

INFORMATION TO USERS

This dissertation was produced from a microfilm copy of the original document. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or patterns which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting thru an image and duplicating adjacent pages to insure you complete continuity.
2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a large round black mark, it is an indication that the photographer suspected that the copy may have moved during exposure and thus cause a blurred image. You will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.
3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., was part of the material being photographed the photographer followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin photoing at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue photoing from left to right in equal sections with a small overlap. If necessary, sectioning is continued again — beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.
4. The majority of users indicate that the textual content is of greatest value, however, a somewhat higher quality reproduction could be made from "photographs" if essential to the understanding of the dissertation. Silver prints of "photographs" may be ordered at additional charge by writing the Order Department, giving the catalog number, title, author and specific pages you wish reproduced.

University Microfilms

300 North Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

A Xerox Education Company

72-29,987

JACKSON, Allen, 1930-

A COMPARISON OF THE ROLE CONCEPT OF THE DISTRICT
PERSONNEL DIRECTOR BY CERTAIN MICHIGAN
SUPERINTENDENTS AND SELECTED AUTHORITIES IN
SCHOOL PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION.

Michigan State University, Ph.D., 1972
Education, administration

University Microfilms, A XEROX Company, Ann Arbor, Michigan

THIS DISSERTATION HAS BEEN MICROFILMED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED

A COMPARISON OF THE ROLE CONCEPT OF THE
DISTRICT PERSONNEL DIRECTOR BY CERTAIN
MICHIGAN SUPERINTENDENTS AND SELECTED
AUTHORITIES IN SCHOOL PERSONNEL
ADMINISTRATION

By

Allen Jackson

A THESIS

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

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Administration and Higher Education

1972

PLEASE NOTE:

Some pages may have
indistinct print.

Filmed as received.

University Microfilms, A Xerox Education Company

ABSTRACT

A COMPARISON OF THE ROLE CONCEPT OF THE DISTRICT PERSONNEL DIRECTOR BY CERTAIN MICHIGAN SUPERINTENDENTS AND SELECTED AUTHORITIES IN SCHOOL PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION

By

Allen Jackson

Purpose of the Study

This study was an attempt to make comparisons of the role concept of the district personnel director as perceived by certain Michigan superintendents and by selected authorities in school personnel administration. Specifically the study attempted to answer the following questions:

1. Is the the superintendents' of school role concept of the personnel director consistent with the role concept as defined by selected authorities?
2. Is the role of the personnel director in large school districts consistent with the role definition by selected authorities and superintendents?

Description of the Methods,
Technique, and Data Used

The nature of the type of study problem implied the use of the normative survey method of research. The most practical and feasible means of gathering data for this study was considered by the researcher to be the use of a questionnaire--a method widely used in survey research involving large sample studies. With the realization that restrictions are existent in research projects utilizing questionnaires, it was decided to proceed under the assumption that administrators would be inclined to respond in an accurate and forthright manner to an unsigned check-type survey form.

The instrument, Check-type Personnel Function Questionnaire was administered to twenty-nine superintendents and six selected authorities in the field of personnel administration.

Additional information on school personnel administration was obtained from secondary sources in the professional literature. Current researchers and practitioners were used in the development of a list of authorities. If the educator was indicated as having researched, or diligently studied the field of school personnel administration, he was considered as an authority in the area of school personnel administration.

Questions for Further Study

1. Would it be valuable to replicate this study by administering a comparative survey of smaller school districts in the state of Michigan?
2. To what extent would it be valuable to perform an experimental study of this nature comparing the opinions of district administrators and selected authorities within the state of Michigan to those in comparable districts in the neighboring states of Wisconsin and Illinois, to test the reliability of this instrument?
3. Would it not be valuable for each school district in Michigan to consider conducting a longitudinal study of its personnel functions over a period of years to see if there are any changes in the opinions and perceptions by the superintendents and selected authorities?
4. If the role of the personnel director is to be investigated, should not the personnel directors themselves indicate what they perceive their role as being?
5. Should the personnel functions of the district be determined by other district administrators?
6. The respondent superintendents of school were selected by stratified random sample for this study. Would the evidence supplied by another technique show a difference in the results?

Major Findings

1. Data revealed few differences between the opinions of selected authorities and Michigan superintendents on the assigning of the personnel functions.

2. The authorities and Michigan superintendents generally agree on the assignment of the responsibility of 76 of the 93 personnel functions surveyed.

3. The greatest disagreement, among the two groups, were those functions listed in the area of personnel transfer, adjustment counsel, and compensation.

4. In the area of recruitment, the function of "supervising student-teacher training programs and activities of the Future Teachers of America Club" was assigned to the assistant superintendent of personnel and sharing this responsibility with principals and assistant superintendent of instruction equally, by most Michigan superintendents. The authorities, however, felt this responsibility was more exclusively that of the building principal.

5. The authorities assigned the personnel leaves of absence function about equally among the assistant superintendent of personnel and the superintendent. The Michigan superintendents would assign these functions to the assistant superintendent of personnel.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am greatly indebted to Dr. Louis Romano, my thesis advisor who provided me with encouragement and inspiration throughout the final stages of my doctoral pursuit. His professional guidance and personal approach has been a model to emulate.

I, also, would like to thank the members of my thesis committee, Dr. Samuel Moore, who directed my first cognitive personnel experiences which attracted me even more into this field. I am indebted to Dr. James McKee, who graciously agreed to serve on my committee, and directed my sociological endeavors.

A very special thanks to Dr. Donald Nickerson, my friend of sixteen years, who directed the early stages of my doctoral work, and to whom I shall ever be grateful for his encouragement, direction, and support through all phases of my graduate program.

The understanding and purpose which Barbara, Allen Jr., and Sherri Jo, the writer's wife and children provided were indispensable to the completion of this thesis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. THE PROBLEM	1
Introduction	1
Significance and Background of the Study. .	2
Purpose of the Study	4
Need for the Study	4
Limitation of the Study	5
Definition of Terms.	6
Questions to be Resolved	9
Overview	9
II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	11
Summary.	41
III. DESIGN OF THE STUDY	43
The Sample and Its Selection.	43
Plan of the Study	44
Development of the Questionnaire	46
Method of Collecting Data.	47
Treatment of Data	48
Summary.	49
IV. PRESENTATION OF DATA	50
Data on Administrator Responsible for Personnel--Policy Formulation.	50
Data on Administrator Responsible for Inter-District Communications.	54
Data on Administrator Responsible for Personnel Records.	60
Data on Administrator Responsible for Personnel Needs	61
Data on Administrator Responsible for Recruitment.	66
Data on Administrator Responsible for Personnel Selection	71

Chapter	Page
Data on Administrator Responsible for Personnel Assignment	77
Data on Administrator Responsible for Substitute Teachers	79
Data on the Administrator Responsible for Liaison Responsibilities	81
Data on Administrator Responsible for Orientation and Induction of Personnel	84
Data on Administrator Responsible for In-Service Development	87
Data on Administrator Responsible for Evaluation	90
Data on Administrator Responsible for Promotion.	95
Data on Administrator Responsible for Personnel Transfer.	98
Data on Administrator Responsible for Adjustment Counsel.	100
Data on Administrator Responsible for Certification	103
Data on Administrator Responsible for Formulation of Job Description.	106
Data on Administrator Responsible for Compensation.	109
Data on Administrator Responsible for Work Loads	115
Data on Administrator Responsible for Leaves of Absence	118
Data on Administrator Responsible for Tenure Recommendations	121
Data on Administrator Responsible for Grievances of Personnel	124
Data on Administrator Responsible for Dismissal.	126
Data on Administrator Responsible for Retirement	129
Questions to be Resolved	133
Inconsistencies Between the Selected Authorities and the Superintendent	139
Summary	148
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	149
Summary	149
Statement of the Problem.	149
Limitations of the Study.	150
Review of the Literature.	150
Design of the Study	151

Chapter	Page
Conclusions Based on Major Findings . . .	152
Discussion of Inconsistencies of Personnel Functions Between the Selected Authorities and the Superintendents . .	153
Recommendations.	162
Recommendations for Further Study. . . .	164
Reflections	165
BIBLIOGRAPHY.	167
APPENDICES	
Appendix	
A. Michigan Superintendents Mailing List . . .	171
B. Authorities Mailing List	173
C. Transmittal Letter and Survey Questionnaire .	174

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. General Organization--Policy Formulation . . .	52
2. General Organization--Inter-District Communications	55
3. General Organization--Personnel Records . . .	62
4. Staff Procurement and Utilization--Personnel Needs	64
5. Staff Procurement and Utilization-- Recruitment	67
6. Staff Procurement and Utilization-- Personnel Selection	72
7. Staff Procurement and Utilization-- Personnel Assignment	78
8. Staff Procurement and Utilization-- Substitute Teachers	80
9. Staff Procurement and Utilization--Liaison Responsibilities	83
10. Staff Development--Orientation and Induction of Personnel.	85
11. Staff Development--In-Service-Development. . .	89
12. Staff Development--Evaluation.	92
13. Staff Development--Promotion	96
14. Staff Development--Personnel Transfer . . .	99
15. Staff Development--Adjustment Counsel . . .	101
16. Conditions of Service--Certification . . .	104

Table		Page
17.	Conditions of Service--Formulation of Job Description	107
18.	Conditions of Service--Compensation.	110
19.	Conditions of Service--Work Loads	116
20.	Conditions of Service--Leaves of Absence	119
21.	Conditions of Service--Tenure Recommendations	123
22.	Conditions of Service--Grievances of Personnel.	125
23.	Conditions of Service--Dismissal.	127
24.	Conditions of Service--Retirement	130

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

Introduction

Procuring, developing, and maintaining an effective school staff is one of the most important functions of school administration.

The profession and institutions of higher learning should constantly strive to develop the appropriate personnel and conditions of service so that the result will be an improved student. An increased conscientious effort in the area of school personnel administration is essential for every school district.

Castetter lends emphasis to this idea by his statement of:

It is generally conceded that the success of any human endeavor is closely related to the quality of personnel, who perform the tasks necessary to the achievement of purpose, as well as to the conditions which affect their physical and mental well-being. This assumption is as applicable to school systems as it is to any organization of human effort. The extent to which public administration succeeds will depend, to a large extent, upon the quality of the personnel engaged in the educational process, and upon the effectiveness with which they discharge individual and group responsibilities. The school plant is important. Purposes count for more than a little. Money is

significant. A well designed program is essential. Leadership is vital. But the most crucial single element in the educational process is the competency of the personnel charged with the task of effecting desirable changes in children and youth.¹

Significance and Background of the Study

Michigan has kept abreast with the developments of educational materials and methods. The three major state institutions of higher learning have done an excellent job in preparing their respective graduates with the educational methods that are current and effective.

In the past, the state institutions of higher education have met the increased educational demands for personnel for Michigan public schools. The nation as a whole has experienced a shortage of personnel to staff the schools. In Havighurst's report to the National Education Association on supply and demand in 1955, he projected the demand for teachers to be 1,685,000 by 1965 with the 1955 supply being 1,200,000 or a needed increase of 485,000 for a ten-year period.² Needless to say, this supply has long since diminished.

¹William B. Castetter, Administering the School Personnel Program (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1962), p. 4.

²Robert J. Havighurst, "Manpower and the Teacher Shortage," Teacher Education, National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards (Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1955), p. 217.

Due to Michigan's increased certification requirements for teachers and administrators, that was legislated in 1963 and again in 1967, and the explosive population of the state, the state institutions of higher learning have been hard pressed to furnish the Michigan public schools with the adequate required supply. The National Education Association research report, Teacher Supply and Demand in Public Schools, 1963, indicated a supply of elementary and secondary school teachers being graduated from state institutions for the next five years was insufficient.³ The Michigan Education Association Research division reports an increase of 2,455 teachers who were placed in Michigan schools from 1968 to 1969. The United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare's Digest of Educational Statutes lists an increase of some 25,000 students in Michigan schools from fall 1968 to fall 1969.⁴ However, in a recent study by the Michigan State Board of Education, it was revealed that if present trends in teacher training continue, Michigan will have an average of 15,000 to 19,000 qualified

³ National Education Association, Teacher Supply and Demand in Public Schools, 1963, Research Report, 1963-64 (Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, May, 1963), p. 34.

⁴ U.S., Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Bureau of Educational Research and Development, Digest of Educational Statistics, Bulletin No. 43 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1968), p. 5.

teachers for whom no jobs will be available in the 1980's.⁵

With the supply problem with the trend toward consolidated districts, increased school services, and increased professional and allied employee organizations, then it would seem that there should be greater focus on the functions of school personnel administration in Michigan.

Purpose of the Study

This study is an attempt to make comparisons of the role concept of the district personnel director as perceived by certain Michigan superintendents and by selected authorities in school personnel administration.

Need for the Study

The majority of the present Michigan superintendents have met the requirements and standards for their positions and now find themselves the head of a complex school system after administering a relatively small school district for years.

Historical data point out that superintendents first saw the need for assistance in handling the business affairs of their expanding districts. Accountants, controllers, business managers, and assistant superintendents

⁵"Study Foresees Surplus of Teachers in Michigan," State News, February 11, 1972, p. 1.

of business affairs were positions designated as part of the central staff. Today, of the 530 operating districts in Michigan, 138 employ a person at the district level to administer the business affairs.

The realization of assistance in the area of instructional programming was made by Michigan superintendents of expanding districts. There are presently ninety-eight districts with a curriculum director.

There are but fifty-four full-time personnel directors employed in the state of Michigan. These data show that Michigan superintendents include in their responsibilities the job of recruitment, selection, etc., of personnel. Therefore, it would appear that a survey of the perceptions of superintendents would show the areas of agreement and disagreement in regard to duties and responsibilities of a district personnel director. This would be a starting point to assist present and future administrators in determining the role of a district personnel director.

Limitation of the Study

This study is limited to the following areas of school personnel administration: (1) general organization, (2) staff procurement and utilization, (3) staff development, and (4) conditions of service.

All Michigan school districts that have a student average daily attendance (1971-72) of 3,000 students or

more were surveyed. A list of professional authorities in the field of school personnel management were surveyed in a like manner. The Michigan superintendents' opinions were compared with the opinions of the selected authorities.

Definition of Terms

For the purpose of this study, the following definitions are used:

District Personnel Director refers to that person assigned to a school system district office who has the responsibility delegated to him from the board and superintendent through policy of obtaining, retraining, developing, and the training of the district employed personnel.

Recruitment constitutes that phase of pre-service selection in which promising persons are encouraged to become part of the district staff.

Selection refers to the securing of information about applicants for district positions and the appointment of the best qualified applicants.

Assignment is the process of appointing an employee to a certain position or to certain duties in the school district.

Orientation is the process of making a person aware of such procedures in his school environment for the purpose of facilitating effective adaptation.

Induction is the process of gradual introduction of employees into the school situation with a view to assisting them in making successfully the full adjustments that are involved later in their work.

In-Service Development is special training or instruction for district-employed persons with a view to increasing the workers' competence.

Promotion is an advance rank, position, or responsibility of a member of the certified or classified personnel of the school system.

Appraisal is that process of synthesizing and interpreting data concerning a district employee.

Compensation refers to those benefits and reimbursements allowed an employee for service rendered.

Transfer concerns that process of assignment of duties and responsibilities to another position within the system.

Evaluation is the process of ascertaining or judging the value of employees after careful appraisal.

Tenure is a system of school employment in which the teacher or other employee, having served a probationary period of a certain number of years, retains his position indefinitely and is protected in his position either by statute or by rule of the school board.

Grievances are those discussions or meetings pertaining to a real or imagined wrong presented by employee(s).

Dismissal is the separation of an employee from a school system by requesting his resignation or by a discharge effected by proper authority.

Retirement refers to the permanent withdrawal of a teacher from a district by reason of age or of length of service.

Certification means meeting the qualifications that are established by state departments of education for teachers in public schools and of issuing teaching certificates to those qualified persons.

Work Loads mean the total responsibilities or units of time for which an employee is expected to provide his services.

Leaves of Absence refers to those periods of time when an employee is absent from his assigned responsibilities involving an extended period of time.

Questions To Be Resolved

1. Is the superintendents' of school role concept of the personnel director consistent with the role concept as defined by selected authorities?
2. Is the role of the personnel director in large school districts consistent with the role definition by selected authorities and superintendents?

Overview

It has been the intent of Chapter I to describe the purpose of the study and to explain why there is a need for a comprehensive comparison of the role concept of the District Personnel Administrator as seen by certain Michigan superintendents and selected authorities in school personnel administration. Concepts vital to an understanding and appreciation for the objectives of the study were explained, followed by a statement of three questions to be resolved.

Chapter II is a review of literature pertinent to the study. Specifically, it will deal with background authority in school personnel administration, and the significance of developing functions, duties, and responsibilities specific to the personnel administrator.

The significant features of these studies will be summarized in the final section of the chapter.

The design of the study will be described in Chapter III, including a description of the sample used in the study. The chapter will include a description of the instruments used in the study. A discussion of methods of administering of the instruments and their scoring will be followed by a statement of the statistical methodology to be used.

Chapter IV will be devoted to an analysis of the data gathered for each category of personnel management included in this study. Findings will be given in the same order as were the questions to resolved in Chapter I. Superintendents' and authorities' opinions on the delegation of responsibilities are compared.

The last chapter will contain a summary of the study and findings. Concluding this chapter will be implications and a list of recommendations for further study.

Having presented the purpose of this study, its need, and some questions to be resolved, it is now essential that a review of the literature be undertaken.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Related literature is reviewed in this chapter. The decade 1952 to 1962 has the focus of attention and received the most concentrated treatment. Recognized standard research sources were reviewed for sources of information about public school personnel administration. These include Encyclopedia of Educational Research,¹ the Education Index,² Research Studies in Education,³ and the Review of Educational Research.⁴ Surveys of administrative organizations of the school systems, textbooks in the fields of public school administration and of school personnel administration were also consulted.

¹ Chester W. Harris, ed., Encyclopedia of Education Research (3rd ed.; New York: Macmillan Company, 1960).

² H. W. Wilson Company, Education Index (New York: The Company, January 1929-December 1960), Vol. I-XI.

³ Phi Delta Kappan, Research Studies in Education (Bloomington, Ind.: Phi Delta Kappan, 1941-1962).

⁴ American Educational Research Association, Review of Educational Research, Vol. I, Nos. 2 and 3; Vol. IV, VII, X, XIII, XVI, XIX, XXII.

It was discovered in most textbooks and indexes of literature that the term "personnel administrator" usually referred to the school guidance officer. There appeared to be a lack of reference made to the public school personnel administrator and his department.

Good's Dictionary of Education added and listed first, a third definition of the term "director of personnel":

Director of Personnel: (1) the administrative official in charge of personnel selection, transfer, and dismissal, the maintenance of records concerning teachers, and in some instances, other personnel programs; usually found only in large school systems; recommends action to the superintendent rather than directly to the school board; (2) a college administrator responsible for supervising the student personnel program; (3) frequently used as the title of the head counselor.⁵

Previous to this 1959 edition, there were only listed the latter definitions.

In 1937 Weber's book⁶ was one of the first publications to give considerable treatment to the personnel department. He states that the superintendent's job becomes too complex in cities of 100,000 population for the superintendent to do justice to the function of teacher selection.

⁵ Carter V. Good, ed., Dictionary of Education (2nd ed.; New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1959), p. 175.

⁶ Samuel Edwin Weber, Cooperative Administration and Supervision of the Teaching Personnel (New York: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1937).

Appointment should be placed in the hands of an assistant or associate superintendent in charge of personnel who should act as the chief examiner, but the superintendent of schools should be the ex-officio chairman of the board of examiners, and all policies observed by that board should be first submitted to him. The superintendent should have the sole responsibility of selecting the administrative and head supervisors employed in his district.⁷

Weber also indicated that the personnel director should be considered as a functional officer whose department should serve as the clearing agency for the entire system and advice concerning staff personnel problems. He further proposed that he should devote much of his time to holding personal interviews with teachers and applicants, classifying teachers for salary purposes, visiting classrooms to establish friendly personal relationship with as many teachers as possible, contributing to the efforts of teachers at work, supervising maintenance of complete personnel records and teachers' classifications, circulating of teacher-rating forms, and administering examination programs.

In 1938 Sears⁸ set up a model program of administrative rules and regulations for large school systems.

⁷ Ibid., p. 253.

⁸ Jesse B. Sears, City School Administrative Controls--An Analysis of the Nature, Placement, and Flow of Authority and Responsibility in the Management of a City School System (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1938).

Sears stated that an assistant superintendent of personnel to be an executive head of the division of staff personnel and responsible for:

All services pertaining to the eligibility, selection, assignments, salaries, efficiency, promotion, transfer, tenure, resignation, dismissal, absence, retirement, and training in-service of all employees of the school.⁹

Sears further stated that special attention should be given to the professional improvement of the staff members in the teaching services, and that continuous studies of work conditions, health, morale, salary schedule, and staff efficiency should be maintained throughout the system and reported to the superintendent.

In 1951 Pittenger¹⁰ stated that school personnel management should endeavor (1) to achieve aims of education, and (2) to protect and promote the proper interest of the personnel. The efficiency concept envisions every individual in an organization as a contributor to the accomplishment of the organization's function. Purposes of the organization are placed foremost. The human viewpoint emphasizes the rights of the individual as a person. Pittenger would give recognition to both viewpoints in personnel administration with direct

⁹ Ibid., p. 143.

¹⁰ Benjamin Floyd Pittenger, Local Public School Administration (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1951).

responsibility being placed on the administrator for basing decisions on the welfare of pupils.

The author emphasized the need for a clear definition of function by the personnel department and the administrative staff in matters of employment, assignment, and promotion. Decentralization of authority was proposed to the officer within whose unit or agency the employee would work.

It was also the author's opinion that principles laid down for school personnel management should cover all employees, not just preferred segments.

Yeager,¹¹ in 1954, attempted to define the nature and limits of the administration of teaching personnel. Confining the position taken by other writers in the field, administration of the school is viewed as a cooperative group enterprise.

The author included a chapter on the organization for personnel administration that gives general treatment to the area under investigation in this study. Selected desirable objectives of the personnel department include:

1. To plan for the over-all policy of personnel administration within the school system, and designate the functions to be performed.
2. To set up an organization designed to facilitate the administration of all functions previously determined and assigned to this division.

¹¹ William A. Yeager, Administration and the Teacher (New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1954).

3. To plan such cooperative relationships with the other staff members, line officers, and teachers which will be necessary in approving the staff in-service, such as workshops and supervision.
4. To report regularly to the superintendent concerning those responsibilities assigned to his office, especially business problems requiring his attention.
5. To advise the superintendent concerning changes in policy as well as matters pertaining to the administration of the office.
6. To conduct studies and engage in research and experimentation in activities associated with personnel.
7. To co-ordinate other services and agencies directly associated with the personnel function, such as teachers' committees, educational departments of higher institutions, placement agencies, and in the community.¹²

The division will be organized in larger districts to include assistant directors in charge of (1) the instructional staff, and (2) the non-instructional staff, including clerical employees. It was noted that custodians might be assigned to the business division, depending upon administrative policy, with references to include them in the personnel division. The director will be directly responsible for the organization and functional arrangement of his department.

The author defined certain responsibilities directly related to this investigation, including (1) policy development prior to determination by the chief executive officer and the board of education, (2) selection of employees and compilation of eligibility list, (3) selection of administrative personnel, (4) evaluate

¹² Ibid.

efficiency, (5) salary adjustment, (6) transfer, (7) dismissal, and (8) conflicts.

In discussing teachers' unions, it was pointed out that it may become necessary for the personnel administrator to deal with their official representatives. Yeager continued with this view:

Ordinarily, there would appear to be no obligation of responsible administrative officers to engage in conferences of this nature. In dealing with these matters, a larger interest of the all-staff members and all the boys and girls should receive major attention.¹³

Further evidence of cooperative action between colleges and universities, and administrators of personnel was reported in the area of assignment of practice teachers, in-service education, use of school as a laboratory, internship programs, and study councils.

Morphett, Johns, and Reller¹⁴ in their 1959 study, emphasized the importance of trained leadership in school administration. The position was held that the administrator should be capable of helping people to identify emerging issues of significance and should possess leadership ability in developing procedures for obtaining solutions. The authors stressed the magnitude of the problem of school personnel administration since large

¹³ Ibid., p. 547.

¹⁴ Edgar L. Morphett, Roe L. Johns, and Theodore L. Reller, Educational Administration (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1959).

numbers of people are involved and their salaries constitute about 85 per cent of the operating budget of public education.

Participation in teacher education programs was considered to be an emerging function of school personnel administrators. The authors noted the rather large number of experimental teacher education programs as evidence of more active cooperation in planning and evaluating than are generally found. It was held that local school systems should do more than provide directed teaching experiences.

Involvement of several staff members in the selection and assignment process was advocated. The authors stated specifically that the principals of the schools should have an established part in the assignment of teachers if they are to be held responsible for the work in their respective schools. Similarly, in the area of promotion, staff participation was recommended in the development of policies pertaining to the selection.

Weber's¹⁵ study identified current school problems of school personnel management and proposed new approaches to obtaining solutions.

¹⁵Clarence A. Weber, Personnel Problems of School Administration (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1954).

The author reiterated substantially the same view as the other more recent writers in the field in the area of participation in policy formulation. The continual need for status leaders was recognized, but in a different setting than they were utilized in the traditional line-staff pattern of organization. Authority was considered to be a practical necessity and an essential element in the operation of the school assistant. Weber holds that authority in a democratic society lies not in persons, but in common agreement regarding a course of action. Leadership becomes essential in executing the course after it has been established.

In 1954 Ellsbree and Reutter¹⁶ presented an analysis of problems related to the professional staff employed in public schools. Trends in school personnel management were identified and their relationship of local leadership to instructional efficiency was established.

The authors pointed out several philosophical tenets on which enlightened school personnel administration might be based. Priority given to the work of the individual would be reflected in personnel policies and management. Evidence of faith in group judgment and discussion would characterize this type of administration.

¹⁶ Willard S. Ellsbree and Edmund E. Reutter, Staff Personnel in the Public School (New York: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1954).

Mandates would be an out-growth of group decisions in which the administrator participated.

Staff participation in the selection of teachers was advocated by most writers in the field. Elsbree and Reutter maintained that the principal who shared in the responsibility of selecting the members of his staff has a greater interest in the success of the candidate chosen than the principal who is not consulted. A similar position was taken in the statement that cooperation of both principals concerned should be obtained in the transfer of teaching personnel. The role of the board of education in the selection of teachers was limited to the formulation of policies.

Commenting on the phenomenal growth of employees' organizations in recent years, Elsbree and Reutter noted a parallel growth in the power and influence of such organizations. This was viewed as an out-growth of normal, human desires for security, status, and a feeling of belonging.

A rather general analysis was made of the program of the American Federation of Teachers and the National Education Association. Similarities in the programs were reported to be more general than the differences. Chief difference between the two associations was attributed to the methods employed in achieving their ends and in the philosophy underlying the associations. An essential element of personnel administration identified by the

authors was the statement that good human relations depend upon clarity of function. This concept represents one of the major assumptions on which this investigation is based. The following quotation exemplifies this principle:

When employees understand their respective roles and the relationship of their work to the work of others, they are likely to be more efficient. Perhaps the view where the greatest need exists for a clear statement in relationship is in the central office. Supervisors often tread on the toes of principals because of the over-lapping duties, and when the functions of these officers have not been clearly delineated, teachers are sometimes caught between the upper and nether milestones.¹⁷

In 1955 Moore and Walters¹⁸ attacked the problem of personnel administration from the standpoint of human relations involved as well as the functions to be performed. Theoretical approaches to the solution of school personnel problems were supported by selected examples of good practices in the field.

A traditional line and staff hierarchy in school administration was questioned. It was proposed that sharp delineation between the two be eliminated. Typical of the attitude expressed was the statement that the greatest challenge to future administrative leadership involves successful administration of the personnel function.

¹⁷ Ibid., p. 7.

¹⁸ Harold E. Moore and Newell B. Walters, Personnel Administration in Education (New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1955).

Further evidence of the authors' views regarding the significance of the field of school personnel administration is indicated in these statements:

It is an axiom in most organizations where success is essentially involved with human services that the best leadership be in that area. To apply such a point of view to public education would require that boards of education, school administrators, and even the profession itself re-orient its thinking.¹⁹

The authors emphasize the tendency for problems of personnel management to become more complicated in districts of extreme size. A high priority was given to the human relationship aspects of personnel administration with lesser importance being attributed to organizational patterns.

In 1955 Chandler and Petty²⁰ utilized the findings of research in business and industry as well as the total field of school administration in charting the future of school personnel work.

An excellent summary of the trend related to this investigation appearing since 1949 include:

1. More attention given to the welfare of the less important person in organizations.
2. Writings dealing with research indicate that most attention has been given to the more obvious aspects of personnel activity, such as time, motion, and duties studies rather than to analyse relationships.

¹⁹ Ibid., p. 455.

²⁰ B. J. Chandler and Paul V. Petty, Personnel Management in School Administration (Yonkers-on-Hudson, N.Y.: World Book, 1955).

3. The in-service aspect of personnel preparation is receiving added attention.
4. Employment and discharge practices are being more formalized.
5. Personnel administration has made exceptional progress in the areas of industry and the public "classified services" but is lag in such areas as public education and hospital administration.
6. Little writing has been done exclusively in the field of public school personnel administration.²¹

The authors view line and staff distinctions as to function as an out-moded concept. It was held that the most modern day positions hold some of both advisory and so-called command functions. Emerging pattern of organization and administration is positive, flexible in its operation, but at the same time, democratic and efficient.

Advisory councils composed of teachers and administrators were proposed as a promising technique for encouraging participation. Personnel policy committees were suggested as one approach to obtaining better personnel administration through involvement in policy formulation.

The authors emphasize the importance of communication and its effect on relationship. Primary function of communication channels was for the accurate dissemination of knowledge to combat the negative influence of rumors.

Persons in groups within the over-all organization have been for working together in situations were all are

²¹
Ibid., pp. 19-20.

of the same level within a functioning organization. Leadership emerges from the combined groups, and the quality of their relationship in this respect is largely dependent upon the quality of communications. The authors stated further that communications from the top, in the case of organizations, the superintendent's office should encourage inter-group activities, and at the same time set a high tone for carrying out these activities.

Castetter's²² book represents a study of personnel problems within the framework of the total school administration process. School personnel management is given the full treatment under the four parts: (1) fundamental concepts of school personnel administration, (2) determining personnel need, (3) satisfaction of personnel need, and (4) maintaining and improving personnel service.

In Part I Castetter presents an overview of the social change, technological revolution, human revolution, population trends, economic revolution, professional supply and demand, employment conditions and their implications for personnel administration. An examination of the perspective, purpose, nature, scope, significance, organization, budget, and policy development of the personnel function is made within this part of the book. Concluding

²² William B. Castetter, Administering the School Personnel Program (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1962).

this Part I, the author points up the problems created by individual needs and organizational demands.

Part II deals with the determination of personnel needs by considering quantity, quality, and compensation structure. Sub-topics within the aspects of "personnel quantity" that are given attention are: (1) nature and scope of the educational program, (2) district, school, and class size, (3) balance in instructional service, (4) staff utilization, (5) schedules and work loads, and (6) function analysis.

The author presents the topic of "quality personnel" by focusing on the processes of quality control, position specification, and employment standards.

Salary scheduling and its factors for certified and classified personnel are given the full treatment by the author in the section titled "The Compensation Structure."

After establishing the concepts of personnel needs, the author, in Part II, follows a natural pattern by presenting the "satisfaction of personnel need." The concepts, practice, and issues of personnel recruitment, selection, and induction receive complete attention by Castetter in this section.

Part IV, "maintaining and improving personnel service," is a good analysis of the development, appraisal, and general welfare of school personnel. Development of school personnel and in-service development are synonymous

in meaning in the profession these days. The author goes into all the ramifications of in-service training programs for administrators, teachers, and classified personnel. The topic of "appraisal of personnel" is a major function of the personnel management progress. This book organizes and presents the personnel functions of transfer, promotion, and dismissal under personnel appraisal. The welfare provisions to be treated within this text are: (1) leaves of absence, (2) substitute service, (3) health, (4) grievances, (5) academic freedom, (6) associations, (7) tenure, and (8) retirement.

Castetter pulls together the newest trends in personnel policies and draws freely upon the writings, surveys, and researches of both practitioners and students of the subject consideration. Emphasis is given throughout to the relationship of the personnel function to the total administrative process of today.

In 1953 Green²³ surveyed the personnel policies and practices of 990 school systems in cities with population ranging from 10,000 to 30,000 and compared their status with ideal policies and practices presented in the literature. Full time or part time personnel directors were indicated in 18 school systems in 8 states and

²³ John Albert Green. "The Policies and Practices of Personnel Administration in the Public School Systems of the Cities Between 10,000 and 30,000 in Population" (unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, University of Colorado, 1953).

personnel staff members in 159. In 95 per cent of the districts, it was indicated that the superintendents, principals, and other staff members held the responsibility for personnel practices.

Madsen²⁴ sought to answer two questions: (1) What responsibility should be assigned to the department of personnel administration, and (2) on what responsibility should the most and the least emphasis be placed in a well balanced program of personnel administration? This study was of personnel administration in city school systems with populations ranging from 100,000 to 900,000. Out of 17 school districts to which he sent questionnaires, Madsen identified seven with personnel departments and administrators. He reported on titles of persons with major responsibility for personnel administration, adequacy of their staff of assistants, their responsibilities, experience, training, and desirable personnel and professional qualifications.

McCarthy's²⁵ 1953 study focused directly on school personnel administrators as individuals or position holders

²⁴Donald H. Madsen, "Personnel Administration in Large City School Systems" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Yale University, 1953).

²⁵Francis J. McCarthy, "The Personnel Administrator in City School Systems: A Study of the Duties and Functions of Personnel Officers and Administrative Organizational Plans for Personnel Management in Public School Systems in Selected Cities as Compared to Personnel

rather than on personnel administration as a function. He studied their duties and functions in the administrative organizational plan for personnel management in school systems as compared to business, industry, and public administration. He identified three organizational plans for personnel administration in 67 school systems with between 100,000 and 500,000 in populations:

1. No personnel department; superintendent acting as personnel director in 24 or 36 per cent of the cities.
2. Personnel function centralized to the extent that an administrator was responsible for it in addition to other duties; for example, director of instruction in personnel in 14, or 21 per cent of the cities.
3. A separate personnel department headed by an executive responsible only for personnel administration in 29, or 43 per cent of the cities.²⁶

He obtained data on the origin and function of the personnel administrator in 33 cities that had centralized the personnel function.

In public schools of cities with 15,000 to 30,000 inhabitants, Millar²⁷ studied the status and trends in teacher personnel administration. He interviewed 20 administrators in 5 states to devise a check list on current

Practices in Other Fields" (unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, New York University, 1953).

²⁶ Ibid., p. 123.

²⁷ Allen Robert Millar, "Teacher Personnel Administration in School Systems in Cities 15,000 to 30,000 in Population" (unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, University of Nebraska, 1956).

practices and projected practices. The check list was sent to 257 administrators in 47 states. Only 13.3 per cent of the reporting schools had personnel departments in operation. The study indicated 74 per cent of the administrators reporting considered teacher personnel departments necessary or desirable. Administrators indicated four chief reasons for establishing teacher personnel departments: (1) greater increase in personnel problems, (2) the increased awareness by the administration for greater personnel expertness in the area, (3) general increase in administrator's duties, and (4) the proven worth of expert personnel management.

The findings indicated that the personnel director should always be responsible to the superintendent. The duties of the teacher personnel department should include (1) recruitment, (2) examination of certified personnel, participation in the selection of teachers, (3) assignment of teachers, (4) maintain evaluation records, (5) recommendation of termination, and (6) the administration of policies and regulations for promotion of position and salary, retirement, teacher loads, leaves of absence, and tenure. Other duties of the teacher personnel department should be in maintenance of personal files of information on vital statistics, training experience, evaluation of records, professional activities, publications and civic activities of certified personnel.

The study recommends that the administrator, in planning a course of action to establish such a department, should familiarize himself with the general field of personnel problems.

In 1956 Wheeler²⁸ sought responses from 234 districts and found 32 per cent with personnel offices. Through these responses he proposed (1) to determine the responsibility of the personnel department in school districts of 10,000 to 30,000 students; (2) to outline the relationship of the personnel department with other divisions within the school district; (3) to determine how the personnel practices in the districts of 10,000 to 30,000 students are fundamentally different from those in districts of larger school population; (4) to discover at what size district, as based on enrollment, a personnel department, as such, is a practical addition to the administrative structure; (5) to develop a set of criteria by use of which each school district administration can evaluate the functions of its own personnel office, or to enable the organization of a personnel department in such districts that do not already have such an organization.

²⁸ Donald R. Wheeler, "The Organization, Relationship and Responsibilities of the Personnel Office in School Districts of 10,000 to 30,000 Enrollment" (unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, University of Southern California, 1956).

Tritt²⁹ made basically the same study as Millar, except with school systems in cities of 30,000 to 60,000 population. Eighteen administrators in six states were interviewed. From the information gained from 117 administrators in 45 states who completed a check list, trends and status of the organization of teacher personnel departments were ascertained. At this time only 22 per cent of the schools reporting have teacher personnel departments in operation. The study did indicate that 77 per cent of the school administrators reporting considered professionally operated teacher personnel departments necessary and desirable.

Tritt's recommendations of proposed duties and responsibilities of teacher personnel departments were basically the same as Millar's.

Egly³⁰ in 1959 investigated personnel practices in public school districts in cities of 100,000 or more population in the United States, with respect to the granting of fringe benefits. Evaluative criteria were drawn to assist districts in the development of fringe

²⁹ Charles William Tritt, "Teacher Personnel Administration in School Systems in Cities, 30,000-60,000 in Population" (unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, University of Nebraska, 1956).

³⁰ Edgar Carl Egly, "Fringe Benefits for Classified Employees of Large City School Districts" (unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, University of Southern California, 1959).

benefit policies. Comparisons were made with existing practice in industry.

The author recommended that fringe benefits for classified employees be similar to those granted certified personnel, taking into consideration differences in responsibility in training. It was held that constant evaluation of the program should be made to ascertain how well the goals for granting such benefits were achieved in practice.

Reference was frequently made in the literature to the dual approach to the school personnel management in which a separate system exists for classified and certified administration. A trend toward a more complete integration of the two kinds of school employees in regard to personnel policies was reported.

Mack³¹ in 1960 sought to determine the personnel functions that should be performed in school districts, the administrative position that should be assigned responsibility for each function, and the patterns of organization that are most conducive to successful performance of the personnel functions. The normative survey technique was employed to collect data from 26 unified and common administration school districts in California. A sample

³¹Jay David Mack, "The Organization of District-Level Personnel Functions in Selected California School Districts" (unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, University of Southern California, 1960).

of the districts was selected having from 5,000 to 22,000 enrollment. Many of the findings in Mack's survey study are directly related to this investigation and are summarized as follows:

1. The average ratio of certified employees to enrollment was 24 students for each certified employee, and size of district had little bearing on the ratio.
2. Large districts were found to maintain one classified employee for each 60 students.
3. Ratio of certified to classified was approximately two to one.³²

Findings related to the position of personnel administrator and pertinent to this study include:

1. The administrator most frequently assigned to the major responsibility for personnel was the personnel director in large districts, and the assistant superintendent in medium size districts.
2. The titles most frequently utilized by districts for classification for large to small were:
 - a. personnel director
 - b. assistant superintendent
 - c. superintendent
3. Respondents usually recommend that titles used be the same as those in actual use.
4. Existing and recommended responses most frequently selected an assistant superintendent, usually the one in charge of business services, to be responsible for classified personnel.
5. Slightly more than half of the districts had a single administrator who carried major responsibility for both certified and classified personnel.³³

Further findings in the area of assigned personnel functions include:

³²Ibid., p. 463.

³³Ibid., pp. 463-64.

1. The superintendent should have major responsibility for salary program.
2. The assistant superintendent should have major responsibility for:
 - a. assignment and transfer
 - b. orientation and in-service training
 - c. employee handbooks
 - d. personnel policies, with minor responsibility for personnel records and the retirement program.³⁴

More than three-fourths of all personnel administrators were directly responsible to the superintendent, and all respondents favored this relationship.

As district enrollments increased, the certified and classified employees assigned to personnel functions increased. A slight increase in the number of such employees was recommended.

In two-thirds of all districts an advisory relationship exists between the personnel administrator and the assistant superintendent in charge of business services. In almost half of the districts studied, a staff relationship existed between the personnel administrator and the assistant superintendent in charge of instructional services. A majority of the respondents recommended an advisory relationship with the school principal.

There was near unanimity of opinion that personnel responsibilities should be stated in writing. As districts' enrollment increased, there was a tendency for personnel responsibilities to be separated from the line relationship

³⁴ Ibid., pp. 467-68.

and to be performed by staff specialists. Mack concluded that there is a general desire on the part of personnel administrators to achieve some form of centralized personnel organization, and a trend was noted in this direction. An advisory relationship should exist between the personnel administrator and other district level administrative positions and school principals.

Addington,³⁵ in 1961, conducted a study to determine whether there are methods, practices, or techniques useful in human relations revealed by research in personnel administration, in business and industry, that could be useful in, but are being used little or not at all in educational personnel administration. After his review of literature, he concluded, among the implications for public education were these:

1. Horizontal communications channels should be kept open to encourage joint problem solving among peers.
2. Teachers and other school employees should receive recognition for work well done. Recognition of good work will contribute to high morale and continued good work.
3. School employees should be informed of school financial matters. Employees, especially teachers, should be informed of the financial reports before the reports are released to the public.
4. Teachers will benefit so far as income taxes are concerned if the school corporation pay retirement costs, life and health insurance premiums,

³⁵ Chester Luther Addington, "A Review on Human Relations in Business and Industrial Personnel Administration with Implications for Educational Personnel Administration" (Abstracts of Doctoral Dissertations, Indiana University, 1961).

organizational membership fees, and school business travel expenses directly rather than paying this money to the teacher who must pay tax on it.³⁶

Morton's³⁷ 1961 study was made to discover the functional relationship which should be maintained by the school district personnel administrator and other departments of the central office, including school principal, employee groups, and certain other agencies. Specifically, the study sought to answer the following questions:

1. What is the current staffing pattern and status of school personnel departments?
2. What are some of the representative relationships maintained by the personnel department with other divisions of the district?
3. What are some of the representative relationships of the personnel department with certain groups outside the district?
4. What would constitute a desirable environmental setting for the operation of the personnel department in relationship with other departments of the central office and the school administrators?
5. What are some of the desirable representative working relationships to be maintained by the personnel department with certain agencies outside the district?³⁸

From the questionnaire sent to 88 school districts in cities of the United States having a population from

³⁶ Ibid., p. 134.

³⁷ Clayton Robert Morton, "The Organization and Relationships of School Personnel Departments in Cities of 100,000 to 500,000 Population in the United States" (unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, University of Southern California, 1961).

³⁸ Ibid., p. 7.

100,000 to 499,999, Morton obtain his information and drew these conclusions:

1. The school personnel administrator maintains an advisory relationship with the staff members.
2. Competency in the performance of assigned functions of all employees is an appropriate concern of the personnel staff.
3. Recognition of the potential role of an adequately staffed personnel department has not been uniformly attained.
4. The assignment of responsibility for all personnel management to a single staff position is an emerging organizational pattern.
5. Effective functioning of the personnel staff requires the maintenance of positive working relationships, through operative communications channels with administrators, professional groups, employees' unions, and agencies.
6. Awareness of the dynamics of employee group action and its bearing on the power structure of an administrative organization is an essential concept in school administration.
7. It is prudent to secure participation of all affected in the recruitment and in-service training of both certified and classified school district employees.
8. Schools of education, teacher placement offices, professional organizations, school principals, the instructional staff, and quality of the instructional programs are important cogs of the personnel department.³⁹

From these conclusions, Morton made the following recommendations:

1. Staffing of school personnel departments needs to be reviewed to determine the adequacy of numbers of employees allocated to perform assigned functions.
2. In view of the unanimity of opinion regarding the responsibility of the personnel administrator in policy formulation and proposals for change, it is recommended that this position be designated to work directly with officers of professional organizations and employees' unions on an established board adopted policy basis. Thus seen, salary

³⁹ Ibid., p. 167.

- requests and other employees' benefit issues would be analysed by the personnel staff and referred to the superintendent with a proposed plan of action.
3. It is recommended that central staff operating patterns be designed to provide an opportunity for the function interaction necessary to insure maximum utilization of human resources in the education of children.
 4. It is recommended that a planned program be created to promote the coordinated efforts of local schools of education, placement offices, instruction and personnel staff members, and school administrators in the recruitment and training of classroom teachers.
 5. To recommend that school districts investigate the possibility of utilizing more fully the services of local state employment offices in the recruitment of classified school employees and the procurement of labor market and wage data.
 6. This study was brought in scope to encompass staffing patterns, general relationships, maintained by school personnel administrators. Future study is necessary to identify specific techniques, particularly in the field of relationship with employee unions, personnel organizations, local-state employment offices, and creating and maintaining the relationships identified in this study.⁴⁰

The entire field of cooperative endeavor by individual school districts and local schools of education in the recruitment and training of teachers merits further study.

Donald's⁴¹ study in 1962 was undoubtedly one of the most complete and recent studies in the area of public school personnel administration. She did a four place

⁴⁰ Ibid., p. 172.

⁴¹ Eleanor Donald, "The Public School Administrator, A Study of the Origin, Administrative Status, Duties and Responsibilities, and Trends of the Position" (unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Columbia University, 1962).

project including the areas of public school personnel administrators' origin, status, duties and responsibilities, and trends of the position.

Of course, the area of public school personnel administrators' duties and responsibilities has great significance to this study.

Her stated purpose for the study was:

1. To study the origin of the position of public school personnel administrators--when, where, and why it was originally established.
2. To describe the administrative status, duties and responsibilities of the personnel administrator.
3. To describe the personal and professional specifications established for the incumbent and characteristics of those persons presently holding the position.
4. To describe directions in which the position will probably develop.⁴²

To find the answer to these problems, Donald reviewed the literature, made a brief inquiry form, sent it to school districts known or believed to employ personnel administrators, had interviews with selected superintendents and personnel administrators, and a study of job descriptions of personnel administrators.

After studying and analyzing 73 job descriptions as stated by personnel administrators and interviewing 15 district superintendents and personnel administrators, Mrs. Donald made this summary of her findings:

1. The Personnel Administrator, regardless of title, is usually directly responsible to and under the supervision of the superintendent of schools.

⁴²Ibid., p. 7.

2. The personnel administrator is generally responsible for two groups of personnel, the professional and clerical staff of the personnel office and other personnel on a district-wide basis.
3. The personnel administrator is always responsible for certified personnel and usually for classified personnel.
4. The personnel administrator holds a staff (rather than line) position in most cases.
5. The personnel administrator is usually a member of the superintendent's administrative cabinet.
6. The personnel administrator is employed on a twelve month basis, with one month vacation.
7. The personnel administrator is subject to state certification laws as well as local laws, rules, and regulations pertaining to other school district personnel, but otherwise, restricted only by his job description.
8. The personnel administrator works closely in a cooperative advisory capacity with other central office administrators, supervisors, and principals.
9. Duties, responsibilities of the position are a college pulled away from or shed by the board, the superintendent, the superintendent's secretary, assistant superintendents of elementary or secondary education, instruction or business, the board of examiners, directors, supervisors, and principals.
10. Creation of the position represents an attempt to have the central office personnel function performed more effectively on a full time basis by someone specifically assigned to this responsibility, and to free other administrators for other tasks.
11. Recruitment of teachers and maintenance of personnel records have always been the personnel administrator's primary responsibility.
12. The personnel administrator participates in many other personnel functions. These are expanding in volume and scope to include activities or functions not originally included in the personnel function when the position was first established forty years ago.
13. Personnel administrators are now in charge of a wide variety of programs and services; indications are that more and more activities will come to be regarded as properly the responsibility of the personnel administrator.⁴³

⁴³Ibid., pp. 173-74.

If this be the case, there is no doubt Michigan and the United States as a whole should, and will have to, concentrate more on perfecting the personnel function of school districts.

Summary

The relationship between the school board and the superintendent of schools has been a problem of great magnitude in recent years. The principle appearing frequently in the literature that the superintendent evaluates and recommends and the board appoints the selection and promotion of school personnel. Disregard of this principle has been noted in some incidence of actual practice.

The policy approach to the personnel management through the board adopted policies is recommended. Responsibility for adoption would rest with the board of education with the help of the superintendent, assistant superintendent of personnel and representative members of the school board, both instructional and non-teaching.

Human values are considered to be of paramount importance in personnel evaluation.

References have been made throughout the literature to the concept that personnel administrators represents all the people in the organization. A very significant statement in this regard, and serves as a genesis and a

summation for this investigation is stated in the next paragraph.

Personnel administration must inject a strong dose of realism into the idealistic mixture prepared by educational planners. Without an understanding of human limitations and without policies and practices that take these limitations into account, participation in the educational enterprise can become more and more frustrating, and the aims of education can become empty promises.

CHAPTER III

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

This study was designed to determine which educational administrators within the school system should be assigned selected personnel functions according to the judgements of (1) Michigan superintendents, and (2) selected authorities in school personnel administration.

The nature of the type of study problem implied the use of the normative survey method of research. The most practical and feasible means of gathering data for this study was considered by the researcher to be the use of a questionnaire--a method widely used in survey research involving sample studies. With the realization that restrictions are existent in research projects utilizing questionnaires, it was decided to proceed under the assumption that administrators would be inclined to respond in an accurate and forthright manner to an unsigned check-type survey form.

The Sample and Its Selection

The normative survey method of research will be used, and the data will be secured by means of a

questionnaire which will be sent to forty of the 150 Michigan school districts having an average daily attendance of 3,000 students or more. A list of authorities in the area of school personnel administration will receive the same questionnaire. A stratified random sampling technique will be used. The statistics will be shown by tables and in percentage form.

Plan of the Study

Primary sources of original data were the responses from superintendents of schools in the state of Michigan and authorities in the area of school personnel administration on a questionnaire indicating their opinions concerning the delegation of responsibilities for personnel functions.

Information on school personnel administration was obtained from secondary sources in the professional literature. Current researchers and practitioners were used in development of a list of authorities. If the educator was indicated as having researched, or diligently studied the field of school personnel administration, he was considered as an authority in the area of school personnel administration.

Educational directories were requested from the state superintendent of public instruction of the state of Michigan. From this source the names and addresses of the superintendents of schools, in districts having 3,000

average daily attendance or more, were obtained. The forty school districts sampled and the six authorities that received the questionnaire are listed in Appendix A.

The questionnaire technique for collecting data was used in this investigation for the following reasons: (1) since respondents were actively engaged in the field and familiar with personnel procedures, there appeared to be little need for further clarification, (2) interviews would have been difficult to schedule due to the varied locations of the respondents.

The survey method of research was used, and the data were secured by means of a questionnaire which was sent to forty of 150 Michigan school districts with an average attendance of 3,000. The selection was a random sample. A list of authorities in the area of school personnel administration received the same questionnaire. Valid responses were received from twenty-nine superintendents, which represents 73 per cent of the superintendents contacted. Questionnaires were sent to six authorities, and six authorities responded. Further analysis was made of the responses in terms of geographic area, size of community, and selected authorities.

It was believed that the study would be more meaningful if current opinions could be obtained from Michigan superintendents, and authorities in school administration.

The questionnaires were addressed to the superintendent of schools of the districts. All authorities received their questionnaires addressed to them at their employment address (see Appendix B). The cover letter identified the researcher, stated the purpose, indicated method of response, and assured the respondents that their identity or contribution would not be indicated by name. Return envelopes and postage were included.

Development of the Questionnaire

A preliminary questionnaire was developed from the literature and through conferences with administrators actively engaged in school personnel work plus the examination and analysis of job descriptions for school personnel administrators. Previous research studies, and professional books and periodicals, were utilized to obtain an extensive list of functions performed by school personnel managers. The preliminary trial questionnaire was reviewed by selected members of the Michigan State University, Department of Administration and Higher Education.

The questionnaire was designed to reflect the opinions of selected superintendents and authorities regarding the delegation of various district personnel functions. There were four parts of the questionnaire.

Part I of the questionnaire obtained opinions relative to the general organization of the personnel

function for a school district. Sub-topics were: policy formulation, inter-district communications, and personnel records.

Part II required an opinion as to the delegation of duties and functions of school personnel administration in the area of staff procurement and utilization. Under this area, the following topics were included: (1) personnel needs, (2) personnel recruitment, (3) personnel selection, (4) personnel assignment, (5) substitute teachers, and (6) liaison responsibilities.

The third part was titled "staff development." Here, opinions were obtained on the topics of: orientation and induction of personnel, professional development, evaluation, promotion, personnel transfer, and adjustment counseling.

Conditions of service is the last part of the questionnaire and included thirty-three items under the sub-titles of certification, formulation of job descriptions, compensation, work loads, leaves of absence, tenure recommendation, grievances, dismissal, and retirement.

Method of Collecting Data

Thirty-two superintendents out of the forty sampled responded to the questionnaire. Of the six authorities contacted, six responded to the questionnaire. This return represents 83 per cent of the total number of

questionnaires distributed. Due to three invalid questionnaires, 7 per cent of the responses were void and not made part of the study.

By eliminating those districts with incomplete and invalid responses, this gives a 76 per cent valid response which provides basic data for the study. This percentage was considered adequate for the purpose of this investigation.

Treatment of Data

Selection of this treatment was made after the following steps were taken: (1) information from all sections of the questionnaire was tabulated manually, (2) the opinions of the Michigan superintendents and authorities for the degree of agreement or disagreement were established with deviations indicated. This information is reported in Chapter IV.

Consistency of responses between the selected authorities and the superintendents was placed at the 60 per cent level, i.e., if the selected authorities stated that a particular personnel function was at the 50 per cent level and the superintendents placed it at the 70 per cent then this particular personnel function was considered to be consistent.

Summary

The purpose of this chapter has been to explain the procedures and instrumentation used to fulfill the objectives of this study.

A detailed description of the questionnaire related to the roles and functions of the District Personnel Director as seen by certain Michigan superintendents and selected authorities was given. The manner in which it was developed was explained.

The forty school districts and six selected authorities which constituted the sample used in this study were described. Unique characteristics of the school districts which make up the sample were listed and discussed.

An explanation of the mechanics of survey administration was given, stressing the need to maintain anonymity among school districts in order to attain the highest possible level of honest expressions from respondents. An explanation of how the data would be treated was also given.

The following chapter will be devoted to the analysis of the data gathered in this study.

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION OF DATA

In the preceding chapter the methods of procedure for this research survey were presented. Contained in Chapter IV is an analysis of the data and the findings. This chapter is divided into twenty-five sections, one for each of the twenty-four areas of interest chosen for study, and a section that lists selected authorities and superintendents' responses to two questions to be resolved.

The statistical analyses of all data for this study were done manually by the investigator with assistance from the Computer Center at Michigan State University.

Data on Administrator Responsible for Personnel--Policy Formulation

The presentation of data in this section is concerned with research and personnel policy, development of personnel policy, organization and consolidation of already existing personnel policy, and administering and interpreting personnel policy.

Table 1 shows the percentage of responses by the selected authorities and the Michigan superintendents as related to the areas in policy formulation.

Data in Table 1 indicate that:

1. Eighty-three per cent of the authorities stated that the development of personnel policy should be the responsibility of the assistant superintendent of personnel while 93 per cent of the superintendents would assign this responsibility to the assistant superintendent of personnel. A small percentage of the superintendents would share this responsibility with other members of the central office staff, while a small percentage of the authorities would share this function with the superintendents.
2. Eighty-three per cent of the authorities reported that the development of personnel policy should be the responsibility of the superintendent and the assistant superintendent of personnel to be shared equally, while 93 per cent of the superintendents would assign this responsibility to the assistant superintendent of personnel. Thirty-one per cent of the superintendents indicated that this responsibility should be assigned to the superintendent.

TABLE 1. General Organization--Policy Formulation.

Which Administrator(s) Should	Authorities						Superintendents					
	Asst Supt of Supt	Asst Supt of Inst	Asst Supt of Pers	Other Prin	Other Admin	Asst Supt of Supt	Asst Supt of Inst	Asst Supt of Pers	Other Prin	Other Admin		
	Bus	Inst	Pers	Prin	Admin	Bus	Inst	Pers	Prin	Admin		
A. Research and survey personnel policy	17		83			14	7	10	93	7	7	
B. Be responsible for the development of person- nel policy	83		83			31	3	7	93	10	7	
C. Organize and consolidate already existing person- nel policy	17		83			10	7	3	100	3		
D. Administer and interpret personnel policy	50		66			10	7	7	93	14	7	

Note: All figures are percentages of the group.

3. Eighty-three per cent of the authorities stated that organizing and consolidating already existing personnel policy should be the duty of the assistant superintendent of personnel, while 100 per cent of the Michigan superintendents would assign this responsibility to the assistant superintendent of personnel. A small percentage of the superintendents would share this responsibility with other central office personnel, while a small percentage of the authorities would share it with the superintendents.
4. Sixty-six per cent of the authorities stated that the responsibility for administering and interpreting the personnel policy should be assigned to the assistant superintendent of personnel, while 50 per cent of the authorities state that this responsibility also should be assigned to the superintendent. Ninety-three per cent of the Michigan superintendents assign this personnel function to the assistant superintendent of personnel, and a small percentage of the superintendents would share it with other central office personnel.

Data on Administrator Responsible for
Inter-District Communications

The presentation of data in this section is concerned with (a) keeping the superintendent and the board of education informed on personnel matters; (b) advertising vacancies; (c) maintaining contact with college placement bureaus and applicants for employment; (d) compiling and distributing a policy handbook for personnel and a district personnel directory; (e) maintaining contact with and working with union, professional, and community groups; (f) keeping informed on recent developments in the field of personnel administration; (g) contributing items of interest on personnel to the district and circulating bulletins to personnel and dissemination information from central office to individual schools.

Table 2 shows the percentage of responses by the selected authorities and the Michigan superintendents as related to the areas of Inter-District Communications.

Data in Table 2 indicate that:

1. Eighty-three per cent of the authorities stated that keeping the superintendent and the board of education informed on personnel matters should be the responsibility of the assistant superintendent of personnel and 33 per cent of the authorities would assign this personnel function to the superintendent. Ninety-seven per cent of the

TABLE 2. General Organization--Inter-District Communications.

Which Administrator(s) Should	Authorities						Superintendents					
	Asst Supt	Asst Supt	Asst Supt	Other			Asst Supt	Asst Supt	Asst Supt	Other		
	of	of	of				of	of	of			
	Supt	Bus	Inst	Pers	Prin	Admin	Supt	Bus	Inst	Pers	Prin	Admin
A. Keep the superintendent and the board of education informed on personnel matters	33			83			3	7	10	97	7	7
B. Advertise vacancies	17			100				3		97		
C. Maintain contact with college placement bureaus and applicants for employment	17			100			7		3	97		
D. Compile and distribute a policy handbook for personnel and a district personnel directory	33			100				3	3	93		7
E. Maintain contact with and work with union, professional, and community groups	50	17		100			28	17	10	100	7	14

TABLE 2. Continued.

Which Administrator(s) Should	Authorities						Superintendents					
	Asst Supt	Asst Supt	Asst Supt	Other Admin	Prin	Supt	Asst Supt	Asst Supt	Asst Supt	Other Admin	Prin	Supt
	of Bus	of Inst	of Pers				of Bus	of Inst	of Pers			
F. Keep informed on recent developments in the field of personnel administration	50		100				28	10	10	97	7	7
G. Contribute items of interest on personnel to the district	50	17	17	100			17	14	14	97	14	17
H. Circulate bulletins to personnel and disseminate information from the central office to individual schools	50		17	83			17	10	20	86		7
I. Plan and administer the district public relations program	50	33	33	50			34	3		52		28

Note: All figures are percentages of the group.

Michigan superintendents assign this responsibility to the assistant superintendent of personnel.

2. One-hundred per cent of the authorities stated that advertising vacancies should be the responsibility of the assistant superintendent of personnel, while 97 per cent of the Michigan superintendents would assign this responsibility to the assistant superintendent of personnel.
3. One-hundred per cent of the authorities stated that maintaining contact with college placement bureaus and applicants for employment should be the responsibility of the assistant superintendent of personnel, while 97 per cent of the superintendents would assign this responsibility to the assistant superintendent of personnel.
4. One-hundred per cent of the authorities reported that compiling and distributing a policy handbook for personnel and a district personnel directory was the responsibility of the assistant superintendent of personnel, while 33 per cent of the authorities further assigned this duty to the superintendent. Ninety-three per cent of the Michigan superintendents assign this function to the assistant superintendent of personnel.

5. One-hundred per cent of the authorities stated that maintaining contact with and working with union, professional, and community groups was the responsibility of the assistant superintendent of personnel, while 50 per cent of those authorities would assign this personnel function to the superintendent on a sharing basis with the assistant superintendent of personnel. One-hundred per cent of the Michigan superintendents would assign this responsibility to the assistant superintendent of personnel. A small percentage of the superintendents would share this responsibility with other members of the central office staff.
6. One-hundred per cent of the authorities stated that keeping informed on recent developments in the field of personnel administration was the responsibility of the assistant superintendent of personnel, while 50 per cent of the authorities would assign this function to the superintendent. Ninety-seven per cent of the Michigan superintendents would assign this personnel function to the assistant superintendent of personnel. A small percentage of the superintendents would assign this function to the superintendent.
7. One-hundred percent of the authorities reported that contributing items of interest on personnel

to the district is the responsibility of the assistant superintendent of personnel, while 50 per cent of the authorities would divide this function equally between the superintendent and the personnel officer. The authorities also shared this responsibility with the assistant superintendent of business (17%), and the assistant superintendent of instruction (17%). Ninety-seven per cent of the Michigan superintendents would assign this responsibility to the assistant superintendent of personnel, while a small percentage of the superintendents would share this responsibility with other members of the central office staff.

8. Eighty-three per cent of the authorities would assign the personnel function of circulating bulletins to personnel and disseminating information from the central office to individual schools to the assistant superintendent of personnel, while 50 per cent of the authorities see this function as a major responsibility of the superintendent. Seventeen per cent would share this responsibility with the assistant superintendent of instruction. Eighty-six per cent of the Michigan superintendents would assign this function to the assistant superintendent of

personnel. A small percentage of the superintendents would share this responsibility with other members of the central office staff.

9. Fifty per cent of the authorities stated that planning and administering the district public relations program should be the responsibility shared equally by the superintendent and the assistant superintendent of personnel. Thirty-three per cent of the authorities further revealed that this responsibility should be divided between the assistant superintendents for business and instruction. Fifty-two per cent of the Michigan superintendents would assign this function to the assistant superintendent of personnel, while 34 per cent of the superintendents would assign this responsibility to their office. This responsibility would be also shared by other administrators in 28 per cent of the cases.

Data on Administrator Responsible
for Personnel Records

The presentation of data in this section is concerned with developing and designing a system of personnel records including forms and/or procedures, keeping, maintaining, and using accurate complete and up-to-date personnel records.

Table 3 shows the percentage of response by the selected authorities and the Michigan superintendents as related to the areas of Personnel Records.

Data in Table 3 indicate that:

1. One-hundred per cent of the authorities stated that developing and designing a system of personnel records including forms and/or procedures should be the responsibility of the assistant superintendent of personnel, while 100 per cent of the Michigan superintendents agreed with the authorities and would assign this duty to the assistant superintendent of personnel.
2. One-hundred per cent of the authorities reported that keeping, maintaining, and using accurate, complete, and up-to-date personnel records was the responsibility of the assistant superintendent of personnel, while 100 per cent of the Michigan superintendents would assign this personnel function to the assistant superintendent of personnel.

Data on Administrator Responsible
for Personnel Needs

The presentation of data in this section is concerned with planning and directing studies of present and future personnel needs, maintaining close communication with all district administrative and advisory personnel

TABLE 3. General Organization--Personnel Records.

Which Administrator(s) Should	Authorities						Superintendents					
	Asst	Asst	Asst				Asst	Asst	Asst			
	Supt	Supt	Supt			Other	Supt	Supt	Supt			Other
	of	of	of	Prin	Admin		of	of	of	Prin	Admin	
	Supt	Bus	Inst	Pers			Supt	Bus	Inst	Pers		
A. Develop and design a system of personnel records including forms and/or procedures				100			10	7	3	100	10	10
B. Keep, maintain, and use accurate, complete, and up-to-date personnel records				100				7		100		

Note: All figures are percentages of the group.

and others in line relationship with employees who supply information on long- and short-range personnel needs, and assembling and coordinating information of personnel needs.

Table 4 shows the percentage of responses by the selected authorities and the Michigan superintendents as related to the areas of Personnel Needs.

Data in Table 4 indicated that:

1. One-hundred per cent of the authorities reported that planning directing studies of present and future personnel needs should be the responsibility of the assistant superintendent of personnel. Thirty-three per cent of the authorities would also assign this function to the assistant superintendent of instruction. Seventeen per cent would allocate this responsibility to both the superintendent and the assistant superintendent of business. Eighty-six per cent of the Michigan superintendents would assign this responsibility to the assistant superintendent of personnel. A small percentage of the superintendents would share this responsibility with other members of the central office staff, except for the assistant superintendent for instruction (24%).
2. One-hundred per cent of the authorities stated that maintaining close communication with all district administrative and advisory personnel

TABLE 4. Staff Procurement and Utilization--Personnel Needs.

Which Administrator(s) Should	Authorities						Superintendents					
	Asst Supt	Asst Supt	Asst Supt			Other	Asst Supt	Asst Supt	Asst Supt			Other
	Supt	Bus	Inst	Pers	Prin	Admin	Supt	Bus	Inst	Pers	Prin	Admin
A. Plan and direct studies of present and future personnel needs	17	17	33	100			14	7	24	86	10	7
B. Maintain close communi- cation with all district administrative and advisory personnel and others in line relationship with employees who supply infor- mation on long and short range personnel needs	17	17		100			24	17	14	83		3
C. Assemble and coordinate information of personnel needs			17	100	17		10	7	10	86	10	7

Note: All figures are percentages of the group.

and others in line relationship with employees who supply information on long- and short-range personnel needs should be the responsibility of the assistant superintendent of personnel, while 17 per cent of the authorities would assign this function to both the superintendent and the assistant superintendent of business. Eighty-three per cent of the Michigan superintendents would assign this responsibility to the assistant superintendent of personnel. Twenty-four per cent of the superintendents would assign this responsibility to the superintendent, while 17 per cent of the superintendents would share this responsibility with the assistant superintendent of business.

3. One-hundred per cent of the authorities stated that assembling and coordinating information of personnel needs should be the responsibility of the assistant superintendent of personnel, while 17 per cent of the authorities would share this responsibility with the principal and the assistant superintendent of instruction. Eighty-six per cent of the Michigan superintendents assigned this function to the assistant superintendent of personnel. A small percentage of the

superintendents would share this responsibility with other members of the central office staff.

Data on Administrator Responsible
for Recruitment

The presentation of data in this section is concerned with supervising student-teacher training programs and activities of Future Teachers of America Club, planning, directing, coordinating, and participating in district recruitment programs; advertising openings and preparing promotional literature, maintaining effective contact with college placement officers and professors, traveling to college campus placement officers to interview prospective teachers and participate in career-day activities, and scheduling trips and making arrangements for recruitment teams.

Table 5 shows the percentage of responses by the selected authorities and the Michigan superintendents as related to the areas in Recruitment.

Data in Table 5 indicate that:

1. Eighty-three per cent of the authorities stated that supervising student-teachers programs and activities of Future Teachers of America Club should be the responsibility of the principal. Thirty-three per cent of the authorities would assign this function to the assistant superintendent of instruction and 17 per cent to the

TABLE 5. Staff Procurement and Utilization--Recruitment.

Which Administrator(s) Should	Authorities						Superintendents					
	Asst Supt of Supt	Asst Supt of Inst	Asst Supt of Pers	Prin	Other Admin	Asst Supt of Supt	Asst Supt of Inst	Asst Supt of Pers	Prin	Other Admin		
	Bus	Inst	Pers	Prin	Admin	Bus	Inst	Pers	Prin	Admin		
A. Supervise student-teacher training program and activities of Future Teachers of America Club		33	17	83			3	31	62	31	10	
B. Plan, direct, coordinate, and participate in district recruitment program			83	33	17	3		20	86	28	14	
C. Advertise openings and prepare promotional literature			83		17			14	100	10	14	
D. Maintain effective contact with college placement officers and professors		33	83	17		7		7	97	7	3	

TABLE 5. Continued.

Which Administrator(s) Should	Authorities						Superintendents					
	Asst Supt	Asst Supt	Asst Supt				Asst Supt	Asst Supt	Asst Supt			
	of Supt	of Bus	of Inst	of Pers	Prin	Other Admin	of Supt	of Bus	of Inst	of Pers	Prin	Other Admin
E. Travel to college campus placement offices to interview prospective teachers, and participate in career day activities				100				10	97	31	14	
F. Schedule trips and make arrangements for recruit- ment teams				100				7	100	7		

Note: All figures are percentages of the group.

assistant superintendent of personnel. Sixty-two per cent of the Michigan superintendents would assign this responsibility to the assistant superintendent of personnel. Thirty-one per cent of the superintendents further indicate that the assistant superintendent of instruction and principal should share this responsibility.

2. Eighty-three per cent of the authorities would assign the responsibility of planning, directing, coordinating, and participating in district recruitment programs to the assistant superintendent of personnel. Thirty-three per cent of the authorities assign this function to the principal. Eighty-six per cent of the Michigan superintendents assign this responsibility to the assistant superintendent of personnel. The superintendents would share this responsibility with other members of the central office staff, namely, the assistant superintendent of instruction (20%), principal (28%), and other administrator (14%).
3. Eighty-three per cent of the authorities stated that advertising openings and preparing promotional literature was the responsibility of the assistant superintendent of personnel; and 17 per cent of the authorities would assign this function to other administrators, while 100 per cent of

the superintendents would assign this responsibility to the assistant superintendent of personnel, and 14 per cent of the superintendents would assign this function to the assistant superintendent of instruction, and 14 per cent of the superintendents assign this duty to other administrators, 10 per cent assigned this responsibility to the principal.

4. Eighty-three per cent of the authorities reported that maintaining effective contact with college placement officers and professors should be the responsibility of the assistant superintendent of personnel, while 33 per cent of the authorities would assign this function to the assistant superintendent of instruction and 17 per cent to the principal. Ninety-seven per cent of the Michigan superintendents assign this responsibility to the assistant superintendent of personnel.
5. One-hundred per cent of the authorities stated that traveling to college campus placement officers to interview prospective teachers and participate in career-day activities should be the responsibility of the assistant superintendent of personnel, while 97 per cent of the Michigan superintendents assign this responsibility to

the assistant superintendent of personnel with assistance from the assistant superintendent of instruction (10%), principal (31%), and other administrator (14%).

6. One-hundred per cent of the authorities stated that scheduling trips and making arrangements for recruitment teams should be the responsibility of the assistant superintendent of personnel, while 100 per cent of the Michigan superintendents agreed with authorities on this assignment to the assistant superintendent of personnel.

Data on Administrator Responsible
for Personnel Selection

The presentation of data in this section is concerned with interviewing and if possible observing all candidates on the job, processing applications for prospective employees, collecting references, reviewing transcripts, checking certification, verifying application forms, arranging interviews for candidates with other district personnel, administering examinations, giving preliminary screening to candidates' applications, and establishing eligibility lists.

Table 6 shows the percentage of responses by the selected authorities and the Michigan superintendents as related to the areas in Personnel Selection.

TABLE 6. Staff Procurement and Utilization--Personnel Selection.

Which Administrator(s) Should	Authorities						Superintendents					
	Asst Supt of Supt	Asst Supt of Inst	Asst Supt of Pers	Prin	Other Admin	Asst Supt of Supt	Asst Supt of Inst	Asst Supt of Pers	Prin	Other Admin		
	Bus	Inst	Pers			Bus	Inst	Pers				
A. Interview, and if possible observe all candidates on the job		17	66	66		3		20	86	48	14	
B. Process applications for prospective employees			100					3	100	3		
C. Collect references, review transcripts, check certi- fication, verify appli- cation forms			100						100	7		
D. Arrange interviews for candidates with other district personnel			100						100	14		
E. Administer examinations			100					7	100	3		
F. Give preliminary screening to candidates' appli- cations and establish eligibility list			100					3	89	10		

TABLE 6. Continued.

Which Administrator(s) Should	Authorities						Superintendents					
	Asst Supt	Asst Supt	Asst Supt	Other Admin	Prin	Supt	Asst Supt	Asst Supt	Asst Supt	Other Admin	Prin	Supt
	of Bus	of Inst	of Pers				of Bus	of Inst	of Pers			
G. Receive and submit to the superintendent and board recommendation for employ- ment		17	100		17		3	3	7	100	10	
H. Issue contracts to employed personnel	33		83			20				89		

Note: All figures are percentages of the group.

Data in Table 6 indicate that:

1. Sixty-six per cent of the authorities stated that interviewing and if possible observe all candidates on the job should be the responsibility of the assistant superintendent of personnel. Sixty-six per cent of the authorities also reported that this function should be the responsibility of the principal, while the assistant superintendent of instruction would share in the responsibility. Eighty-six per cent of the Michigan superintendents assign this responsibility to the assistant superintendent of personnel. Forty-eight per cent of the superintendents further revealed that this function should be designated to the principal, while the assistant superintendent of instruction (20%) and other administrator (14%) would also assist.
2. One-hundred per cent of the authorities stated that processing applications for prospective employees should be the responsibility of the assistant superintendent of personnel, while 100 per cent of the superintendents agreed with the authorities and assign this function to the assistant superintendent of personnel.
3. One-hundred per cent of the authorities stated that collecting references, reviewing transcripts,

checking certifications, verifying application forms should be the responsibility of the assistant superintendent of personnel, while 100 per cent of the Michigan superintendents assign this responsibility to the assistant superintendent of personnel.

4. One-hundred per cent of the authorities reported that arranging interviews for candidates with other district personnel should be the responsibility of the assistant superintendent of personnel, while 100 per cent of the superintendents agreed with the authorities on the assignment of this function. Principals (14%) would share in this responsibility according to the superintendents.
5. One-hundred per cent of the authorities stated that administering examinations should be the responsibility of the assistant superintendent of personnel. One-hundred per cent of the superintendents would assign this responsibility to the assistant superintendent of personnel.
6. One-hundred per cent of the authorities stated that giving preliminary screening to candidates' applications and establishing eligibility lists should be the responsibility of the assistant

superintendent of personnel. Eighty-nine per cent of the superintendents would assign this responsibility to the assistant superintendent of personnel. A small percentage of the superintendents would share this responsibility with other members of the central office staff.

7. One-hundred per cent of the authorities reported that receiving and submitting to the superintendent and board recommendations for employment should be the responsibility of the assistant superintendent of personnel, and they would share this responsibility with the assistant superintendent of instruction (17%), and the principals (17%). One-hundred per cent of the Michigan superintendents would assign this function to the assistant superintendent of personnel, also.
8. Eighty-three per cent of the authorities stated that issuing contracts to employed personnel should be the responsibility of the assistant superintendent of personnel. Thirty-three per cent of the authorities would assign this function to the superintendent. Eighty-nine per cent of the Michigan superintendents would assign this responsibility to the assistant superintendent of personnel, while 20 per cent of the superintendents would have this function assigned to the superintendent.

Data on Administrator Responsible
for Personnel Assignment

The presentation of data in this section is concerned with conducting studies relating to basis for assigning personnel in the school, and coordinating and supervising assignment of personnel to the superintendent.

Table 7 shows the percentage of responses by the selected authorities and the Michigan superintendents as related to the areas in Personnel Assignment.

Data in Table 7 indicate that:

1. One-hundred per cent of the authorities reported that conducting studies relating to basis for assigning personnel in the school should be the responsibility of the assistant superintendent of personnel. Sixty-six per cent of the authorities also would assign this function to the assistant superintendent of instruction and the principal. Eighty-three per cent of the Michigan superintendents assign this responsibility to the assistant superintendent of personnel. Thirty-four per cent of the superintendents would share this responsibility with the assistant superintendent of instruction, while 24 per cent would share it with the principal.
2. Eighty-three per cent of the authorities stated that coordinating and supervising assignment of

TABLE 7. Staff Procurement and Utilization--Personnel Assignment.

Which Administrator(s) Should	Authorities						Superintendents					
	Asst	Asst	Asst				Asst	Asst	Asst			
	Supt	Supt	Supt				Supt	Supt	Supt			
	of	of	of	Other			of	of	of	Other		
	Supt	Bus	Inst	Pers	Prin	Admin	Supt	Bus	Inst	Pers	Prin	Admin
A. Conduct studies relating to basis for assigning personnel in the school	17		66	100	66		10		34	83	24	3
B. Coordinate and supervise assignment of personnel to the superintendent	50			83			24		17	79	7	

Note: All figures are percentages of the group.

personnel to the superintendent should be the responsibility of the assistant superintendent of personnel, while 50 per cent of the authorities would assign this responsibility to the superintendent. Seventy-nine per cent of the Michigan superintendents would assign this responsibility to the assistant superintendent of personnel. They would also share this responsibility with the assistant superintendent of instruction (17%), and the superintendent (24%).

Data on Administrator Responsible
for Substitute Teachers

The presentation of data in this section is concerned with recruitment, approving, and maintaining lists of substitute teachers, verifying information on applications from substitute teachers, distributing substitute teachers lists.

Table 8 shows the percentage of responses by the selected authorities and the Michigan superintendents as related to the areas in Substitute Teachers.

Data in Table 8 indicate that:

1. One-hundred per cent of the authorities stated that recruitment, approving, and maintaining lists of substitute teachers should be the responsibility of the assistant superintendent of personnel, while sharing this function with the principal

TABLE 8. Staff Procurement and Utilization--Substitute Teachers.

Which Administrator(s) Should	Authorities						Superintendents					
	Asst	Asst	Asst				Asst	Asst	Asst			
	Supt	Supt	Supt			Other	Supt	Supt	Supt			Other
	Supt	Bus	Inst	Pers	Prin	Admin	Supt	Bus	Inst	Pers	Prin	Admin
A. Recruit, approve and maintain list of substi- tute teachers			17	100	33					97	7	
B. Verification of infor- mation on applications from substitute teachers				100	17					97	3	3
C. Distribute substitute lists				83	33					100		3

Note: All figures are percentages of the group.

(33%), and the assistant superintendent of instruction (17%). Ninety-seven per cent of the Michigan superintendents would assign this responsibility to the assistant superintendent of personnel.

2. One-hundred per cent of the authorities reported that verifying information on applications from substitute teachers should be the responsibility of the assistant superintendent of personnel, and also share this with the principal (17%), while 97 per cent of the superintendents would assign this function to the assistant superintendent of personnel.
3. Eighty-three per cent of the authorities stated that distribution of substitute lists should be the responsibility of the assistant superintendent of personnel. Thirty-three per cent of the authorities would assign this function to the principal. One-hundred per cent of the Michigan superintendents would assign this responsibility to the assistant superintendent of personnel.

Data on the Administrator Responsible
for Liaison Responsibilities

The presentation of data in this section is concerned with representing the school system on all occasions

when personnel administration is a topic of concern, representing the superintendent's "voice of personnel" at professional meetings by giving speeches to educational councils.

Table 9 shows the percentage of responses by the selected authorities and the Michigan superintendents as related to the areas in Liaison Responsibilities.

Data in Table 9 indicate that:

1. One-hundred per cent of the authorities stated that representing the school system on all occasions when personnel administration is a topic of concern should be the responsibility of the assistant superintendent of personnel. Thirty-three per cent of the authorities would divide this function between the superintendent and the assistant superintendent of personnel. The assistant superintendent of instruction (17%) and the superintendent of business (17%) would share this responsibility. Ninety-three per cent of the Michigan superintendents would assign this function to the assistant superintendent of personnel, while 20 per cent of the superintendents would share this responsibility with the assistant superintendent of personnel.
2. One-hundred per cent of the authorities stated that representing the superintendent's "voice of

TABLE 9. Staff Procurement and Utilization--Liaison Responsibilities

Which Administrator(s) Should	Authorities						Superintendents					
	Asst	Asst	Asst				Asst	Asst	Asst			
	Supt	Supt	Supt				Supt	Supt	Supt			
	of	of	of	Prin	Other		of	of	of	Prin	Other	
	Supt	Bus	Inst	Pers	Admin		Supt	Bus	Inst	Pers	Admin	
A. Represent the school system on all occasions when personnel administration is a topic of concern	33	17	17	100			20			93		
B. Represent the superintendent's "voice of personnel" at professional meetings by giving speeches to educational councils				100			17		7	86	3	

Note: All figures are percentages of the group.

personnel" at professional meetings by giving speeches to educational councils should be the responsibility of the assistant superintendent of personnel, while 86 per cent of the Michigan superintendents would assign this responsibility to the assistant superintendent of personnel. Seventeen per cent of the superintendents reported that they would share this responsibility with the assistant superintendent of personnel.

Data on Administrator Responsible for
Orientation and Induction
of Personnel

The presentation of data in this section is concerned with assisting teachers in finding suitable living accommodations, being chairman of the orientation program committee, planning, direction, and conducting the orientation and instruction program.

Table 10 shows the percentage of responses by the selected authorities and the Michigan superintendents as related to the areas of Orientation and Induction of Personnel.

Data in Table 10 indicate that:

1. Eighty-three per cent of the authorities stated that assisting teachers in finding suitable living accommodations should be the responsibility of the assistant superintendent of personnel, while 50 per cent of the authorities would share this

TABLE 10. Staff Development--Orientation and Induction of Personnel

Which Administrator(s) Should	Authorities						Superintendents					
	Asst Supt	Asst Supt	Asst Supt	Other			Asst Supt	Asst Supt	Asst Supt	Other		
	of	of	of				of	of	of			
	Supt	Bus	Inst	Pers	Prin	Admin	Supt	Bus	Inst	Pers	Prin	Admin
A. Assist teachers in finding suitable living accommodations				83	50	17	7	10	3	93	24	14
B. Be chairman of the orientation program committee	17		33	83	33		3		24	79	10	3
C. Plan, direct, and conduct the orientation and induction program	17		17	83	33		3		24	86	10	3
D. Distribute informational materials to new employees			17	66	33		7	3	7	89	7	10

Note: All figures are percentages of the group.

responsibility with the principal. Ninety-three per cent of the Michigan superintendents assign this responsibility to the assistant superintendent of personnel, while 24 per cent of the superintendents would share this responsibility with the principal.

2. Eighty-three per cent of the authorities stated that being chairman of the orientation program committee should be the responsibility of the assistant superintendent of personnel. Thirty-three per cent of the authorities would divide this function between the assistant superintendent of instruction and the principal and the superintendent (17%). Seventy-nine per cent of the Michigan superintendents would assign this function to the assistant superintendent of personnel, while 24 per cent would assign this function to the assistant superintendent of instruction.
3. Eighty-three per cent of the authorities reported that planning, directing, and conducting the orientation and induction program should be the responsibility of the assistant superintendent of personnel. Thirty-three per cent of the authorities would assign this function to the principal, while the assistant superintendent

for instruction (17%) and the superintendent (17%) would share in this responsibility. Eighty-six per cent of the Michigan superintendents assign this responsibility to the assistant superintendent of personnel, while 24 per cent of the superintendents assign this function to the assistant superintendent of instruction.

4. Sixty-six per cent of the authorities stated that distribution of informational materials to new employees should be the responsibility of the assistant superintendent of personnel. Thirty-three per cent of the authorities further indicated that this function should belong to the principal, while the assistant superintendent of instruction would share in this responsibility. Eighty-nine per cent of the superintendents assign the responsibility to the assistant superintendent of personnel. A small percentage of the superintendents would share this responsibility with other members of the central office staff.

Data on Administrator Responsible for In-Service Development

The presentation of data in this section is concerned with directing the administration of the in-service development program, analyzing, and recommending in-service development, maintaining records of in-service development participation.

Table 11 shows the percentage of responses by the selected authorities and the Michigan superintendents as related to the areas involved in in-service training.

Data in Table 11 indicate that:

1. Sixty-six per cent of the authorities stated that directing the administration of the in-service development program should be the responsibility of the assistant superintendent of personnel. Sixty-six per cent of the authorities would assign this function to the assistant superintendent of instruction, while the principal (33%) and the assistant superintendent of business would share in this responsibility. Fifty-nine per cent of the selected superintendents would assign this responsibility to the assistant superintendent of personnel, while 45 per cent of the superintendents would assign this function to the assistant superintendent of instruction.
2. Sixty-six per cent of the authorities stated that analyzing and recommending in-service development should be the responsibility of the assistant superintendent of instruction. Thirty-three per cent of the authorities would assign this function to the assistant superintendent of personnel and 17 per cent to the principal. Sixty-nine per cent of the superintendents would assign this

TABLE 11. Staff Development--In-Service-Development.

Which Administrator(s) Should	Authorities						Superintendents					
	Asst	Asst	Asst				Asst	Asst	Asst			
	Supt	Supt	Supt				Supt	Supt	Supt			
	of	of	of	Prin	Other		of	of	of	Prin	Other	
	Supt	Bus	Inst	Pers	Admin		Supt	Bus	Inst	Pers	Admin	
A. Direct the administration of the in-service develop- ment program	17		66	66	33		7	3	45	59	10	7
B. Analyze and recommend in- service development			66	33	17		10	7	42	69	14	3
C. Maintain records of in- service development participation			33	83	17				34	72	10	3

Note: All figures are percentages of the group.

responsibility to the assistant superintendent of personnel. Forty-two per cent of the superintendents would assign this function to the assistant superintendent of instruction.

3. Eighty-three per cent of the authorities reported that maintaining records of in-service development participation should be the responsibility of the assistant superintendent of personnel. Thirty-three per cent of the authorities would assign this responsibility to the assistant superintendent of instruction. Seventy-two per cent of the superintendents assign this responsibility to the assistant superintendent of personnel. Thirty-four per cent of the superintendents would assign this function to the assistant superintendent of instruction.

Data on Administrator Responsible for Evaluation

The presentation of data in this section is concerned with developing a system of evaluation procedures, standards, and forms, administering the evaluation program, distributing evaluation forms to principals and supervisors, evaluating personnel if there is some doubt about a particular individual, evaluate principals and supervisors, and assemble and review evaluations.

Table 12 shows the percentage of responses by the selected authorities and the Michigan superintendents as related to the areas in Evaluation.

Data in Table 12 indicate that:

1. Eighty-three per cent of the authorities stated that developing a system of evaluation procedures standards and forms should be the responsibility of the assistant superintendent of personnel. Thirty-three per cent of the authorities would assign this function to the principal, while 17 per cent of the authorities would further assign this responsibility to the assistant superintendent of instruction. Sixty-nine per cent of the superintendents would assign this responsibility to the assistant superintendent of personnel. Forty-two per cent of the superintendents would assign this function to the assistant superintendent of instruction.
2. One-hundred per cent of the authorities reported that administering the evaluation program should be the responsibility of the assistant superintendent of personnel. Thirty-three per cent of the authorities would share this function with the principal. Sixty-six per cent of the superintendents would assign this responsibility to the assistant superintendent of personnel, while

TABLE 12. Staff Development--Evaluation.

Which Administrator(s) Should	Authorities						Superintendents					
	Asst Supt of Supt	Asst Supt of Inst	Asst Supt of Pers	Other			Asst Supt of Supt	Asst Supt of Inst	Asst Supt of Pers	Other		
	Bus	Inst	Pers	Prin	Admin		Bus	Inst	Pers	Prin	Admin	
A. Develop a system of evaluation procedures, standards and forms		17	83	33	17		14	10	42	69	20	14
B. Administer the evaluation program			100	33			7	3	31	66	17	7
C. Distribute evaluation forms to principals and supervisors			100				3		20	69	7	3
D. Evaluate personnel if there is some doubt about a particular individual	33	17	33	83	83		17	10	42	69	28	10
E. Evaluate principals and supervisors	33	33	33	33			45	7	34	52	3	10
F. Assemble and review evaluations	66		50	66	17		34		14	62	3	

Note: All figures are percentages of the group.

31 per cent of the superintendents would assign this function to the assistant superintendent of instruction and 17 per cent to the principal.

3. One-hundred per cent of the authorities stated that distributing evaluation forms to principals and supervisors should be the responsibility of the assistant superintendent of personnel. Sixty-nine per cent of the superintendents assign this responsibility to the assistant superintendent of personnel. Twenty per cent of the superintendents would assign this responsibility to the assistant superintendent of instruction.
4. Eighty-three per cent of the authorities stated that evaluation of personnel if there is some doubt about a particular individual should be the responsibility of the assistant superintendent of personnel. Eighty-three per cent of the authorities also stated that this function should be shared by the principal, while 33 per cent of the authorities would divide this responsibility between the superintendent and the assistant superintendent of instruction. Sixty-nine per cent of the selected superintendents would assign this responsibility to the assistant superintendent of personnel. Forty-two per cent of the superintendents would also assign this function

to the assistant superintendent of instruction, and to other central officers as follows: superintendent (17%) and principal (28%).

5. Thirty-three per cent of the authorities stated that the evaluation of principals and supervisors should be the responsibility of four district administrative officers, the superintendent, assistant superintendent of business, assistant superintendent of instruction, and the assistant superintendent of personnel. Fifty-two per cent of the selected superintendents would assign this responsibility to the assistant superintendent of personnel. Forty-five per cent of the superintendents would assign this function to the superintendent's office and 34 per cent to the assistant superintendent of instruction.
6. Sixty-six per cent of the authorities stated that assembling and reviewing evaluations should be the responsibility equally shared by the superintendent and the assistant superintendent of personnel. Fifty per cent of the authorities would assign this responsibility to the assistant superintendent of instruction. Sixty-two per cent of the selected superintendents would assign this responsibility to the assistant superintendent

of personnel. Thirty-four per cent of the superintendents would assign this function to the superintendent.

Data on Administrator Responsible
for Promotion

The presentation of data in this section is concerned with advertising promotional openings, screening candidates, and compiling promotional eligibility lists, administering promotional examinations, organizing, planning, and implementing a cadet or administrative training program.

Table 13 shows the percentage of responses by the selected authorities and the Michigan superintendents as related to the areas in Promotion.

Data in Table 13 indicate that:

1. Eighty-three per cent of the authorities stated that advertising promotional openings should be the responsibility of the assistant superintendent of personnel, while sharing this responsibility with the superintendent (33%), the assistant superintendent of instruction (17%) and other administrator (33%).
2. One-hundred per cent of the authorities reported that screening candidates and compiling promotional eligibility lists should be the responsibility of the assistant superintendent of personnel.

TABLE 13. Staff Development--Promotion.

Which Administrator(s) Should	Authorities						Superintendents					
	Asst Supt of Supt	Asst Supt of Inst	Asst Supt of Pers	Prin	Other Admin	Asst Supt of Bus	Asst Supt of Inst	Asst Supt of Pers	Prin	Other Admin		
	Supt	Bus	Inst	Pers	Prin	Supt	Bus	Inst	Pers	Prin	Admin	
A. Advertise promotional openings	33		17	83		33	7		3	100		
B. Screen candidates and compile promotional eligibility list	17		17	100	33		7	3	10	100	10	7
C. Administer promotional examination	17	17	17	100	17		10	3	7	89	7	
D. Organize, plan, and implement a cadet or administrative training program			34	83	17	66	14		14	89	7	7

Note: All figures are percentages of the group.

Thirty-three per cent of the authorities would assign this function to the principal, while the superintendent (17%) and assistant superintendent of instruction (17%) would share in this responsibility. One-hundred per cent of the superintendents assign this responsibility to the assistant superintendent of personnel. A small percentage of the superintendents would share this function with other members of central office.

3. One-hundred per cent of the authorities stated that administering promotional examinations should be the responsibility of the assistant superintendent of personnel, while the superintendent (17%) and the assistant superintendent of business (17%) and assistant superintendent of instruction (17%) would share in this responsibility. Eighty-nine per cent of the superintendents would assign this function to the assistant superintendent of personnel.
4. Eighty-three per cent of the authorities stated that organizing, planning, and implementing a cadet or administrative training program should be the responsibility of the assistant superintendent of personnel. Thirty-four per cent of the authorities would assign this function to the assistant superintendent of instruction,

and 66 per cent would assign this responsibility to other administrators. Eighty-nine per cent of the superintendents would assign this responsibility to the assistant superintendent of personnel. A small percentage of the superintendents would share this responsibility with other members of the central office staff.

Data on Administrator Responsible
for Personnel Transfer

The presentation of data in this section is concerned with receiving and reviewing all requests for transfer, processing, and implementing the transfer.

Table 14 shows the percentage of responses by the selected authorities and the Michigan superintendents as related to the areas in Personnel Transfer.

Data in Table 14 indicate that:

1. Eighty-three per cent of the authorities stated that receiving and reviewing all requests for transfer should be the responsibility of the assistant superintendent of personnel. Thirty-three per cent of the authorities would assign this function to the principal. Ninety-three per cent of the selected superintendents would assign this function to the assistant superintendent of personnel. A small percentage of

TABLE 14. Staff Development--Personnel Transfer.

Which Administrator(s) Should	Authorities						Superintendents					
	Asst Supt	Asst Supt	Asst Supt	Other Admin	Prin	Admin	Asst Supt	Asst Supt	Asst Supt	Other Admin	Prin	Admin
	of Bus	of Inst	of Pers				of Bus	of Inst	of Pers			
A. Receive and review all requests for transfer			83		33	17	3	7	10	93		
B. Process and implement the transfer	17	17	17		83	33	50	10	10	14	93	

Note: All figures are percentages of the group.

the superintendents would share this responsibility with other members of the central office staff.

2. Eighty-three per cent of the authorities reported that processing and implementing the transfer should be the responsibility of the assistant superintendent of personnel. Thirty-three per cent of the authorities would assign this function to the principal. They would also share this responsibility with other administrators, superintendent (17%), assistant superintendent of business (17%), assistant superintendent of instruction (17%), and other administrator (50%). Ninety-three per cent of the superintendents would assign this responsibility to the assistant superintendent of personnel.

Data on Administrator Responsible
for Adjustment Counsel

The presentation of data in this section is concerned with aid and assistance to teachers with personal complicated and emotional or mental problems, and being able to divest himself of the aura of administrative office and be able to create a climate of genuine trust and confidence for the teachers.

Table 15 shows the percentage of responses by the selected authorities and the Michigan superintendents as related to the areas in Adjustment Counsel.

TABLE 15. Staff Development--Adjustment Counsel

Which Administrator(s) Should	Authorities						Superintendents					
	Asst Supt	Asst Supt	Asst Supt			Other Admin	Asst Supt	Asst Supt	Asst Supt			Other
	of	of	of				of	of	of			Admin
	Supt	Bus	Inst	Pers	Prin		Supt	Bus	Inst	Pers	Prin	
A. Aid and assist teachers with personal compli- cated and emotional or mental problems	33	17	33	83	66	17	14	14	17	83	24	7
B. Be able to divest himself of the aura of his adminis- trative office and be able to create a climate of genuine trust and confi- dence for the teachers	50	50	50	83	66	50	42	34	34	72	14	31

Note: All figures are percentages of the group.

Data in Table 15 indicate that:

1. Eighty-three per cent of the authorities stated that aid and assistance to teachers with complicated emotional problems should be the responsibility of the assistant superintendent of personnel. Sixty-six per cent of the authorities would assign this function to the principal, while 33 per cent of the superintendents, 33 per cent of the assistant superintendents of instruction, and 17 per cent assistant superintendents of business would share in this responsibility. Eighty-three per cent of the superintendents would assign this responsibility to the assistant superintendent of personnel. Twenty-four per cent of the superintendents would assign this function to the principal, while 17 per cent of the superintendents would have the assistant superintendent of instruction share in this responsibility.
2. Eighty-three per cent of the authorities reported that the central office administrative officer most likely to be able to divest himself from the aura of administration should be the responsibility of the assistant superintendent of personnel. Sixty-six per cent of the authorities would assign this function to the principal. Fifty per cent of the authorities would assign the shared

responsibility between the superintendent, assistant superintendent of business, assistant superintendent of instruction, and the other administrator. Seventy-two per cent of the selected superintendents would assign this function to the assistant superintendent of personnel. Thirty-four per cent of the selected superintendents would divide this responsibility between the assistant superintendent for business and the assistant superintendent of instruction, while 42 per cent would assign this responsibility to the superintendent, and 31 per cent would assign this function to other administrators.

Data on Administrator Responsible
for Certification

The presentation of data in this section is concerned with evaluation of transcripts in terms of the certification law, determining whether teachers are fully and properly certificated, and if not, help them become so, act as contact with and a resource to the state department on certification matters, keep teachers posted on changes in state certification law.

Table 16 shows the percentage of responses by the selected authorities and the Michigan superintendents as related to the areas of Certification.

TABLE 16. Conditions of Service--Certification.

Which Administrator(s) Should	Authorities						Superintendents					
	Asst Supt	Asst Supt	Asst Supt				Asst Supt	Asst Supt	Asst Supt			
	of Supt	of Bus	of Inst	of Pers	Prin	Other Admin	of Supt	of Bus	of Inst	of Pers	Prin	Other Admin
A. Evaluate transcripts in terms of the certification law	17			100	33	17	10		3	100	7	
B. Determine whether teachers are fully and properly certificated, and if not, help them become so	17			100			10		3	100	7	
C. Act as contact with and a resource to the State Department on certifi- cation matters	17			100	17		10		3	100	10	7
D. Keep teachers posted on changes in state certifi- cation law	17			100			13		3	100	7	

Note: All figures are percentages of the group.

Data in Table 16 indicate that:

1. One-hundred per cent of the authorities stated that evaluating transcripts in terms of certification law should be the responsibility of the assistant superintendent of personnel. Thirty-three per cent of the authorities would assign this function to the principal. One-hundred per cent of the selected superintendents assign this function to the assistant superintendent of personnel.
2. One-hundred per cent of the authorities stated that determining whether teachers are fully and properly certified should be the responsibility of the assistant superintendent of personnel, while 100 per cent of the selected superintendents assigned this function to the assistant superintendent of personnel, also.
3. One-hundred per cent of the authorities stated that acting as contact with and a resource to the State Department on certification matters should be the responsibility of the assistant superintendent of personnel, while 100 per cent of the selected superintendents would assign this function to the assistant superintendent of personnel, also.

4. One-hundred per cent of the authorities stated that keeping teachers posted on changes in state certification law should be the responsibility of the assistant superintendent of personnel. One-hundred per cent of the selected superintendents would assign this function to the assistant superintendent of personnel.

Data on Administrator Responsible for
Formulation of Job Description

The presentation of data in this section is concerned with preparing job descriptions, maintaining an up-to-date file on job descriptions, and studying new or modified positions and alter the job description as needed.

Table 17 shows the percentage of responses by the selected authorities and the Michigan superintendents as related to the areas in Formulation of Job Descriptions.

Data in Table 17 indicate that:

1. Eighty-three per cent of the authorities stated that preparing a job description should be the responsibility of the assistant superintendent of personnel. Fifty per cent of the authorities would assign this function to the principal, while 17 per cent of the superintendents, 17 per cent business office, and 33 per cent assistant superintendents of instruction would share in

TABLE 17. Conditions of Service--Formulation of Job Description.

Which Administrator(s) Should	Authorities						Superintendents					
	Asst Supt	Asst Supt	Asst Supt	Other			Asst Supt	Asst Supt	Asst Supt	Other		
	of	of	of				of	of	of			
	Supt	Bus	Inst	Pers	Prin	Admin	Supt	Bus	Inst	Pers	Prin	Admin
A. Prepare, or have prepared, by a staff committee or by persons most closely associated with or who knows the most about a particular job	17	17	33	83	50		24	17	20	97	17	14
B. Maintain an up-to-date file on job description				100	33		17	3	7	100	3	
C. Study new or modified positions and alter the job description as needed			17	83	33		17	10	14	93	10	10

Note: All figures are percentages of the group.

this responsibility. Ninety-seven per cent of the selected superintendents would assign this responsibility to the assistant superintendent of personnel. Twenty-four per cent of the superintendents would assign this function to the superintendent, while the assistant superintendent of business (17%), assistant superintendent of instruction (20%), and principal (17%) would share in this responsibility.

2. One-hundred per cent of the authorities reported that maintaining an up-to-date file on job descriptions would be the responsibility of the assistant superintendent of personnel. Thirty-three per cent of the authorities would assign this function to the principal. One-hundred per cent of the selected superintendents would assign this function to the assistant superintendent of personnel. A small percentage of the superintendents would share this responsibility with other members of the central office staff.
3. Eighty-three per cent of the authorities stated that studying new or modified positions and alter the job description as needed should be the responsibility of the assistant superintendent of personnel. Thirty-three per cent of the authorities would assign this function to the

principal. Ninety-three per cent of the selected superintendents would assign this responsibility to the assistant superintendent of personnel. A small percentage of the superintendents would share this responsibility with other members of the central office staff.

Data on Administrator Responsible
for Compensation

The presentation of data in this section is concerned with interpreting the salary schedule to personnel, administer the salary schedule, study, prepare, develop, and revise salary schedule for district, keep up-to-date on local conditions and maintain a level of compensation competitive with other fields, interpret training and experience of prospective employees prior to their placement on the salary schedule, negotiate with employee groups on salary questions, and certify the payroll to the business department.

Table 18 shows the percentage of responses by the selected authorities and the Michigan superintendents as related to the areas of Compensation.

Data in Table 18 indicate that:

1. Fifty per cent of the authorities would assign this function to the assistant superintendent of personnel. Fifty per cent of the authorities reported that interpreting the salary schedule

TABLE 18. Conditions of Service--Compensation.

Which Administrator(s) Should	Authorities						Superintendents					
	Asst Supt of Supt	Asst Supt of Inst	Asst Supt of Pers	Prin	Other Admin	Asst Supt of Supt	Asst Supt of Inst	Asst Supt of Pers	Prin	Other Admin		
	Bus	Inst	Pers		Admin	Bus	Inst	Pers		Admin		
A. Interpret the salary schedule to personnel	33	50		50			7	7		89	3	3
B. Administer the salary schedule	50	33		33			14	38	7	72	3	3
C. Study, prepare, develop, and revise salary schedule for the district, keep up- to-date on local conditions and maintain a level of compensation competitive with other fields	33	17		33			24	28		76	3	10
D. Interpret training and experience of prospective employees prior to their placement on the salary schedule	33	17	33	66	33		14	3		100	3	3

TABLE 18. Continued.

Which Administrator(s) Should	Authorities						Superintendents					
	Asst	Asst	Asst				Asst	Asst	Asst			
	Supt	Supt	Supt				Supt	Supt	Supt			
	of	of	of				of	of	of			
	Supt	Bus	Inst	Pers	Prin	Other Admin	Supt	Bus	Inst	Pers	Prin	Other Admin
E. Negotiate with employee groups on salary questions	17	33		33	17					69	3	20
F. Certify the payroll to the business department	33	50	17	50	17	17	17			83	17	7

Note: All figures are percentages of the group.

to personnel should be the responsibility of the assistant superintendent of business. Thirty-three per cent of the authorities would assign this responsibility to the superintendent. Eighty-nine per cent of the selected superintendents assign this function to the assistant superintendent of personnel. A small percentage of the superintendents would share this responsibility with other members of the central office staff.

2. Fifty per cent of the authorities reported that administering the salary schedule should be the responsibility of the superintendent. Thirty-three per cent of the authorities would assign this function to the assistant superintendent of business. Thirty-three per cent of the authorities would assign this function to the assistant superintendent of personnel. Seventy-two per cent of the Michigan superintendents assign this responsibility to the assistant superintendent of personnel. Thirty-eight per cent of the superintendents assign this responsibility to the assistant superintendent of business.
3. Thirty-three per cent of the authorities stated that preparing, developing, and revising salary schedules for the district should be the

responsibility of the superintendent. Thirty-three per cent of the authorities also assigned this responsibility to the assistant superintendent of personnel, while 17 per cent of the authorities assigned this function to the business office. Seventy-six per cent of the selected superintendents would assign this responsibility to the assistant superintendent of personnel. Twenty-eight per cent of the superintendents assigned this function to the assistant superintendent of business. Twenty-four per cent of the superintendents assign this function to the superintendent.

4. Sixty-six per cent of the authorities reported that interpreting training and experience of prospective employees prior to their placement on the salary schedule should be the responsibility of the assistant superintendent of personnel. Thirty-three per cent of the authorities would assign this function to the superintendent. Thirty-three per cent of the authorities would divide the function between the assistant superintendent of instruction and the principal. One-hundred per cent of the superintendents would assign this responsibility to the assistant superintendent of personnel.

5. Thirty-three per cent of the authorities stated that negotiations with employee groups on salary questions should be the responsibility of the assistant superintendent of personnel. Thirty-three per cent of the authorities reported that this function should be assigned to the assistant superintendent of business, while the superintendent (17%) and the principal (17%), would share in this responsibility. Sixty-nine per cent of the superintendents would assign this function to the assistant superintendent of personnel, while 20 per cent of the superintendents would assign this function to other central office personnel.
6. Fifty per cent of the authorities stated that certification of the payroll to the business department should be the responsibility of the assistant superintendent of personnel. Thirty-three per cent of the authorities would assign this function to the superintendent, while 50 per cent assigned the business office, 17 per cent to instruction superintendent, 17 per cent principal, and 17 per cent other administrator sharing this responsibility. Eighty-three per cent of the superintendents assigned this function to the assistant superintendent of personnel, while

17 per cent of the superintendents would share this responsibility with the business office, and 17 per cent of the principals share this function.

Data on Administrator Responsible
for Work Loads

The presentation of data in this section is concerned with study work loads of all personnel, and make appropriate recommendations for equitable distribution of work load.

Table 19 shows the percentage of responses by the selected authorities and the Michigan superintendents as related to the areas of work loads.

Data in Table 19 indicate that:

1. Sixty-six per cent of the authorities stated that studying work loads of all personnel should be the responsibility of the assistant superintendent of personnel. Thirty-three per cent of the authorities would assign this function to the assistant superintendent of business, while 17 per cent of the authorities would share this responsibility with the assistant superintendent of instruction, principal, and other administrator. Sixty-nine per cent of the selected superintendents assign this function to the assistant superintendent of personnel. Twenty-four per cent of

TABLE 19. Conditions of Service--Work Loads.

Which Administrator(s) Should	Authorities						Superintendents					
	Asst Supt	Asst Supt	Asst Supt	Other			Asst Supt	Asst Supt	Asst Supt	Other		
	Supt Bus	of Inst	of Pers	Prin	Admin		Supt Bus	of Inst	of Pers	Prin	Admin	
A. Study work loads of all personnel	33	17	66	17	17	20	17	24	69	14	20	
B. Make appropriate recom- mendations for equitable distribution of work load	17	17	50	66	50	17	20	14	24	72	14	20

Note: All figures are percentages of the group.

the superintendents would assign this responsibility to the assistant superintendent of instruction, 20 per cent to the superintendent, 17 per cent to the business department, 14 per cent to the principal, and 20 per cent to other central office staff.

2. Sixty-six per cent of the authorities stated that making recommendation for equitable distribution of work loads should be the responsibility of the assistant superintendent of personnel. Fifty per cent of the authorities would assign this function to the assistant superintendent of instruction and the principal, while 17 per cent of the authorities would assign this responsibility to the business office, and 17 per cent to the superintendent. Seventy-two per cent of the superintendents would assign this function to the assistant superintendent of personnel. Twenty-four per cent of the superintendents would assign this function to the assistant superintendent of instruction, while 20 per cent of the authorities would have the superintendent and other administrator share this responsibility.

Data on Administrator Responsible
for Leaves of Absence

The presentation of data in this section is concerned with developing and recommending leave policy, receiving and processing leave requests, keeping and checking records to determine eligibility for leave, providing information and advice to staff members about leave, recommendation of persons eligible for leave to the superintendent.

Table 20 shows the percentage of responses by the selected authorities and the Michigan superintendents as related to the area of Leaves of Absence.

Data in Table 20 indicate that:

1. Sixty-six per cent of the authorities stated that developing and recommending leave policy should be the responsibility of the assistant superintendent of personnel. Fifty per cent of the authorities would assign this function to the superintendent. Ninety-three per cent of the selected superintendents assign this function to the assistant superintendent of personnel. Thirty-one per cent of the superintendents would assign this responsibility to the superintendent. Twenty-four per cent of the superintendents would assign this responsibility to the assistant superintendent of instruction, and 17 per cent

TABLE 20. Conditions of Service--Leaves of Absence.

Which Administrator(s) Should	Authorities						Superintendents					
	Asst Supt	Asst Supt	Asst Supt	Other Admin	Prin	Supt	Asst Supt	Asst Supt	Asst Supt	Other Admin	Prin	Supt
	of Bus	of Inst	of Pers				of Bus	of Inst	of Pers			
A. Develop and recommend leave policy	50		66		17		31	17	24	93	14	3
B. Receive and process leave requests	33	17	17		83	17	17	7	10	97	3	
C. Keep and check records to determine eligibility for leave	33	17			83	17	3	7	3	100	3	
D. Provide information and advice to staff members about leave	33	17	17		83	66	3	7	7	100	10	
E. Recommend persons eligible for leave to the superin- tendent	17				83	33		7	10	100	7	

Note: All figures are percentages of the group.

of the authorities would share this responsibility with the assistant superintendent of business.

2. Eighty-three per cent of the authorities stated that the receiving and processing of leave requests should be the responsibility of the assistant superintendent of personnel. Thirty-three per cent of the authorities would assign this responsibility to the superintendent, while 17 per cent would have the assistant superintendent of business and the assistant superintendent of instruction, principal, and other administrator share this responsibility. Ninety-seven per cent of the superintendents assign this responsibility to the assistant superintendent of personnel, with the superintendent (17%) sharing this function.
3. Eighty-three per cent of the authorities stated that keeping and checking records to determine eligibility for leave should be the responsibility of the assistant superintendent of personnel, while 33 per cent of the authorities would assign this function to the superintendent. One-hundred per cent of the superintendents assign this responsibility to the assistant superintendent of personnel.

4. Eighty-three per cent of the authorities stated that providing information and advice to staff members about leave should be the responsibility of the assistant superintendent of personnel. Thirty-three per cent of the authorities would assign this function to the superintendent. Sixty-six per cent of the authorities would assign the responsibility to the principal. One-hundred per cent of the selected superintendents would assign this function to the assistant superintendent of personnel.
5. Eighty-three per cent of the authorities stated that recommending persons eligible for leave to the superintendent should be the responsibility of the assistant superintendent of personnel. Thirty-three per cent of the authorities would assign this function to the principal. One-hundred per cent of the selected superintendents assign this responsibility to the assistant superintendent of personnel.

Data on Administrator Responsible
for Tenure Recommendations

The presentation of data in this section is concerned with keeping track of those employees eligible for

tenure, and submitting to the superintendent a list of staff to be tenured with recommendations from their immediate supervisors.

Table 21 shows the percentage of responses by the selected authorities and the Michigan superintendents as related to the areas in Tenure Recommendations.

Data in Table 21 indicate that:

1. Eighty-three per cent of the authorities stated that keeping track of those employees eligible for tenure should be the responsibility of the assistant superintendent of personnel. Seventeen per cent of the authorities would assign this function to the assistant superintendent of business. Ninety-three per cent of the superintendents assign this responsibility to the assistant superintendent of personnel. Fourteen per cent of the superintendents would assign this function to the principal.
2. Eighty-three per cent of the authorities stated that the submitting to the superintendent a list of staff to be tenured with recommendations from their immediate supervisors should be the responsibility of the assistant superintendent of personnel. Thirty-three per cent of the authorities would assign this responsibility to the assistant

TABLE 21. Conditions of Service--Tenure Recommendations.

Which Administrator(s) Should	Authorities						Superintendents					
	Asst Supt	Asst Supt	Asst Supt			Other	Asst Supt	Asst Supt	Asst Supt			Other
	Supt	Bus	Inst	Pers	Prin	Admin	Supt	Bus	Inst	Pers	Prin	Admin
A. Keep track of those employees eligible for tenure		17		83			7		3	93	14	
B. Submit to the superin- tendent a list of staff to be tenured with recommendations from their immediate superiors		17	33	83					7	97	20	3

Note: All figures are percentages of the group.

superintendent of instruction. Ninety-seven per cent of the Michigan superintendents would assign this responsibility to the assistant superintendent of personnel. Twenty per cent of the superintendents would share this responsibility with other members of the central office staff.

Data on Administrator Responsible
for Grievances of Personnel

The presentation of data in this section is concerned with maintaining contact with the grievance committee of the teachers' association and union, and being aware of the work with all grievances submitted by local teachers' organizations.

Table 22 shows the percentage of responses by the selected authorities and the Michigan superintendents as related to the areas in Grievances of Personnel.

Data in Table 22 indicate that:

1. Eighty-three per cent of the authorities stated that maintaining contact with the grievance committee of the teacher's association and union should be the responsibility of the assistant superintendent of personnel. Fifty per cent of the authorities would assign this responsibility to the principal. Eighty-six per cent of the superintendents would assign this responsibility

TABLE 22. Conditions of Service--Grievances of Personnel

Which Administrator(s) Should	Authorities						Superintendents					
	Asst	Asst	Asst	Other	Prin	Admin	Asst	Asst	Asst	Other	Prin	Admin
	Supt	Supt	Supt				Supt	Supt	Supt			
	of	of	of				of	of	of			
	Supt	Bus	Inst	Pers			Supt	Bus	Inst	Pers		
A. Maintain contact with the grievance committee of the teachers' association and union				83	50		10	3	7	86	20	7
B. Be aware of and work with all grievances submitted by local teachers' organi- zations	33			66	50		28	7	14	93	14	7

Note: All figures are percentages of the group.

to the assistant superintendent of personnel.

Twenty per cent of the superintendents would assign this function to the principal.

2. Sixty-six per cent of the authorities reported that being aware of and working with all grievances submitted by local teachers' organizations should be the responsibility of the assistant superintendent of personnel. Fifty per cent of the authorities would assign this function to the principal. Thirty-three per cent of the authorities assign the responsibility to the superintendent. Ninety-three per cent of the superintendents assign this function to the assistant superintendent of personnel. Twenty-eight per cent of the superintendents would assign this function to the superintendent.

Data on Administrator Responsible
for Dismissal

The presentation of data in this section is concerned with developing policies or procedures under which staff may be dismissed, evaluating recommendations for termination of an employee, and assembling information for dismissal of an employee.

Table 23 shows the percentage of responses by the selected authorities and the Michigan superintendents as related to the areas in Dismissal.

TABLE 23. Conditions of Service--Dismissal.

Which Administrator(s) Should	Authorities						Superintendents					
	Asst	Asst	Asst				Asst	Asst	Asst			
	Supt	Supt	Supt				Supt	Supt	Supt			
	of	of	of	Other			of	of	of	Other		
	Supt	Bus	Inst	Pers	Prin	Admin	Supt	Bus	Inst	Pers	Prin	Admin
A. Develop policies or procedures under which staff may be dismissed	50	17	17	66	50	17	24	17	17	93	17	7
B. Evaluate recommendations for termination of an employee	50	17	50	66	33	17	24	10	20	93	10	10
C. Assemble information for dismissal of an employee	17	17	17	66	50	17	14	3	10	89	17	3

Note: All figures are percentages of the group.

Data in Table 23 indicate that:

1. Sixty-six per cent of the authorities stated that developing policies or procedures under which staff may be dismissed should be the responsibility of the assistant superintendent of personnel. Fifty per cent of the authorities would assign this function to the superintendent, and the principal. Ninety-three per cent of the superintendents would assign this responsibility to the assistant superintendent of personnel. Twenty-four per cent would assign this responsibility to the superintendent, while the assistant superintendent of business (17%), assistant superintendent of instruction (17%), and the principal (17%) would share this responsibility.
2. Sixty-six per cent of the authorities stated that evaluating recommendations for termination of an employee should be the responsibility of the assistant superintendent of personnel. Fifty per cent of the authorities would assign the responsibility to the superintendent and the assistant superintendent of instruction, while the principal (33%) and the business office (17%) should share in this responsibility. Ninety-three per cent of the superintendents would assign the

responsibility to the assistant superintendent of personnel. Twenty-four per cent of the superintendents would assign this function to the superintendent, and 20 per cent would assign this responsibility to the assistant superintendent of instruction.

Data on Administrator Responsible
for Retirement

The presentation of data in this section is concerned with developing policy on retirement, acting as the authorized agent for the state retirement fund in the district, providing resource data as a basis for retirement legislation, keeping and checking records for verification of status of employees, counsel personnel of problems related to retirement, and providing information to the business department of the district and to the state or local retirement board.

Table 24 shows the percentage of responses by the selected authorities and the Michigan superintendents as related to the areas in Retirement.

Data in Table 24 indicated that:

1. Eighty-three per cent of the authorities stated that developing policy on retirement should be the responsibility of the assistant superintendent of personnel. Fifty per cent of the authorities would also assign this function to the

TABLE 24. Conditions of Service--Retirement.

Which Administrator(s) Should	Authorities						Superintendents					
	Supt	Asst Supt of Bus	Asst Supt of Inst	Asst Supt of Pers	Prin	Other Admin	Supt	Asst Supt of Bus	Asst Supt of Inst	Asst Supt of Pers	Prin	Other Admin
A. Develop policy on retire- ment	50			83	33	17	24	28	10	83	7	10
B. Act as the authorized agent for the state retirement fund in the district	33	50		83			14	45	3	55		7
C. Provide resource data as a basis for retirement legislation	17	33	17	100	17		14	24	3	79	7	
D. Keep and check records for verification of status of employees		17		66	17		3	20		83	7	
E. Counsel personnel of prob- lems related to retirement				83	17		7	17		79	10	3
F. Provide information to the business department of the district and to the state or local retirement board	17	66		66			3	48	7	72		3

Note: All figures are percentages of the group.

superintendent, while 33 per cent of the authorities would assign this function to the principal. Eighty-three per cent of the selected superintendents assign this responsibility to the assistant superintendent of personnel. Twenty-eight per cent of the superintendents would assign this function to the assistant superintendent of business. Twenty-four per cent of the superintendents would assign the responsibility to the superintendent.

2. Eighty-three per cent of the authorities stated that acting as the authorized agent for the state retirement fund in the district should be the responsibility of the assistant superintendent of personnel. Fifty per cent of the authorities assign this responsibility to the assistant superintendent of business, and 33 per cent of the authorities assigned this responsibility to the superintendent. Fifty-five per cent of the superintendents assign this responsibility to the assistant superintendent of personnel. Forty-five per cent of the superintendents assign this responsibility to the assistant superintendent of business.
3. One-hundred per cent of the authorities stated that providing resource data as a basis for retirement

legislation should be the responsibility of the assistant superintendent of personnel. Thirty-three per cent of the authorities would assign this function to the assistant superintendent of business, while the superintendents (17%), the assistant superintendent of instruction (17%), and the principal (17%) would share this responsibility. Seventy-nine per cent of the superintendents would assign this responsibility to the assistant superintendent of personnel. Twenty-four per cent of the superintendents assign this function to the assistant superintendent of business.

4. Sixty-six per cent of the authorities report that keeping and checking records for verification of status of employees should be the responsibility of the assistant superintendent of personnel, while 17 per cent of the authorities would share this responsibility with other central office staff. Eighty-three per cent of the selected superintendents assign this responsibility to the assistant superintendent of personnel, while 20 per cent of the superintendents would assign this function to the assistant superintendent of business.
5. Eighty-three per cent of the authorities stated that counseling personnel on problems related to

retirement should be the responsibility of the assistant superintendent of personnel, while 79 per cent of the superintendents would assign this responsibility to the assistant superintendent of personnel.

6. Sixty-six per cent of the authorities report that providing information to the business department of the district and to the state or local retirement board should be shared by the assistant superintendent of personnel and the assistant superintendent of business. Seventy-two per cent of the superintendents would assign this responsibility to the assistant superintendent of personnel, while 48 per cent of the superintendents would assign this responsibility to the assistant superintendent of business.

Questions to Be Resolved

Question 1.--"Is the superintendents' of school role concept of the personnel director consistent with the role concept as defined by selected authorities?"

Question 2.--"Is the role of the personnel director in large school districts consistent with the role definition by selected authorities and superintendents?"

In the data presented, there were seventy-six job responsibilities of the personnel directors' position in

which there was consistency between selected authorities and superintendents. The role definition of the personnel director in large school districts (15,000 pupils enrollment or over) was consistent with the role definitions of the selected authorities and superintendents in agreement with job functions as listed. These job responsibilities are as follows:

1. Research and survey personnel policy
2. Be responsible for the development of personnel policy
3. Organize and consolidate already existing personnel policy
4. Keep the superintendent and the board of education informed of personnel matters
5. Advertise vacancies
6. Maintain contact with college placement bureaus and applicants for employment
7. Compile and distribute a policy handbook for personnel and a district personnel directory
8. Maintain contact with and work with union, professional, and community groups
9. Keep informed on recent developments in the field of personnel administration
10. Contribute items of interest on personnel to the district newsletter

11. Circulate bulletins to personnel and disseminate information from the central office to individual schools
12. Plan and administer the district public relations program
13. Keep, maintain, and use accurate, complete, and up-to-date personnel records
14. Plan and direct studies of present and future personnel needs
15. Maintain close communication with all district administrative and advisory personnel and other in line relationship with employees who supply information on long and short range personnel needs
16. Assemble and coordinate information on personnel needs
17. Plan, direct, coordinate, and participate in district recruitment program
18. Advertise openings and prepare promotional literature
19. Travel to college campus placement offices to interview prospective teachers
20. Schedule trips and make arrangements for recruitment teams
21. Process applications of prospective employees

22. Collect references, review transcripts, check certification, verify application forms
23. Arrange interviews for candidates with other district personnel
24. Administer examinations
25. Give preliminary screening
26. Receive and submit to the superintendent and board recommendations for employment
27. Issue contracts to employed personnel
28. Conduct studies relating to basis for assigning personnel in the school
29. Coordinate and supervise assignment of personnel to the superintendent
30. Recruit, approve, and maintain list of substitute teachers
31. Verification of information on applications from substitute teachers
32. Represent the school system on all occasions when personnel administration is a topic of concern
33. Represent the superintendent's "voice of personnel" at professional meetings by giving speeches to educational councils
34. Assist teachers in finding suitable living accommodations
35. Be chairman of the orientation program committee
36. Plan, direct and conduct the orientation and induction program

11. Circulate bulletins to personnel and disseminate information from the central office to individual schools
12. Plan and administer the district public relations program
13. Keep, maintain, and use accurate, complete, and up-to-date personnel records
14. Plan and direct studies of present and future personnel needs
15. Maintain close communication with all district administrative and advisory personnel and other in line relationship with employees who supply information on long and short range personnel needs
16. Assemble and coordinate information on personnel needs
17. Plan, direct, coordinate, and participate in district recruitment program
18. Advertise openings and prepare promotional literature
19. Travel to college campus placement offices to interview prospective teachers
20. Schedule trips and make arrangements for recruitment teams
21. Process applications of prospective employees

37. Distribute informational materials to new employees
38. Direct the administration of the professional development program
39. Maintain records of development (In-Service)
40. Development of a system of evaluation procedures, standards, and forms
41. Evaluate principals and supervisors
42. Assemble and review evaluations
43. Advertise promotional openings
44. Screen candidates and compile promotional eligibility lists
45. Administer promotional examinations
46. Organize, plan, and implement a cadet or administrative program
47. Receive and review all requests for transfer
48. Process and implement the transfer
49. Aid and assist teachers with personal complicated and emotional or mental problems
50. Be able to divest himself of the aura of his administrative office and create a climate of genuine trust and confidence of the teacher
51. Evaluate transcripts in terms of the certification law
52. Determine whether teachers are fully and properly certificated
53. Act as a contact with and a resource to the State Department on certification matters

54. Keep teachers posted on changes in state certification law
55. Prepare job description about a particular position
56. Maintain an up-to-date file on job description
57. Study new or modified positions and alter the job description as needed
58. Study work loads of all personnel
59. Make appropriate recommendations for equitable distribution of work load
60. Develop and recommend leave policies
61. Receive and process leave requests
62. Keep and check records to determine eligibility for leave
63. Provide information and advice to staff members about leave
64. Recommend persons eligible for leave to superintendent
65. Submit to the superintendent a list of staff to be tenured with recommendations from their immediate superiors
66. Maintain contact with the grievance committee of the teachers' association of union
67. Develop policies or procedures under which staff may be dismissed
68. Evaluate recommendations for termination of an employee

69. Assemble information for dismissal of an employee
70. Develop policy on retirement
71. Provide resource data as a basis for retirement legislation
72. Keep and check records for verification status of employees
73. Counsel personnel of problems related to retirement
74. Provide information to the business department of the district and to the state or local retirement board
75. Plan and administer the district public relations program.
76. Develop and design a system of personnel records including forms and/or procedures.

Inconsistencies Between the Selected
Authorities and the Superintendents

Tables 1, 5, 6, 8, 11, 12, 18, 22, and 24 include the inconsistencies of responses by selected authorities and superintendents concerning the questions to be resolved.

The data in Table 1 show:

1. Eighty-three per cent of the authorities would assign further responsibility of development of personnel policy to the superintendent and share this responsibility with the assistant

superintendent of personnel, while only 31 per cent of the selected superintendents would assign this responsibility to the superintendent.

2. Sixty-six per cent of the authorities stated that the responsibility for administering and interpreting the personnel policy should be assigned to the assistant superintendent of personnel, while 50 per cent of the authorities state that this responsibility also should be assigned to the superintendent. Ninety-three per cent of the Michigan superintendents assign this personnel function to the assistant superintendent of personnel, and a small percentage of the superintendents would share it with other central office personnel.
3. Eighty-three per cent of the authorities stated that supervising student-teachers of America Club should be the responsibility of the principal. Thirty-three per cent of the authorities would assign this function to the assistant superintendent of instruction and 17 per cent to the assistant superintendent of personnel. Sixty-two per cent of the Michigan superintendents would assign this responsibility to the assistant superintendent of personnel. Thirty-one per cent

of the superintendents further indicate that the assistant superintendent of instruction and the principal should share this responsibility.

4. Eighty-three per cent of the authorities reported that maintaining effective contact with college placement officers and professors should be the responsibility of the assistant superintendent of personnel, while 33 per cent of the authorities would assign this function to the assistant superintendent of instruction and 17 per cent to the principal. Ninety-seven per cent of the Michigan superintendents assign this responsibility to the assistant superintendent of personnel.
5. Sixty-six per cent of the authorities stated that interviewing and if possible observe all candidates on the job should be the responsibility of the assistant superintendent of personnel. Sixty-six per cent of the authorities reported that this function should be the responsibility of the principal, while the assistant superintendent of instruction would share in the responsibility. Eighty-six per cent of the Michigan superintendents assign this responsibility to the assistant superintendent of personnel. Forty-eight per cent of the superintendents further revealed that

this function should be designated to the principal, while the assistant superintendent of instruction (20%) and other administrator (14%) would also assist.

6. Eighty-three per cent of the authorities stated that the distribution of substitute lists should be the responsibility of the assistant superintendent of personnel. Thirty-three per cent of the authorities would assign this function to the principal. One hundred per cent of the Michigan superintendents would assign this function to the assistant superintendent of personnel.
7. Sixty-six per cent of the authorities stated that analyzing and recommending in-service development should be the responsibility of the assistant superintendent of instruction. Thirty-three per cent of the authorities would assign this function to the assistant superintendent of personnel, and 17 per cent to the principal. Sixty-nine per cent of the superintendents would assign this responsibility to the assistant superintendent of personnel. Forty-two per cent of the superintendents would assign this function to the assistant superintendent of instruction.

8. One hundred per cent of the authorities reported that administering the evaluation program should be the responsibility of the assistant superintendent of personnel. Thirty-three per cent of the authorities would share this function with the principal. Sixty-six per cent of the superintendents would assign this responsibility to the assistant superintendent of personnel, while 31 per cent of the superintendents would assign this function to the assistant superintendent of instruction and 17 per cent to the principal.
9. One hundred per cent of the authorities stated that distributing evaluation forms to the principals and supervisors should be the responsibility of the assistant superintendent of personnel. Sixty-nine per cent of the superintendents assign this responsibility to the assistant superintendent of personnel. Twenty per cent of the superintendents would assign this responsibility to the assistant superintendent of instruction.
10. Eighty-three per cent of the authorities reported that the development of personnel policy should be the responsibility of the superintendent and the assistant superintendent of personnel to be shared equally, while 93 per cent of the superintendents would assign this responsibility to the

assistant superintendent of personnel. Thirty-one per cent of the superintendents indicated that this responsibility should be assigned to the superintendent.

11. Fifty per cent of the authorities reported that interpreting the salary schedule to personnel should be the responsibility of the assistant superintendent of personnel. Fifty per cent of the authorities would assign this function to the assistant superintendent of business. Thirty-three per cent of the authorities would assign this responsibility to the superintendent. Eighty-nine per cent of the selected superintendents assign this function to the assistant superintendent of personnel. A small percentage of the superintendents would share this responsibility with other members of the central office staff.
12. Fifty per cent of the authorities reported that administering the salary schedule should be the responsibility of the superintendent. Thirty-three per cent of the authorities would assign this function to the assistant superintendent of business. Thirty-three per cent of the authorities would assign this function to the assistant superintendent of personnel. Seventy-two per cent of the

Michigan superintendents assign this responsibility to the assistant superintendent of personnel. Thirty-eight per cent of the superintendents assign this responsibility to the assistant superintendent of business.

13. Thirty-three per cent of the authorities stated that preparing, developing, and revising salary schedules for the district should be the responsibility of the superintendent. Thirty-three per cent of the authorities also assigned this responsibility to the assistant superintendent of personnel, while 17 per cent of the authorities assigned this function to the business office. Seventy-six per cent of the selected superintendents would assign this responsibility to the assistant superintendent of personnel. Twenty-eight per cent of the superintendents assigned this function to the assistant superintendent of business. Twenty-four per cent of the superintendents assign this function to the superintendent.
14. Sixty-six per cent of the authorities reported that interpreting training and experience of prospective employees prior to their placement on the salary schedule should be the responsibility of the assistant superintendent of personnel. Thirty-three per cent of the authorities would assign

this function to the superintendent. Thirty-three per cent of the authorities would divide the function between the assistant superintendent of instruction and the principal. One-hundred per cent of the superintendents would assign this responsibility to the assistant superintendent of personnel.

15. Thirty-three per cent of the authorities stated that negotiations with employee groups on salary questions should be the responsibility of the assistant superintendent of personnel. Thirty-three per cent of the authorities reported that this function should be assigned to the assistant superintendent of business, while the superintendent (17%) and the principal (17%) would share this responsibility. Sixty-nine per cent of the superintendents would assign this function to the assistant superintendent of personnel, while twenty per cent of the superintendents would assign this function to other central office personnel.
16. Fifty per cent of the authorities stated that certification of the payroll to the business department should be the responsibility of the assistant superintendent of personnel. Thirty-three per cent of the authorities would assign this function to the superintendent, while

50 per cent assigned the business office, 17 per cent to instruction superintendent, 17 per cent to the principal, and 17 per cent other administrator sharing this responsibility. Eighty-three per cent of the superintendents assigned this function to the assistant superintendent of personnel, while 17 per cent of the superintendents would share this responsibility with the business office, and 17 per cent of the principals share this function.

17. Sixty-six per cent of the authorities reported that being aware of and working with all grievances submitted by local teacher's organizations should be the responsibility of the assistant superintendent of personnel. Fifty per cent of the authorities would assign this function to the principal. Thirty-three per cent of the authorities further assign this responsibility to the superintendent. Ninety-three per cent of the superintendents assign this function to the assistant superintendent of personnel. Twenty-eight per cent of the superintendents would assign this function to the superintendent.
18. Eighty-three per cent of the authorities stated that acting as the authorized agent for the state retirement fund in the district should be the

responsibility of the assistant superintendent of personnel. Fifty per cent of the authorities assign this responsibility to the assistant superintendent of business, and 33 per cent of the authorities assigned this responsibility to the superintendent. Fifty-five per cent of the superintendents assign this responsibility to the assistant superintendent of personnel. Forty-five per cent of the superintendents assign this responsibility to the assistant superintendent of business.

Summary

Presented in Chapter IV is an analysis of the data obtained from 81 per cent return of completed questionnaires from the forty Michigan school superintendents and six selected authorities.

The chapter was divided into twenty-five areas; one for each of the major personnel functional categories, and section concerning the three questions to be resolved.

Tables consisting of the percentage of response by selected authorities and Michigan superintendents were constructed for each of the twenty-four major personnel categories, and the major findings presented in each table were explained.

In Chapter V, the summary, major findings, conclusions, discussion and recommendations will be reported.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In the preceding chapter the findings of this research survey were presented. In this chapter may be found: (1) summary of the survey conducted, (2) the major findings, (3) conclusions based upon the findings, (4) discussion, and (5) recommendation for further research.

Summary

Statement of the Problem

This study was designed to determine which educational administrators within the school system should be assigned selected personnel functions according to judgments of (1) Michigan superintendents, and (2) selected authorities in school personnel administration.

In order to explore the purpose of this study, two questions to be resolved were developed:

1. Is the superintendent's school role concept of the personnel director consistent with the role concept as defined by selected authorities?
2. Is the role of the personnel director in large school districts consistent with the role definition by selected authorities?

Throughout Chapter IV data were presented in an attempt to answer those two questions.

Limitations of the Study

This study was limited to the following area of school personnel administration: (1) General Organization (2) Staff Procurement and Utilization, (3) Staff Development, and (4) Conditions of Service.

All Michigan school districts that have a student average daily attendance (1970-71) of 3,000 students or more were surveyed. A list of professional authorities in the field of school personnel management were surveyed in a like manner. The Michigan superintendents' opinions were compared with the opinions of the selected authorities.

Review of the Literature

The general area of interest for this study consisted of pertinent literature which specifically dealt with background authority in school personnel adminis-

tration, and the significance of developing functions, duties, and responsibilities specific to the personnel administrator.

The principle appearing frequently in the literature that the superintendent evaluates and recommends and the board appoints the selections and promotions of school personnel enhances the relationship between the school board and the superintendent.

The policy approach to the personnel management through the board adopted policies is recommended. Responsibility for adoption would rest with the board of education with the help of the superintendent, assistant superintendent of personnel and representative members of the school board, both instructional and non-teaching.

Personnel administration must inject a strong dose of realism into the idealistic mixture prepared by educational planners.

Design of the Study

The primary purpose of this study was to determine which educational administrators within the school system should be assigned selected personnel functions according to the judgments of Michigan Superintendents and Selected authorities in school personnel administration.

The sample used in this study consisted of twenty-nine Michigan Superintendents and six Selected Authorities

in school personnel administration. The schools participating in this study were selected by random sample.

A preliminary questionnaire was developed from the literature and through conferences with administrators actively engaged in school personnel work plus the examination and analysis of job descriptions for school personnel administrators. Previous research studies, and professional books and periodicals were utilized to obtain an extensive list of functions performed by school administrators. The questionnaire was designed to reflect the opinions of selected superintendents and authorities regarding the delegation of various district personnel functions.

Consistency of responses between the selected authorities and the superintendents was placed at the 60 per cent level, i.e., if the selected authorities stated that a particular personnel function was at the 50 per cent level and the superintendents placed it at the 70 per cent than this particular personnel function was considered to be consistent.

Conclusions Based on Major Findings

A major finding of this study was that the data revealed few differences between the opinions of selected authorities and Michigan superintendents on the assigning of the personnel functions.

1. The authorities and Michigan superintendents generally agree on assigning the responsibility of seventy-six of the ninety-three personnel functions surveyed.

Discussion of Inconsistencies of Personnel Functions Between the Selected Authorities and the Superintendents

It was found that in seventeen personnel functions the selected authorities and superintendents could not agree. Each of the seventeen functions are listed and discussed to determine probable reasons for this inconsistency between their responses.

1. Development of personnel policy

The selected authorities would share this responsibility with the superintendent and the assistant superintendent of personnel. Development of personnel policy would definitely be included in the job functions of the assistant superintendent of personnel, but it would be imperative that the superintendent would be involved in possibly the development of the policy, but most assuredly, at that point where the policy must be approved before submission to the Board of Education. It is interesting to note that the superintendent (93%) would assign this responsibility to the assistant superintendent of personnel

while 31 per cent of the superintendents would share this responsibility with the superintendent's office.

2. Administering and interpreting personnel policy

The selected authorities stated that this personnel function should be shared with the superintendent and the assistant superintendent of personnel. One report stated, "The assistant superintendent of personnel has the major responsibility of this task, but the superintendent must be available to assist in any way in the administration and interpretation of policy related to personnel administration." This comment points out that the major responsibility is in office of personnel, but shared with the superintendent.

3. Supervising student-teacher training programs and activities for Future Teachers of America Club

The authorities would assign this responsibility to the principals while the superintendents would assign it to the assistant superintendent of personnel. The authorities see this job function as a principal responsibility because the direct supervision of training programs is usually an activity under the leadership of a member of the teaching staff of a particular building. It, therefore, does not belong in the personnel office. Clubs, too, are a responsibility of a principal. Superintendents may have decided that the statement implied the coordination of student teachers, which could rightfully be placed in the

personnel office, but the direct supervision of a student teacher program is the responsibility of the building principal.

4. Maintaining effective contact with college placement officers and professors (Table 6)

Ninety-seven per cent of the superintendents placed this job function in the office of the assistant superintendent of personnel, but the selected authorities gave it to the assistant superintendent of personnel (83%) and to the assistant superintendent of instruction (33%). A comment from a selected authority stated, "It's good for the assistant superintendent of instruction to have contacts with professors especially for in-service work." This certainly is true, but this statement has nothing to do with contacting placement officers and professors for teacher procurement. There seems to be no logical reason for having the assistant superintendent of instruction involved in this job function.

5. Distributing substitute lists (Table 8)

The selected authorities gave this responsibility to the assistant superintendent of personnel (83%) and to the principal (33%). It would seem that the actual making of the substitute lists would be the responsibility of the assistant superintendent of personnel, and he would in turn distribute them to the principals. Question must be raised on the sharing of this responsibility with the

principals. The principals would use the approved list of substitutes to pick qualified substitutes.

6. Analyzing and recommending in-service development
(Table 11)

In both cases, the selected authorities and the superintendents would share this responsibility with the assistant superintendent of personnel and the assistant superintendent of instruction. Possibly there was a need to define who would be involved in the in-service program. If secretaries and other nonprofessional personnel are to receive in-service work then it would be the responsibility of the assistant superintendent of personnel. In-service work for teachers should be the major responsibility of the assistant superintendent of instruction, but the assistant superintendent of personnel might serve on the curriculum council. The curriculum council representing teachers at all levels would develop in-service programs for professionals in cooperation with the assistant superintendent of instruction and the assistant superintendent of personnel.

7. Administering the evaluation program (Table 12)

The selected authorities would share this responsibility as follows: assistant superintendent of personnel (100%) and the principal (33%). Again a clearer definition of this job function would have eliminated the confusion. The assistant superintendent of personnel

would be responsible for administration of the evaluation program, i.e., distribution of evaluation forms to the principal, collection of evaluation forms from the principal, and summarizing the data collected. The principal would be responsible for administration of the evaluation program through visiting classrooms for determining teacher effectiveness and then completing the necessary evaluation forms. These forms would then be submitted to the assistant superintendent of personnel. The superintendents in turn would share this responsibility with the assistant superintendent of personnel (66%), assistant superintendent of instruction (31%), and the principal (17%). The confusion here might be due to the fact that in some school districts the assistant superintendent of instruction does play a part in the evaluation of teacher effectiveness. It is surprising to note that the superintendents only include 17 per cent of their responses to the principal.

8. Distributing evaluation forms (Table 12)

One hundred per cent of the authorities gave this job function to the assistant superintendent of personnel, but the superintendents would share this responsibility with the assistant superintendent of personnel (69%), and the assistant superintendent of instruction (20%). Again it would seem that in some school districts the assistant superintendent of instruction is involved in the

supervision of teacher effectiveness and would therefore distribute the necessary forms to teachers.

9. Interpret the salary schedule to personnel

The selected authorities would share this responsibility as follows: assistant superintendent of personnel (50%), assistant superintendent of business (50%), and superintendent (33%). Apparently, the selected authorities felt that these three professionals should be available for the interpretation of the salary schedule. Traditionally, this has been the responsibility of the superintendent and the assistant superintendent of business. More and more the interpretation of the salary schedule is placed in the hands of the assistant superintendent of personnel because it is another of the many personnel functions staff is concerned about.

10. Study, prepare, develop, and revise salary schedules for district (Table 18)

Both the selected authorities and the superintendents would share this responsibility with the assistant superintendent of personnel, assistant superintendent of business, and the superintendent. In this particular job function, it would seem logical that all three professionals would be involved.

11. Interpret training and experience of prospective employees prior to their placement on the salary schedule.

The selected authorities shared this responsibility with the following people: assistant superintendent of personnel (66%), superintendent (33%), assistant superintendent of instruction (33%), assistant superintendent of business (33%), and the principal (33%). Logically, this responsibility should be in the hands of the assistant superintendent of personnel. He is the person who has all of what is desirable on training and experience of a prospective employee. The task would then mean assigning the correct salary level according to the prospective employees training and experience. It must be questioned placing this job function in the office of the principal and the assistant superintendent of instruction. Traditionally, this has been placed in the superintendent's office and/or the assistant superintendent of business. With a trained personnel officer, this job function should be placed in his office.

12. Negotiate with employee groups on salary questions
(Table 18)

The selected authorities shared this responsibility as follows: superintendent (17%), assistant superintendent of business (33%), assistant superintendent of personnel (33%) and the principal (17%). Much confusion exists at the present time in the state of Michigan in the area of negotiations. Even the literature is not clear on who is responsible for this job function. It is interesting to

note that the superintendents placed this job function in the assistant superintendent of personnel's office (69%). Apparently, the superintendents are following the industrial model where the personnel officer is directly involved in this job function.

13. Certify the payroll to the business department
(Table 18)

The selected authorities shared this responsibility with most of the administrators in the central office and the principal. The job function clearly states the task, but apparently tradition comes into play. For example, in many small school districts the superintendent still certifies the payroll. It is surprising to note that the principal does this task in some school districts. It is no small wonder that the principal does not have time for educational leadership tasks. The majority of the superintendents placed this job function with the assistant superintendent of personnel (83%) and the assistant superintendent of business (17%). Again it has been the pattern that the business office certify the payroll.

14. Be aware of the work with all grievances submitted by local teacher's organizations (Table 22)

The selected authorities and superintendents would share this responsibility with the assistant superintendent of personnel and the principal. This would seem logical because the first level of grievances would be at the

building level. If the grievance can be handled successfully at this level then it would not go any further. If the grievance should go to the second level then the assistant superintendent of personnel would definitely be involved.

15. Act as the authorized agent for the state retirement fund in the district (Table 24)

Both the selected authorities and the superintendents placed this job function with the assistant superintendent of personnel, assistant superintendent of business, and the superintendent. Again, traditional patterns found in small districts prevails. The superintendent and assistant superintendent of business have served in this capacity in the past years. As the personnel officer comes into his own, this job function will be placed in that office.

16. Administer the salary schedule (Table 18)

Both the selected authorities and the superintendents placed this job function with the assistant superintendent of personnel, assistant superintendent of business, and the superintendent. This pattern of operation is found in many small school districts where the superintendent and the assistant superintendent of business administer the salary schedule. Confusion resulted in this job function because of the meaning of the term "administer."

17. Interview, and if possible, observe all candidates on the job

Both the selected authorities and the superintendents shared this responsibility with the assistant superintendent of personnel and the principal. The principals should visit teachers on site because these teachers will be placed in their respective schools. The assistant superintendent should do the initial screening so as to eliminate prospective candidates who do not fit the job description. Following the initial screening, principals would have the opportunity to have a closer look at prospective candidates on site.

Recommendations

This study was designed to determine which educational administrators within the school system should be assigned selected personnel functions according to the judgments of (1) Michigan Superintendents, and (2) Selected Authorities in school personnel administration. Based on the data obtained in this study, and the information acquired from reviewing the literature, the following recommendations for further research are made:

1. It would be valuable to replicate this study by administering a comparative survey of smaller school districts in the state of Michigan.

2. It would be valuable to perform an experimental study of this nature comparing the opinions of district administrators and selected authorities within the state of Michigan to those in comparable districts in the neighboring states of Wisconsin and Illinois, to test the reliability of this instrument.
3. Each school district should consider conducting a longitudinal study of its personnel functions over a period of years to see if there are any changes in the opinions and perceptions by any of the superintendents and selected authorities.
4. Personnel administrators in each district in this study should consider a further investigation of each individual personnel function. This would be particularly significant for those functions which receive negative responses from district administrators, teachers, and the community.
5. The role of the personnel administrator should be investigated more thoroughly. The results of this study indicates that the personnel administrators are unsure of the degree of responsibility they should assume.

6. The role of the personnel administrator in the management of the responsibility of the personnel functions of evaluations, adjustment counsel and dismissal should be investigated.

As was stated in Chapter I, the purpose of this study was to Compare the Role Concept of the District Personnel Director by Certain Michigan Superintendents and Selected Authorities in School Personnel Administration. After conducting this study of twenty-nine school district superintendents and six selected authorities, the researcher feels that other states and other districts will find the same methods and instruments are effective means for researching district personnel functions.

Recommendations for Further Study

It is recommended that an in-depth study of each of the major personnel categories outlined in this study be conducted to further determine the effectiveness of personnel administration in the public high schools of the state of Michigan.

Also recommended is a comparative study between states to assess the opinions of superintendents and selected authorities toward personnel administration programs operating in their respective states.

This research raises questions and suggests answers which will lead to the selection and preparation of programs in personnel administration that will result in desirable experiences for teachers.

Reflections

Some confusion existed when the data were analyzed because the job function statements were not clear cut. In a replication of the study, the researcher would define clearly terminology used in some of the job functions. Despite a definition of terminology, confusion would still reign. Many school district officials tend to administer as they observed it, or assumed certain job functions which they "felt" belonged to their office or to another position.

It was disturbing to see the difference of opinions among the authorities as to the job functions of the assistant superintendent of personnel. The confusion was caused when two of the selected authorities would check more than one position for a particular job function. In many cases, they would be three and four positions for a particular job function. In a replication of the study, the researcher would develop an ideal job description as defined by the four selected authorities who were consistent in their definition of the role of the assistant superintendent of instruction. This ideal job description would be given to the superintendents to determine their

agreement or disagreement with the job description.

Another approach to this problem is to ask the assistant superintendent of personnel in several major cities and personnel directors in the business world to define an ideal job description. Maybe this procedure would result in a more accurate job description. This job description would then be submitted to the superintendents.

It would have been interesting to determine if the assistant superintendent of personnel in the reporting school district is actually involved with the job functions checked by the superintendents or was it a case where the superintendent thought it would be advisable to have the personnel director carry out this job function.

In conclusion, much needs to be done in researching the role of the assistant superintendent of personnel especially with the many changes going on in education such as negotiations.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- American Association of School Administrators. Profile of the Administrative Team. Washington, D.C.: The American Association of School Administrators, 1971.
- Castetter, William B. Administering the School Personnel Program. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1962.
- Chandler, B. J., and Petty, Paul V. Personnel Management in School Administration.
- Elsbee, Willard S., and Reutter, Edmund E. Staff Personnel in the Public School. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1954.
- Engelhardt, Fred. Public School Organization and Administration. New York: Ginn and Company, 1931.
- Moore, Harold E., and Walters, Newell B. Personnel Administration in Education. New York: Harper Brothers, 1955.
- Morphett, Edgar L.; Roe, L. Johns; and Reller, Theodore L. Educational Administration. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Ind., 1959.
- Pittenger, Benjamin Floyd. Local Public School Administration. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1951.
- Sears, Jesse B. City School Administrative Controls--An Analysis of the Nature, Placement, and Flow of Authority and Responsibility in the Management of a City School System. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1938.
- Spears, Harold. Curriculum Planning Through In-Service Programs. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1957.

- Weber, Clarence A. Personnel Problems of School Administrators.
- Weber, Samuel Edwin. Cooperative Administration and Supervision of the Teaching Personnel. New York: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1937.
- Whitehill, Arthur M. Jr. Personnel Relations. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1955.
- Wiles, Kimball. Supervision for Better Schools. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1951.
- Yeager, William A. Administration of the Noninstructional Personnel and Services. New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1959.

Publications of Organizations

- American Association of School Administrators. School Board Superintendent Relationships. Thirty-fourth Yearbook. Washington, D.C.: American Association of School Administrators, 1956.
- _____. Staff Relations in School Administration. Thirty-third Yearbook. Washington, D.C.: American Association of School Administrators, 1955.
- _____. The American School Superintendent. Thirtieth Yearbook. Washington, D.C.: American Association of School Administrators, 1952.
- Havighurst, Robert J. Manpower and the Teacher Storage--Teacher Education. National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1955.
- National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards. Personnel Policies for Schools of the Future. Report of the Washington Conference. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, June, 1957.
- National Education Association. A New Personnel Administrator is Appointed. Research Bulletin XC. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, May, 1962.

National Education Association. Teacher Personnel Practices, 1950-51: Appointment and Termination of Service. Research Bulletin XXX. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, February, 1952.

. Teacher Personnel Practices. Urban School Districts, 1955-56. Special Memo. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, June, 1956.

State News. Study Forsees Surplus of Teachers in Michigan. February 11, 1972.

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Digest of Educational Statistics. Bureau of Educational Research and Development. Bulletin #43. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1963.

. Staff Personnel Administration, Selected Practices and Issues. Bulletin #6. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1963.

Unpublished Materials

Addington, Chester Luther. "A Review of Human Relations in Business and Industrial Administration with Implications for Educational Personnel Administration." Unpublished thesis, Indiana University, 1951.

Deever, Roy Merwin. "An Analysis of Personnel Practices in Selected School Systems of the Southwest Region." Unpublished thesis, The University of Oklahoma, 1959.

Donald, Eleanor. "The Public School Administrator, A Study of the Origin, Administrative Status, Duties and Responsibilities, and Trends of the Position." Unpublished thesis, Columbia University, 1962.

Egly, Edgar Carl. "Fringe Benefits for Classified Employees of Large City School Districts." Unpublished thesis, University of Southern California, 1959.

Green, John Albert. "The Policies and Practice of Personnel Administration in the Public School Systems of the Cities Between 10,000 and 30,000 in Population." Unpublished thesis, University of Colorado, 1953.

- Mack, Jay David. "The Organization of District-Level Personnel Functions in Selected California School Districts." Unpublished thesis, University of Southern California, 1960.
- Madsen, Donald H. "Personnel Administration in Large City School Systems." Unpublished thesis, Yale University, 1953.
- McCarthy, Francis J. "The Personnel Administrator in City School Systems: A Study of the Duties and Functions of Personnel Officers in Public Systems in Selected Cities as Compared to Personnel Practices in Other Fields." Unpublished thesis, New York University, 1953.
- Millar, Allen Robert. "Teacher Personnel Administration in School Systems in Cities 15,000 to 30,000 in Population." Unpublished thesis, University of Nebraska, 1956.
- Morton, Clayton Robert. "The Organization and Relationships of School Personnel Departments in Cities of 100,000 to 500,000 Population in the United States." Unpublished thesis, University of Southern California, 1961.
- Tritt, Charles William. "Teacher Personnel Administration in School Systems in Cities 30,000 to 60,000 in Population." Unpublished thesis, University of Nebraska, 1956.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

MICHIGAN SUPERINTENDENTS MAILING LIST

APPENDIX A

MICHIGAN SUPERINTENDENTS MAILING LIST

Carlo W. Heikkinen, Supt.
Adrian School District
204 E. Church St.
Adrian, Michigan, 49221

Harry R. Davidson, Supt.
Battle Creek School District
Willard Library Bldg.
Battle Creek, Michigan 49016

Raymond Sreboth, Supt.
Benton Harbor School District
400 Pipestone St.
Benton Harbor, Michigan 49022

W. Carl Holbrook, Supt.
Eaton Rapids School District
501 King St.
Eaton Rapids, Michigan 48827

William J. Early, Supt.
Flint Public School District
932 E. Kearsley St.
Flint, Michigan 48502

Donald R. Shader, Supt.
Garden City School District
1333 Radcliff St.
Garden City, Michigan 48135

LaVerne H. Boss, Supt.
Grandville School District
3131 Barrett, SW
Grandville, Michigan 49418

Jack E. Meeder, Supt.
Albion School District
709 N. Clinton St.
Albion, Michigan 49224

Randall Coates, Supt.
Beecher School District
1020 W. Coldwater Rd.
Flint, Michigan 48505

Malcolm Katz, Supt.
East Lansing School District
509 Burcham Dr.
East Lansing, Michigan 48823

John J. Houghton, Supt.
Ferndale School District
130 E. Nine Mile Rd.
Ferndale, Michigan 48220

M. B. McDonald, Supt.
Flushing School District
525 Coutant St.
Flushing, Michigan 48433

Phillip Runkel, Supt.
Grand Rapids School District
143 Bostwick, NE
Grand Rapids, Michigan 49502

Paul H. Emerich, Supt.
Highland Park School District
20 Bartlett St.
Highland Park, Michigan 48203

Lawrence F. Read, Supt.
Jackson School District
290 W. Michigan Ave.
Jackson, Michigan 49201

Willis C. Olson, Supt.
L'Anse Creuse School District
Mt. Clemens P O
Mt. Clemens, Michigan 49946

Howard Campbell, Supt.
Lincoln Park School District
1545 Southfield St.
Lincoln Park, Michigan 48146

George H. Owen, Supt.
Midland Public School District
600 E. Carpenter St.
Midland, Michigan 48640

John E. Sydnor, Supt.
Muskegon Heights School
District
Peck & Sherman Sts.
Muskegon Heights,
Michigan 49444

Kenneth W. Olsen, Supt.
Okemos School District
4406 Okemos Rd.
Okemos, Michigan 48864

Robert W. Coulter, Supt.
Port Huron School District
509 Stanton St.
Port Huron, Michigan 48061

Jack Taylor, Supt.
Saginaw Public School
District
550 Millard St.
Saginaw, Michigan 48607

Reed H. Hagen, Supt.
Kalamazoo School District
1220 Howard St.
Kalamazoo, Michigan 49001

I. Carl Candoli, Supt.
Lansing Public School
District
3426 S. Cedar St.
Lansing, Michigan 48910

Rolland H. Upton, Supt.
Livonia Public School
District
15125 Farmington Rd.
Livonia, Michigan 48154

William L. Austin, Supt.
Muskegon School District
349 W. Webster St.
Muskegon, Michigan 49440

Richard B. Warren, Supt.
Niles School District
720 E. Main St.
Niles, Michigan 49120

James Rossman, Supt.
Plymouth School District
1024 S. Mill St.
Plymouth, Michigan 48170

Paul Shoemaker, Supt.
Redford Union School District
18499 Beech-Daly Rd.
Detroit, Michigan 48240

APPENDIX B

AUTHORITIES MAILING LIST

APPENDIX B

AUTHORITIES MAILING LIST

Dr. Phillip Gusick
409 Erickson Hall
Michigan State Univ.
East Lansing, Michigan

Dr. Vandel C. Johnson
419 Erickson Hall
Michigan State Univ.
East Lansing, Michigan

Dr. Samuel A. Moore II
404 Erickson Hall
Michigan State Univ.
East Lansing, Michigan

Dr. Kenneth Harper
Director of Personnel Service
East Lansing School District
509 Burcham Dr.
East Lansing, Michigan 48823

Dr. Alexander J. Kloster
408 Erickson Hall
Michigan State Univ.
East Lansing, Michigan

Dr. Louis Romano
406 Erickson Hall
Michigan State Univ.
East Lansing, Michigan

APPENDIX C

**TRANSMITTAL LETTER AND
SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE**

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY EAST LANSING - MICHIGAN 48821

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION - DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION AND HIGHER EDUCATION
ERICKSON HALL

February 28, 1972

Dear Sir:

I am pursuing a Doctor of Philosophy degree at Michigan State University. This study has the endorsement of the Bureau of Educational Research and Services at Michigan State University.

You have been randomly selected to participate in a study to determine the consensus of opinions of public school superintendents and authorities in school personnel management as to the delegation of the responsibility of certain school personnel functions.

This questionnaire is arranged in such a manner that the check mark system will indicate your response. According to the pilot study, it can be completed in approximately 15 minutes.

Identity of the person or district or its contributions to the study will not be made a part of the results. All participants will receive a summary of the opinions expressed by all respondents, if requested.

In the interest of educational research, your contributions to this study will be greatly appreciated. A self-addressed envelope of the investigator is attached for the return of the questionnaire.

Sincerely yours,

Allen Jackson
Room 503(E)
Owen Graduate Hall
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan

For the purpose of this study, assume you have the following assistants in your district: assistant superintendent of business, assistant superintendent of instruction, and assistant superintendent of personnel. Other title descriptions or designations for these positions may exist in your district.

The district daily attendance is: _____ (10/1/71)

On my district staff I presently have:

- _____ An Assistant Superintendent of Business
 _____ An Assistant Superintendent of Instruction
 _____ An Assistant Superintendent of Personnel

You are asked to designate the person to whom the responsibilities of staff recruitment, selection, placement, orientation, and other personnel related tasks should be assigned.

GENERAL ORGANIZATION		Asst. Supt. of Bus.	Asst. Supt. of Instr.	Asst. Supt. of Pers.	Prin.	Other Admin.
<u>Policy Formulation</u>		Supt.				
Which administrator(s) should:						
A. Research and survey personnel policy?		_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
B. Be responsible for the development of personnel policy?		_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
C. Organize and consolidate already existing personnel policy?		_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
D. Administer and interpret personnel policy?		_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

Inter-District Communications

Which administrator(s) should:

- A. Keep the superintendent and the board of education informed of personnel matters? _____

	Supt.	Asst. Supt. of Bus.	Asst. Supt. of Instr.	Asst. Supt. of Pers.	Prin.	Other Admin.
B. Advertise vacancies?	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
C. Maintain contact with college placement bureaus and applicants for employment?	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
D. Compile and distribute a policy handbook for personnel and a district personnel directory?	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
E. Maintain contact with and work with union, professional, and community groups?	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
F. Keep informed on recent developments in the field of personnel administration?	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
G. Contribute items of interest on personnel to the district newsletter?	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
H. Circulate bulletins to personnel and disseminate information from the central office to individual schools?	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
I. Plan and administer the district public relations program?	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

Personnel Records

Which administrator(s) should:

- A. Develop and design a system of personnel records including forms and/or procedures?

	Supt.	Asst. Supt. of Bus.	Asst. Supt. of Instr.	Asst. Supt. of Pers.	Prin.	Other Admin.
B. Keep, maintain, and use accurate, complete, and up-to-date personnel records?	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

STAFF PROCUREMENT AND UTILIZATION

Personnel Needs

Which administrator(s)
should:

A. Plan and direct studies of present and future personnel needs?	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
B. Maintain close communication with all district administrative and advisory personnel and others in line relationship with employees who supply information on long and short range personnel needs?	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
C. Assemble and coordinate information on personnel needs?	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

Recruitment

Which administrator(s)
should:

A. Supervise student-teacher training program and activities of Future Teachers of America Club?	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
B. Plan, direct, coordinate, and participate in district recruitment program?	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

	Supt.	Asst. Supt. of Bus.	Asst. Supt. of Instr.	Asst. Supt. of Pers.	Prin.	Other Admin.
C. Advertise openings and prepare promotional literature?	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
D. Maintain effective contact with college placement officers and professors?	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
E. Travel to college campus placement offices to interview prospective teachers, and participate in career day activities?	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
F. Schedule trips and make arrangements for recruitment teams?	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

Personnel Selection

Which administrator(s) should:

A. Interview, and if possible, observe all candidates on the job?	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
B. Process applications of prospective employees?	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
C. Collect references, review transcripts, check certification, verify application forms?	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
D. Arrange interviews for candidates with other district personnel?	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
E. Administer examinations?	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
F. Give preliminary screening?	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

	Supt.	Asst. Supt. of Bus.	Asst. Supt. of Instr.	Asst. Supt. of Pers.	Prin.	Other Admin.
G. Receive and submit to the superintendent and board recommendations for employment?	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
H. Issue contracts to employed personnel?	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

Personnel Assignment

Which administrator(s) should:

A. Conduct studies relating to basis for assigning personnel in the school?	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
B. Coordinate and supervise assignment of personnel to the superintendent?	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

Substitute Teachers

Which Administrator(s) should:

A. Recruit, approve, and maintain list of substitute teachers?	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
B. Verification of information on applications from substitute teachers?	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
C. Distribute substitute lists?	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

	Asst. Supt. of Bus.	Asst. Supt. of Instr.	Asst. Supt. of Pers.	Prin.	Other Admin.
Supt.					

GENERAL ORGANIZATION

Liaison Responsibilities

Which administrator(s)
should:

- A. Represent the school system on all occasions when personnel administration is a topic of concern?

- B. Represent the superintendent's "voice of personnel" at professional meetings by giving speeches to educational councils?

STAFF DEVELOPMENT

Orientation and Induction of Personnel

Which administrator(s)
should:

- A. Assist teachers in finding suitable living accommodations?

- B. Be chairman of the orientation program committee?

- C. Plan, direct, and conduct the orientation and induction program?

- D. Distribute informational materials to new employees?

	Asst. Supt. of Bus.	Asst. Supt. of Instr.	Asst. Supt. of Pers.	Prin.	Other Admin.
Supt.					

Profession Development

Which administrator(s)
should:

- A. Direct the adminis-
tration of the pro-
fessional development
program (college
courses, university
workshops, etc.)?

_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------

- B. Analyze and recom-
mend?

_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------

- C. Maintain records of
development?

_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------

Evaluation

Which administrator(s)
should:

- A. Develop a system of
evaluation procedures,
standards, and forms?

_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------

- B. Administer the
evaluation program?

_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------

- C. Distribute evalu-
ation forms?

_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------

- D. Evaluate personnel
if there is some doubt
about a particular
individual?

_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------

- E. Evaluate principals
and supervisors?

_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------

- F. Assemble and review
evaluations?

_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------

	Asst. Supt. of Bus.	Asst. Supt. of Instr.	Asst. Supt. of Pers.	Prin.	Other Admin.
Supt.					

Promotions

Which administrator(s)
should:

- A. Advertise promotional openings?
- B. Screen candidates and compile promotional eligibility list?
- C. Administer promotional examination?
- D. Organize, plan, and implement a cadet or administrative training program?

_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

Personnel Transfer

Which administrator(s)
should:

- A. Receive and review all requests for transfer?
- B. Process and implement the transfer?

_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

Adjustment Counsel

Which administrator(s)
should:

- A. Aid and assist teachers with personal complicated and emotional or mental problems?
- B. Be able to divest himself of the aura of his administrative office and be able to create a climate of genuine trust and confidence of the teacher?

_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

	Asst. Supt. of Bus.	Asst. Supt. of Instr.	Asst. Supt. of Pers.	Prin.	Other Admin.
Supt.					

CONDITIONS OF SERVICE

Certification

Which administrator(s)
should:

- A. Evaluate transcripts in terms of the certification law?

_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------

- B. Determine whether teachers are fully and properly certificated, and if not, help them become so?

_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------

- C. Act as a contact with and a resource to the State Department on certification matters?

_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------

- D. Keep teachers posted on changes in state certification law?

_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------

Formulation of Job Description

Which administrator(s)
should?

- A. Prepare, or have prepared, by a staff committee or by the person(s) most closely associated with or who knows the most about a particular position, a job description of it?

_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------

- B. Maintain an up-to-date file on job description?

_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------

- C. Study new or modified positions and alter the job description as needed?

_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------

	Asst. Supt. of Bus.	Asst. Supt. of Instr.	Asst. Supt. of Pers.	Prin.	Other Admin.
Supt.					

Compensation

Which administrator(s)
should:

- | | | | | | |
|---|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| A. Interpret the salary schedule to personnel? | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| B. Administer the salary schedule? | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| C. Study, prepare, develop, and revise salary schedules for the district, keep up-to-date on local conditions and attempting to maintain a level of compensation competitive with other fields? | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| D. Interpret training and experience of prospective employees prior to their placement on the salary schedule? | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| E. Negotiate with employee groups on salary questions? | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| F. Certify the payroll to the business department? | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |

Work Loads

Which administrator(s)
should:

- | | | | | | |
|--|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| A. Study work loads of all personnel: | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| B. Make appropriate recommendations for equitable distribution of work load? | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |

	Supt.	Asst. Supt. of Bus.	Asst. Supt. of Instr.	Asst. Supt. of Pers.	Prin.	Other Admin.
--	-------	------------------------------	--------------------------------	-------------------------------	-------	-----------------

Leaves of Absence

Which administrator(s)
should:

A. Develop and recom-
mend leave policies?

_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------

B. Receive and process
leave requests?

_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------

C. Keep and check records
to determine eligi-
bility for leave?

_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------

D. Provide information
and advice to staff
members about leave?

_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------

E. Recommend persons
eligible for leave to
the superintendent?

_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------

Tenure Recommendations

Which administrator(s)
should:

A. Keep track of those
employees eligible
for tenure?

_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------

B. Submit to the super-
intendent a list of
staff to be tenured
with recommendations
from their immediate
superiors?

_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------

Grievances of Personnel

Which administrator(s)
should:

A. Maintain contact with
the grievance committee
of the teachers' associ-
ation and union?

_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------

	Supt.	Asst. Supt. of Bus.	Asst. Supt. of Instr.	Asst. Supt. of Pers.	Prin.	Other Admin.
B. Be aware of and work with all grievances submitted by local teachers' organizations?	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

Dismissal

Which administrator(s) should:

A. Develop policies or procedures under which staff may be dismissed?	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
B. Evaluate recommendations for termination of an employee?	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
C. Assemble information for dismissal of an employee?	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

Retirement

Which administrator(s) should:

A. Develop policy on retirement?	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
B. Act as the authorized agent for the state retirement fund in the district?	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
C. Provide resource data as a basis for retirement legislation?	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
D. Keep and check records for verification of status of employees?	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
E. Counsel personnel of problems related to retirement?	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

	Asst. Supt. of Bus.	Asst. Supt. of Instr.	Asst. Supt. of Pers.	Prin.	Other Admin.
Supt.					

F. Provide information to
the business and de-
partment of the district
and to the state or
local retirement board?

Signature

District