and Roderick F. McPhee, The Organization and Control of American Schools (Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Books, Inc., 1965), p. 210.

role as a neutral third party.³¹ Blankenship agreed that the superintendent was clearly the executive agent of the board. It was the superintendent's responsibility to direct negotiations for the board as well as to develop a cadre of young negotiators which could supplement him. Although he might not want to represent the board of education at the bargaining table, he needed to be constantly apprised to communicate with the board of education and must carry on with the board of education to advise as to the negotiability on certain items.³²

Noting that professional negotiations were causing practicing superintendents great concern about their role in professional negotiations, the American Association of School Administrators developed a statement to ease his dilemma. This statement provided that a superintendent should be chiefly concerned with the student. This allegiance to the learner was to be shared by the superintendent and the teaching staff. His responsibility was to provide favorable conditions for the teaching-learning process. In doing this he would work with the staff in satisfying their professional goals.³³

This position was further advanced by the 1963 Guidelines for Professional Negotiations, which advocated the superintendent's role as being a member of the united profession, refraining from direct responsi-

³¹ Myron Lieberman, "The Impact of Collective Negotiations Upon Teacher-Administrator Relationships," in Readings on Collective Negotiations in Public Education, eds., by Stanley M. Elam, Myron Lieberman, and Michael H. Moskow, Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1967), pp. 229-33.

³² Alden H. Blankenship, "The Role of the Superintendent in Teacher Negotiations," Theory Into Practice, XI (April, 1955), pp. 70-74

³³ The Association, Roles, Responsibilities, Relationships of the School Board, Superintendent, and Staff (Washington: American Association of School Administrators, 1963), pp. 8-9.

bility to either the teachers or the board of education. Rather, he was to act as a fulcrum giving aid and information to both sides.³⁴ This position was further advanced by the American Association of School Administrators; however, the Association pledged itself" . . . to resist any effort to displace the superintendent and his authority in matters affecting the interest and welfare of school personnel."³⁵

To satisfy these aims, the same publication developed a comprehensive statement which attempted to specify how personnel policies and professional negotiation matters could be enacted with a minimum of conflict between the two polar positions. The scope of the statement dwelled on the superintendent involving as many as possible in the development of operational policies. Further, such deliberations should be characterized by accommodations by all parties in satisfying the needs of the local school district.³⁶

Dykes concluded that professional negotiations have altered the role of the superintendent through the evolution of shared determination of policies. The Administrator has been forced to allow teachers a voice in decision making, and in doing so strengthened his own position. He was now able to lead more effectively as a result of teachers demanding a voice in the evolution of policies. Goal determination and respective responsibilities have been solidified by teachers and administrators working cooperatively. The superintendents' chief role now has changed

³⁴Office of Professional Development and Welfare, Guidelines for Professional Negotiation (Washington: National Education Association, 1963), pp. 21-22.

³⁵The Association, Roles, Responsibilities, Relationships, p.13

³⁶Ibid., pp. 12-13.

to effectively administering the ongoing and emerging program.³⁷

THE ASSOCIATIONS AND PROFESSIONAL AGREEMENTS

As teachers have begun to negotiate with their administrators and boards of education for a myriad of proposals and provisions, claims and counterclaims have been hurled by each group. One side suggested that this new phenomenon was a labor type tactic while the other contended strongly that negotiation was a step toward professionalism. Lieberman, an advocate for teachers' rights and professionalism, stated the latter view in the following manner:

One clear lesson to be learned from the history of the professions is that systematic attention to the problems of professionalization by any practitioner is always a prerequisite to the professionalization of any occupation. . . . Thus if the acknowledged professions be taken as a guide, teachers cannot expect to achieve professional status until the teachers themselves participate in the drive toward professionalization.³⁸

This drive for professionalism and negotiations have become a major concern of educators recently. However, the seeds which spawned professional negotiations were not laid in the early 1960's. Rather, the NEA Executive Committee approved the following policy statement in 1947, which appeared to be the first indication of a movement toward professional negotiations. This policy stressed group action by teachers on salary considerations. It suggested that a committee be composed to speak for the entire faculty in recommending a single salary schedule.³⁹

³⁷ Archie R. Dykes, "The Emergent Role of Administrators and the Implications for Teacher-Administrator Relationships," in Collective Negotiations and Educational Administration, ed. by Roy B. Allen and John Schmid (Columbus, Ohio: University Council for Educational Administration, 1966) pp. 33-42.

³⁸ Lieberman, Education as a Profession, p. 13.

³⁹ NEA Executive Committee, "The Professional Way to Meet the Education Crisis," NEA Journal, XXXVI (February, 1947), p. 47.

It would appear that this was one of the first official positions taken by the professional group; however, the widespread fomentation of professional negotiations grew rapidly following President John F. Kennedy's signing of Executive Order #10988. This order signalled the right of federal employees to organize and negotiate with their federal employing units for personnel policies and working conditions. The Executive Order established a pattern for public employees in seeking negotiation rights. As public employees, teachers began efforts to gain legislation in their respective states which would give them negotiation privileges.⁴⁰

Since then eleven states have enacted legislation approving teacher negotiation and several other states have bills before their legislatures seeking this right.⁴¹ State education associations have begun to work to organize local education associations as well as to broaden the knowledge and tactics of professional negotiation throughout their respective states. On the national level, Lieberman noted that the NEA is making additional provisions for increased professional negotiations throughout the nation. It has budgeted much more money and established regional offices to assist local education associations. He speculated that by 1970 about eighty percent of the nation's teachers will be teaching in states which have some type of teacher negotiation statute.⁴²

Building powerful forces throughout the nation has been character-

⁴⁰The Association, Administrators View Professional Negotiations, pp. 15-16.

⁴¹Stinnett, Kienmann, and Ware, Professional Negotiations, pp. 36-38.

⁴²Myron Lieberman, "Collective Negotiations, Status and Trends," American School Board Journal, CIV (October, 1967), pp. 7-11.

istic of many organizations. The same has been true of public education as more and more teachers have been organized. The NEA Journal listed three priorities which should help local education associations to accumulate power and enable them to have a full voice in school affairs: (1) obtaining a written professional negotiation agreement, (2) build up membership in local, state, and national associations, and (3) involve more young teachers.⁴³

The professional associations were eager to be a part of this movement. As a result, the National Education Association, during its 1962 Denver convention, took a much more progressive and/or militant stand than ever before with the following determined language:

The National Education Association insists on the right of professional associations, through democratically selected representatives, using professional channels, to participate with boards of education in the determination of policies of common concern, including salary and other conditions of professional service.⁴⁴

This seemingly opened the pathway to a determined effort to allow and assist local and state professional associations begin and/or continue efforts for recognition through professional negotiation. The previously cited Guidelines were revised and made more specific in 1965, now generalizing a more philosophical and well defined scope of matters of negotiation. This statement concluded that ". . . negotiations should include all matters which affect the quality of the educational system."⁴⁵

The 1965 Guidelines for Professional Negotiation further advocated

⁴³"The More We Grow, The More We Do," NEA Journal, LIV (May, 1965), pp. 26-27.

⁴⁴NEA, 1963 Guidelines, p. 6.

⁴⁵NEA, 1965 Guidelines, pp. 21-22.

exclusive recognition of a single association and negotiating for all teachers, not just those who belong to a particular association. The final result of the negotiations was to be an agreement which would deal with such things as the terms and conditions of employment. For the first time, the National Education Association advocated written agreements.⁴⁶

The American Association of School Administrators, attempting to stay within the general framework established by the NEA, soon noted that comprehensive negotiation agreements were an advantage to the smooth operation of schools as various roles and procedures were specifically delineated. Specific advantages to the existence of a negotiation agreement were that communications would be enhanced and teachers would have a voice in the decision-making process.⁴⁷

A great deal of confusion existed, however, as there was little determination of how written agreements were to be expressed. West, an upper echelon National Education Association staff member, concluded that professional agreements should include at least the following five points, if it was to be an effective process: (1) recognition of local association as the official spokesman for teachers, (2) provision for regular meetings between the board of education and the local association, (3) provision guidelines for how negotiation is to take place, including the role of the superintendent, (4) provision for a system to deal with an impasse, if one should occur, and (5) provide for how agreements should be expressed.⁴⁸

⁴⁶NEA, Guidelines, 1965, p. 12.

⁴⁷Association, Administrators View Professional Negotiations, p. 34.

⁴⁸Allen W. West, "Local Associations Move Toward Professional Negotiation," NEA Journal, LIII (February, 1964), pp. 26-27.

This, however, appeared to be an oversimplification of what was established in such agreements. Wildman and Perry specified more closely what could and no doubt would be considered to be a part of the agreement. They suggested the following: (1) salary, (2) optimal or reasonable class size, (3) seniority, (4) transfers and promotion policies, (5) "battle pay", (6) money collection, (7) length of school day, and (8) frequency and length of after school meetings.⁴⁹

Lieberman presented a comprehensive listing of negotiable areas⁵⁰ and collaborated with Moskow in a later work which further identified items which could be included in negotiation agreements. They noted that this listing was not at all exhaustive and did not include such items as recognition, or reference to legislation covering previously signed agreements between the local association and the board of education. Lieberman and Moskow suggested that written agreements could easily incorporate the following negotiable items:

Accident benefits	Paid absence for negotiators
Book duty	Pensions
Cafeteria duty	Personal leave
Central placement	Preparation periods
Class size	Professional meetings
Compensation for extra duties	Promotions
Cumulative absence	Relief from nonteaching duties
Damage to teacher property	Sabatical leaves
Duty free lunch period	Salary schedule
Hospitalization insurance	Seniority
In-service courses	Sick pay
Jury duty	Summer school assignments
Leave without pay	Teacher aides
Legal assistance for teachers	Teaching assignments
Length of school day	Teaching hours
Medical examinations	Transfers
Military leave	Washroom facilities ⁵¹

⁴⁹Wildman and Perry, Group Conflict, p. 250.

⁵⁰Lieberman, Education as a Profession, p. 357.

⁵¹Lieberman and Moskow, Collective Negotiations, p. 227.

The American Association of School Administrators prepared a similar listing of those areas which they felt to be negotiable. Although not concurring unanimously with Lieberman and Moskow, a close relationship existed in the possible content of written master agreements.

Their listing follows:

Curriculum	Recognition of the negotiating team
Inservice education	Lunch periods
Personnel policies	Rest periods
Teaching assignments	Salaries
Recruitment of Teachers	Wages
Discharge and discipline of teachers	Welfare benefits
Provision for physical facilities for teachers	Class size
Grievance procedures	Leaves of absence
	Expiration date of negotiation agreement

This listing concluded with an item which suggested that other items could be added if they were mutually agreed-upon matters which directly affected the quality of the educational program.⁵²

Wildman, in a study of professional agreements signed to date in large school districts, reported that ". . . Most of the more professional matters, such as the structure of in-service, instruction and curriculum, and the health and safety of children, in general have not yet become the subjects of written bilateral agreements."⁵³ Contracts to date have dealt with factors of working conditions, fringe benefits, and salary provisions. Curricular and subject matter considerations will be soon included in teacher-organization-board of education agreements, he concluded, as provisions where teachers are allowed to meet and consult with the board of education are now appearing in many

⁵²Association, School Administrators View Professional Negotiations, pp. 39-40.

⁵³Wesley A. Wildman, "What Prompts Greater Teacher Militancy?" American School Board Journal, CLIV (January, 1967), p. 28.

professional agreements.⁵⁴

Daly, feeling that salary considerations have been highlighted far too much, suggested that "instead of enumerating items in writing, most agreements use a broad statement such as 'all other matters of educational concern' or 'all matters affecting the quality of the educational program.'"⁵⁵ He argued that the emphasis should be placed on the many facets of the teachers' professional concern rather than the special working conditions and salary items which were characteristic of many agreements.

Attempting to estimate the scope of written agreements throughout the nation, the National Education Association completed a study of the 1540 agreements on file for the 1966-67 school year. These data follow:

Negotiation Procedure

Procedure for recognition of employee organization	374
Procedure for specific items included or excluded	456
Provision for negotiating sessions	1061
Procedure for impasse in negotiation	524

Scope of Agreement

General statement of parties to agreement	629
General statement of recognition	908
Classification of persons covered or excluded	421
Effect on prior rules and policies	256
Information pertinent to negotiation (financial)	543
Nondiscrimination clause against membership in employee organization	528
Use of school communications, bulletin boards, mail boxes	458
Use of building facilities	371
Check-off or dues deduction	335
Organizational representatives allowed time off without loss of salary for negotiation sessions or grievance hearings	172

Teacher Activity

Individual or minority representation to the administration	187
Teachers' rights under law not abridged	115

⁵⁴Ibid., pp. 27-32.

⁵⁵Ronald O. Daly, "Professional Negotiations," NEA Journal, LIV (May, 1965), pp. 30-31.

Board Rights

General statement of responsibility	227
-------------------------------------	-----

Instructional Program

School calendar or year	253
Pupil ratio and class size	222
Instructional aids which are available for the teachers' use in the classroom	169
Selection and distribution of textbooks	140
Student extracurricular activities supervision	131
Integration of education for textbooks, pupils, and staff	116
Parent-teacher conferences	94
Curriculum review	85
Teacher aides	73
Teacher qualification	66

Personnel Policies and Practices

Grievance procedure	369
Method of selection of arbitrator, mediator, or review panel for grievance procedure	324
Transfers	265
Promotion to higher classification	243
Teaching assignment in subject areas	242
Procedure for teacher evaluation	241
Lunch period for elementary teachers	237
Lunch periods for secondary teachers	222
Assault cases and pupil discipline	234
Teacher facilities	214
Duty free periods for planning	213
Teaching hours or day	203

Salary Policy

Salary credits for prior growth and experience	267
Salary schedule	366
Salary increments for professional preparation	361
Extra-duty for special activities	277

Fringe Benefits

Terminal leave or severance pay	110
Tuition reimbursement	97
Travel allowance for transportation, food, lodging	95

Part or full premium payments by board or other agency

Health insurance	226
Life insurance	94
Income protection or disability insurance	34
Liability insurance	32

Available through board cooperation only

Tax sheltered annuity	41
Life insurance	20
Income protection or disability insurance	18

Absences with Full or Part Pay

Sick leave	106
Personal business leave	163
Educational conferences	152
Bereavement leave	142
Jury duty	130
Sabbatical leave	126
Court summons or other legal action	108
General (not specified) leave	106
Other school visitations	104
Family illness leave	34
Selective service examinations	88

Absences Without Pay

Maternity leave	233
Military leave	193
Sick leave	138
Public office or political campaigns	99
General (not specified)	98
Peace Corps	92
Professional business leave	88
Sabbatical leave	66
Foreign exchange teaching ⁵⁶	30

A similar survey conducted by the Michigan Education Association of the contents of professional negotiation agreements throughout the State of Michigan garnered the following. The data was derived from 333 local agreements from Michigan school districts.

1. Provision that individual teacher agreements are subject to terms of master agreements	292
2. Arbitration as final step in grievance disposition	133
3. Provision for employment of teacher aides	88
4. Reference to Professional Code of Ethics	221
5. Provision for extended school year to increase educational opportunity	20
6. Provision for teacher-board of education consultation on school district fiscal programs	121
7. Provision for required membership or equivalent fees	25
8. Provision for continuing negotiations on regular monthly basis	27
9. Provision for teacher participation in curriculum study	215
10. Provision for regularly scheduled meeting for curriculum study	107
11. Reference to student teachers' conditions	65

⁵⁶ National Education Association, "What's Negotiable?" NEA Research Bulletin, XLVI (May, 1968), 42-3.

12. Requirement that teachers be assigned in major or minor area fields	212
13. Requirement that contracts only be offered new teachers with bachelor's degree or higher degree, and provisional or permanent certificates	89
14. Provision for board requirement to provide legal counsel to teachers in school related incidents	203
15. Specific requirement for maximum class size	123
16. Provision for teacher employment beyond the regular school year for development or evaluation of school program. ⁵⁷	33

Teacher salaries also received considerable attention throughout Michigan as teachers attempted to negotiate for more salary. Although not laying claim to the increased salaries earned by Michigan teachers, a Michigan Education Association report noted that median salaries increased as much as \$924.00 for the 1966-67 school year for those teachers who held the master's degree.⁵⁸

The above indicated extreme divergency in the scope of written master agreements signed in Michigan, which would suggest a rather loose form of coordination; however, Schmidt, Parker, and Repas presented the following statement which suggested that the reverse was true:

. . . The MEA operates throughout the state in a strong advisory capacity, with its local organization. For example, in the first two years of negotiations, the state organization circulated a "suggested" master agreement to all local organizations, assisted in the local bargaining when asked or where a "target district" had been selected, and attempted to have all local units submit their negotiated agreements to MEA headquarters for review and comments before the agreements were signed and ratified. Additionally, field representatives are assigned throughout the state from central MEA headquarters to assist the local organizations in a variety of ways, including bargaining. Finally, the similarity of many of the local MEA agreements strongly suggests that centralized rather than local control may be the chief characteristic

⁵⁷Stanley Hecker, John Meeder, and Thomas J. Northey, Survey of Selected Data from 333 Education Association Agreements, 1967-68, (East Lansing; Michigan Education Association, 1967), pp. 48-79.

⁵⁸"MEA Break Thru," Michigan Educational Journal, LXIV (January, 1967), pp. 17-20.

of the MEA bargaining structure.⁵⁹

Stinnett, Kleinmann, and Ware concluded that the success of the local education association hinged greatly on the role the state education association assumes. They perceived that for maximum good, the state education association should serve as a strong advisor to the local association--assisting them in the areas where help was needed. In general, they advised that the state associations should always consider that it was on alert to ways of facilitating the growth and direction of the local association. This might easily include such things as dissemination of material and providing personnel to assist in a great number of ways. Articulation between the state and local education association must be continuous and meaningful if the local education association is to meet its goals.⁶⁰

Stinnett, Kleinmann, and Ware emphasized that educational associations have worked and must continue to work in concert with one another toward the betterment of education. Citing how local organizations' programs are of utmost importance to the state and national associations the local association has been the one which is chiefly important. The purpose of the larger organization is to assist the local association's development. They specifically felt that this was true as it pertained to professional negotiations as both the state and national associations have published widely and given consultation to local associations in the development of local professional agreements.⁶¹

⁵⁹Schmidt, Parker, and Repas, Collective Negotiations, :. 13.

⁶⁰Stinnett, Kleinmann, and Ware, Professional Negotiations, p. 83.

⁶¹Ibid., pp. 90-100.

SUMMARY

This chapter attempted to explain the role of professional negotiation in the public sector, primarily as the phenomenon existed in the field of education. Data were presented which explained the means by which professional negotiation arrived in education by showing causes which brought it about.

The respective roles of the Michigan Education Association, the National Education Association and the local education associations were presented together with an analysis of the intent and content of written master agreements between local education associations and boards of education. Recent research concerning the content of master agreement was cited.

One section pertained to the superintendent of schools and the role he occupied in professional negotiations.

CHAPTER III

THE DESIGN OF THE STUDY

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this chapter was to present the design of the study: explaining the construction of the instruments, the sample to be studied, and the treatment of the data. The hypotheses were also stated.

THE DESIGN OF THE INSTRUMENTS

The items contained in the instruments employed in this study were developed from the contents of the Michigan Education Association Sample Professional Agreement distributed to all affiliated local associations. The investigator itemized the major provisions contained in it, and summarized its contents into brief statements. The Bureau of Research Consultation of Michigan State University aided in developing the items and the rating scales on which the respondents estimated the influence of the Michigan Education Association with respect to requests and/or demands made to boards of education, the status of provisions being negotiated by local education associations, and superintendent's perceptions of the degree of reasonableness of each item. (See Appendices B and D).

Following the development of the instruments, the investigator conferred with personnel from both the Michigan Education Association Research Division and the Michigan Association of School Administrators for their editorial comments and criticisms. Upon their recommendations, minor adjustments were made before the instruments were field tested. The field testing of the instruments was accomplished by sixteen Mott Interns in Flint, Michigan. After additional study, further changes were made. Prior to sending the instruments to various school districts,

the Bureau of Research Consultation of Michigan State University was again consulted to study the two questionnaires and make any final recommendations.

Together with a stamped return address envelope, an introductory letter and directions for completing the questionnaire was sent to superintendents and local association presidents. Each group was asked to complete the following:

The local association. Each local association president was asked to report what was included in the initial package that the local association presented to the board of education. He was asked to note if the provision was sought from the Board of Education. If the request was made, he was instructed to estimate the degree of influence of the Michigan Education Association in establishing the item for negotiation. A Likert scale was constructed for the respondent to estimate the degree of MEA influence which ranged as follows: (1) entirely MEA influence, (2) mostly MEA influence, partly local member influence, (3) half MEA influence, and half local member influence, (4) mostly local member influence, (5) partly MEA influence, and (6) entirely local influence.

Local association presidents also were asked to indicate reasons for not making a request to the board of education even though it was included in the MEA sample agreement. The possible reasons were as follows: (1) our school district allowed this provision before Public Act 379 was in effect, (2) our negotiations have obtained this provision since Public Act 379 was in effect, (3) our local association will attempt to obtain this provision in future negotiations, and (4) our local association will not attempt to obtain this provision in future negotiations.

The local superintendent. Each local superintendent was asked to determine what was included in the initial package that the local association presented to the board of education. If the item was included the respondent was instructed to estimate the influence of the Michigan Education Association in making the request. The same Likert scale was used to estimate MEA influence, which ranged as follows: (1) entirely MEA influence, (2) mostly MEA influence, partly local member influence, (3) half MEA influence and half local member influence, (4) mostly local member influence, partly MEA influence, and (5) entirely local member influence.

Local superintendents were asked to respond reporting their perceptions of why requests for specific provisions were not made to the board of education. The possible reasons offered were as follows: (1) our school district allowed this provision before Public Act 379 was in effect, and (2) our negotiations have obtained this provision since Public Act 379 was in effect. It was assumed that superintendents would be unable to respond to the other two categories which were presented to the local association presidents.

Local superintendents were also asked to estimate how reasonable they considered the request. A Likert scale was constructed which offered the following responses: (1) very reasonable, (2) reasonable, (3) partly reasonable, partly unreasonable, can not decide (4) unreasonable, (5) very unreasonable. It was assumed that the local association would consider the requests to be reasonable; therefore, this scale was not offered to local associations.

Content questions. Several questions were included for both groups to respond to common questions concerning salary schedules, contract hours, severance pay, longevity pay, insurance benefits, and similar

provisions.

ANALYSIS OF THE INSTRUMENTS

The instruments were divided into categories, each representing a different part of the negotiations agreement. The classifications were drawn from a similar classification schema published by the National Education Association Research Division.¹ The various divisions follow: negotiation procedures, scope of agreement, professional activity, instructional program, personnel practices and procedures, salary and supplemental income, fringe benefits, full or partial premium payments, absences with full or partial pay, and absences without pay.

Table 3.1 shows the provisions within each category:

TABLE 3.1 - DIVISIONS OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

Item Number	Category/provision
NEGOTIATION PROCEDURE	
1.	The local association will have exclusive representation
77.	Negotiating meetings will be held regularly throughout the year
78.	Negotiations will begin between March 1 and March 15 each year
79.	Individual teacher contracts will be subject to the master agreement
80.	The master agreement will be considered part of the policy of the board of education
81.	Any section declared illegal will not invalidate the entire agreement.
SCOPE OF AGREEMENT	
2.	The local association will have the use of the school district's equipment and facilities
3.	The board of education will consult with the local association on academic policies
4.	The board of education will consult with the local association on fiscal policies
5.	The board of education will consult with the local association on building construction policies.

¹National Education Association, "What's Negotiable?" NEA Research Bulletin, XLVI (May, 1968), pp. 42-43.

TABLE 3.1 - (continued)

Item Number	Category/provision
6.	Teachers will join the local association or pay the equivalent amount to the association
7.	The board of education will deduct local association dues from checks of teachers
8.	The board of education, upon written authorization by the teacher, may deduct other items from teachers' checks
46.	The standards of the previous agreement will be upheld
47.	If other school districts join with this school district, this agreement will be upheld
48.	If this school district joins with another school district, the board of education will help to find positions for the teachers in this district in adjacent districts
49.	Teachers will not strike within the dates of this agreement
50.	The board of education will not use unfair labor practices as defined by PERA, Section 10
	PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITY
41.	The local association will establish a procedure to deal with teacher ethics
42.	The local association will establish a procedure to initiate proceedings against a teacher who violates the Code of Ethics
45.	Voluntary workshops and/or conferences held after school may be established by the local association or board of education initiative
65.	Supervisors of student teachers will have at least a master's degree
66.	Student teachers will be honorary members of the local association
67.	Money received by the district for placing student teachers will be used for educational uses (workshops, conferences, etc.)
68.	The supervising teachers will file a report of the student teacher's progress every four weeks
	INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM
13.	Maximum pupil-teacher contact hours will be specified
14.	A maximum pupil-teacher ratio will be established
17.	The board of education will hire psychologists and/or visiting teachers
18.	A teacher reference library will be established in each school
20.	Teachers' aides will be provided
21.	Department chairmen will be provided
22.	The board of education will try to hire only qualified and certified teachers

TABLE 3.1 - (continued)

Item Number	Category/provision
23.	The board of education will not hire temporarily certified substitutes for more than ninety days
35.	Teachers will have academic freedom in subject matter choice and determination
PERSONNEL PRACTICES AND PROCEDURES	
9.	A reporting and leaving time is specified for teachers
10.	A duty free and specific time allotment is specified for teachers' lunch periods
11.	Rest periods are specified for elementary teachers
12.	Rest periods are specified for specialized teachers (music, art, etc.)
16.	Teachers will be paid for being required to attend meetings more than a specified amount of hours per week or month
24.	The board of education, if possible, will fill positions from within the organization
26.	Each teacher will contribute a specified number of days annually to a common bank for sick leave
36.	Probationary teachers will be evaluated a specific number of times annually
37.	Tenure teachers will be evaluated a specific number of times annually
38.	There will be a specific length of the observation of teachers performance
39.	Evaluation of the teacher will be placed in written form
40.	Teachers will have access to their personnel file
51.	The Tuesday and Wednesday following Labor Day will be used for preschool conferences
52.	School will officially open with pupils in attendance on the Thursday following Labor Day
63.	The local board of education will pay a specific amount daily and/or hourly to substitute teachers
64.	Preference will be given to tenure teachers for extra teaching assignments (driver training, summer school, etc.)
69.	A teacher may exclude an incorrigible student from class for one day
70.	The board of education will provide reduced class size and/or more free periods to teachers who have large numbers of discipline cases in their classes
71.	The board of education will provide an attorney to represent the teacher if legal action is brought against him for discipline cases in their classes
73.	The board of education will pay for lost, damaged, or stolen clothing or personal property which a teacher encounters in school
74.	A Joint Instructional Council will be established
75.	A Discipline Review Board will be established
76.	A grievance procedure will be established

TABLE 3.1 - (continued)

Item Number	Category/provision
SALARY AND SUPPLEMENTAL INCOME	
15.	The board of education will provide additional compensation for teacher overload
19.	Uniforms will be supplied for specialized teachers (art, industrial arts, home economics)
43.	The board of education will reimburse teachers for courses taken in NCATE universities
53.	Teachers new to the district will receive full credit on the salary schedule for their prior experience
54.	The board of education will pay, over and above the salary schedule, a specified amount or percent for teachers' longevity in the school district
55.	The board of education will reimburse teachers a specified amount for post master's degree course work
56.	The board of education will pay additional compensation for extra duty assignments
59.	The board of education will provide severance pay to teachers who are leaving the school district
FRINGE BENEFITS	
44.	Teachers may attend professional meetings at the expense of the board of education
57.	The board of education will pay a specified amount of money for expenses to teachers who are required to drive throughout the school district
58.	The board of education will provide liability insurance for teachers who are required to drive throughout the school district
FULL OR PARTIAL PREMIUM PAYMENTS	
60.	The board of education will provide each teacher with a life insurance policy of a specified value
61.	The board of education will provide uninterrupted, 12 month health insurance to each teacher
62.	The board of education will provide family health insurance to each teacher
ABSENCES WITH FULL OR PARTIAL PAY	
25.	Teachers will have unlimited sick leave provisions which accrues at 15 days annually
27.	The board of education will pay the difference between sick leave benefits and Workmen's Compensation benefits for injury to the teacher while at school
28.	Teachers contracting childhood diseases will be paid salary during absence from school and will not lose days of accrued sick leave benefits
29.	A specified number of days will be allotted for professional or personal business leave

TABLE 3.1 - (continued)

Item Number	Catagory/provision
30.	The board of education will pay the difference between a teacher's regular salary and jury duty salary, if he is required to serve such duty
31.	The board of education will make provision for sabbatical leave after a specified term of service in the school district
72.	In the event of a teacher being injured by a student, he will suffer no loss of income or sick leave for his recuperative period
	ABSENCES WITHOUT LEAVE
32.	The board of education will make provision for a leave of absence after a specified term of service in the school district
33.	Leaves of absence will be granted, ranging up to four years, when requested by the teacher
34.	Maternity leaves up to eighteen (18) months will be granted upon request by the teacher

SELECTION OF THE SAMPLE

The population for this study was comprised of school districts in which the Michigan Education Association concluded that professional negotiation agreements were being negotiated for the next school year(s). These school districts represented all sizes of student population and geographical location within the state of Michigan. One hundred and sixty school districts were randomly selected for inclusion in the study.

Having selected the school districts, the investigator asked for and received the names and addresses of the presidents of the local education association. Similarly, the investigator appeared before the Executive Council of the Michigan Association of School Administrators to explain the purpose and procedures of the study. This group unanimously approved a resolution endorsing the study and enlisting the support of its members. It further approved the investigator's placing a notation in each questionnaire sent to superintendents which explained the groups' action

and quoted the resolution. (See Appendix I) Superintendents' names and addresses were then obtained which corresponded to those school districts previously randomly selected for the study.

The return of the data. As previously mentioned, each school district to be included in the study received two questionnaires. One was sent to the school superintendent while the other was sent to the local education association president. Each was asked to return the questionnaire in approximately two weeks. Those who did not return the questionnaire within this time period were sent another letter and questionnaire, again soliciting a response.

A total 122 or 76.25 percent of the school districts returned the questionnaires which were sent to them, either initially or following the second letter and questionnaire. The local association officials returned 77 questionnaires or 48.12 percent of those submitted. The superintendents returned 93 or 58.12 percent of those submitted to them.

By comparing the usable questionnaires returned from each district, it was determined that 47 school districts, 28.38 percent of the total sample, were to be paired for inclusion in the analysis of the data.

The student population in the forty-seven school districts studied ranged from over 600 students in grades one through twelve to more than 18,000 students in grades kindergarten through twelve. Each district was assured that its responses and school district name would be held in strict anonymity. Table 2 showed the student population of each school in the study.

TABLE 3.2 - STUDENT POPULATION OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS USED IN THE STUDY

school district size	number of school
1-999	11
1000-1999	20
2000-2999	3
3000-3999	3
4000-4999	3
5000-5999	2
6000-6999	1
8000-8999	2
14000-14999	1
18000-18999	1
	<u>1</u>
	N=47

THE HYPOTHESES

The hypotheses to be studied in this investigation were as follows, expressed in null form:

Hypothesis One. Public educators who participated in this study perceived that the Michigan Education Association Sample Professional Agreement did not influence the provisions that were negotiated for the local professional agreement.

Hypothesis Two. Local education association leaders and superintendents who were a part of this study did not differ in their perceptions of the influence of the Michigan Education Association concerning those provisions which were sought for the local association agreement.

Hypothesis Three. Local education association leaders and superintendents who were a part of this study did not differ in their perceptions of the reasonableness of provisions which were included in the initial submission agreement.

Hypothesis Four. Several provisions were not included in present initial submission agreements which local education associations planned to include in future initial submission agreements.

Hypothesis Five. Several provisions contained on the instrument were not considered inappropriate to local education association leaders; therefore, they felt that these provisions would be included in future initial submission agreements.

TREATMENT OF THE DATA

The data from the two instruments were arranged so that they were recorded on electronic data processing data cards. The data were punched onto cards using the data processing equipment of the Computer Institute for Social Science Research of Michigan State University. After the cards were punched, they were verified and an initial print-out of the data was obtained, using the CISSR ONEWAY program. The initial print-out was used for additional verification and possible correction of the deck of data cards.

Data were further analyzed by the computer, using the STAT series UNEQ1 ROUTINE. This program yielded simple statistics such as the frequency, sum, mean, standard deviation, sum of squares, and related simple statistics for each category of the two instruments. In addition, the statistic was computed to allow the investigator to note the statistical significance between the two means on each item.

The study established the minimum level of .05 for all statistical tests of significance. Null hypotheses were rejected if the level of significance rose above this level. Null Hypotheses Four and Five did not lend themselves to statistical analysis; therefore, they were rejected only when five or more local education associations responded accordingly. The investigator determined that five such responses would reject the hypotheses. The Bureau of Research Consultation concurred with these decisions.

BASES FOR ACCEPTING OR REJECTING THE NULL HYPOTHESES

The decisions to accept or reject the null hypotheses stated in the study were made on the following rationales:

Hypothesis One. Those provisions which had a mean of 3.0 and/or above, as identified from the local education association instrument, were considered to be accepted and influenced by the Michigan Education Association. The 3.0 level showed that the MEA was instrumental in the decision to make the request/demand. After close study, the Bureau of Research Consultation upheld the decision to reject the hypothesis at this point.

Hypothesis Two. The data from each provision on the two instruments were compared for analysis. The data were analyzed for statistical significance by measuring the difference between the two means established by the respondents. A t score was then computed to measure the level of significance and thus accept or reject the null hypothesis at the .05 level.

Hypothesis Three. The data from each provision on the superintendents questionnaire were analyzed for statistical significance. Since an assumption in the study was that the local education association considered each provision as being reasonable, a mean of 2.0 and a standard deviation of 0.0 was established. This mean corresponded to the ranking which the superintendents stated as being reasonable. Using these data a t score was computed for measuring the level of significance.

Hypothesis Four. The data from the local education association instruments were tabulated to learn which provisions were to be included in future initial negotiation packages to the boards of education. The intent was to determine the scope of professional negotiations for the future. The investigation determined that this hypothesis was considered

to be rejected when five or more local education associations noted that they planned to include this provision in future initial submission agreements. The Bureau of Research Consultation concurred with the decision.

Hypothesis Five. The data from the local education association questionnaire were tabulated to learn which provisions were to be excluded from future negotiations with the board of education. The intent was to determine those provisions which local education associations felt would probably not be negotiated into a master agreement. The investigator determined that this hypothesis was considered to be rejected when five or more local education associations noted that they planned to exclude this provision from future initial submission agreements. The Bureau of Research Consultation concurred with this decision.

SUMMARY

CHAPTER III presented the design of the study. Explanations were made concerning the development of the two questionnaires and the items were made a part of each division of the instruments. The selection of the random sample was explained and an analysis of school enrollment was presented. The null hypotheses and the treatment of the data were presented and discussed.

CHAPTER IV
THE PRESENTATION OF THE DATA
INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this chapter was to present the data which were collected during the study. Each null hypothesis was treated separately. Other information gleaned from the two instruments was presented and discussed as they had relevance to the study.

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

NULL HYPOTHESIS ONE

Public educators who were a part of this study perceived that the Michigan Education Association Sample Professional Agreement did not influence the provisions that were requested for the local professional agreement.

Local education association leaders were requested to indicate their perception of the degree of influence which the Michigan Education Association exerted on the local education association's inclusion of items submitted to the local board of education for the next professional negotiations. The investigator assumed that if a perception was made, it was taken as fact. These responses were tabulated to provide a comparative analysis of Michigan Education Association and local education association influence. Mean scores and standard deviations were computed to determine the degree of influence. As previously stated, the null hypothesis was rejected when the mean score of the local education association's responses on an item reached a level of 3.0 or above.

Data derived from the analysis resulted in the rejection of the null hypothesis in at least one provision in each category of the instrument. The null hypothesis was rejected for all provisions in three categories: fringe benefits, full or partial premium payments, and absences without

pay. In total, the null hypothesis was rejected for fifty-four of the eighty-one provisions contained on the questionnaire. It was rejected in each category as follows: one of six provisions were rejected in the negotiation procedure category; four of seven, professional activity; sixteen of twenty-three, personnel practices and procedures; five of eight, salary and supplemental income; three of three, fringe benefits; three of three, full or partial premium payments; three of seven, absences with full or partial pay; and three of three, absences without pay. This seemed to indicate that the Michigan Education Association exerted considerable influence on local education associations concerning the initial packages.

Table 4.1 explained the influence of the Michigan Education Association on provisions submitted to local boards of education for the local professional agreement. These data established the mean and standard deviation for each provision listed on the instrument. The table showed those provisions which caused the null hypothesis to be accepted or rejected.

TABLE 4.1 - AN ANALYSIS OF THE INFLUENCE OF THE MICHIGAN EDUCATION ASSOCIATION ON PROFESSIONAL NEGOTIATION PROVISIONS, SHOWING INFLUENCE AS RELATED BY LOCAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION LEADERS.

Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	accept/reject
NEGOTIATION PROCEDURE			
1. Exclusive representation	2.91	1.26	accept
77. Regular meetings for negotiation	2.70	.82	accept
78. Negotiation begin between March 1-15	3.13	.99	reject
79. Individual contract subject to master agreement	2.12	1.18	accept
80. Agreement to be part of board policy	2.51	1.29	accept
81. Illegal section will not invalidate agreement	2.38	1.24	accept

TABLE 4.1 - (continued)

Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	accept/reject
SCOPE OF AGREEMENT			
2. Association will have use of buildings and facilities	3.68	1.32	reject
3. Board will consult on academic policies	3.57	.98	reject
4. Board will consult on fiscal policies	3.00	1.17	reject
5. Board will consult on building construction	3.29	1.20	reject
6. Teachers will join the association or pay equivalent amount	2.56	1.10	accept
7. Board may deduct dues, etc.	3.77	1.43	reject
8. Board may deduct other things	3.72	1.30	reject
46. Previous agreement will be upheld	3.17	1.20	reject
47. Agreement will be upheld in case of consolidation	3.06	1.39	reject
48. If merged, board will find positions for teachers	2.77	1.17	accept
49. Teachers will not strike	3.15	1.31	reject
50. Board will not use unfair labor practices	2.52	1.15	accept
PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITY			
1. Association will deal with teacher ethics	2.89	1.41	accept
42. Association will initiate proceedings against teachers	2.86	1.23	accept
45. Workshops will be held on board or association initiative	3.47	1.06	reject
65. Student teacher supervisors must have masters degree	2.67	1.15	accept
66. Student teachers will be honorary member	5.00	0.00	reject
67. Money to be used for educational expenses	4.16	.98	reject
68. Supervising teacher will file report every four weeks	3.67	2.30	reject
INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITY			
13. Maximum pupil-teacher contact hours specified	3.22	1.35	reject
14. Pupil-teacher ratio specified	3.44	1.36	reject
17. Teacher aides hired	3.55	1.29	reject
18. Reference library in each building	4.00	1.15	reject
20. Psychologists or visiting teachers hired	3.61	.98	reject
21. Department chairmen designated	4.33	.82	reject

TABLE 4.1 - (continued)

Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	accept/reject
22. Hire only qualified and certified teachers	2.75	1.14	accept
23. Only qualified substitutes hired for more than 90 days	2.64	1.22	accept
35. Teachers will have academic freedom	3.30	1.33	reject
PERSONNEL PRACTICES AND PROCEDURES			
9. Reporting and leaving time specified	3.90	1.21	reject
10. Duty free lunch periods	3.34	1.32	reject
11. Rest periods, elementary teachers	3.24	1.25	reject
12. Rest periods, specialized teachers	3.24	1.10	reject
16. Maximum hours for meetings	3.14	1.21	reject
24. Promote from within	3.37	1.19	reject
26. Sick leave bank	3.12	1.55	reject
36. Probationary teachers evaluated	2.96	1.10	accept
37. Tenure teachers evaluated	2.79	.83	accept
38. Length of teacher evaluation	2.90	.88	accept
39. Evaluation in writing	3.37	1.04	reject
40. Teacher access to personnel file	3.23	1.24	reject
51. Tuesday and Wednesday after Labor Day for conferences	3.00	.71	reject
52. School opens on the Thursday after Labor Day	2.86	1.35	accept
63. Substitute salary	2.96	1.10	accept
64. Tenure teachers take extra teaching assignments, if they want them	3.53	1.28	reject
69. Incurables dismissed from class for one day	4.12	1.11	reject
70. Smaller classes for large number of discipline cases	3.33	1.51	reject
71. Board attorney will represent teachers	2.95	1.19	accept
73. Board will pay for damaged, lost, or stolen property	2.87	1.36	accept
74. Joint Instructional Council	3.25	1.39	reject
75. Discipline Review Board	2.51	1.29	reject
76. Grievance procedure	2.02	1.05	accept
SALARY AND SUPPLEMENTAL INCOME			
15. Teacher overload	3.46	1.13	reject
19. Board will provide uniforms	3.00	1.49	reject
43. Board will pay for NCATE courses	2.92	1.44	accept
53. Full credit for past experience	2.82	1.17	accept
54. Longevity pay	3.16	1.07	reject
55. Reimburse for post masters courses	3.44	1.29	reject

TABLE 4.1 - (continued)

Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	accept/reject
56. Pay for extra duty assignments	3.69	1.14	reject
59. Severance pay	2.64	.74	accept
FRINGE BENEFITS			
44. Board will pay for expenses at professional meetings	3.39	1.13	reject
57. Board will pay for required automobile expenses	3.81	1.24	reject
58. Board will pay for required automobile insurance	3.65	1.17	reject
FULL OR PARTIAL PREMIUM PAYMENTS			
60. Life insurance	3.25	1.23	reject
61. Uninterrupted health insurance	3.22	1.23	reject
62. Family health insurance	3.28	1.10	reject
ABSENCES WITH FULL OR PARTIAL PAY			
25. Sick leave, 15 days annually	2.92	1.04	accept
27. Board will pay difference between Workmen's Compensation and salary	3.04	1.16	reject
28. No loss of pay for teacher having childhood diseases	2.42	.79	accept
29. Personal and professional leave	3.37	1.18	reject
30. Board will pay difference between salary and jury duty pay	2.87	1.33	accept
31. Sabbatical leave	3.10	1.18	reject
72. No loss of income for attack by student	2.96	1.36	accept
ABSENCES WITHOUT PAY			
32. Leaves allowed	3.21	1.24	reject
33. Four year leave	3.17	1.17	reject
34. Maternity leave, 18 months	3.32	1.20	reject

NULL HYPOTHESIS TWO

Local education association leaders and superintendents who were a part of this study did not differ in their perceptions of the influence of the Michigan Education Association concerning the provisions which were sought for the local association agreement.

Local education association leaders and superintendents were asked to indicate the degree of influence which they felt the Michigan Educa-

tion Association exerted in those provisions which were requested for the local association professional agreement. Responses for each provision were tabulated from each group and the data were treated. Mean scores and standard deviations were computed a t score was computed to determine the statistical differences between the two groups. As previously stated, the null hypothesis was rejected when the t score was significant at or above the .05 level.

An analysis of the difference between the two means showed that a significant difference existed in thirty-one of the eighty-one items on the instrument. The null hypothesis was rejected for at least one provision in each category except the one entitled absences without pay. The category entitled full or partial premium payments was the only division where the responses caused the null hypothesis to be rejected for all provisions in the category. It was rejected a specific number of times in each division as follows: two of six provisions were rejected in the negotiation procedure category; five of twelve, scope of agreement; two of seven, professional activity; two of nine, instructional activity; seven of twenty-three, personnel practices and procedures; five of eight, salary and supplemental income; two of three, fringe benefits; three of three, full or partial premium payments; three of seven absences with full or partial pay; none of three, absences without pay.

In general, the summarization of the data showed that local education associations were influenced more by the Michigan Education Association than superintendents perceived to be the case. This was evidenced not only by the rejection of the null hypothesis on thirty-one occasions, but also that the mean scores of local education associations on most responses were higher than those tabulated for the superin-

tendent's responses.

Table 4.2 showed the means and standard deviations for the various items as reported by local education association leaders and superintendents. A t score was also shown as well as its statistical significance in the cases where such was warranted. Finally, Table 4.2 indicated whether the data for each item warranted the acceptance or rejection of the hypothesis in each item of the questionnaire.

TABLE 4.2 - AN ANALYSIS OF THE DIFFERENCE IN PERCEPTION OF THE DEGREE OF INFLUENCE EXERTED BY THE MICHIGAN EDUCATION ASSOCIATION BY LOCAL EDUCATION LEADERS AND SUPERINTENDENTS, AS RELATED TO PROFESSIONAL NEGOTIATION PROVISIONS

Item	Association			Superintendent			t score
	Mean	S	D	Mean	S	D	
NEGOTIATION PROCEDURE							
1. Exclusive representation	2.91	1.26		2.06	1.06		2.89 ^b
77. Regular meetings for negotiations	2.70	.82		2.86	1.07		.34
78. Negotiations begin March 1--15	3.13	.99		2.17	1.03		2.48 ^a
79. Individual contract subject to master contract	2.12	1.18		1.97	1.19		.52
80. Agreement to be part of board policy	2.51	1.29		2.27	1.15		.76
81. Illegal section will not invalidate agreement	2.38	1.24		2.36	1.26		.06
SCOPE OF AGREEMENT							
2. Association will have use of buildings and facilities	3.68	1.32		3.00	1.34		2.06 ^a
3. Board will consult on academic policies	3.57	.98		2.70	1.36		2.40 ^a
4. Board will consult on fiscal policies	3.00	1.17		2.32	1.16		1.84 ^a
5. Board will consult on building construction	3.29	1.20		2.58	1.31		1.42
6. Teachers will join ass'n or pay equivalent	2.56	1.10		1.46	0.59		4.18 ^b
7. Board may deduct dues	3.77	1.43		2.72	1.31		2.92 ^b
8. Board may deduct other things	3.72	1.30		3.23	1.24		1.37

a = significant at .05 level

b = significant at .01 level

TABLE 4.2 - (continued)

Item	Association		Superintendent		t score
	Mean	S D	Mean	S D	
46. Previous agreement will be upheld	3.17	1.20	2.21	1.25	2.86 ^b
47. Agreement will be upheld in case of consolidation	3.06	1.39	2.23	1.18	1.59
48. If merged, board will find positions for teachers	2.77	1.17	2.25	1.29	1.06
49. Teachers will not strike	3.15	1.31	2.93	1.28	.49
50. Board will not use unfair labor practices	2.52	1.25	1.88	1.22	1.59
PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITY					
1. Association will deal with teacher ethics	2.89	1.41	2.24	1.30	1.45
42. Association will initiate proceedings against teacher	2.86	1.23	1.80	0.79	2.38 ^a
45. Workshops will be held on board of association initiative	3.47	1.06	3.31	1.11	0.39
65. Student teacher supervisor must have masters degree	2.67	1.15	2.75	1.26	.09
66. Student teachers will be honorary members	5.00	.00	2.00	1.41	3.00 ^b
67. Money to be used for educational expenses	4.16	.98	3.50	1.00	1.04
68. Supervision teacher will file report each 4 weeks	3.67	2.30	2.60	1.14	.90
INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITY					
13. Maximum pupil-teacher contact hours	2.22	1.35	2.24	1.15	2.32 ^a
14. Pupil-teacher ratio	3.44	1.36	2.28	1.13	2.71 ^a
17. Teacher aides hired	3.55	1.29	2.75	.50	1.17
18. Reference library in each building	4.00	1.15	3.11	1.45	1.60
20. Psychologists or visiting teachers hired	3.61	.98	3.12	1.26	1.25
21. Department chairmen	4.33	.82	3.20	1.10	1.97
22. Hire only qualified and certified teachers	2.75	1.14	2.24	1.09	1.71
23. Only qualified substitutes hired for more than 90 days	2.64	1.22	2.39	1.29	.62
35. Teachers will have academic freedom	3.30	1.33	2.47	1.30	1.91

a = significant at .05 level

b = significant at .01 level

TABLE 4.2 - (continued)

Item	Association		Superintendent		t score
	Mean	S D	Mean	S D	
PERSONNEL PRACTICES AND PROCEDURES					
9. Reporting and leaving time	3.90	1.21	3.03	1.05	2.90 ^b
10. Duty free lunch period	3.34	1.32	2.57	1.20	2.46 ^a
11. Rest periods, elementary	3.24	1.25	2.71	1.16	1.28
12. Rest periods specialized	3.27	1.10	2.50	1.08	1.62
16. Maximum hours for meetings	3.14	1.21	1.90	.74	2.63 ^a
24. Promote from within	3.37	1.19	2.48	1.31	2.58 ^a
26. Sick leave bank	3.12	1.55	1.40	.55	2.36 ^a
36. Probationary teachers evaluated	2.96	1.10	3.12	1.36	.46
37. Tenure teachers evaluated	2.79	.83	3.05	1.28	.80
38. Length of teacher observation	2.90	.88	2.71	1.70	.30
39. Evaluation in writing	3.37	1.04	3.39	1.41	.06
40. Teacher access to personnel file	3.23	1.24	2.58	1.59	1.61
51. Tuesday and Wednesday after Labor Day for conferences	3.00	.71	2.57	1.98	.46
52. School opens on Thursday after Labor Day	2.86	1.35	2.67	1.86	.21
63. Substitute salary	3.60	1.19	2.96	.98	1.95
64. Tenure teachers take extra assignments, if they want	3.53	1.28	2.53	1.39	2.24 ^a
69. Incurrigibles ejected	4.12	1.11	2.69	1.38	3.14 ^b
70. Smaller classes for large numbers of discipline cases	3.33	1.51	1.80	.84	2.02
71. Board attorney will represent teacher	2.95	1.19	2.37	1.12	1.57
73. Board will pay for lost, damaged, stolen property	2.87	1.36	2.21	1.19	1.37
74. Joint instructional council	3.25	1.39	2.44	1.38	1.69
75. Discipline Review Board	2.51	1.29	2.27	1.15	.76
76. Grievance procedure	2.03	1.05	1.97	1.16	.23
SALARY AND SUPPLEMENTAL INCOME					
15. Teacher overload	3.46	1.13	2.27	1.12	3.03 ^b
19. Board will provide uniforms	3.00	1.49	2.18	1.25	1.37
43. Board will pay for NCATE courses	2.92	1.44	2.43	1.40	.93
53. Full credit for past experience	2.82	1.17	1.94	1.06	2.45 ^a
54. Longevity pay	3.16	1.07	1.92	.83	3.58 ^b
55. Reimburse for past masters courses	3.44	1.29	3.00	1.24	.98

a = significant at .05 level

b = significant at .01 level

TABLE 4.2 - (continued)

Item	Association			Superintendent			t score
	Mean	S	D	Mean	S	D	
56. Pay for extra duty assignments	3.69	1.14		2.94	1.29		2.45 ^a
59. Severance Pay	2.64	.74		1.77	.83		2.88 ^b
FRINGE BENEFIT							
44. Board will pay for expenses at professional meetings	3.39	1.13		2.35	1.26		3.21 ^b
57. Board will pay for required automobile expenses	3.81	1.24		3.38	1.06		1.35
58. Board will pay for required automobile insurance	3.65	1.17		2.58	1.24		2.35 ^a
FULL OR PARTIAL PREMIUM PAYMENTS							
60. Life insurance	3.25	1.23		2.33	1.03		2.36 ^a
61. Uninterrupted health insurance	3.22	1.23		2.36	1.06		2.89 ^b
62. Family health insurance	3.28	1.10		2.25	.97		3.74 ^b
ABSENCES WITH FULL OR PARTIAL PAY							
25. Sick leave, 15 days	2.92	1.04		1.79	.89		3.06 ^b
27. Board will pay the difference between Workmens Compensation and salary	3.04	1.16		2.45	1.34		1.55
28. No loss of pay for teacher having childhood diseases	2.42	.79		1.60	.70		2.54 ^a
29. Personal and professional leave	3.37	1.18		2.90	1.40		1.67
30. Board will pay difference between salary and jury duty pay	2.87	1.33		2.04	.86		2.58 ^a
31. Sabbatical leave	3.10	1.18		2.54	1.32		1.48
72. No loss of income for attack by student	2.96	1.36		2.26	1.14		1.88
ABSENCES WITHOUT PAY							
32. Leaves allowed	3.21	1.24		2.78	1.35		1.08
33. Four year leave	3.17	1.17		2.75	1.71		.46
34. Maternity leave, 18 months	3.32	1.20		3.00	1.00		.91

a = significant at .05 level

b = significant at .01 level

NULL HYPOTHESIS III

Local education association leaders and superintendents who were a part of this study did not differ in their perceptions of the reasonableness of provisions which were included in the initial submission agreement.

Superintendents were requested to indicate their perception of the reasonableness of the provisions which were included on the superintendents' questionnaire. Responses for each provision were tabulated and a mean and standard deviation were computed for each item. Since there was no corresponding scale on the local education association questionnaire, the investigator assumed a mean of 2.0 and a standard deviation of 0.0 for responses from this group. This measure was the one where superintendents reported their perception of the reasonableness of individual provisions. Using the above data, a t score was computed to establish the statistical difference between the two groups. As previously stated, the null hypothesis was rejected when the t score was significant at the .05 level.

An analysis of the difference between the two means on each item showed that sixty of the eighty-one provisions caused the rejection of the null hypothesis. The null hypothesis was rejected at least once in every division of the questionnaire. The null hypothesis was rejected for all provisions in the categories entitled instructional activity, full or partial premium payment, and absences with full or partial pay. The null hypothesis was rejected in each category as follows: three of six provisions were rejected in the negotiation procedure division; seven of twelve, scope of agreement; two of seven, professional activity; eighteen of twenty-three, personnel practices and procedures; seven of eight, salary and supplemental income; two of three, fringe

benefits; three of three, full or partial premium payments; seven of seven, absences with full or partial pay; two of three, absences without pay. A total of fifty-five (55) provisions met the criteria to reject the null hypothesis at the .01 level.

Table 4.3 showed the mean scores and standard deviations for the various items as superintendents responded to them. A t score was also reported as well as its statistical significance noted.

Finally, Table 4.3 indicated whether the data for each item warranted the acceptance or rejection of the null hypothesis in each item of the questionnaire. The data were presented in the various categories of the instrument.

TABLE 4.3 - AN ANALYSIS OF THE DIFFERENCE IN PERCEPTION OF THE REASONABLENESS OF PROFESSIONAL NEGOTIATION PROVISIONS AS RELATED BY SUPERINTENDENTS, WHERE THE LOCAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION MEAN AND STANDARD DEVIATION WERE ASSUMED AT 2.0 AND 0.0 RESPECTIVELY

Item	Superintendent		t score
	Mean	S D	
NEGOTIATION PROCEDURE			
1. Exclusive representation	1.977	.672	-.22
77. Regular meetings for negotiation	2.878	.872	6.45 ^a
78. Negotiations begin March 1-15	2.707	.814	5.56 ^a
79. Individual contract subject to master contract	2.024	.780	.20
80. Agreement to be part of board policy	2.425	.984	2.73 ^a
81. Illegal section will not invalidate agreement	2.143	.783	1.18
SCOPE OF AGREEMENT			
2. Association will have use of buildings and facilities	1.953	.722	-.43
3. Board will consult on academic policies	2.227	.859	1.75
4. Board will consult on fiscal policies	2.689	.874	5.29 ^a
5. Board will consult on building construction	2.907	1.192	4.99 ^a
6. Teachers will join association or pay equivalent	3.842	1.033	11.82 ^a
7. Board may deduct dues	2.155	.824	1.26
8. Board may deduct other things	2.000	.747	.18

a = significant at .01 level.

TABLE 4.3 - (continued)

Item	Superintendent		t score
	Mean	S D	
46. Previous agreement will be upheld	3.095	.983	7.22 ^a
47. Agreement will be upheld in case of consolidation	3.028	1.028	6.00 ^a
48. If merged, board will find positions for teachers	3.111	.919	7.25 ^a
49. Teachers will not strike	1.714	.891	-2.08 ^b
50. Board will not use unfair labor practices	2.020	1.72	.36
PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITY			
1. Association will deal with teacher ethics	3.841	.906	13.32 ^a
42. Association will initiate proceedings against teacher	2.047	1.133	.27
45. Workshops will be held on board or association initiative	2.100	.672	.98
65. Student teacher supervisors must have masters degree	2.703	1.051	4.05 ^a
66. Student teachers will be honorary members	2.432	1.325	1.98
67. Money to be used for educational expenses	2.029	1.317	.13
68. Supervising teacher will file report each 4 weeks	2.194	1.117	1.04
INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITY			
13. Maximum pupil-teacher contact hours	2.881	.916	6.23 ^a
14. Pupil-teacher ratio	3.488	1.077	8.82 ^a
17. Teacher aides hired	2.973	.866	6.83 ^a
18. Reference library in each building	2.537	1.027	3.35 ^a
20. Psychologists or visiting teachers hired	2.524	.634	5.36 ^a
21. Department chairmen	3.04	1.082	6.11 ^a
22. Hire only qualified and certified teachers	2.364	.917	2.63 ^b
23. Only qualified substitutes hired for more than 90 days	2.614	.919	4.38 ^b
35. Teachers will have academic freedom	3.023	1.035	6.47 ^a
PERSONNEL PRACTICES AND PROCEDURE			
9. Reporting and leaving time	2.133	.842	1.06
10. Duty free lunch period	2.155	.673	1.54
11. Rest periods, elementary	2.651	.870	4.91 ^a
12. Rest periods, specialized	2.585	.865	4.33 ^a
16. Maximum hours for meeting	3.561	1.026	9.74 ^a

a = significant at .01 level

b = significant at .05 level

TABLE 4.3 - (continued)

Item	Superintendent		t score
	Mean	S D	
24. Promote from within	3.089	1.145	6.38 ^a
26. Sick leave bank	3.537	.897	10.97 ^a
36. Probationary teachers evaluated	2.022	.702	.59
37. Tenure teachers evaluated	2.066	.751	.59
38. Length of teacher observation	2.588	1.076	3.58 ^a
39. Evaluation in writing	3.786	.606	-2.29 ^b
40. Teacher access to personnel file	2.636	1.183	3.63 ^a
51. Tuesday and Wednesday after Labor Day for conferences	3.590	1.163	8.54 ^a
52. School opens on Thursday after Labor Day	3.821	1.048	10.85 ^a
63. Substitute salary	2.405	1.037	2.53 ^b
64. Tenure teachers take extra assignments, if they want	3.256	1.115	7.39 ^a
69. Incurrigibles ejected	3.310	1.158	7.33 ^a
70. Smaller classes for large numbers of discipline cases	3.293	.901	9.19 ^a
71. Board attorney will represent teacher	2.525	.876	3.96 ^a
73. Board will pay for lost, damaged, stolen property	3.302	1.186	7.20 ^a
74. Joint instructional council	2.286	1.066	1.74
75. Discipline Review Board	3.250	1.025	7.32 ^a
76. Grievance procedure	3.889	.487	12.24 ^a
SALARY AND SUPPLEMENTAL INCOME			
15. Teacher overload	3.429	1.039	8.91 ^a
19. Board will provide uniforms	3.452	.968	9.72 ^a
43. Board will pay for NCATE courses	3.163	1.067	7.15 ^a
53. Full credit for past experience	3.558	1.201	8.51 ^a
54. Longevity pay	3.512	.952	10.17 ^a
55. Reimburse for past masters courses	2.814	.982	5.14 ^a
56. Pay for extra duty assignments	2.089	.668	.89
59. Severance Pay	3.860	.889	13.72 ^a
FRINGE BENEFITS			
44. Board will pay for expenses at professional meetings	2.705	1.112	4.21 ^a
57. Board will pay for required automobile expenses	2.047	.815	.38
58. Board will pay for required automobile insurance	2.558	.983	3.72 ^a

a = significant at .01 level

b = significant at .05 level

TABLE 4.3 - (continued)

Item	Superintendent		t score
	Mean	S D	
FULL OR PARTIAL PREMIUM PAYMENT			
60. Life insurance	3.116	.931	7.86 ^a
61. Uninterrupted health insurance	2.783	.917	5.79 ^a
62. Family health insurance	3.093	1.087	6.59 ^a
ABSENCES WITH FULL OR PARTIAL PAY			
25. Sick leave, 15 days	3.524	.890	11.10 ^a
27. Board will pay the difference between Workmens Compensation and salary	2.659	1.077	4.06 ^a
28. No loss of pay for teachers having childhood diseases	3.550	1.011	9.71 ^a
29. Personal and professional leave	2.511	.815	3.69 ^a
30. Board will pay difference between salary and jury duty pay	2.512	.910	3.68 ^a
31. Sabbatical leave	2.658	.925	6.22 ^a
72. No loss of income for attack by student	2.500	.834	3.89 ^a
ABSENCES WITHOUT PAY			
32. Leaves allowed	2.279	.984	1.86
33. Four year leave	2.805	1.145	4.50 ^a
34. Maternity leave, 18 months	2.465	.960	3.18 ^a

a = significant at .01 level

NULL HYPOTHESIS FOUR

Several provisions were not included in present initial submission agreements which local education associations planned to include in future initial submission agreements.

Local education association leaders were requested to identify provisions which they felt the local education association would incorporate into future negotiations with the local board of education. These responses were then tabulated to provide an analysis of those provisions most frequently identified. As previously stated, the null hypothesis was rejected for those items on which five or more local education associations responded that this item would be included in future negotiation packages.

This hypothesis was intended to determine those professional negotiations provisions about which local education associations clearly felt were negotiable items, but were withheld from present negotiations. Such responses could give an indication of those items about which local education associations wished to negotiate. Further, this analysis might establish a pattern for the scope of negotiations in future years. It also gave the study an additional dimension by identifying possible reasons for local education associations' not including the items in the present initial submission agreement.

The data determined that only thirteen provisions contained on the questionnaire did not meet the criteria to reject the null hypothesis, leaving a total of sixty-eight provisions which local education associations planned to include in future negotiation packages. It was found that more than eighty percent of the provisions listed on the questionnaire were considered negotiable at some future date. Such data indicated that local education associations have considered many provisions, and accepted most of them as worthy of inclusion in future initial negotiation packages.

Table 4.4 showed the number of responses of local education associations reporting that the provision would be submitted in future initial submission agreements.

TABLE 4.4 - AN ANALYSIS OF THOSE PROFESSIONAL NEGOTIATION PROVISIONS WHICH LOCAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATIONS STATED WOULD BE INCLUDED IN FUTURE INITIAL SUBMISSION AGREEMENTS

Item	Number of Responses	accept/reject
NEGOTIATION PROCEDURE		
1. Exclusive representation	0	accept
77. Regular meetings for negotiations	16	reject
78. Negotiations begin March 1-15	11	reject

TABLE 4.4 - (continued)

Item	Number of Responses	accept/reject
79. Individual contract subject to master agreement	1	accept
80. Agreement to be a part of board policy	3	accept
81. Illegal section will not invalidate agreement	6	reject
SCOPE OF AGREEMENT		
2. Association will have use of buildings and facilities	0	accept
3. Board will consult on academic policies	15	reject
4. Board will consult on fiscal policies	11	reject
5. Board will consult on building construction	17	reject
6. Teachers will join association or pay equivalent amount	23	reject
7. Board may deduct dues	1	accept
8. Board may deduct other things	2	accept
46. Previous agreement will be upheld	8	reject
47. Agreement will be upheld in case of consolidation	16	reject
48. If merged, board will find positions for teachers	17	reject
49. Teachers will not strike	6	reject
50. Board will not use unfair labor practices	10	reject
PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITY		
41. Association will deal with teacher ethics	10	reject
42. Association will initiate proceedings against teacher	17	reject
45. Workshops will be held on board or association initiative	13	reject
65. Student teacher supervisor will have masters degree	20	reject
66. Student teachers will be honorary members	18	reject
67. Money to be used for educational expenses	17	reject
68. Supervising teacher will file report every four weeks	17	reject
INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITY		
13. Maximum pupil-teacher contact hours	21	reject
14. Pupil-teacher ratio	24	reject
17. Teacher aides hired	10	reject
18. Reference library in each building	21	reject
20. Psychologists or visiting teachers hired	15	reject
21. Department chairmen hired	15	reject
22. Hire only qualified and certified teachers	8	reject
23. Only qualified substitutes hired for more than 90 days	14	reject
35. Teachers will have academic freedom	3	accept

TABLE 4.4 - (continued)

Item	Number of Responses	accept/reject
PERSONNEL PRACTICES AND PROCEDURES		
9. Reporting and leaving time	2	accept
10. Duty free lunch period	4	accept
11. Rest periods, elementary	18	reject
12. Rest periods, specialized	21	reject
16. Maximum hours for meetings	18	reject
24. Promote from within	3	accept
26. Sick leave bank	18	reject
36. Probationary teachers evaluated	8	reject
37. Tenure teachers evaluated	8	reject
38. Length of teacher observation	15	reject
39. Evaluation in writing	5	reject
40. Teacher access to personnel file	5	reject
51. Tuesday and Wednesday after Labor Day for conferences	10	reject
52. School opens on Thursday after Labor Day	7	reject
63. Substitute salary	8	reject
64. Tenure teachers take extra assignments, if they want them	16	reject
69. Incurables ejected	13	reject
70. Smaller classes for large numbers of discipline cases	20	reject
71. Board attorney will represent teacher	9	reject
73. Board will pay for loss, damaged, or stolen property	20	reject
74. Joint Instructional Council	17	reject
75. Discipline Review Board	27	reject
77. Grievance procedure	1	accept
SALARY AND SUPPLEMENTAL INCOME		
15. Teacher overload	22	reject
19. Board will provide uniforms	15	reject
43. Board will pay for NCATE courses	21	reject
53. Full credit for past experience	18	reject
54. Longevity pay	17	reject
55. Reimburse for post masters courses	17	reject
56. Pay for extra duty assignments	2	reject
59. Severance pay	15	reject
FRINGE BENEFITS		
44. Board will pay for expenses at professional meetings	6	reject
57. Board will pay for required automobile expenses	7	reject
58. Board will pay for required automobile insurance	14	reject
FULL OR PARTIAL PREMIUM PAYMENTS		
60. Life insurance	23	reject

TABLE 4.4 - (continued)

Item	Number of Responses	accept/reject
61. Uninterrupted health insurance	23	reject
62. Family health insurance	10	reject
ABSENCES WITH FULL OR PARTIAL PAY		
25. Sick leave, 15 days	24	reject
27. Board will pay difference between Workmen's Compensation and salary	11	reject
28. Board will pay for teacher having childhood diseases	19	reject
29. Personal and professional leave	1	accept
30. Board will pay difference between salary and jury duty pay	5	reject
31. Sabbatical leave	18	reject
72. No loss of income for attack by student	9	reject
ABSENCES WITHOUT PAY		
32. Leaves allowed	11	reject
33. Four year leave	16	reject
34. Maternity leave, 18 months	11	reject

NULL HYPOTHESIS FIVE

Several provisions contained on the instrument were not considered inappropriate to local education associations; therefore, they felt that these provisions would be included in future initial submission agreements.

Local education association leaders were requested to identify provisions which they felt the local education association would exclude from future initial submission agreements. These responses were then tabulated to provide an analysis of those provisions most frequently identified. As previously stated, the null hypothesis was rejected for those items when five or more local education associations responded in manner.

This hypothesis resulted in an identification of those responses which local education association leaders considered to be irrelevant or

undesirable to the needs of the local education association or the school district. Respondents noted that these provisions would never be submitted as a part of the initial submission agreements. A total of forty-six of the eighty-one provisions met the criteria to reject the null hypothesis, thus indicating that these items might be permanently excluded from negotiations.

Some of the returned questionnaires carried notations that those provisions dealing with student teaching were not applicable as the school district did not participate in a student teaching program with any college or university. Provisions dealing with department chairmen, psychologists and visiting teachers, and required automobile insurance and/or expenses were also ruled inappropriate by some school districts. It was also noted that intra-district travel was not possible as only one school building existed in the school district. Others indicated that the small pupil enrollment did not justify the selection of department chairmen while others noted that psychologists and visiting teachers were hired and their services were supplied by the intermediate district office.

The null hypothesis was rejected at least one time for each division of the questionnaire. It was rejected for each provision listed in two categories, professional activity and absences without leave. There appeared to be no apparent trend in other categories except that at least one provision garnered a sufficient number of responses to reject the null hypothesis. It may be found in Table 4.5 that the number of responses of local education associations reporting that the provision would be excluded from future initial submission agreements. The data were presented in the various categories of the questionnaire in stating the acceptance or rejection of the null hypothesis.

TABLE 4.5 - AN ANALYSIS OF THOSE PROFESSIONAL NEGOTIATION PROVISIONS
WHICH LOCAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATIONS STATE WOULD BE EXCLUDED
FROM FUTURE INITIAL SUBMISSION AGREEMENTS

Item	Number of Responses	accept/reject
NEGOTIATION PROCEDURE		
1. Exclusive representation	0	accept
77. Regular meetings for negotiations	15	reject
78. Negotiations begin between March 1-15	10	reject
79. Individual contract subject to master agreement	1	accept
80. Agreement to be part of board policy	1	accept
81. Illegal section will not invalidate agreements	3	accept
SCOPE OF AGREEMENT		
2. Association will have use of building and facilities	0	accept
3. Board will consult on academic policies	1	accept
4. Board will consult on fiscal policies	5	reject
5. Board will consult on building construction	8	reject
6. Teachers will join the association or pay equivalent amount	1	accept
7. Board may deduct dues, etc.	0	accept
8. Board may deduct other things	2	accept
46. Previous agreement will be upheld	4	accept
47. Agreement will be upheld in case of consolidation	11	reject
48. If merged, board will find positions for teachers	13	reject
49. Teachers will not strike	13	reject
50. Board will not use unfair labor practices	8	reject
PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITY		
41. Association will deal with teacher ethics	11	reject
42. Association will initiate proceedings against teachers	10	reject
45. Workshops will be held on board or association initiative	10	reject
65. Student teacher supervisors must have masters degree	22	reject
66. Student teachers will be honorary members of the association	26	reject
68. Supervision teacher will file report every four weeks	25	reject
77. Money to be used for education expenses, student teaching	19	reject
INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITY		
13. Maximum pupil-teacher contact hours specified	0	accept

TABLE 4.5 - (continued)

Item	Number of Responses	accept/reject
14. Pupil-teacher ratio specified	0	accept
17. Teacher aides hired	20	reject
18. Reference library in each building	5	reject
20. Psychologists or visiting teacher hire	2	accept
21. Department chairmen designated	14	reject
22. Hire only qualified and certified teachers	0	accept
23. Only qualified substitutes hired for more than 90 days	3	accept
35. Teachers will have academic freedom	5	reject
PERSONNEL PRACTICES AND PROCEDURES		
9. Reporting and leaving time specified	4	accept
10. Duty free lunch periods	0	accept
11. Rest periods, elementary teacher	4	accept
12. Rest periods, specialized teacher	8	reject
16. Maximum hours for meetings	14	reject
24. Promote from within	4	accept
26. Sick leave bank	14	reject
36. Probationary teachers evaluated	8	reject
37. Tenure teachers evaluated	6	reject
38. Length of teacher observation	15	reject
39. Evaluation in writing	3	accept
40. Teacher access to personnel file	2	accept
51. Tuesday and Wednesday after Labor Day for conferences	28	reject
52. School opens on Thursday after Labor Day	29	reject
63. Substitute salary	7	reject
64. Tenure teachers take extra teaching assignments, if they want them	8	reject
70. Smaller classes for large number of discipline cases	8	reject
71. Board attorney will represent teachers	4	accept
73. Board will pay for damaged, lost and stolen property	7	reject
74. Joint instructional council	7	reject
75. Discipline Review Board	18	reject
76. Grievance procedure	1	accept
SALARY AND SUPPLEMENTAL INCOME		
15. Teacher overload	8	reject
19. Board will provide uniforms	17	reject
43. Board will pay for NCATE courses	8	reject
53. Full credit for past experience	3	accept
54. Longevity pay	5	reject
55. Reimburse for post masters courses	3	accept
59. Severance pay	16	reject

TABLE 4.5 - (continued)

Item	Number of Responses	accept/reject
FRINGE BENEFITS		
44. Board will pay for expenses at professional meetings	4	accept
57. Board will pay for required automobile expenses	1	accept
58. Board will pay for required automobile insurance	9	reject
FULL OR PARTIAL PREMIUM PAYMENTS		
60. Life insurance	5	reject
61. Uninterrupted health insurance	0	accept
62. Family health insurance	1	accept
ABSENCES WITH FULL OR PARTIAL PAY		
25. Sick leave, 15 days annually	7	reject
27. Board will pay difference between Workmen's Compensation and salary	6	reject
28. No loss of pay for teacher having childhood diseases	8	reject
29. Personal and professional leave	1	accept
30. Board will pay difference between salary and jury duty pay	5	reject
31. Sabbatical leave	3	accept
72. No loss of income for attack by student, days lost	4	accept
ABSENCES WITHOUT PAY		
32. Leaves allowed	5	reject
33. Four year leave	18	reject
34. Maternity leave, 18 months	7	reject

ANALYSIS OF THE ADDITIONAL DATA

Local education association leaders and superintendents were both requested to identify provisions which were already accepted by the board of education before Public Law 379 was in effect. Although there was general agreement between the two groups, several discrepancies existed in the responses to the various provisions as the two groups occasionally disagreed in their responses. Table 4.6 showed the responses of both local education association leaders and superintendents. The

data were presented in the categories of the questionnaire.

TABLE 4.6 - AN ANALYSIS OF LOCAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION LEADERS AND SUPERINTENDENTS' RESPONSES CONCERNING THOSE PROVISIONS WHICH WERE ALLOWED BY THE BOARDS OF EDUCATION BEFORE THE PASSAGE OF PUBLIC ACT 379

Item	Responses	
	Superintendent	Association
NEGOTIATION PROCEDURE		
1. Exclusive representation	4	3
77. Regular meetings for negotiations	2	0
78. Negotiations begin between March 1-15	2	1
79. Individual contract subject to master agreement	1	1
80. Agreement to be part of board policy	2	0
81. Illegal section will not invalidate agreements	0	0
SCOPE OF AGREEMENT		
2. Association will have use of building and facilities	9	7
3. Board will consult on academic policies	10	5
4. Board will consult on fiscal policies	8	4
5. Board will consult on building construction	8	6
6. Teachers will join the association or pay equivalent amount	2	2
7. Board may deduct dues, etc.	11	10
8. Board may deduct other things	12	9
46. Previous agreement will be upheld	4	2
47. Agreement will be upheld in case of consolidation	2	0
48. If merged, board will find position for teachers	1	0
49. Teachers will not strike	2	0
50. Board will not use unfair labor practices	1	0
PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITY		
41. Association will deal with teacher ethics	5	3
42. Association will initiate proceedings against teachers	3	2
45. Workshops will be held on board of association initiative	4	3
65. Student teacher supervisors must have masters degree	3	0
66. Student teachers will be honorary members of the association	1	0
67. Money to be used for education expenses, student teaching	2	3
68. Supervising teacher will file report every four weeks	1	1

TABLE 4.6 - (continued)

Item	Responses	
	Superintendent	Association
INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITY		
13. Maximum pupil-teacher contact hours specified	4	1
14. Pupil-teacher ration specified	1	0
17. Teacher aides hired	6	4
18. Reference library in each building	11	7
20. Psychologists or visiting teacher hired	8	2
21. Department chairmen designated	8	3
22. Hire only qualified and certified teachers	5	2
23. Only qualified substitutes hired for more than 90 days	3	0
35. Teachers will have academic freedom	4	4
PERSONNEL PRACTICES AND PROCEDURES		
9. Reporting and leaving time specified	6	6
10. Duty free lunch periods	1	0
11. Rest periods, elementary teachers	1	1
12. Rest periods, specialized teachers	2	2
16. Maximum hours for meetings	3	0
24. Promote from within	5	1
26. Sick leave bank	4	0
36. Probationary teachers evaluated	5	1
37. Tenure teachers evaluated	4	1
38. Length of teacher observation	7	1
39. Evaluation in writing	7	1
40. Teacher access to personnel file	4	4
51. Tuesday and Wednesday after Labor Day for conferences	4	0
52. School opens on Thursday after Labor Day	4	0
63. Substitute salary	7	6
64. Tenure teachers take extra teaching assignments, if they want them	4	2
70. Smaller classes for large number of discipline cases	1	2
71. Board attorney will represent teachers	2	3
73. Board will pay for damaged, lost, and stolen property	4	1
74. Joint instructional council	4	2
75. Discipline Review Board	2	1
76. Grievance procedure	3	0
SALARY AND SUPPLEMENTAL INCOME		
15. Teacher overload	1	0
19. Board will provide uniforms	6	0
43. Board will pay for NCATE courses	5	1
53. Full credit for past experience	2	1
54. Longevity pay	5	3
55. Reimburse for post masters courses	6	2
56. Pay for extra duty assignments	6	4

TABLE 4.6 - (continued)

Item	Responses	
	Superintendent	Association
59. Severance pay	3	0
FRINGE BENEFITS		
44. Board will pay for expenses at professional meetings	9	5
57. Board will pay for required automobile expenses	6	5
58. Board will pay for required automobile insurance	7	5
FULL OR PARTIAL PREMIUM PAYMENTS		
60. Life insurance	2	1
61. Uninterrupted health insurance	2	1
62. Family health insurance	1	2
ABSENCES WITH FULL OR PARTIAL PAY		
25. Sick leave, 15 days annually	2	0
27. Board will pay difference between Workmen's Compensation and salary	5	2
28. No loss of pay for teacher having childhood diseases	4	0
29. Personal and professional leave	7	3
30. Board will pay difference between salary and jury duty pay	6	1
31. Sabbatical leave	4	3
72. No loss of income for attack by student, days lost	1	2
ABSENCES WITHOUT PAY		
32. Leaves allowed	8	3
33. Four year leave	5	2
34. Maternity leave, 18 months	4	0

It was noted that superintendents perceived that the school districts allowed more of these provisions, prior to the passage of Public Law 379, than did the local educational association. Superintendents stated that the provisions were present more frequently than did the local education association except in the cases of three items: items 70, 71, and 62. Item 62 dealt with insurance benefits while items 70 and 71 dealt with personnel policies and procedures.

Local education association leaders and superintendents were

requested to identify provisions which had been incorporated into professional agreements since the passage of Public Law 379. Table 4.7 showed the responses which identified those provisions which have been incorporated into agreements.

TABLE 4.7 - AN ANALYSIS OF LOCAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION LEADERS CONCERNING THOSE PROVISIONS WHICH HAVE BEEN INCORPORATED INTO PROFESSIONAL AGREEMENTS SINCE THE PASSAGE OF PUBLIC ACT 379

Item	Response
NEGOTIATION PROCEDURE AGREEMENT	
79. Individual contract subject to the master agreement	13
1. Exclusive representation	12
81. Illegal section will not invalidate agreement	12
80. Agreement to part of policy	8
78. Negotiations begin between March 1-15	5
77. Regular meeting for negotiation	3
SCOPE OF AGREEMENT	
4. Board will consult on fiscal policies	6
2. Association will have use of building and facilities	6
3. Board will consult on academic policies	5
5. Board will consult on building construction	4
7. Board may deduct dues, etc.	4
8. Board may deduct other things	4
50. Board will not use unfair labor practices	4
46. Previous agreement will be upheld	3
48. If merged, board will find positions for teachers	2
6. Teachers will join the association or pay equivalent	1
47. Agreement will be upheld in case of consolidation	1
PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITY	
45. Workshops will be held on board or association initiative	5
41. Association will deal with teacher ethics	4
67. Money to be used for educational expenses	4
42. Association will initiate proceedings against teacher	2
66. Student teachers will be honorary members	1
65. Student teacher supervisors will have master degree	0
68. Supervising teacher will file report every four weeks	0
INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITY	
14. Pupil-teacher ratio established	6
13. Pupil-teacher contact hours specified	5
23. Only qualified substitutes hired for more than 90 days	4
35. Teachers will have academic freedom	4
18. Reference library in each building	3
20. Psychologists or visiting teachers hired	3
21. Department chairmen designated	3

TABLE 4.7 - (continued)

Item	Response
17. Teacher aides hired	2
22. Hire only qualified and certified teachers	2
PERSONNEL PRACTICES AND PROCEDURES	
39. Evaluation in writing	10
40. Teacher access to personnel file	9
10. Duty free lunch periods	8
9. Reporting and leaving time specified	7
36. Probationary teachers evaluated	7
12. Rest periods, specialized teachers	6
37. Tenure teachers evaluated	6
11. Rest periods, elementary teachers	5
26. Sick leave bank	5
16. Maximum hours for meetings	4
24. Promote from within	4
51. Tuesday and Wednesday after Labor Day for conferences	2
76. Grievance procedure	13
71. Board attorney will represent teacher	8
73. Board will pay for damaged, lost, and stolen property	8
52. School opens on Thursday after Labor Day	3
64. Tenure teachers take extra teaching assignments, if they want them	3
70. Smaller classes for large number of discipline cases	3
75. Discipline Review Board	3
63. Substitute salary	2
74. Joint Instructional Council	1
SALARY AND SUPPLEMENTAL INCOME	
54. Longevity pay	6
56. Pay for extra duty assignments	6
19. Board will provide uniforms	5
53. Full credit for past experience	4
55. Reimburse for post masters courses	4
59. Severance pay	4
43. Board will pay for NCATE courses	3
15. Teacher overload	2
FRINGE BENEFITS	
57. Board will pay for required automobile expenses	5
44. Board will pay for expenses at professional meetings	4
58. Board will pay for required automobile insurance	2
FULL OR PARTIAL PREMIUM PAYMENTS	
60. Life insurance	2
61. Uninterrupted health insurance	2
62. Family health insurance	2
ABSENCES WITH FULL OR PARTIAL PAY	
72. No loss of income for attack by student on days lost	8

TABLE 4.7 - (continued)

Item	Response
30. Board will pay the difference between salary and jury duty pay	7
28. No loss of income for teacher having shildhood diseases	6
29. Personal and professional leave	6
27. Board will pay difference between Workmen's Compensation and salary	5
31. Sabbatical leave	3
25. Sick leave, 15 days annually	1
ABSENCES WITHOUT PAY	
34. Leaves allowed	5
33. Four year leave	3
32. Maternity leave, 18 months	1

Responses were gathered for each item in each catagory of the questionnaire. The tabulation revealed that only two provisions listed on the questionnaire had not been included in at least one local agreement. Both of these, items 65 and 68, were in the division of the instrument entitled professional activity. The Negotiation Procedure catagory appeared with more frequency in professional negotiation agreements since the passage of Public Act 379 than did any of the other catagories.

TABLE 4.8 - ADDITIONAL PROVISIONS NOT INCLUDED ON THE QUESTIONNAIRE, BUT ADDED BY THE RESPONDENTS

Provisions
1. Each teacher will have two free passes to school sponsored activities
2. Teachers will suffer no loss of pay for their tardiness in arriving at school because of bad road conditions
3. The local association president will have one day released time weekly to conduct association business
4. A policy book will be developed for each building
5. The board of education will consult with the local association prior to taking any action which is a result of community pressure
6. The board of education will respect the human rights of teachers
7. Administrators will not be allowed to prevent teacher transfers from one school building to another

TABLE 4.8 - (continued)

Provisions

8. The salary schedule will reflect professional growth
9. The board of education will allow attendance at workshops or educational meetings as the representative of the association
10. The board of education will allow twenty days of sick leave to be transferred into the school system
11. A procedure will be established for teachers to be evaluated by their fellow teachers

Table 4.8 showed the listing of the provisions which local associations requested from boards of education which were not made a part of the questionnaire. Eleven such negotiation items were identified from the responses of the two groups. There did not appear to be a disproportionate number of additional items in any one category. Each was supplied by the local association questionnaire, and in most cases was confirmed by the superintendent's questionnaire.

Respondents were asked to state the minimum and maximum salary levels requested in the initial negotiation package. They were asked to supply this information at three salary levels: bachelor's degree, master's degree, and master's degree plus thirty hours. The number of school districts responding to this varied somewhat in each category. Table 4.9 showed the mean and range of each division.

TABLE 4.9 - MEAN SALARY REQUESTS AND RANGE OF REQUESTS SUBMITTED BY THE RESPONDENTS

Degree	number districts	mean minimum	number of districts		range	
					low	high
Bachelor	45	\$6666	42	10642	\$5700	\$16400
Master	43	7836	39	10792	6100	15200
Master 30	17	9212	16	11124	6400	18400

The amount of annual increment varied greatly, from a low of \$150 minimum for teachers holding the bachelor's degree to \$500 maximum for

teachers holding the master's degree plus thirty hours additional. A total of thirty-five districts responded at both the bachelor's and master's degree level and thirteen districts responded for the master's degree plus thirty hours category. Table 4.10 showed the mean salary increment in each division and the range of salary increments reported by the respondents.

TABLE 4.10 - MEAN AND RANGE OF THE AMOUNT OF ANNUAL SALARY INCREMENTS AT THE BACHELOR'S, MASTER'S, AND MASTER PLUS THIRTY HOURS LEVEL

Degree	number of districts	mean salary increment	range	
			low	high
Bachelor	35	\$326.75	150	465
Master	35	321.00	150	500
Master 30	13	358.00	225	500

The number of increments varied greatly, from a low of eight increments to a high of fourteen years in each category. Forty-five school districts responded at both the bachelor's and master's degree level and sixteen school districts responded at the master's degree plus thirty hours level. Table 4.11 showed the mean number of increments in each division and the range of the number of increments in each category as reported by the respondents.

TABLE 4.11 - MEAN AND RANGE OF THE NUMBER OF ANNUAL SALARY INCREMENTS AT THE BACHELOR'S, MASTER'S, AND MASTER'S PLUS THIRTY HOURS LEVEL

Degree	number of districts	mean number of increments	range	
			low	high
Bachelor	45	10.35	8	14
Master	45	10.84	8	14
Master 30	16	11.12	8	14

Respondents were asked to note the number of weekly unassigned periods at each of the school levels; elementary, junior high, and senior

high. The range of weekly unassigned periods varied from no unassigned periods to at each level to ten unassigned periods at both the junior and senior high school levels. The number of districts also varied from thirty school districts reporting the number of weekly unassigned elementary periods to thirty-nine school districts reporting this data about the senior high schools. Table 4.12 showed the mean number of weekly unassigned periods in each division and the range of weekly unassigned periods as reported by the respondents.

TABLE 4.12 - MEAN AND RANGE OF THE NUMBER OF WEEKLY UNASSIGNED PERIODS AT THE ELEMENTARY, JUNIOR HIGH, AND SENIOR HIGH SCHOOLS

Schools	number of districts	mean number of unassigned periods	range	
			low	high
Elementary	30	2.73	0	6
Junior High	38	5.47	0	10
Senior High	39	4.89	0	10

Respondents were asked to note the number of weekly contact hours that teachers worked with pupils at each school level: elementary, junior high, and senior high schools. The range of weekly contact hours varied from twenty-four at the junior and senior high school levels to forty hours weekly at all three levels. Table 4.13 showed the mean number of weekly pupil-teacher contact hours and the range in each division as reported by the respondents.

TABLE 4.13 - MEAN AND RANGE OF THE NUMBER OF WEEKLY PUPIL-TEACHER CONTACT HOURS AT THE ELEMENTARY, JUNIOR HIGH, AND SENIOR HIGH SCHOOLS

School	number of districts	mean number weekly contact hours	range	
			low	high
Elementary	30	30.5	25	40
Junior High	32	28.28	24	40
Senior High	32	29.16	24	40

Respondents were also asked to note the number of weekly teaching periods at each of the school levels: junior high, and senior high. The range of weekly teaching periods varied from twenty teaching periods at the junior and senior high school to forty-five teaching periods at the same levels. The number of districts reporting varied from forty school districts at the junior and senior high schools to thirty school districts at the elementary school level. Table 4.14 showed the mean number of weekly teaching periods in each division and the range of weekly teaching periods as reported by the respondents.

TABLE 4.14 - MEAN AND RANGE OF THE NUMBER OF WEEKLY TEACHING PERIODS AT THE ELEMENTARY, JUNIOR HIGH, AND SENIOR HIGH SCHOOLS

School	number of districts	mean number of teaching periods	range	
			low	high
Elementary	30	27.81	25	35
Junior High	40	27.37	20	45
Senior High	40	26.75	20	45

Concerning required attendance at meetings, four school districts reported that the local association sought to negotiate for a weekly maximum number of hours for after school meetings. Three local education associations requested a maximum of one hour weekly and the fourth local education association requested one and one-half maximum hours weekly for after school meetings.

Sixteen local associations sought to negotiate for a monthly maximum number of hours for after school meetings. The range varied from one hour monthly to a maximum of five hours monthly for after school meetings. The mean number of hours for after school meetings was for 2.34 maximum hours per month.

Local association leaders and superintendents alike were asked to

respond to whether the initial negotiation agreement requested teacher aides. High school districts responded that the local education association sought to negotiate for the hiring of teacher aides. The range of teachers aide to be assisted by an aide varied from a high of one teacher aide per two teachers to a low of one teacher aide to assist thirty teachers.

Both local association leaders and superintendents were requested to respond to whether the initial negotiation package requested sabbatical leaves for teachers after a specified term of service in the district. Thirteen school districts reported that the local association planned to negotiate a sabbatical leave provision. The amounts varied from one hundred percent of salary to ten percent of full salary. In like manner, the number of months requested for sabbatical leave varied from six months to twelve months. The mean percent of full salary allowance which the local association requested was 55.22 percent of full salary while the mean number of month's requested for sabbatical leave was 11.46 months.

Local association leaders and superintendents were asked to report whether the negotiation agreement contained a provision for longevity payment to teachers after a prescribed number of years in a school district. Thirteen school districts responded that such a provision was requested. Seven school districts proposed a sabbatical leave allowance of a percentage of the salary after a prescribed number of years of service while six responded that the request was made for a flat grant following a prescribed number of years of service.

Tables 4.15 and 4.16 showed the mean amounts and/or percentages as well as the mean number of years negotiated for longevity payments, as reported by the respondents.

TABLE 4.15 - MEAN AMOUNTS OF DOLLARS AND NUMBER OF YEARS OF LONGEVITY
PAYMENTS TO TEACHERS FOLLOWING A PRESCRIBED NUMBER OF YEARS
OF SERVICE IN THE SCHOOL DISTRICT

	first payment	second payment	third payment
amount dollars	\$200.00	\$350.00	\$516.67
after			
# years	12.5	17.5	21.67

The first longevity payment was requested after a mean of 12.5 years for a mean amount of \$200; the second payment was requested after a mean of 17.5 for a mean amount of \$350; and the third longevity payment was requested after a mean of 21.67 years for a mean amount of \$516.67. Concerning those school districts which requested a percentage longevity payment rather than an amount of dollars longevity payment, the first longevity payment was requested after 13.85 years for a mean percentage of 6.28; the second longevity payment was requested after 19.5 years for a mean percentage of 10.55; and the third longevity payment was requested after 22.8 years for a mean percentage of 10.16. Table 4.16 showed this data in tabular form.

TABLE 4.16 - MEAN PERCENTAGE OF SALARY AND NUMBER OF YEARS OF LONGEVITY
PAYMENTS TO TEACHERS FOLLOWING A PRESCRIBED NUMBER OF YEARS
OF SERVICE IN THE SCHOOL DISTRICT

	first payment	second payment	third payment
percentage of salary	6.28	10.55	10.16
after			
# years	13.85	19.5	22.8

Local association leaders and superintendents were asked to note whether the initial negotiation package submitted by the local education

association requested a provision for the amount of dollars a substitute teacher would earn for his service in the district. Twenty-three school districts responded that the local education association sought to negotiate for substitute teacher salary. All responded that they requested salary on a full day basis rather than an hourly basis. The range of amount requested for substituted teacher payment varied from a low of twenty dollars daily to a high of thirty-five dollars daily. The mean requested amount for substitute teacher daily payment was \$26.35.

Local association leaders and superintendents were asked to note whether the initial package submitted by the local association requested a provision for health insurance. Forty-one districts responded that the local association did include this provision in their initial submission document. Sixteen of the school districts sought partial payment of health insurance benefits from the board of education and twenty-five of the local associations sought full premium payment by the board of education.

Local association leaders and superintendents were asked to note whether the negotiation package submitted by the local association requested a provision for life insurance. Eighteen school districts reported that the local association was seeking life insurance premium payments paid by the board of education. The range of the amount requested varied from a policy valued at \$2,000.00 to one valued at \$12,500.00. The mean life insurance policy value which was requested by the local association was \$6,611.00.

Local association leaders and superintendents were requested to note whether the negotiation package submitted by the local association requested a provision for a maximum pupil-teacher ratio. Twenty school districts responded that such a provision was requested. The range of

maximum pupil-teacher ratio varied from a low of twenty-five students per teacher to a high of thirty-three students per teacher. The mean number of students per teacher was 26.4.

SUMMARY

Chapter IV presented an analysis of the data derived from the study as the hypotheses and additional data were presented and treated separately. It appeared that the Michigan Education Association generated considerable influence concerning the type and nature of negotiation items, and that superintendents tended to underestimate the NEA's influence in this respect. Even while superintendents considered most items quite unreasonable, local education association leaders noted plans for an increase in the number of future negotiation items. The data suggested that local education association leaders considered nearly all items to be negotiable.

Additional data were presented and explained as it had relevance to the study.

CHAPTER V

THE FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this chapter was to present the findings and conclusions of the study as well as to indicate recommendations for further research. A brief review of the problem, purpose of the study and the procedures utilized were also presented.

THE PROBLEM

Essentially, the problem was to determine to what extent the Michigan Education Association (MEA), through its Sample Professional Agreement, had influenced local education associations in determining the requests made to the boards of education. There seemed to be much speculation that the Michigan Education Association had considerable influence; nevertheless, there was no quantitative evidence to support this contention. It was hypothesized there would be a close relationship because of the following:

In order to provide equal and good educational opportunities for all the children of Michigan, this document is provided with the intent of establishing terms and conditions of professional employment that are as nearly uniform as possible for teachers throughout the state. There is little justification for teachers in small communities working under standards less favorable than those recognized as fair which prevail in larger communities.

For this reason, local associations are urged to follow as closely as they can the Recommended Education Association Agreements for 1968-69. While there will necessarily be some variation among school districts because of local conditions, this Sample Agreement should be regarded as a statement of minimum professional goals for negotiations during the school year.¹

An additional part of the problem of the study was to determine superintendents' attitudes concerning the following: (1) how did

¹Supra., p.2.

superintendents perceive the influence of the Michigan Education Association and (2) how reasonable did superintendents perceive these requests or demands.

The study attempted to determine what provisions were being sought by the local education association for the next professional agreement; to isolate areas of agreement and conflict; and to measure perceptions of the respondents' concerning the reasonableness of the provisions.

The provisions of the MEA Sample Professional Agreement were considered and provisions contained within it determined the criteria for the type and nature of requests made to local boards of education. The study attempted (1) to determine the degree to which the local education association presidents perceived the extent to which the Michigan Education Association coordinated and/or directed the content and nature of requests made to local boards of education by local education associations, and (2) to determine the degree to which superintendents perceived the extent to which the Michigan Education Association coordinated and/or directed the content and nature of requests made to local boards of education by local education associations. Superintendents were also asked to report their perception of the various provisions. This study attempted to speak to the following questions:

1. How closely did local education association follow the prototype agreement published by the Michigan Education Association? What group, the state or the local education association, was instrumental in suggesting the requests made to the boards of education?

2. What were the areas of conflict common to many school districts?
3. What provisions were being sought for the next professional agreement?
4. What were the major areas of agreement and conflict between the local education association and local administrators in regard to the reasonableness of the individual requests?

THE PROCEDURES UTILIZED IN THE STUDY

To attempt to satisfy the requirements of the problem, it was necessary to construct two different questionnaires for submission to the two referrent groups. One questionnaire was prepared for submission to local education association leaders while the other was prepared to be submitted to local superintendents.

Following the construction of the instruments a random sample of one hundred and sixty Michigan school districts was drawn for inclusion in the study. The appropriate questionnaire was then mailed to the local education association president and the superintendent in each of the selected school districts. Totally, 122 or 76,25 percent of the school districts returned at least one of the questionnaires. Both questionnaires were returned and considered usable from forty-seven school districts, or 28.38 percent of the sample. The data from the forty-seven school districts were those which were included in the final analyses.

Five null hypotheses were measured and other additional data were collected for presentation in the study. The data were treated both statistically and by inspection. All data were punched onto electronic data processing cards. A total of two standard computer program were utilized in the compilation of the data: ONEWAY and UNEQ1. A special program was developed for the third null hypothesis. This program, a

product of the programming applications group of the computer laboratory at Michigan State University, was written to measure the statistical significance of the difference of means of the reasonable scale. This was necessitated because the means and standard deviations from the local education associations were assumed rather than determined from data supplied from local education associations.

FINDINGS FROM THE NULL HYPOTHESES

The null hypothesis were changed from their initial statements into question form in an attempt to present the findings more fully. These data follow:

Hypothesis number one: Did local education association leaders feel that the Michigan Education Association exerted any influence on what provisions were submitted in the initial negotiation package?

Local education association leaders were asked to indicate the influence of the Michigan Education Association concerning the content of the negotiation package. The treatment of the data included the tabulation of responses and computation of the mean for each provision listed on the questionnaire.

The first null hypothesis was rejected a total of fifty-four to eighty-one times by the data. This suggested that the influence of the Michigan Education Association was great, especially in the divisions of the questionnaire entitled fringe benefits, full or partial premium payments, and absences without pay. The null hypothesis was rejected for all provisions in each of these three instances. Further, the null hypothesis was rejected at least once in each division. There appeared to be no other apparent emphasis except that mentioned above, yet,

Michigan Education Association influence was considered strong in each division of the questionnaire. Clearly, the data indicated a strong influence of the Michigan Education Association in all professional negotiation provisions with a full two-thirds of the provisions meeting or surpassing the criteria to reject the null hypothesis.

Hypothesis number two: Did local education association leaders and superintendents who were a part of the study differ in their perception of the influence of the Michigan Education Association concerning those items which were sought for the local agreements?

Local education association leaders and superintendents were asked to indicate the degree of influence which they felt the Michigan Education Association exerted on those provisions which were requested for suggested negotiations by the local education association agreement. Responses for each provision were tabulated from each group.

The data suggested that local education associations were influenced more by the Michigan Education Association than superintendents generally perceived. The null hypothesis was rejected a total of thirty-one times in the eighty-one provisions listed on the questionnaires. In each category, the null hypothesis was rejected in at least one instance. Full or partial premium payment was the only division of the questionnaire where all provisions met the criteria to reject the null hypothesis for each provision. The other rejections of the null hypothesis were spread fairly evenly throughout the other divisions of the questionnaire. Generally, means derived from data from local education associations were higher than means derived from superintendents' questionnaires.

This suggested that superintendents should expect that local education associations will continue to follow the lead of the state organization, possibly to the extent of negotiations being conducted on a

total statewide basis. Administrators might be well advised to form a coalition of some type to present a united front throughout the state. It did appear that considerable difference existed in the two groups' perceptions of the influence of the Michigan Education Association concerning the provisions sought for the local master agreement.

Hypothesis number three: Did local education association leaders and superintendents who were a part of this study differ in their perceptions of the reasonableness of provisions which were included in the initial submission agreement?

Superintendents were requested to indicate their perceptions of the reasonableness of the provisions which were included on the superintendent's questionnaire. Responses for each provision were tabulated and a mean and standard deviation were computed. Since no corresponding scale appeared on the local education association questionnaire, the investigator assumed and established a mean of 2.0 and a standard deviation of 0.0 for responses from this group. This implied that superintendents find nearly all negotiation items very unreasonable. Efforts should be expended to find reasons why these items are requested by teachers. Similarly, superintendents' reactions need to be studied to determine the cause(s) of the conflict. It was evident that both groups felt strongly about their respective positions. Resolution of such conflict would make the operation of school systems more effective for the needs of the students.

An analysis of the difference between the two means from each provision showed that a total of sixty of the eighty-one provisions met the criteria to reject the null hypothesis. It was rejected at least once in every division and was rejected for all provisions in three divisions of the questionnaire: instructional activity, full or partial premium

payments, and absences with full or partial pay. The data caused the null hypothesis to be rejected in nearly three-fourths of the provisions, most of which--fifty-five provisions--were rejected at the .01 level.

Null hypothesis four. Were there some provisions which local education associations planned to include in future initial submission agreements, but did not include in the current initial negotiations package?

Local education association leaders were requested to identify provisions which they felt the local education association would incorporate into future initial submission agreements. These responses were then tabulated to provide an analysis of those provisions most frequently identified.

It appeared that most provisions met the criteria to reject the null hypothesis as it was rejected in sixty-eight of the eighty-one provisions contained on the questionnaire. The null hypothesis was rejected for all provisions in five of the divisions of the questionnaire and at least once in every division. It was rejected for all provisions in the following categories: professional activity, salary and supplemental income, fringe benefits, full or partial premium payments, and absences without pay. It was evident that many provisions were withheld from present negotiation, but will be presented to boards of education in forthcoming professional negotiations.

This finding suggested that local education associations plan to broaden the scope of negotiations in the future. The data suggested that several areas dealing with salary, fringe benefits, and supplemental income features will be negotiated with increasing frequency. Local education associations apparently felt that nearly anything was negotiable. The biggest concern was when to include the item into the

initial negotiation package.

Null hypothesis five. Were there some professional negotiation provisions which local education association leaders felt would probably never be submitted to the local board of education?

Local education association leaders were asked to identify provisions which they felt local education associations would exclude from future initial submission agreements. These responses were tabulated to provide an analysis of those provisions most frequently identified.

Forty-six of the eighty-one items on the questionnaire met the criteria to reject the null hypothesis. Several local education associations noted that the provision was inappropriate to their school district for various reasons, mainly because of geographic location and size of the student enrollment. This suggested that the NEA influence on statewide uniformity in initial negotiations packages could be a disservice to the local school district. The uniformity could force irrelevant and/or inappropriate negotiations items on the school district while disregarding some other pressing needs. There appeared to be no apparent trend evident in other categories except that at least one provision in each category gathered sufficient responses to reject the null hypothesis.

ADDITIONAL FINDINGS

Other related information was requested from local education association leaders and/or superintendents. The findings from these data were as follows:

1. Local education association leaders and superintendents were requested to identify provisions which were allowed by the board of education prior to the passage of P. A. 379. Although there

was general agreement between the two groups, several discrepancies existed in the answers. It was noted that the perceptions of superintendents exceeded those of the local education association concerning what was allowed prior to the enactment of P. A. 379. This suggested an apparent lack of communication between the board of education, superintendent, and the local education association.

2. Local superintendents and local education association leaders noted only eleven negotiations items which were requested, but not listed on the MEA Sample Professional Agreement. This further supported the hypothesis that the MEA exerted considerable influence on the scope of negotiations throughout Michigan.
3. Local education association leaders and superintendents were requested to identify provisions which had been incorporated into professional negotiation agreements since the passage of P. A. 379. It appeared that provisions in each division of the questionnaire were included in the analysis; thus, all categories listed on the questionnaire have been considered in professional negotiation. This lent further support to the finding that local education associations are considering that nearly any item is negotiable.
4. The amount of salary requests or demands varied considerably, as did the amount and number of increments. Analysis of this data indicated that salary considerations were determined on the local basis, primarily established on the ability of the school district rather than an MEA minimum recommendation.

5. Elementary teachers appeared to be given less consideration in terms of unassigned teaching periods, pupil contact hours, and the number of weekly teaching periods. In each instance, elementary teachers spent more clock hours with pupils than did their counterparts in the secondary schools. Knowing this, education associations and administrators would be aware that elementary teachers may seek relief from this situation in any number of possible ways. Steps could be taken to remedy this situation before it reaches a more critical plane.
6. Demands for longevity pay, sabbatical pay, teacher aides, insurance benefits, and pupil teacher ratio varied markedly. Several school districts requested these provisions, however, there was little indication of any specified amount which were presented uniformly. This might be one of the greatest problem areas in negotiations if uniformity comes throughout the state. The MEA may even render strong recommendations which will bring the same demands to nearly all boards of education. This will present a more united front of teachers as they negotiate with boards of education.

CONCLUSIONS

Several conclusions were reached as a result of the findings which were determined by the analysis of the data derived from the two questionnaires. The conclusions follow:

1. The Michigan Education Association exerted considerable influence in the decisions of the local education associations to request certain professional negotiation provisions from the boards of education. Much of the influence was registered

in areas directly related to financial consideration. However, considerable influence was evident in all areas. This led to the conclusion that the MEA will, under present operation, probably continue to grow in influence in negotiations.

2. Superintendents tended to underestimate the influence of the Michigan Education Association in their determination of its influence, concerning what professional negotiations provisions were sought for the local agreement. Superintendents might be well advised to work closely with their local education association to keep steady communications in operation. This might well alleviate some of the problem of their underestimation.
3. Superintendents tended to perceive that most professional negotiation provisions were unreasonable. The analysis of data allowed the conclusion that parts of each category were unreasonable and that nearly three-fourths of the negotiations items were clearly unreasonable. This conclusion adds credibility to the charge that administrators are bargaining in poor faith.
4. Many local education associations are planning to present nearly any professional negotiation provision, as listed on this questionnaire, in future initial submission agreements. It appeared that nearly all provisions were considered negotiable by many local education associations. It would appear from this that the phenomena of conflict in negotiations has just begun. If all things are negotiable, close attention will need to be given to communications so that the local education association and the superintendent know the needs and circumstances of the

other at all times.

5. Many local education associations noted that certain professional negotiation provisions listed on the questionnaire would not be included in future initial submission agreements. Many of the provisions were rejected because of circumstances of minimal student enrollment and/or geographic location. This lends great support for the contention that negotiations should be maintained on the local rather than state level. Needs of school districts are too diverse to be controlled on a state-wide basis.
6. A great deal of indecision occurred as to the status of some professional negotiation provisions. Some of the provisions were listed both as those which would never be requested. A possible factor in this indecision might have been the recent adoption of professional negotiation in many other Michigan school districts. This recency could have led to the ambivalence related to the status of these provisions. It would appear, though, that local education associations will rapidly organize their positions on the scope of negotiations.
7. Superintendents, more than local education association leaders, perceived that boards of education allowed more of the provisions prior to the passage of P.A. 379. This apparent confusion and/or disagreement may have been the result of a lack of communications and understanding between the superintendent and the faculty. Further, such disagreement and/or confusion may have been one of the causes of the rise of professional negotiation in these school districts.
8. There appeared to be no one specific category of the question-

naire which had received an excessive amount of attention in previously negotiated agreements. Rather, at least part of each category had been included in existing local agreements. This tended to support the previously mentioned conclusion that many local education associations considered nearly any provision as being negotiable.

9. Further supporting the conclusion that the Michigan Education Association influenced the scope of professional negotiation agreements, only eleven provisions were submitted by local education associations which were not previously contained on the questionnaire. The converse would have been true if many more provisions were included in the initial negotiations package, but not listed on the questionnaire.
10. A wide range of salary requests existed at each degree level, thus showing a wide latitude in local education associations requesting what was appropriate to the local needs and abilities to pay salaries to the faculty.
11. Elementary teachers appeared to receive the least consideration of the teachers in terms of weekly unassigned periods, weekly contact hours, and weekly teaching periods. Elementary teachers tended to have more contact hours with pupils.
12. Because local education associations wanted a minimum number of after school meetings, inservice education and curriculum development could be a major problem. Such a provision might well release teachers from the privilege and responsibility of attempting to develop innovations and carry out curriculum development projects.
13. Sabbatical leave provisions were reportedly quite inconsistent

as to what was requested by local education associations. In the main, however, an increase in such requests might well be anticipated.

14. A longevity pay provision was requested by less than one third of the school districts; however, the requests which were made were fairly ambitious. There was little difference in terms of whether requests were made for a percentage of the salary or a flat amount of money.
15. Nearly all local education associations responded that family health insurance benefits were being requested for inclusion into the local agreement. This provision appeared to be one of the few which nearly all local education associations agreed should be negotiated.
16. There was little uniformity concerning what amount was requested for life insurance benefits. The wide range of the amount requested concerning the policy value led to the conclusion that further indecision and confusion might accompany this provision in later years.
17. There was general agreement concerning the establishment of a pupil-teacher ratio. Many school districts reported that such a request was made and the pupil-teacher ratio was fairly well solidified.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

The results of the study answered many questions which were pertinent to the scope of professional negotiation and the influence of a state education association. Further insights were given to superintendents' attitudes concerning the reasonableness of each provision.

The scope of this study did offer data on the questions which were originally posed; however, certain relevant questions remained unclear. These unanswered questions constituted the rationale for stating the following recommendations for further research. Future investigators might well find these helpful in the development of studies in the general areas of professional negotiation.

1. This study could be replicated. If such a replication were undertaken, it should be planned to include a larger sample or to compare the results from Michigan and another state. Care should be taken in selecting another state where the state education association apparently controls the scope and nature of negotiations within the state. This would suggest the difference in the influence of the two state education associations. The investigator could determine other states which he wished to study in an attempt to study the influence of other state education associations as compared to the Michigan Education Association.
2. A significant segment of this study was the determination of superintendents' attitudes concerning the reasonableness of individual provisions. It would be recommended that a study be undertaken to determine the difference in the perception of both groups. The present study assumed that local education associations considered each provision to be reasonable, which may or may not have been a safe assumption.
3. It would be recommended that a study be completed which not only determined which professional negotiation provisions were sought from the board of education but also those provisions which were finally incorporated into the local agreement. Such a study

- could incorporate the present local education association questionnaire to elicit the initial requests. An additional questionnaire would need be developed to acquire the provisions which were finally made a part of the local agreement.
4. An additional study could be completed whereby local education associations ranked the priority of professional negotiation provisions which they had requested. This would seemingly determine the degree of importance which local education associations attached to individual provisions. Such a study would help determine the relative importance of individual professional negotiation provisions.
 5. A great deal of discussion has emerged about the intent of negotiations items. A study could be completed whereby local education association leaders and superintendents determined whether the intent of the provision was curriculum development or teachers welfare.

SUMMARY

Chapter V presented a short review of the problem, purpose, and design of the study. The findings were presented for each null hypothesis and additional data which was incorporated into the study. Conclusions were drawn from these findings and presented under a separate section of the chapter. Finally, a section of the chapter was prepared which suggested recommendations for further research in areas closely related to the general subject of professional negotiations and the influence of professional associations.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BOOKS

- The American Assembly. Challenges to Collective Bargaining. Edited by Lloyd Ulman. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1967.
- American Association of School Administrators, School Administrators View Professional Negotiations. Washington: American Associations of School Administrators, 1966.
- Berelson, Bernard and Gary A. Steiner. Human Behavior: An Inventory of Scientific Findings. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1964.
- Best, John W. Research in Education. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1959.
- Blau, Peter M. and W. Richard Scott. Formal Organizations: A Comparative Approach. San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Company, 1962.
- Campbell, Raold F., Luvern L. Cunningham, and Roderick F. McPhee. The Organization and Control of American Schools. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Books, Inc., 1965.
- Crow, Lester D. and Alice Crow. Introduction to Education. New York: American Book Company, 1966.
- Corwin, Ronald G. The Development of an Instrument for Examining Staff Conflicts in the Public Schools. Cooperative Research Project No. 1934. Office of Education, United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1963.
- Dykes, Archie R. The Emergent Role of Administrators and the Implications for Teacher-Administrator Relationships. Collective Negotiations and Educational Administration. Edited by Roy B. Allen and John Schmid. Columbus, Ohio: University Council for Educational Administration and University of Arkansas, 1966.
- Eurich, Alvin C. "Is Money Enough?" The Great Debate. Edited by Scott C. Winfield, Clyde M. Hill, and Robert W. Burns. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1959.
- Fischer, John H. "A Framework for Looking at Collective Negotiations in Education." Readings on Collective Negotiations in Public Education. Edited by Stanley M. Elam, Myron Lieberman, and Michael H. Moskow. Chicago: Rand-McNally and Company, 1967.
- Garrett, Henry E. Statistics in Psychology and Education. New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1962.
- Good, Carter V. Dictionary of Education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1959.
- Greider, Calvin and Stephen Romine. American Education, Third Edition. New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1965.

- Griffiths, Daniel. "Board-Superintendent-Teacher Relations: Viable Alternatives to the Status Quo." Struggle for Power in Education. Edited by Frank W. Iutz and Joseph J. Azzarelli. New York: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1966.
- Hecker, Stanley, John Meeder, and Thomas J. Northey. Survey of Selected Data From 333 Education Association Agreements, 1967-68. East Lansing: Michigan Education Association, 1968.
- Katz, Daniel and Robert L. Kahn. The Social Psychology of Organizations. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1966.
- Keppel, Francis. The Necessary Revolution in American Education. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1966.
- Lieberman, Myron and Michael H. Moskow. Collective Negotiations for Teachers: An Approach to School Administration. Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1966.
- Lieberman, Myron. Education as a Profession. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1956.
- Lieberman, Myron. The Future of Public Education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1960.
- Lieberman, Myron. "The Impact of Collective Negotiations Upon Teacher-Administrator Relationships." Readings on Collective Negotiations in Public Education. Edited by Stanley M. Elam, Myron Lieberman and Michael H. Moskow. Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1967.
- James G. March, ed. Handbook of Organizations. Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1965.
- Metcalf, Henry C. and L. Urwick, eds. Dynamic Administration: The Collected Papers of Mary Parker Follett. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers.
- Presthus, Robert. The Organization Society. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1962.
- Ree, Gordon C. "The Changing Role of the Teacher." The Changing American School. Edited by John I. Goodlad. Sixty-fifth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1966.
- Redfern, George B. and Forrest E. Conner. The School Administrator and Negotiations. Washington: American Association of School Administrators, 1968.
- Scott, William G. The Management of Conflict: Appeal Systems in Organizations. Homewood, Illinois: Richard D. Irwin, Inc. and The Dorsey Press, 1965.
- Schmidt, Charles T., Hyman Parker, and Bob Repas. A Guide to Collective

Negotiations in Education. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1967.

Steffensen, James P., Teachers Negotiate with Their School Boards. United States Office of Education Bulletin 1964, No. 40. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1964.

Stinnett, T. M., Jack H. Kleinmann, and Martha L. Ware. Professional Negotiations in Public Education. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1966.

Tyler, Ralph, ed. Social Forces Influencing American Education. Sixtieth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education Part II. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1961.

Walton, Richard E. and Robert B. Kersie. A Behavioral Theory of Labor Negotiations. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1965

Wildman, Wesley A. "Teacher Collective Action in the United States, 1965." Negotiations in the Schools. Edited by R. E. Ohm and O. D. Johns. Norman: College of Education, University of Oklahoma, 1965.

Wirtz, W. Willard. "Public Employment and Public Policy." Readings on Collective Negotiations in Public Education. Edited by Stanley M. Elam, Myron Lieberman, and Michael H. Moskow. Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1967.

PERIODICAL ARTICLES

"Are Teachers Happy?" National Education Association Research Bulletin, XLVI (May, 1968), 40-41.

Batchelder, Richard D. "Today's Militant Teachers," NEA Journal, LIV (September, 1965), 18-19.

Bechtal, James. "NEA and Teacher Unions Bicker and Battle for Recognition" The Nation's Schools, LXXIV (August, 1964), 35-41.

Becker, Harry A. "Collective Bargaining May Force School Boards to Organize," American School Board Journal, CLIII (October, 1966), 57-58.

Blanke, Virgil. "Teachers in Search of Power," The Educational Forum, XXX (January, 1966), 231-38.

Blankenship, Alden H. "The Role of the Superintendent in Teacher Negotiations," Theory Into Practice, XI (April, 1955), 70-74.

Boy, Angelo V. and Gerald J. Pine. "Needed for Teachers: A Role Description," The Clearing House, XXXVIII (September, 1963), 7-12.

Brown, George W. "Teacher Power Techniques," American School Board Journal, CLII (February, 1966), 11-13.

- Combe, George W., Jr. "How to Minimize Teachers vs Boards' Conflict Over Collective Bargaining," American School Board Journal, CLIII (August, 1966), 53-55.
- Corwin, Ronald G. "Militant Professionalism: Initiative and Compliance in Public Education," Sociology of Education, XXXVIII (Summer, 1965), 310-31.
- Daly, Ronald O. "Professional Negotiations," NEA Journal, LIV (May, 1965), 30-31.
- Dashiell, Dick. "Teachers Revolt in Michigan," Phi Delta Kappan, KLIX (September, 1967), 22-26.
- Doherty, Robert E. "Letter to a School Board," Phi Delta Kappan, XLVIII (February, 1967), 272-77.
- Doherty, Robert E., "Public Interest at Stake," American School Board Journal, CLV (October, 1967), 11-14.
- "Improvement of Instruction," NEA Journal, LIV (May, 1965), 28-29.
- Jensen, Vernon. "The Process of Collective Bargaining and the Question of Its Obsolescence," Industrial and Labor Relations Review, XVI (July, 1963), 549-50.
- Lieberman, Myron. "Collective Negotiations: Status and Trends," American School Board Journal, CLV (October, 1967), 7-11.
- Looking Beyond Negotiations," Michigan Education Journal, XLV (September, 1967), 23-25.
- Lowe, William T. "Who Joins Which Teachers' Group?" Teachers' College Record, (April, 1965), 614-623.
- Manning, William R. "Negotiations: The Process in Collective Bargaining," American School Board Journal, CLIII (August, 1966), 14-16.
- Metzler, John H. and Oscar Knade, Jr. "A Tranquillizer for Negotiations," American School Board Journal, CLV (December, 1967), 12-13.
- "NEA Break Thru," Michigan Education Journal, XLIV (November, 1966), 1.
- "NEA Break Thru," Michigan Education Journal, XLIV (January, 1967), 17-20.
- Miller, William C. "Curricular Implications of Negotiations," Educational Leadership, XXIII (April, 1966), 533-536.
- Moeller, Gerald H. "Bureaucracy and Teachers' Sense of Power," The School Review, LXXII (Summer, 1964), 137-57.
- Moskow, Michael H. "Teacher Organization: An Analysis of the Issues," Teachers' College Record, LXVI (February, 1965), 453-63.

- National Education Association Executive Committee, "The Professional Way to Meet the Educational Crisis," NEA Journal, XXXVI (February, 1947), 47.
- Nolte, M. Chester. "Teacher Militancy May Be Counter Pressure," American School Board Journal, CLI (October, 1965), 7-8.
- Robbins, Russell and Herbert H. Hughes. "Measurement of the Attitudes of Teachers Toward Teaching as a Profession," Journal of Educational Research, LX (February, 1967), 243-48.
- Sheehan, Wilfred J. "State Associations Work Closely with Locals," NEA Journal, LIII (February, 1964), 20-21.
- Steeb, Marion L. "Professional Associations: More Than Unions," Teachers' College Record, LXVI (December, 1964), 203-18.
- Stiles, Lindley J. "Ideas From Abroad for Winning Teacher Loyalty," Phi Delta Kappan, XLV (March, 1964), 278-82.
- Taylor, George W. "The Public Interest in Collective Negotiations in Education," Phi Delta Kappan, XLVIII (September, 1966), 16-22.
- "The More We Grow, the More We Do," NEA Journal, LIV (May, 1965), 26-27.
- Ware, Martha. "Professional Negotiation," NEA Journal, LI (November, 1962) 28-30.
- West, Allen W. "Local Associations Move Toward Professional Negotiations," NEA Journal, LIII (February, 1964), 26-28.
- West, Allen W. "What's Bugging Teachers?" Saturday Review, XLVIII (October 16, 1965), 88.
- "What's Negotiable?" National Education Association Research Bulletin, XLVI (May, 1968), 42-43.
- Wildman, Wesley A. and Charles R. Perry. "Group Conflict and School Organization," Phi Delta Kappan, XLVII (January, 1966) 244-51.
- Wildman, Wesley A. "What Prompts Greater Teacher Militancy?" American School Board Journal, CLIV (March, 1967), 27-32.

PAMPHLETS AND BULLETINS

- Office of Professional Development and Welfare. Guidelines for Professional Negotiations. Washington: National Education Association, 1963.
- Office of Professional Development and Welfare. Guidelines for Professional Negotiations. Washington: National Education Association, 1965.

Office of Professional Development and Welfare. Selected Statements of School Board, Administrator, Teacher Relationships. Washington: National Education Association, 1965.

Michigan Education Association. 1967 MEA Platform, Continuing Policies, Current Resolutions. East Lansing, Michigan: Michigan Education Association, no date.

Roles, Responsibilities, Relationships of the School Board, Superintendent, and Staff. Washington: American Association of School Administrators and National Education Association, 1963.

UNPUBLISHED MATERIALS

Birdsell, Donald F. "A Study of the Status of Professional Negotiation in Selected Schools in Twelve Midwestern States." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Iowa, 1965.

Kite, Robert H. "A Study to Determine the Degree of Influence Selected Factors Had in Causing Teacher Strikes and to Determine the Degree to Which These Factors Were Present in School Districts in Which Teacher Strikes Were Averted." Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Mississippi, 1964.

Redmond, James F. "Administrative Factors Affecting Teachers Strikes." Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Teachers' College, Columbia University, 1947.

Schiff, Albert A. "A Study and Evaluation of Teachers' Strikes in the United States." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Wayne State University, 1953.

APPENDIX A

The directions listed below should be used in completing the questionnaire. This sheet is not bound into the questionnaire to allow reference to the proper responses in the designation of your choices to the various items.

DIRECTIONS

You are asked to follow these directions in completing this questionnaire :

1. COLUMN " A " : In COLUMN " A " check whether or not the provision is being sought for the new professional agreement between the board of education and the local association. If you check " Yes " in Column A, go to Column B and check the most appropriate answer. If you check " No " in Column A, go to Column C and check the most appropriate answer.
2. COLUMN " B " : In COLUMN " B " your marking indicates how much the state education association (MEA) and the local members influenced the inclusion of this provision in the initial agreement submission. The responses are as follows :
 1. Entirely MEA influence.
 2. Mostly MEA influence, partly local member influence.
 3. Half MEA influence and half local member influence.
 4. Mostly local member influence, partly MEA influence.
 5. Entirely local member influence.
3. COLUMN " C " : In COLUMN " C " your marking indicates why you feel this provision was not included in the initial agreement submission. The various reasons are as follows :
 1. Our school district allowed this provision before P.A. 379 was in effect.
 2. Our negotiations have obtained this provision since P.A. 379 was in effect.
 3. Our local association will attempt to obtain this provision in future negotiations.
 4. Our local association will not attempt to obtain this provision in future negotiations.

KEY

A		B					C			
Yes	No	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4

APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRE

SAMPLE AGREEMENT PROVISIONS	Column A		Column B					Column C			
	Yes	No	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4
1. The local association will have exclusive representation.											
2. The local association will have use of the school district's equipment and facilities.											
3. The board of education will consult with the local association on academic policies.											
4. The board of education will consult with the local association on fiscal policies.											
5. The board of education will consult with the local association on building construction policies.											
6. Teachers will join the local association or pay an equivalent amount to the association.											
7. The board of education will deduct local association dues from checks of teachers.											
8. The board of education, upon written authorization by the teacher, may deduct other items from teachers' checks.											
9. A reporting and leaving time for teachers is specified.											
10. A duty free and specific time allotment is specified for teachers' lunch periods.											
11. Rest periods are specified for elementary teachers.											
12. Rest periods are specified for specialized teachers (music, art, etc.).											
13. Maximum pupil-teacher contact hours are specified.											
14. A maximum pupil-teacher ratio will be established.											
15. The board of education will provide additional compensation for teacher overload.											

QUESTIONNAIRE

SAMPLE AGREEMENT PROVISIONS	Column A		Column B					Column C			
	Yes	No	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4
16. Teachers will be paid for being required to attend meetings more than a specified amount of hours per week or month.											
17. The board of education will hire psychologists and/or visiting teachers.											
18. A teacher reference library will be established in each school.											
19. Uniforms will be supplied for specialized teachers (art, industrial arts, home economics.)											
20. Teachers' aides will be provided.											
21. Department chairmen will be selected.											
22. The board of education will try to hire only qualified and certified teachers.											
23. The board of education will not hire temporarily certified substitutes for more than ninety days.											
24. The board of education will, if possible, fill positions from inside the organization.											
25. Teachers will have unlimited sick leave provisions which accrues at 15 days annually.											
26. Each teacher will contribute a specified number of days annually to a common bank for sick leave.											
27. The board of education will pay the difference between sick leave benefits and Workmen's Compensation benefits for injury to the teacher while at school.											
28. Teachers contracting childhood diseases will be paid salary during absence from school and will not lose days of accrued sick leave benefits.											
29. A specified number of days will be allotted for professional or personal business leave.											

QUESTIONNAIRE

SAMPLE AGREEMENT PROVISIONS	Column A		Column B					Column C			
	Yes	No	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4
30. The board of education will pay the difference between a teacher's regular salary and jury duty salary, if he is required to serve such duty.											
31. The board of education will make provision for sabbatical leave after a specified term of service in the school district.											
32. The board of education will make provision for a leave of absence after a specified term of service in the school district.											
33. Leaves of absence will be granted, ranging up to four years, when requested by the teacher.											
34. Maternity leaves of up to eighteen (18) months will be granted upon request by the teacher.											
35. Teachers will have academic freedom in subject matter choice or determination.											
36. Probationary teachers will be evaluated a specific number of times annually.											
37. Tenure teachers will be evaluated a specific number of times annually.											
38. There will be a specific length of the observation of teacher's performance.											
39. Evaluation of the teacher will be placed in written form.											
40. Teachers will have access to their personnel file.											
41. The local association will establish a procedure to deal with teacher ethics.											
42. The local association will establish a procedure to initiate proceedings against a teacher who violates the Code of Ethics.											
43. The board of education will reimburse teachers for courses taken in approved NCATE universities.											

QUESTIONNAIRE

SAMPLE AGREEMENT PROVISIONS	Column A		Column B					Column C			
	Yes	No	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4
44. Teachers may attend professional meetings at the expense of the board of education.											
45. Voluntary workshops and/or conferences held after school may be established by the local association or board of education initiative.											
46. The standards of the previous agreement will be upheld.											
47. If other school districts join with this school district, this agreement will be upheld.											
48. If this school district joins with another school district, the board of education will help to find positions for the teachers in this district in adjacent districts.											
49. Teachers will not strike within the dates of this agreement.											
50. The board of education will not use unfair labor practices as defined by PERA, Section 10.											
51. The Tuesday and Wednesday following Labor Day will be used for pre-school conferences.											
52. School will officially open with pupils in attendance on the Thursday following Labor Day.											
53. Teachers new to the district will receive full credit on the salary schedule for their prior experience.											
54. The board of education will reimburse teachers a specified amount for post master's degree course work.											
55. The board of education will pay, over and above the salary schedule, a specified amount or percent for teacher's longevity in the school district.											
56. The board of education will pay additional compensation for extra duty assignments.											
57. The board of education will pay a specified amount of money for car expenses to teachers who are required to drive throughout the school district.											

QUESTIONNAIRE

SAMPLE AGREEMENT PROVISIONS	Column A		Column B					Column C			
	Yes	No	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4
58. The board of education will provide liability insurance for teachers who are required to drive throughout the school district.											
59. The board of education will pay teachers who are leaving the school district severance pay.											
60. The board of education will provide each teacher with a life insurance policy of a specified value.											
61. The board of education will provide family health insurance to each teacher.											
62. The board of education will provide uninterrupted, 12 month health insurance to each teacher.											
63. The local board of education will pay a specific amount daily and/or hourly to substitute teachers.											
64. Preference will be given to tenure teachers for extra teaching assignments (driver training, summer school, etc.)											
65. Supervisors of student teachers will have at least a master's degree.											
66. Student teachers will be honorary members of the local association.											
67. Money received by the district for placing student teachers will be used for educational uses (workshops, conferences, etc.)											
68. The supervising master teacher will file a report of the student teacher's progress every four weeks.											
69. A teacher may exclude an incorrigible student from class for one day.											
70. The board of education will provide reduced class size and/or more free periods to teachers who have large number of discipline cases in their classes.											
71. The board of education will provide an attorney to represent the teacher if legal action is brought against him for discipline of a student.											

QUESTIONNAIRE

SAMPLE AGREEMENT PROVISIONS	Column A		Column B					Column C			
	Yes	No	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4
72. In the event of a teacher being injured by a student, he will suffer no loss of income or sick leave for his recuperative period.											
73. The board of education will pay for lost, damaged, or stolen clothing or personal property which a teacher encounters in school.											
74. A joint Instructional Council will be established.											
75. A Discipline Review Board will be established.											
76. A grievance procedure will be established.											
77. Negotiating meetings will be held regularly throughout the year.											
78. Negotiations will begin between March 1 and March 15 each year.											
79. Individual teacher contracts will be subject to the master agreement.											
80. The master agreement will be considered part of the policy of the board of education.											
81. Any section declared illegal will not invalidate the entire agreement.											

In the following spaces, write a short statement of any provisions which the local organization initiated, which have not been listed above. Then check the appropriate space in Column B.

82.											
83.											
84.											

PART II

In the spaces provided below fill in the specific provisions of your latest initial agreement submission. If any of the items are not applicable, leave blank.

1. Salary Schedule :

Educational Level	Annual Salary		Increments	
	Minimum	Maximum	Amount	No. of Yrs.
Bachelor's				
Master's				
Master's + 30				

2. Contact hours and assigned periods :

	Number of week-ly unassigned periods	Number of week-ly teaching periods	Number of week-ly contact hours
Elementary			
Junior High			
Senior High			

3. Maximum required attendance at meetings : The maximum amount of time that a teacher may be required to stay after school for professional meetings is ____ hours weekly and/or ____ hours monthly.

4. Teacher Aides : The board of education will use one teacher aide per ____ teachers.
(number)

5. Sabbatical Leaves : The board of education will pay ____ % salary per ____ month period, or ____ % salary per ____ month period.
(number)

6. Longevity Pay : In addition to regular salary, the local association is asking the board of education to allow a longevity pay of ____ % after ____ years, ____ % after ____ years, and ____ % after ____ years.
(number) (number) (number)

7. Substitute Pay : The local association is asking that the board of education pay substitute teachers \$ ____ per day or \$ ____ per hour.

8. Insurance Benefits : The local association is asking that the board of education provide each teacher with a Life Insurance policy benefit of \$ ____ . It further asks that the board of education pay for Health Insurance benefits on a :
(check one) ☐ full basis ☐ partial basis

9. Pupil Teacher Ratio : The local association is requesting the board of education to establish a ratio of ____ pupils for each full time teacher.

PART III

Please answer the following questions. The items drawn from them will be used for return identification purposes only and no reference to school names or geographical area will be used.

1. What is the name of the school district ? _____
2. Who completed this questionnaire ? (Check those persons who participated) :

_____ 1. Local association president _____ 2. Executive secretary _____ 3. Negotiator (association) _____ 4. Superintendent	_____ 5. Assistant Superintendent _____ 6. Principal _____ 7. Negotiator (board of education) _____ 8. Other _____
--	---
3. How many students are enrolled in the school district ? _____

Return Questionnaire To :

Jon E. Rockhold
 965 East Seventh Street
 Flint, Michigan 48503

APPENDIX C

The directions listed below should be used in completing the questionnaire. This sheet is not bound into the questionnaire to allow reference to the proper responses in the designation of your choices to the various items.

DIRECTIONS

2. **COLUMN A:** In COLUMN " A " check whether or not the provision is being sought for the new professional agreement between the board of education and the local association. If you check " YES " in COLUMN A, go to COLUMN B and check the most appropriate answer. If you check " NO " in COLUMN A, go to COLUMN C and check the most appropriate answer.

3. **COLUMN B:** In COLUMN " B " your marking indicates how much you feel the state education association (MEA) and the local association influenced the inclusion of this provision in the initial agreement submission.

The responses are as follows :

1. Entirely MEA influence.
2. Mostly MEA influence, partly local member influence.
3. Half MEA influence and half local member influence.
4. Mostly local member influence, partly MEA influence.
5. Entirely local member influence.

4. **COLUMN C:** In COLUMN " C " your marking indicates why you feel this provision was not included in the initial agreement submission. The various reasons are as follows :

1. Our school district allowed this provision before P. A. 379 was in effect.
2. Our negotiations have obtained this provision since P. A. 379 was in effect.

5. **COLUMN D:** In COLUMN " D " your marking indicates how reasonable you feel such a provision is. The various responses are as follows :

1. Very Reasonable .
2. Reasonable .
3. Partly Reasonable, Partly Unreasonable, Can't Decide.
4. Unreasonable.
5. Very Unreasonable.

KEY

COLUMNS														
A		B					C		D					
Yes	No	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	1	2	3	4	5	

APPENDIX D

QUESTIONNAIRE

SAMPLE AGREEMENT PROVISIONS	COLUMNS														
	A		B					C		D					
	Yes	No	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	1	2	3	4	5	
16. Teachers will be paid for being required to attend meetings more than a specified amount of hours per week or month.															
17. The board of education will hire psychologists and/or visiting teachers.															
18. A teacher reference library will be established in each school.															
19. Uniforms will be supplied for specialized teachers (art, industrial arts, home economics.)															
20. Teachers' aides will be provided.															
21. Department chairmen will be selected.															
22. The board of education will not hire only qualified and certified teachers.															
23. The board of education will not hire temporarily certified substitutes for more than ninety days.															
24. The board of education will, if possible, fill positions from inside the organization.															
25. Teachers will have unlimited sick leave provisions which accrues at 15 days annually.															
26. Each teacher will contribute a specified number of days annually to a common bank for sick leave.															
27. The board of education will pay the difference between sick leave benefits and Workmen's Compensation benefits for injury to the teacher while at school.															
28. Teachers contracting childhood diseases will be paid salary during absence from school and will not lose days of accrued sick leave benefits.															
29. A specified number of days will be allotted for professional or personal business leave.															

QUESTIONNAIRE

SAMPLE AGREEMENT PROVISIONS	COLUMNS														
	A		B					C		D					
	Yes	No	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	1	2	3	4	5	
30. The board of education will pay the difference between a teacher's regular salary and jury duty salary, if he is required to serve such duty.															
31. The board of education will make provision for sabbatical leave after a specified term of service in the school district.															
32. The board of education will make provision for a leave of absence after a specified term of service in the school district.															
33. Leaves of absence will be granted, ranging up to four years, when requested by the teacher.															
34. Maternity leaves of up to eighteen (18) months will be granted upon request by the teacher.															
35. Teachers will have academic freedom in subject matter choice or determination.															
36. Probationary teachers will be evaluated a specific number of times annually.															
37. Tenure teachers will be evaluated a specific number of times annually.															
38. There will be a specific length of the observation of teacher's performance.															
39. Evaluation of the teacher will be placed in written form.															
40. Teachers will have access to their personnel file.															
41. The local association will establish a procedure to deal with teacher ethics.															
42. The local association will establish a procedure to initiate proceedings against a teacher who violates the Code of Ethics.															
43. The board of education will reimburse teachers for courses taken in approved NCATE universities.															

QUESTIONNAIRE

SAMPLE AGREEMENT PROVISIONS	COLUMNS														
	A		B					C		D					
	Yes	No	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	1	2	3	4	5	
44. Teachers may attend professional meetings at the expense of the board of education .															
45. Voluntary workshops and/or conferences held after school may be established by the local association or board of education initiative.															
46. The standards of the previous agreement will be upheld.															
47. If other school districts join with this school district, this agreement will be upheld.															
48. If this school district joins with another school district, the board of education will help to find positions for the teachers in this district in adjacent districts.															
49. Teachers will not strike within the dates of this agreement.															
50. The board of education will not use unfair labor practices as defined by PERA, Section 10.															
51. The Tuesday and Wednesday following Labor Day will be used for pre-school conferences.															
52. School will officially open with pupils in attendance on the Thursday following Labor Day.															
53. Teachers new to the district will receive full credit on the salary schedule for prior experience.															
54. The board of education will pay, over and above the salary schedule, a specified amount or percent for teacher's longevity in the school district.															
55. The board of education will reimburse teachers a specified amount for post master's degree course work.															
56. The board of education will pay additional compensation for extra duty assignments.															
57. The board of education will pay a specified amount of money for car expenses to teachers who are required to drive throughout the school district.															

QUESTIONNAIRE

SAMPLE AGREEMENT PROVISIONS	COLUMNS														
	A		B					C		D					
	Yes	No	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	1	2	3	4	5	
58. The board of education will provide liability insurance for teachers who are required to drive throughout the school district.															
59. The board of education will pay teachers who are leaving the school district severance pay.															
60. The board of education will provide each teacher with a life insurance policy of a specified value.															
61. The board of education will provide uninterrupted, 12 month health insurance to each teacher.															
62. The board of education will provide family health insurance to each teacher.															
63. The local board of education will pay a specific amount daily and/or hourly to substitute teachers.															
64. Preference will be given to tenure teachers for extra teaching assignments (driver training, summer school, etc.)															
65. Supervisors of student teachers will have at least a master's degree.															
66. Student teachers will be honorary members of the local association.															
67. Money received by the district for placing student teachers will be used for educational uses (workshops, conferences, etc.)															
68. The supervising master teacher will file a report of the student teacher's progress every four weeks.															
69. A teacher may exclude an incorrigible student from class for one day.															
70. The board of education will provide reduced class size and/or more free periods to teachers who have large number of discipline cases in their classes.															
71. The board of education will provide an attorney to represent the teacher if legal action is brought against him for discipline of a student.															

QUESTIONNAIRE

SAMPLE AGREEMENT PROVISIONS	COLUMNS														
	A		B					C		D					
	Yes	No	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	1	2	3	4	5	
72. In the event of a teacher being injured by a student he will suffer no loss of income or sick leave for his recuperative period.															
73. The board of education will pay for lost, damaged, or stolen clothing or personal property which a teacher encounters in school.															
74. A joint Instructional Council will be established.															
75. A discipline Review Board will be established.															
76. A grievance procedure will be established.															
77. Negotiating meetings will be held regularly throughout the year.															
78. Negotiations will begin between March 1 and March 15 each year.															
79. Individual teacher contracts will be subject to the master agreement.															
80. The master agreement will be considered part of the policy of the board of education.															
81. Any section declared illegal will not invalidate the entire agreement.															
In the following spaces, write a short statement of any provisions which the local organization initiated which have not been listed above. Then check the appropriate space in Column B.															
82.															
83.															
84.															

PART II

In the spaces provided below fill in the specific provisions of your latest initial agreement submission. If any of the items are not applicable, leave blank.

1. Salary Schedule :

Educational Level	Annual Salary		Increments	
	Minimum	Maximum	Amount	No. of Yrs.
Bachelor's				
Master's				
Master's + 30				

2. Contact hours and assigned periods :

	Number of week-ly unassigned periods	Number of week-ly teaching periods	Number of week-ly contact hours
Elementary			
Junior High			
Senior High			

3. Maximum required attendance at meetings : The maximum amount of time that a teacher may be required to stay after school for professional meetings is ____ hours weekly and/or ____ hours monthly.

4. Teacher Aides : The board of education will use one teacher aide per ____ teachers.
(number)

5. Sabbatical Leaves : The board of education will pay ____ % salary per ____ month period, or ____ % salary per ____ month period.
(number) (number)

6. Longevity Pay : In addition to regular salary, the local association is asking the board of education to allow a longevity pay of ____ % after ____ years, ____ % after ____ years, and ____ % after ____ years.
(number) (number) (number)

7. Substitute Pay : The local association is asking that the board of education pay substitute teachers \$ ____ per day or \$ ____ per hour.

8. Insurance Benefits : The local association is asking that the board of education provide each teacher with a Life Insurance policy benefit of \$ ____ . It further asks that the board of education pay for Health Insurance benefits on a :
(check one) ☐ full basis ☐ partial basis

9. Pupil Teacher Ratio : The local association is requesting the board of education to establish a ratio of ____ pupils for each full time teacher.

PART III

Please answer the following questions. The items drawn from them will be used for return identification purposes only and no reference to school names or geographical area will be used.

1. What is the name of your school district ?

2. Who completed this questionnaire ? (Check those persons who participated) :

- ☐ 1. Business Manager
- ☐ 2. Superintendent
- ☐ 3. Assistant Superintendent
- ☐ 4. Principal
- ☐ 5. Negotiator (Board of Education)
- ☐ 6. Other _____

3. How many students are enrolled in the school district ? _____

Return Questionnaire To :

Jon E. Rockhold
965 East Seventh Street
Flint, Michigan 48503

APPENDIX E

May 13, 1968

Return to :
Jon E. Rockhold
965 East Seventh Street
Flint, Michigan 48503

Dear Sir :

Professional negotiations are now a significant factor in Michigan Public Schools. Signed agreements between local education associations and boards of education have brought much controversy about requests made to the board of education and how the request evolved. This study will attempt to answer the following questions :

1. How closely do local associations follow the prototype agreement published by the Michigan Education Association (MEA) ? What group, the state or the local education association, is instrumental in evolving the requests made to the board of education ?
2. What are the areas of conflict common to many school districts. ?
3. What are the major areas of agreement and conflict between the local associations and local administrators in regard to the reasonableness of the individual requests?
4. Do the referent groups perceive that the request is made primarily for instructional improvement or teacher welfare ?

The purpose of this study is to determine what provisions are sought for the new master contract; to isolate areas of agreement and conflict; and to test perceptions of the respondents concerning the intent of the provisions. The items are those which are currently being negotiated in the state of Michigan. The final analysis could be of great value toward meaningful negotiations and the resolution of conflict between local associations and boards of education to help identify major areas of conflict in the state.

The investigation is being completed with the cooperation of Michigan State University and will result in a doctoral dissertation. The findings could be made available to any interested groups or organizations. Responses will be kept in strictest confidence and no allusions will be made to district names or particular areas of the state.

Your cooperation in the completion of the questionnaire is essential. It is designed for completion in about fifteen (15) minutes. We urge you to complete the questionnaire and return it before June 1, 1968. Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely


Jon E. Rockhold
Investigator



David C. Smith
College of Education
Department of Administration and Higher Education
Michigan State University

APPENDIX F

May 13, 1968

Return to :
Jon E. Rockhold
965 East Seventh Street
Flint, Michigan 48503

Dear Sir :

Professional negotiations are now a significant factor in Michigan Public Schools. Signed agreements between local education associations and boards of education have brought much controversy about requests made to the board of education and how the request evolved. This study will attempt to answer the following questions :

1. How closely do local associations follow the prototype agreement published by the Michigan Education Association (MEA) ? What group, the state or the local education association, is instrumental in evolving the requests made to the board of education ?
2. What are the areas of conflict common to many school districts. ?
3. What are the major areas of agreement and conflict between the local associations and local administrators in regard to the reasonableness of the individual requests?
4. Do the referent groups perceive that the request is made primarily for instructional improvement or teacher welfare ?

The purpose of this study is to determine what provisions are sought for the new master contract; to isolate areas of agreement and conflict; and to test perceptions of the respondents concerning the intent of the provisions. The items are those which are currently being negotiated in the state of Michigan. The final analysis could be of great value toward meaningful negotiations and the resolution of conflict between local associations and boards of education to help identify major areas of conflict in the state.

The investigation is being completed with the cooperation of Michigan State University and will result in a doctoral dissertation. The findings could be made available to any interested groups or organizations. Responses will be kept in strictest confidence and no allusions will be made to district names or particular areas of the state.

Your cooperation in the completion of the questionnaire is essential. It is designed for completion in about fifteen (15) minutes. We urge you to complete the questionnaire and return it before June 1, 1968. Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely


Jon E. Rockhold
Investigator


David C. Smith

College of Education
Department of Administration and Higher Education
Michigan State University

APPENDIX G

REMINDER

You recently received a copy of the enclosed questionnaire and were requested to complete and return it by June 1, 1968. To date, the questionnaire has not been received. If you sent it in the last few days, please accept my thanks and disregard this reminder questionnaire. If you did not complete it, please complete this one.

You may remember that the MASA Executive Council approved this study on May 15, 1968, by passing a unanimous resolution favoring the study. The effect of the resolution was that research in the area of negotiations was badly needed and that this study could be of value in helping to minimize conflict.

Please complete and return this by June 21, 1968. It is essential this information is received. There appears to be no other practical way that such data can be collected. Thank you for your assistance.

APPENDIX H

REMINDER

You recently received a copy of the enclosed questionnaire and were requested to complete and return it. To date, the questionnaire has not been received. If it was sent in the last few days, please accept my thanks and destroy the enclosed. If not, we need your responses to these items.

Both Mr. Northey and Mr. Patterson of the Michigan Education Association (MEA) have worked closely in the development of this project concerning the design, scope, and structure of the questionnaires. Your responses will be helpful to the MEA and the education profession in planning in the area of professional negotiations.

The MEA has suggested that the president of the local associations would be the ones most knowledgeable about this area. You have worked with the proposals which have been prepared for submission to the board of education; therefore, your knowledge and opinions will be of great consequence.

Please, complete and return this to me by June 21. It is essential that this information is received as there is no other way that such data can be collected. Thank you for your assistance.

APPENDIX I

The investigator appeared before the Executive Committee of the Michigan Association of School Administrators to explain the nature and scope of this project. As a result of this explanation, this group unanimously approved the following resolution:

Because of the problems arising through professional negotiations and the lack of research in this area of study, this proposed study may be of significant value.