

1966

An Appraisal of Teacher-Negotiation Effort as Perceived by School Superintendents

Carl Alan Blumer
Central Washington University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.cwu.edu/etd>



Part of the [Educational Administration and Supervision Commons](#), and the [Teacher Education and Professional Development Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Blumer, Carl Alan, "An Appraisal of Teacher-Negotiation Effort as Perceived by School Superintendents" (1966). *All Master's Theses*. 551.

<https://digitalcommons.cwu.edu/etd/551>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Master's Theses at ScholarWorks@CWU. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@CWU. For more information, please contact scholarworks@cwu.edu.

AN APPRAISAL OF TEACHER-NEGOTIATION EFFORT
AS PERCEIVED BY SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENTS



A Thesis
Presented to
the Graduate Faculty
Central Washington State College



In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Education



by
Carl Alan Blumer
June 1966

LD
5771.3
B658a

SPECIAL
COLLECTION

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARY

ANN ARBOR, MICHIGAN

1954

of Michigan

and the University of Michigan

Library of the University of Michigan

in partial fulfillment of

the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

OSCAR W. RICHARDSON

June 1954

138663

APPROVED FOR THE GRADUATE FACULTY

E. Frank Price, COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN

Roy Ruebel

Alexander H. Howard Jr.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Grateful acknowledgment is extended to Dr. Frank Price, Dr. Alexander Howard, and Dr. Roy Ruebel for their guidance, direction, and constructive criticism which has been invaluable. The sincere efforts of each member of this committee in helping the author achieve the intended purpose has been paramount to whatever success was realized.

The author also wishes to express his appreciation to Dr. Edward Erickson for his assistance and encouragement during the early development of this study.

Special appreciation and gratitude is extended to the writer's wife, Ruth, for the countless hours she devoted to typing. Her assistance and gentle encouragement during this study has been a major contribution.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. THE PROBLEM AND DEFINITIONS OF TERMS USED . . .	1
The Problem	3
Statement of the problem	4
Assumptions	4
Hypothesis	5
Limitations of the study	5
Definitions of Terms Used	5
Professional negotiations	5
Collective bargaining	6
Professional negotiations law	6
Significant level of agreement	6
Organization of the Remainder of the Study . .	6
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	8
Establishing a Need for Professional Negotiations	8
Legal Precedents Responsible for Current Legislation	11
The Professional Organizations' View of Negotiating	12
Some "Professional" Considerations	15
What Can Be Negotiated	17
III. PROCEDURES USED	18

CHAPTER	PAGE
Background	18
Questionnaire Design and Procedures	19
Analysis Procedures	21
IV. ANALYSIS OF DATA	22
The Various General Areas	28
Teacher welfare	28
Professional rights and responsibilities	29
Conditions of work	30
Evaluation, training, and assignment	31
Instruction	31
Most important subordinate items	33
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	35
Summary	36
Conclusions	37
Recommendations	37
BIBLIOGRAPHY	39
APPENDIX A. Questionnaire	43
APPENDIX B. Letter to Superintendents	47

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
I. Number and Percentage of Superintendents Replying to Section A--Instruction	23
II. Number and Percentage of Superintendents Replying to Section B--Conditions of Work . .	24
III. Number and Percentage of Superintendents Replying to Section C--Evaluation, Training, and Assignment	25
IV. Number and Percentage of Superintendents Replying to Section D--Professional Rights and Responsibilities	26
V. Number and Percentage of Superintendents Replying to Section E--Teacher Welfare	27
VI. A Rank Order of the General Areas	28
VII. Rank Order of Subordinate Items Within the Area of Teacher Welfare	29
VIII. Rank Order of Subordinate Items Within the Area of Professional Rights and Responsibilities	30
IX. Rank Order of Subordinate Items Within the Area of Conditions of Work	31
X. Rank Order of the Subordinate Items Within the Area of Evaluation, Training, and Assignment	32

TABLE

PAGE

XI. Rank Order of the Subordinate Items Within
the Area of Instruction 33

XII. Rank Order of the Eleven Most Prominent
Subordinate Items 34

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM AND DEFINITIONS OF TERMS USED

The professional negotiations law is enacted legislation which recognizes the right of employee organizations to represent certificated employees in their relations with the school districts. The law, simply stated, encourages all educators and school directors to cooperate and contribute their best thinking on matters of mutual concern. This law is designed to be implemented by using educational channels on a team basis by the board, teachers, and administrative staff. As a result of this legislative action, teachers are now in a position to participate legally in the development of school board policy.

Historically school boards and the administrative staff have been alone in their capacity to influence the educational setting through the establishment of policy. The role of the administrators has been to implement these policies through the administrative procedures and practices established in the superintendent's office. The role of the teacher has been one of abiding by the board policies within the context of the administrative procedures set forth by school administrators.

The lack of opportunity to participate with school boards in helping to develop school policy has encouraged

teachers to seek legislative means for being recognized as an equal partner of the school board. The professional negotiations law as defined in Chapter 143 of 1965 Public Laws of the State of Washington clearly recognizes the right of teachers to negotiate matters of mutual concern between themselves and local school boards.

In the past, teachers have been recognized as one of the members of the educational team, but not on an equal basis with the board in respect to developing school policy. The professional negotiations law provides an opportunity for teachers to share, on an equal basis, the responsibility for developing school policies.

Each segment of the policy-making team brings professional training and experience unique to their respective groups. School board members represent the wishes of the parents and have the authority to make final policy decisions which will serve the best interests of the community within the educational setting. They represent the wishes, needs, and aspirations of the public while at the same time they are the guardians of the public trust. In this capacity the board insures control of the schools by the public.

Administrators bring with them a high degree of professional training, experience, and general competence in the administration of school programs. Because of their unique experience and training, they are able to see the whole

picture within their respective educational communities. They view each of the parts within the whole and make value judgments which determine the relationships each part will have to the whole.

Classroom teachers view a more limited part of the educational program, but they bring a high degree of training, experience, and competence within their respective areas of responsibility. All members of the team serve purposes and functions which are designed to make the teacher's job the most productive. The teacher's function is to facilitate learning and growth within and without the classroom. If the teacher fails in his responsibility through a lack of understanding or agreement with the policy, all other team members' work will have been in vain.

I. THE PROBLEM

Professional negotiation is designed to capitalize on the exclusive experience and training of each member of the team. The collective interaction among board, teachers, and administrators should tend to broaden the base upon which decisions are made and better insure success in implementing them.

The implications of this law are far reaching. Teachers are now in a legal posture to give direction, jointly with the school board, to educational development by participating in establishing school policy.

Because the language of the law is very imprecise, teachers have almost unchecked freedom to participate in whatever policy-making they desire.

Statement of the problem. The purpose of this study will be to determine which areas may elicit greatest concern, interest, and participation on the part of teachers due to the passage of the professional negotiations law. Because of the unique position of superintendents, they will be asked to judge those areas of greatest concern, interest, and participation by teachers in professional activities.

Assumptions. For the purposes of this study, the following assumptions will be made:

1. Superintendents are in a unique position to appraise the concerns, or increased interest and participation, of teachers in professional activities.
2. Superintendents, selected randomly from within the strata of first-class districts, will be able to ascertain the concerns, or increased interest and participation, in professional activities.
3. These activities included in this study will be representative of those that the majority of teachers in the State of Washington will be

involved in as a result of the professional negotiations law.

4. Those general areas included in the questionnaire, along with the minor items accompanying each general area, are a fair and representative sample of professional activities in which teachers can become involved.

Hypothesis. There is a significant level of agreement among randomly selected administrators in Washington State as to the areas or problems of mutual concern, interest, and participation as a result of the professional negotiations law.

Limitations of the study. The study will be limited to the evaluation and judgment of thirty randomly selected school administrators, within the strata of first-class school districts, in the State of Washington. The data for this study will be drawn from opinions cited from the sample through a questionnaire.

II. DEFINITIONS OF TERMS USED

Professional negotiations.

Professional negotiations is a set of procedures, written and officially adopted by the local association and the school board, which provides an orderly method for the school board and the local association to negotiate, through professional channels, on matters of

mutual concern, to reach agreement on these matters, and to establish educational channels for mediation and appeal in the event of impasse (27:1).

Collective bargaining. This term is one used to describe a process which was designed to meet the needs of labor. It describes the relationship between labor and management in bargaining for matters of mutual concern. It excludes the supervisors or management from the bargaining unit, provides for labor channels and arbitration routes, places educational operations and decisions in the labor setting, restricting legal procedures to labor laws.

Professional negotiations law. Professional negotiations law is interpreted as meaning Chapter 143 of the Public Laws of 1965, of the State of Washington.

Significant level of agreement. For the purposes of this study, a significant level of agreement will be considered to exist when superintendents have established one item or general area to be more important than another. This will be determined by respondents checking subordinate items to be of either considerable or major importance.

III. ORGANIZATION OF THE REMAINDER OF THE STUDY

The remainder of the report will enlarge upon the following:

1. Chapter II will present the current literature available on this topic. Information solicited from major educational groups will also be included to provide a historical background in an area about which there is little published in book form.
2. Chapter III deals with a detailed discussion of the procedures employed in this study.
3. Chapter IV reports the findings of this study with an analysis of the data presented in table form.
4. Chapter V presents a summary and reports conclusions based on the hypothesis which may be drawn from the study. Suggested implications and recommendations for further study in respect to professional negotiations will also be made.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

I. ESTABLISHING A NEED FOR PROFESSIONAL NEGOTIATIONS

The single most important issue in American education today is the question of whether or not teachers will be organized in strong, independent, professional associations with a voice which will be heard (9:1).

The relationship between school boards and the teachers has been characterized by teachers having a voice, but their voices were not necessarily heard. The pressures and demands made on the educational team today necessitates taking full advantage of each member's talents, training, and experience to the fullest. The new professional negotiation law has recognized that the potential of teachers be tapped in solving problems of mutual concern.

In attempting to describe how teachers and board members could solve these problems together, Dr. George Brain noted that:

If democracy--with its fundamental emphasis of worth, dignity, and the importance of each individual--has taught the people of this country anything, it is that the capacities of people are used more fruitfully, results more rewarding, and the job is better done when the individuals who are involved in any common endeavor participate freely in developing policies and procedures, setting goals, and establishing the general conditions that govern their work. The school-systems that are making the most progress in this regard today are those which have sought, with full school-board support and approval, to give every member of the staff--

administrators, supervisors, and teachers--a feeling of responsibility for the well-being of the entire school system, not just a tiny part of it (6:8).

Blanke outlines six major forces which he feels are responsible for teachers joining together to affect change:

1. Continual change in employee-employer relations. Unions and teacher organizations are gradually achieving one of their important goals--the elimination of paternalistic administration.
2. Increased size and bureaucratization of districts which caused more directives to be issued--but less communication resulting. Rules taking precedence over people, and red tape replaces reason. Few people feel they actually "belong."
3. The dilemma of organization, size, and complexity has caused another collective teacher reaction. Boards many times make decisions based on administrators recommendations; while the administrators are not always sensitive to teacher wishes and problems. The teachers feel threatened in their job security. Personal insecurity and anxiety motivate them to join "militant" teacher organizations. The primary saleable commodities of unions have been (a) increased economic gain and (b) personal security.
4. Public resistance to increased taxes is reflected in both the board and generally the administration. This conservative nature of the community and the collective action of teachers is sometimes in direct opposition. This opposition between the board and teachers generates a fight which describes the union concept of collective bargaining as practiced in industry.
5. There are more teachers now vitally concerned with controlling their careers.
6. The membership fight between the American Federation of Teachers (A. F. T.) and the National Education Association (N. E. A.) is causing a much greater cohesive effect among all teachers (5:8).

Today's teacher, man or woman, is not the quiet, unseen individual who accepts genteel poverty as a necessary condition of his calling. Because of greater competence, increased knowledge, and opportunity professional organizations afford him to develop effective leadership qualities, today's teacher is actively concerned about all facets of school operation--working conditions, school organization, salary schedules, staffing policies, and program improvement (32:33).

With the increased competence and opportunity to serve, educators have become anxious to assume a greater share of responsibility in policy-making decisions. This more dynamic, contemporary individual is sometimes regarded as power-hungry or militant. Regardless of what name is used to describe teachers' new-found enthusiasm, the condition may be the result of pressure or:

. . . counterpressure to societal pressures to which teachers as a group have been subjected for some time. Much of the pressure teachers have felt most keenly is in areas over which they have little real control. Such being the case, it behooves school boards, teachers' organizations, and school administrators to strive diligently at this time to effect a mutually beneficial settlement designed to reduce pressures on both sides which threaten the very existence of our American system of public education. The National Education Association plan is worthy of full consideration in this regard (25:8).

Teachers are going to have more power, professional and political, in the coming decades. This is all to the good, provided it is exercised responsibly. The sterling record of American educators suggests that it will be. Indeed, American teachers have had perhaps too much modesty and patience in the past. If they have been under-paid, perhaps they have been under-proud (3:41).

In identifying the forces which may affect change by collective action, it may be well to ask, "What kind of changes will most likely take place?" This is central to the topic and purpose of this study. Generally, the changes which do take place by a collective action between the board and teachers will have benefitted the community in one of two ways: (1) Boards and teachers will be better able to identify and select the best ideas. (2) Professional negotiations will encourage a broader concern and participation by board, teachers, and administration.

II. LEGAL PRECEDENTS RESPONSIBLE FOR CURRENT LEGISLATION

Certain legal precedents are responsible for the present statutes as they exist in several states. The precedents leading to the 1965 Washington statute can be traced back to 1935. The National Labor Relations Act of 1935 permanently opened the door for collective bargaining. This act, however, specifically excluded public employees. This denied to public employees the same rights guaranteed employees of private industry. Since that time demands have been made by public employees guaranteeing them the same rights as those granted private industry. Indicative of the trend was the 1961 Wisconsin law recognizing and guaranteeing the rights of public employees to organize and bargain

collectively. The terms of this law made it applicable to school districts.

In 1962 President Kennedy, under presidential order, authorized the Department of Labor to determine majority representation.

. . . exclusive recognition is provided, written agreements may be signed, arbitration can be advisory only, and the strike and union shop are forbidden (26:11).

In 1917 the Chicago Board of Education prohibited teachers from joining a union and fired some for so doing. The Illinois Supreme Court said:

No person has the right to demand that he or she shall be employed as a teacher. The board has the absolute right to decline to employ or to reemploy any applicant for any reason whatever or for no reason at all. The board is not bound to give any reason for its action (26:11).

It is very doubtful that the same decision would be given today. "It seems imperative that boards cut through red tape and seek to set up orderly procedures for meeting with teachers--legally--across the bargaining table" (26:12).

III. THE PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS'

VIEW OF NEGOTIATING

The professional negotiations law has as its purpose "to improve the school policy-making process by fixing the responsibility for policy development on professional staff and school boards" (30:16). The one outstanding feature of

this process is "to strengthen methods of administering employer-employee relations through the establishment of orderly methods of communication between certificated employees and the school district" (30:16).

In order to understand how teacher organizations and other educational groups interpret their roles in negotiating, it is necessary to examine policy positions taken by respective educational organizations.

The following are statements excerpted from the different organizations' literature, as well as comments made by the respective leaders of the groups included. "Our first objective in any community is to achieve collective bargaining status. Teachers must take an active part in deciding educational policy" (1:84). This comment was made in a policy statement by the American Federation of Teachers.

The National Education Association has a similar policy, but seems to be more all-encompassing. They state: "We insist on the right of teachers to participate with school boards in determining policies of common concern, including salary and other professional conditions" (1:85).

The United States Office of Education (USOE) has had consultants working with local school boards and teacher organizations in order to help implement a more direct line of communication between the board and teachers. James P.

Steffensen, specialist for local school systems, from the USOE, stated:

Negotiations rights must be established as a right of the teachers rather than following from unilateral action of the board--they must be established by statute (30:16).

The following statement authored by the National School Boards Association (NSBA) is characteristic of their attitude regarding negotiations.

Each local school board must actively involve teachers in discussing total budget needs, with particular emphasis on determining salaries and handling grievances (1:81).

The American Association of School Administrators (AASA) believes that teachers, school administrators, and school boards must together seek pathways yet uncharted in the areas of personnel policies and practices. Shared responsibility in policy development is a professional concept. The right to discuss pro's and con's and to participate in developing a program does not imply the right to make decisions (6:9).

Each of the above-mentioned statements seem to indicate that teachers should be given a voice in developing school policy. It is important to note the distinction between making policy and helping to develop policy. The degree to which teachers will be afforded an opportunity to negotiate will be primarily based upon the ability and willingness of teachers to assume greater responsibility. The law asks much more than it gives, in that each area to be negotiated must bring with it all the wisdom, competence,

and professional judgment possible--for both the teachers and board members.

IV. SOME "PROFESSIONAL" CONSIDERATIONS

Within the realm of "professionalism" fall a multitude of considerations regarding negotiating. One consideration is whether to follow the concept of negotiating, or that of collective bargaining. The NEA supports the position that the use of educational channels in resolving a disagreement is the only defensible one to take. The AFT contends that the use of labor precedents and practices is the only defensible position.

One consideration seems paramount to all others in resolving which of the two divergent philosophies to follow. Which organization will provide teachers with the best possible leadership while seeking goals which represent the highest ideals of the profession? In a more operational sense this organization must be capable of attaining realistic objectives.

Professionalism is a drive for status. It represents the efforts of some members of a vocation to control their work. In order to monopolize a type of work, a vocation in the process of professionalization will seek to wrest power from those groups which traditionally have controlled the vocation. Professionalization in this sense apparently must be a militant process (11:313).

In the drive to become "professionalized," teachers must determine which vehicle will serve the best interests of their vocation. A major question each teacher must resolve for himself is, "What means is best to achieve my professional goals?" Those who follow the NEA will negotiate, while those following the AFT will be involved in collective bargaining.

Doctors, lawyers, and dentists are different in many respects from teachers. All are fee-takers and are not generally paid by a common employer. These professional people have problems which are common to each profession. They don't resolve their common problems by collective action generally because the conditions would vary so much. When doctors have had a common employer, they have used the strike to resolve an impasse. In both Canada and Belgium this has occurred in recent years. Doctors are prohibited from serving where they can't assume responsibility for the outcome of their work. Lawyers are to withdraw services from clients who insist they use unethical means to reach a favorable verdict. A priest doesn't perform services of excommunication until conditions are met--which the clergy establishes (19:238).

Educators are now legally in a position to assume responsibility for the outcome of their work. They may help establish policies which are consistent with their vocational

goals. It would seem to follow that teachers should share the responsibility with boards in developing school policy.

V. WHAT CAN BE NEGOTIATED?

All educational matters are negotiable in Washington.

Proposed policies related to, but not limited to, curriculum, textbook selection, in-service training, student-teaching programs, personnel, hiring and assignment practices, leaves-of-absence, salaries and salary schedules, and noninstructional duties (37:1).

With such a wide latitude available for negotiating it seems to suggest a rather monumental task for teachers, for whatever part of policy-making teachers become involved in, they must bring with them to the negotiating table a far greater knowledge of whatever topic they are negotiating. A much broader understanding of total school needs will also have to be a part of the teacher's negotiating. One aspect of school work will be quite novel to school teachers--that of acquiring a sophistication in negotiating matters of mutual concern between themselves and the school board.

As indicated earlier, the language of the Washington professional negotiations law does not impose limits as to what can or cannot be negotiated. It states that they must be matters of mutual concern. Through the efforts of this study a direction or trend may be detected as to specific areas in which teachers will devote their major negotiation efforts.

CHAPTER III

PROCEDURES USED

I. BACKGROUND

It was indicated earlier that this study has been conducted in an effort to identify specific areas of interest in which teachers will become involved as a result of the professional negotiations law enacted in the State of Washington. The broad areas of possible teacher involvement studied were: (1) Instruction, (2) Conditions of Work, (3) Evaluation, Training, and Assignment, (4) Professional Rights and Responsibilities, and (5) Teacher Welfare. Within each of the five general areas additional activities were identified in an effort to be as inclusive as possible in covering the entire range of activities falling within each major area.

It was assumed in this study that the five areas were a fair and representative sample of professional activities in which teachers can become involved.

It was the hypothesis of this study that there would be a significant level of agreement among randomly selected administrators as to the areas of mutual concern, interest, and participation as a result of the professional negotiations law.

The study has been limited to the evaluation and judgment of thirty randomly selected school superintendents from Washington State, within the strata of first-class school districts.

II. QUESTIONNAIRE DESIGN AND PROCEDURES

The process of finding enough material for the questionnaire and developing the format proved to be a major task. The first step was to search the published literature for those activities in which teachers might become involved. All professional journals and other related printed matter published by the NEA and the Washington Education Association (WEA) was searched for possible activities. Correspondence by mail, telephone conversations, and personal interviews with representatives of the WEA provided many helpful suggestions regarding topics to be included. From these various activities the five major areas decided upon were formulated. Through the search of the literature and other correspondence, an extensive list of subordinate items was accumulated. These items were assumed to be activities which were most representative of those in which teachers could become involved. From this procedure, five major areas were included with a list of thirty-five activities, each of which were placed in one of the five areas.

A search was undertaken to find a questionnaire format suitable for this study. All appropriate books, journals, theses, and other printed matter available in the library at Central Washington State College were searched. The result was that many ideas from various sources were finally combined. A combination of the best ideas found and adaptation of various other ideas to better fit the purposes of this study resulted in the questionnaire used. (See Appendix A.)

Copies of the questionnaire were mailed to thirty superintendents from first-class school districts in Washington State. The sample was determined by the use of a table of random numbers.

The questionnaires were sent with an explanatory letter (Appendix B) and a stamped, self-addressed envelope on April 8, 1966.

The respondents were asked to indicate, on the basis of their experience, those areas within which they felt teachers would want to negotiate with school boards.

A rating scale was provided for each activity which was designed to read as follows:

1. little or no negotiation effort by teachers
2. mild negotiation effort by teachers
3. moderate negotiation effort by teachers
4. considerable negotiation effort by teachers

5. major negotiation effort by teachers

Following the collection of the data, conclusions were drawn in respect to the hypothesis being tested.

III. ANALYSIS PROCEDURES

Only those responses in the considerable or major columns of the questionnaire were used to determine the rank order of the general areas and subordinate items. Having decided that the considerable and major columns of the questionnaire would receive equal value, the total number of responses in these two columns were counted. The totals were then converted into percentages with corresponding subordinate items and general areas being placed in rank order. The percentages were based on 100 per cent representing the total number of responses to each item.

The considerable and major columns were used in this analysis because they were the two choices which represented the strongest indications possible on the rating scale in relation to teacher-negotiation effort.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF DATA

This chapter presents data obtained by means of a questionnaire and what seems to be the significant inferences that may be drawn from an analysis of the data.

(Appendix A)

Of the thirty superintendents included in the study, twenty-five or 83 1/3 per cent of the sample completed and returned the questionnaire.

The questionnaire was designed in a manner that would determine the general areas of most importance to teachers in negotiation efforts. Five general areas of possible involvement by teachers were included in the study. Within each of the five general areas there were varying numbers of subordinate items. Superintendents were asked to rate each item as to its importance by indicating one of the following categories: "Major," "considerable," "moderate," "mild," or "little or no." A tally was kept of all responses and the results recorded as the questionnaires were returned. The results of this tally may be seen in Tables I through V.

TABLE I

NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF SUPERINTENDENTS REPLYING TO
SECTION A--INSTRUCTION

Item	Degree of Importance									
	Little or No		Mild		Moderate		Consider- able		Major	
	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent
1. Curriculum planning	4	16	8	32	9	36	4	16	0	0
2. Teaching procedures	7	28	6	24	10	40	2	8	0	0
3. Non-instructional duties	1	4	4	16	4	16	12	48	4	16
4. Newer educational media	9	36	7	28	8	32	1	4	0	0
5. Educational experiments	8	32	9	36	8	32	0	0	0	0
6. School-plant planning	8	32	9	36	5	20	3	12	0	0
7. Professional libraries	13	52	4	16	5	20	2	8	1	4
8. Testing and evaluation	7	28	7	28	9	36	2	8	0	0
9. Educational goals	9	36	6	24	8	32	2	8	0	0

Note: This table should be read as follows: Under the topic "Curriculum Planning," four respondents indicated it to be of little or no importance in negotiation effort by teachers. This represents 16 per cent of the total respondents. Similarly, eight respondents indicated the same item to be of mild importance. This represents 32 per cent of the sample.

TABLE II
 NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF SUPERINTENDENTS REPLYING TO
 SECTION B--CONDITIONS OF WORK

Item	Degree of Importance									
	Little or No		Mild		Moderate		Consider- able		Major	
	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent
1. Teacher-pupil ratios	1	4	5	20	5	20	11	44	3	12
2. Preparation periods	1	4	6	24	2	8	10	40	6	24
3. Specific class loads	3	12	5	20	3	12	10	40	4	16
4. Extra-curricular activities	3	12	6	24	2	8	9	36	5	20
5. Secretarial and clerical help	2	8	8	32	15	60	0	0	0	0

Note: This table should be read as follows: Under item 1, "Teacher-Pupil ratios," one respondent indicated it to be of little or no importance in negotiation effort by teachers. This represents four per cent of the total respondents. Similarly, five respondents indicated the same item to be of mild importance. This represents 20 per cent of the sample.

TABLE III

NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF SUPERINTENDENTS REPLYING TO
SECTION C--EVALUATION, TRAINING, AND ASSIGNMENT

Item	Degree of Importance									
	Little or No		Mild		Moderate		Consider- able		Major	
	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent
1. Teacher evaluation	3	12	2	8	10	40	8	32	2	8
2. In-service education	3	12	5	20	12	48	5	20	0	0
3. Teacher assignment	4	16	5	20	11	44	5	20	0	0
4. Student-teaching program	9	36	8	32	6	24	1	4	1	4
5. Hiring practices	6	24	8	32	8	32	3	12	0	0
6. New-teacher orientation	3	12	14	56	7	28	1	4	0	0
7. Determination of professional training	3	12	7	28	7	28	8	32	0	0
8. Preservice education	12	48	7	28	6	24	0	0	0	0

Note: This table should be read as follows: Under item 1, "Teacher evaluation," three respondents indicated it to be of little or no importance in negotiation effort by teachers. This represents 12 per cent of the total respondents. Similarly, two respondents indicated the same item to be of mild importance. This represents eight per cent of the sample.

TABLE IV

NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF SUPERINTENDENTS REPLYING TO
SECTION D--PROFESSIONAL RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES

Item	Degree of Importance									
	Little or No		Mild		Moderate		Consider- able		Major	
	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent
1. Tenure or continuing- contract policies	5	20	2	8	6	24	9	36	3	12
2. Personnel policies	0	0	2	8	7	28	11	44	5	20
3. Grievance procedures	1	4	3	12	5	20	10	40	6	24
4. Teacher transfer	6	24	2	8	11	44	5	20	1	4
5. Professional Rights and Responsibility committee handling of local problems	3	12	3	12	6	24	10	40	3	12
6. Implementation of Code of Ethics	6	24	5	20	6	24	8	32	0	0
7. The role of administration	5	20	4	16	9	36	5	20	2	8

Note: This table should be read as follows: Five respondents indicated item 1, "Tenure or continuing contract policies," to be of little or no importance in negotiation effort by teachers. This represents 20 per cent of the total respondents. Similarly, two respondents indicated the same item to be of mild importance. This represents eight per cent of the sample.

TABLE V

NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF SUPERINTENDENTS REPLYING TO
SECTION E--TEACHER WELFARE

Item	Degree of Importance									
	Little or No		Mild		Moderate		Consider- able		Major	
	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent
1. Cooperative insurance	4	16	3	12	5	20	10	40	3	12
2. Extended contracts	3	12	5	20	5	20	9	36	3	12
3. Sabbatical and leaves of absence	2	8	0	0	11	44	10	40	2	8
4. Improvement of salary	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	8	22	88
5. Teacher-liability insurance	5	20	6	24	5	20	6	24	3	12
6. Length of teaching contract	2	8	3	12	5	20	10	40	5	20

Note: This table should be read as follows: Four respondents indicated item 1, "Cooperative insurance," to be of little or no importance in negotiation effort by teachers. This represents 16 per cent of the total respondents. Similarly, three respondents indicated the same item to be of mild importance. This represents 12 per cent of the sample.

The hypothesis of this study is that there is agreement among superintendents as to which areas teachers will become increasingly involved in as a result of the professional negotiations law. In order to test the hypothesis stated above, an analysis of the responses was undertaken. The results of the analysis and the resulting rank of the general areas is reported in Table VI.

TABLE VI
A RANK ORDER OF THE GENERAL AREAS

Rank	General Areas	Percentage Indicating Considerable or Major Importance
1	Teacher Welfare	56.6
2	Professional Rights and Responsibilities	44.5
3	Conditions of Work	25.6
4	Evaluation, Training, and Assignment	17.0
5	Instruction	14.6

I. THE VARIOUS GENERAL AREAS

Teacher welfare. Of the five general areas, superintendents indicated Teacher Welfare matters would be of most importance in teacher efforts to negotiate with school boards. From among the six subordinate welfare items, Improvement of

Salary was considered to be of primary importance. Ninety-six per cent of those administrators who responded to this item indicated it to be of either major or considerable importance. Table VII reveals the rank in importance as indicated by the sample.

TABLE VII
RANK ORDER OF SUBORDINATE ITEMS WITHIN THE
AREA OF TEACHER WELFARE

Rank	Items	Percentage Indicating Considerable or Major Importance
1	Improvement of Salary	96.0
2	Length of Teaching Contract	60.0
3	Cooperative Insurance	52.0
4	Extended Contracts	48.0
5	Sabbatical and Leaves of Absence	48.0
6	Teacher-Liability Insurance	36.0

Professional rights and responsibilities. Ranked second in importance is the area of Professional Rights and Responsibilities. Of interest is the considerably greater amount of agreement between items within this area as compared to Teacher Welfare. Table VIII shows the ranking by importance of the subordinate items within this area.

TABLE VIII

RANK ORDER OF SUBORDINATE ITEMS WITHIN THE AREA
OF PROFESSIONAL RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES

Rank	Items	Percentage Indicating Considerable or Major Importance
1	Personnel Policies	64.0
2	Grievance Procedures	64.0
3	Professional Rights and Responsibility Committee Handling of Local Problems	52.0
4	Tenure or Continuing-Contract Policies	48.0
5	Implementation of Code of Ethics	32.0
6	The Role of Administration	28.0
7	Teacher Transfer	24.0

Conditions of Work. Superintendents are in general agreement that of the five subordinate items within the area of Conditions of Work, the first four may receive more than cursory attention from teachers when they negotiate. Total agreement was reached regarding Item 5, Secretarial and Clerical Help. All of the respondents agreed that there would be minimum attention paid to this item in negotiation effort. Table IX shows the ranking by importance of the subordinate items.

TABLE IX
RANK ORDER OF SUBORDINATE ITEMS WITHIN THE
AREA OF CONDITIONS OF WORK

Rank	Items	Percentage Indicating Considerable or Major Importance
1	Preparation Periods	64.0
2	Teacher-Pupil Ratios	56.0
3	Specific Class Loads	56.0
4	Extra-Curricular Activities	56.0
5	Secretarial and Clerical Help	0.0

Evaluation, training, and assignment. The results of the questionnaire indicate that this area can expect, as a group, to receive little attention from teachers in their negotiation efforts. Individually the subordinate item of Teacher Evaluation seems most likely to become a relatively active item. All other items seem to indicate a somewhat inactive part in negotiation activities. Table X indicates the relative degree of importance items within this area have been rated.

Instruction. The item dealing with Non-Instructional Duties was the only one within this area designated as being important to teachers in their negotiations efforts. Sixty-six per cent of the respondents indicated that this item would be of either major or considerable importance. The

TABLE X

RANK ORDER OF THE SUBORDINATE ITEMS WITHIN THE AREA
OF EVALUATION, TRAINING, AND ASSIGNMENT

Rank	Items	Percentage Indicating Considerable or Major Importance
1	Teacher Evaluation	40.0
2	Determination of Professional Training	32.0
3	In-Service Education	20.0
4	Teacher Assignment	20.0
5	Hiring Practices	12.0
6	Student-Teaching Program	8.0
7	New-Teacher Orientation	4.0
8	Pre-Service Education	0.0

item ranked next in importance is that of Curriculum Planning. Only 16 per cent of the respondents designated this item as major or considerable importance.

According to the findings of this study, this area will generally be of least importance to teachers. With the exception of the item ranked first in importance, all others have been assigned a relatively unimportant future as they relate to teacher negotiation effort. Table XI shows the relative importance of each item.

TABLE XI
RANK ORDER OF THE SUBORDINATE ITEMS WITHIN THE
AREA OF INSTRUCTION

Rank	Items	Percentage Indicating Considerable or Major Importance
1	Non-Instructional Duties	64.0
2	Curriculum Planning	16.0
3	School-Plant Planning	12.0
4	Professional Libraries	12.0
5	Teaching Procedures	8.0
6	Testing and Evaluation	8.0
7	Educational Goals	8.0
8	Newer Educational Media	4.0
9	Educational Experiments	0.0

Most important subordinate items. Because professional negotiations is a process which is very new in the State of Washington, it is difficult to know which direction it will take. The questionnaire, a carefully selected sample of opinion from school superintendents, provides data that may give insight into the trends and movements that will take place in the future.

Of the thirty-five individual subordinate items included in the questionnaire, several stand out as most important to teachers in their negotiation efforts.

Table XII indicates those subordinate items which, judging by the results of this study, are among the most prominent.

TABLE XII
RANK ORDER OF THE ELEVEN MOST PROMINENT
SUBORDINATE ITEMS

Rank	Items	Percentage Indicating Considerable or Major Importance
1	Improvement of Salary	96.0
2	Personnel Policies	64.0
3	Grievance Procedures	64.0
4	Preparation Periods	64.0
5	Non-Instructional Duties	64.0
6	Length of Teaching Contract	60.0
7	Teacher-Pupil Ratios	56.0
8	Specific Class Loads	56.0
9	Extra-curricular Activities	56.0
10	Professional Rights and Responsibility Committee Handling of Local Problems	52.0
11.	Cooperative Insurance	52.0

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Professional negotiations has been made possible through the passage of Chapter 143 of the 1965 Public Laws of the State of Washington. This law clearly recognizes the right of teachers to negotiate matters of mutual concern between themselves and local school boards. The language of the Washington professional negotiations law is imprecise. It allows teachers to negotiate almost any matter which is subject to policy decision by the school board.

The purpose of this study has been to determine which areas may elicit greatest concern, interest, and participation on the part of teachers due to the passage of the professional negotiations law.

Through the use of a questionnaire, evidence was sought which would support or refute the hypothesis that there was agreement among superintendents as to areas or problems of mutual concern, interest, and participation as a result of the professional negotiations law. Because of the unique position of superintendents, they were asked to judge areas which they felt would be of greatest concern to teachers in their negotiation efforts.

I. SUMMARY

It was the opinion of those included in this study that the area of Teacher Welfare will be of major interest to teachers in negotiating with school boards. Fifty-seven per cent of all respondents indicated this area to be of either considerable or major importance in teacher negotiation effort.

Within the broad area of Teacher Welfare, Item 1, Salary Improvement, will be of primary importance in negotiation efforts as indicated by 96 per cent of the respondents.

Superintendents have indicated that Professional Rights and Responsibilities activities are second in importance. Forty-four and a half per cent of all respondents indicated this broad area to be of either considerable or major importance in teacher negotiations.

The area third in importance as ranked by superintendents is that of Conditions of Work with Evaluation, Training, and Assignment being ranked fourth. Of the respondents, 26 and 17 per cent, respectively, indicated these areas to be of either considerable or major importance to teachers.

Approximately 15 per cent of the sample indicated that the area of Instruction would be of either considerable or major importance to teachers. This area, from among the

five included in the study, is perhaps the one most closely related to the actual substance of the educative process. Instructional matters determine what the educational program will be.

II. CONCLUSIONS

From the results of this study it may be concluded that a direction or trend in teacher negotiation effort does exist as perceived by school superintendents. That direction is toward Teacher Welfare and Professional Rights and Responsibilities. The trend is not in the direction of instructional matters. The areas of Conditions of Work and Evaluation, Training, and Assignment can be expected, as judged by the sample, to assume a role of minor importance in negotiation effort by teachers. On the basis of the evidence shown by this study, the hypothesis of the study can be supported.

III. RECOMMENDATIONS

It is the contention of this study that attention needs to be paid by various educational leaders to long-range goals in negotiating efforts with school boards.

Professional negotiations is a professional concept which implies a professional responsibility. The law asks much more than it gives. It requires that educators bring

to bear their professional training, experience, and judgment in all matters of mutual concern between themselves and school boards.

It is recommended that efforts are undertaken to broaden the base upon which negotiations take place. All matters of mutual concern are negotiable and teachers must assume the responsibility for becoming involved in all matters. To assume a narrowness of activity implies a narrowness of purpose.

In view of the fact that this study represents what superintendents think will happen, further study needs to be undertaken which will indicate those matters which have been negotiated.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Abramson, Paul (ed). "Negotiations With Teachers," School Management, 5:81-87, May, 1965.
2. _____ . "The American Federation of Teachers: What it Wants, How it Bargains, Where it's Headed," School Management, 8:56-62, February, 1964.
3. Ashley, Leonard R. "The Shape of Things to Come," National Elementary Principal, 44:40-46, May, 1965.
4. Becker, Henry A. "The Role of School Administrators in Professional Negotiations," The American School Board Journal, 150:9-10, June, 1965.
5. Blanke, Virgil E. "Teachers in Search of Power," The American School Board Journal, 151:7-9, November, 1965.
6. Brain, George. "Professional Negotiations: Responsible Education," Washington Education, 77:5-10, October, 1965.
7. Brown, G. W. "Teacher Power Techniques," American School Board Journal, 152:11-13, February, 1966.
8. Carr, William G. "E. P. C. Says, Keep Your Independence," Phi Delta Kappan, 46:17-18, September, 1964.
9. Chandler, Joe A. "A Way to Work Effectively in the Public Interest," The Whys, Whats, and Hows of Professional Negotiation. Seattle: Washington Education Association, 1964.
10. Christian Science Monitor, March 19, 1966.
11. Corwin, Ronald G. "Militant Professionalism, Initiative and Compliance in Public Education," Sociology of Education, 38:310-331, Summer, 1965.
12. Daly, Ronald O. "Professional Negotiations," National Education Association Journal, 54:30-31, May, 1965.
13. Department of Classroom Teachers of the National Education Association. Classroom Teachers Speak on the Responsibility of the Local Association for the Improvement of Instructional Services. Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, 1965.

14. Donovan, B. E., et al. "Collective Bargaining versus Professional Negotiation," School Management, 9:68-75, November, 1965.
15. Elam, Stanley M. (ed). "Collective Bargaining or Professional Negotiations and Sanctions," Phi Delta Kappan, 44:1-9, October, 1964.
16. "Formal Group Action; Teacher Opinion Poll," National Education Association Journal, 54:23-24, September, 1965.
17. Garber, L. O. "These Ten Legal Principles Control Collective Bargaining," Nations Schools, 76:67-68, September, 1965.
18. Hannan, Cecil J. "A Strong Voice for an Independent Profession," The Whys, Whats, and Hows of Professional Negotiation, Seattle: Washington Education Association, 1964.
19. Lieberman, Myron. "Teachers Strikes: Acceptable Strategy?" Phi Delta Kappan, 46:237-40, January, 1965.
20. Moskow, Michael H. "Recent Legislation Affecting Collective Negotiations for Teachers," Phi Delta Kappan, 47:136-41, November, 1965.
21. _____. "Teacher-Board Relations and the Public Interest." Paper read at the Annual Summer Conference of the Pennsylvania School Boards Association, Indiana, Pennsylvania, July 17, 1965.
22. _____. "Teacher Organizations: An Analysis of the Issues," Teachers College Record, 66: No. 5-453-463, February, 1965.
23. National Education Association. Professional Practices Regulations. Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, 1965.
24. NEA Reporter, November 19, 1965.
25. Nolte, Chester M. "Teacher Militancy May Be Counter-pressure," The American School Board Journal, 151:7-8, October, 1965.
26. _____. "Teachers Face Boards of Education Across the Bargaining Table Legally," The American School Board Journal, 150:10-12, June, 1965.

27. Office of Professional Development and Welfare. Guidelines for Professional Negotiation. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1965.
28. Office of Professional Development and Welfare. Professional Negotiations: Selected Statements of School Board, Administration, Teacher Relationships. Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, 1964.
29. Research Division. Professional Negotiation with School Boards. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1965.
30. Rice, Arthur H. "Board Asks Superintendents: For Us or Against Us?" Nations Schools, 76:16, July, 1965.
31. Roles, Responsibilities, Relationships of the School Board, Superintendent, and Staff. The American Association of School Administrators, Washington, D. C.; 1963.
32. Schooling, H. W. "Teacher-Administrative Relationships," National Education Association Journal, 54:32-34, February, 1965.
33. STA News, October, 1965.
34. Steffenson, James P. Teachers Negotiate with their School Boards. U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Washington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1964.
35. Stumpf, W. A. "New World of Educational Administration; Teacher Militancy," American School Board Journal, 152:10, February, 1966.
36. Van de Water, John R. Union-Management Relations in Public and Private Education. Los Angeles: Graduate School of Business Administration, University of California at Los Angeles, 1965.
37. Washington Education Association. Guidelines for Professional Negotiation. Seattle: Washington Education Association, 1965.
38. Wildman, W. A., and C. R. Perry. "Group Conflict and School Organization," Phi Delta Kappan, 47:136-41, January, 1966.

APPENDIX A

AN APPRAISAL OF PROFESSIONAL NEGOTIATIONS

by SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS

This rating scale is provided for you to indicate, on the basis of your experience, those areas within which you feel teachers will want to negotiate with the school board.

DIRECTIONS: Check each item as you see it in importance. The rating scale is designed to read as follows:

- 1 little or no negotiation effort by teachers
- 2 mild negotiation effort by teachers.
- 3 moderate negotiation effort by teachers
- 4 considerable negotiation effort by teachers
- 5 major negotiation effort by teachers

A. <u>INSTRUCTION</u>	1	2	3	4	5
	little or no	mild	moderate	considerable	major
1. Curriculum planning	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Teaching procedures	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Non-instructional duties	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Newer educational media	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Educational experiments	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. School-plant planning	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. Professional libraries	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. Testing and evaluation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. Educational goals	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
B. <u>CONDITIONS OF WORK</u>					
1. Teacher-pupil ratios	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Preparation periods	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Specific class loads	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Extra-curricular activities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	1	2	3	4	5
	little or no	mild	moderate	considerable	major
B. <u>CONDITIONS OF WORK</u> (continued)					
5. Secretarial and clerical help	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
C. <u>EVALUATION, TRAINING AND ASSIGNMENT</u>					
1. Teacher evaluation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. In-service education	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Teacher assignment	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Student-teaching program	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Hiring practices	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. New-teacher orientation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. Determination of professional training	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. Preservice education	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
D. <u>PROFESSIONAL RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES</u>					
1. Tenure or continuing-contract policies	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Personnel policies	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Grievance procedures	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Teacher transfer	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Professional Rights and Responsibility committee handling of local problems	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Implementation of Code of Ethics	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. The Role of Administration	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
E. <u>TEACHER WELFARE</u>					
1. Cooperative insurance	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Extended contracts	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Sabbatical and leaves of absence	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Improvement of salary	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Teacher-liability insurance	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Length of teaching contract	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Do you wish a tabulation of the results of this study? _____yes _____no

Please return this questionnaire to:

Carl Alan Blumer

402 East 7th

Ellensburg, Washington

Thank You For Your Cooperation!

APPENDIX B

APPENDIX B

April 8, 1966

The implications of the Professional Negotiations Law of 1965 are enormous, but the understanding of the law is limited. In an attempt to identify those areas which may become matters for negotiation between teachers and local school boards in developing school policies, a study is being conducted at Central Washington State College.

Information, by means of a questionnaire, is being sought from a group of administrators, selected at random, from first-class school districts throughout the state of Washington. You are one of the persons selected and your cooperation in completing the form would be greatly appreciated.

This study is being conducted as a part of the requirements for a graduate degree under the direction of Mr. F. E. Price, Dr. A. H. Howard, and Dr. R. F. Ruebel.

In no way will your name, or the name of your school district be mentioned in connection with reporting the results of this study.

A pre-addressed and stamped envelope is enclosed for your ease in returning the completed questionnaire.

Please return the questionnaire at your earliest convenience. Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Carl Alan Blumer
Central Washington
State College